

I imagine this chronology will be a constant work in progress because I could keep revisiting it to add more detail. This draft will be used to give people an idea about generally when and how my main ideas came about. Key ideas that are referred to in other bits of work are highlighted in bold type.

## The Timeline

1971 – April – Born! Yay!! I mean waaaaahhhh!!!

1979 – I think I was around about 8 years old when I first challenged the idea of an Heaven you went to when you died. I couldn't put my around about 8 year old finger on it but something about that story didn't sound right even back then. I remember saying to the person who told me: "Zoinks!! How big is this place? It'd have to be *massive* to fit every person." "Only 144,000 people will get in." "Only 144,000?? Out of everybody whose ever lived? How many priests and nuns are there? It's not looking good for the rest of us."

1982 – When I started Religious Studies in secondary school, I thought the word atheist summed up my beliefs about God the most. Although that would be 98% atheist, 2% other because I didn't feel comfortable giving up the belief of God completely. You know, just in case.

1990 – There was no change in my view of God until I became unemployed and had lots of thinking time on my hands. I came to believe that it's much more likely that there really isn't an already all-knowing God observing/testing us. If God was there, he probably wasn't watching. If he was watching, he wouldn't have a bad opinion about what was going on because he created it all and knew exactly how it was going to unfold. I re-evaluated that 2% and realised it was there solely because of fear. It felt as if a gigantic weight had been lifted from my shoulders. I believed I was free to do whatever I wanted without fear of all my actions and thoughts being scrutinised. That thought alone made me feel a lot better about everything. This was the first of many apparent emotional upturns.

I had repetitive debates with people about God and their religion. A few people said as long as you believed in some form of God that was enough because they are basically referring to the same thing. I pointed out that different versions of God have different rules and different versions of Heaven. If you believed in one and it was the wrong one, it's possible that you're in the same position as an atheist.

I questioned why God was usually referred to as a male. Genders have purposes: females and males co-exist so they can couple and procreate. If a gender is to be assigned, surely female would be more descriptive because it is the female who usually gives birth and this is supposedly the thing that gave birth to the universe. The fact that God is usually referred to as male made me think it much more likely he was made up by a man.

1991 – July – I got dumped. Didn't like it. I didn't go out with this person for that long but I liked her a lot and looked forward to going out with her so pretty much built a concrete future for us. Even though I didn't really acknowledge it before I knew I had a good life compared to a lot of people around the world. I hadn't

been through any real hardships and didn't have anyone close to me die so this seemed like the worst feeling I had ever felt.

I have a stutter, which is far from severe now but back then I frequently had bad feelings because of it. I considered it a major problem that affected a lot of areas in my life and I couldn't seem to overcome it. I have two older brothers. One of them was reading a self-help book acclaimed above the others at the time. He suggested I read it.

This book focussed on the observation and manipulation of bio-feedback processes. It said that emotions could be used a servo-mechanism, i.e. if you're trying to achieve a goal but have bad feelings, you should take that as a sign to change direction so that you could get back on course. It explained this servo-mechanism process by describing how the guidance system of a missile works. A missile sets off with co-ordinates to a target but those co-ordinates might be inaccurate so in-flight adjustments have to be made.

The book was successful in terms of making me care less about my stutter because it made me care less about other things that I perceived as bigger problems. This enabled me to gain a more **rational** perspective on other historically rigid traits. So whereas I'd be inclined to worry about things that might happen in the future, I realised worrying about things is not going to change them. In fact it might make the thing you're worrying about worse because of self-fulfilling prophecies and other reasons.

It made me realise that I shouldn't feel bad about the past because the past doesn't exist. The event I'm remembering is now just part of my imagination so subject to distortion. Not only that, I may have misinterpreted the event originally. Either way the event has past. Consequences from the event might still exist but I should aim to make the best of those. We could have doubts or regrets about past actions but acting in a certain manner in the past could have negative consequences much in the same way as not acting in a certain manner. I reasoned making a conscious effort to make the most of the **now** should increase the chance of working towards a better future. The future will become the now, which will turn into the past and so on.

My previous perspective was to regret mistakes as opposed to see them as learning experiences. My renewed perspective of the past was a welcome change because I was evidently carrying around a large amount of baggage in terms of negative past events. Changing my perspective of my past took another enormous weight off my shoulders.

I used this more rational stance to feel better about future events. As I recall at the time because I was unemployed, my performance at interviews were the source of many a worrying thought. With the intention of crossing those particular bridges when I came to them, I found I was easily able to defer worry until later and by the time the event occurred, most worries had evaporated. I came to view mistakes as learning experiences and started to view potentially difficult or challenging things on the horizon as opportunities to learn. This gave me more energy to focus on the now and this produced another emotional upturn.

The book definitely helped me come to terms with the fact that my happiness during the now was more under my control than I previously believed. Even if

my happiness was triggered by something external, the sensations themselves were coming from within. The decision to feel those sensations was also coming from within. The book made this clear by explaining that four people perceiving the same event could potentially feel four different ways. If all four people are feeling a variety of good and bad, it is clear that they are making subconscious choices to feel that way based on their personalities, i.e. their choices were the most appropriate responses to have based on their past experiences. If that wasn't the case, they would all be forced to respond to the event in the same way. That example helped me to start to realise that happiness has always come from within so I was no longer going to let external things dictate my happiness in the same way as they used to.

This had a big impact when I thought about my ex-girlfriend. At the time, I didn't overly concern myself with what the gain was of telling myself to feel bad about her, I just wanted to stop doing it.

I started writing my first book, which I titled 'The Bable'. This book was first and foremost a story but contained ideals I hoped I would one day live my life by.

December – I made notes based on the book I had read, which equated to approximately twenty lines of general **counter concepts**. Thinking about these ideas caused my bad emotions to continue reducing. A general counter concept that seemed to help every time I noticed myself wallowing in self-pity or worrying about something was the fact that I'm in a much better position than a huge amount of people in the world and they could be much more appreciative about their situation. Instead of focussing on what I wanted, I could instead focus on what I did have and be appreciative.

I gave myself the task of changing how I responded to things on the television. I figured I shouldn't let the TV have that much control over my emotions since most of the things on it are fictional. I didn't know the real reason for bad emotions but I was fairly certain that they shouldn't be triggered because Nick Cotton was up to his old tricks again on Eastenders. Suffice to say I felt justified trying to condition not feeling bad at fictional things. That worked to a certain extent but for some reason it seemed harder to not feel bad about some things.

I felt better about a lot of historically negative things in my past. I started to question why bad emotions were there in the first place. I acknowledged that when I felt bad I was subconsciously telling myself to feel bad but why would I do that? Why would I make a bad situation even worse by subconsciously making myself feel crappy on top of what was already going on? I asked people for reasons why they believed bad emotions were there and started to hear the same things that no longer seemed to ring as true.

What are now old favourites emerged like: *you need bad to know/appreciate good and bad emotions keep people from doing bad things*. The latter is obviously untrue because crimes are being committed by people who feel bad. I knew this was untrue for me because since my good feelings started to mushroom, I was often faced with the choice of doing something that'll probably make me feel good or doing something else that'll possibly make someone else feel bad. Out of habit, want of revenge or whatever, the thought of doing something bad to another person would come to mind but definitely more times than not, I focussed on trying to generate good feelings for myself instead of possibly providing bad ones to other people.

My good feelings seemed to develop further better because my bad emotions were not the factors they used to be. They no longer lurked in the background. They were getting less significant and since I had spoken to quite a few intellectual people about their continuation to feel bad, who gave answers that I now knew were not true, I was fairly certain that I wasn't doing anything that was going to be emotionally or psychologically detrimental.

Seemingly nobody could provide an unobjectionable answer to the question 'Why do we feel bad?' and I was satisfied not knowing the real reason. They didn't know so maybe it was one of those unanswerable things so I stopped looking. My search resumed when a friend asked if I could stop her bad feelings.

I again spoke to a range of different people in different fields about the potential purpose of bad emotions and one of the best explanations for it was the fact that it could be used as that emotional servo-mechanism referred to in the book I read. I questioned the extremity of some emotions so knew that wasn't the best answer so the quest for truth continued. One evening my aunt asked me to babysit her 2 year old daughter. Whilst I was babysitting, my cousin wanted to play with a certain toy. When I didn't give the toy to her, she started to cry. In that instant it all became clear to me. 1. I was being temporarily mean and 2. she wanted something and in the past, feeling bad and then expressing that bad feeling usually resulted in positive action. That was the first time I noticed what I came to call the '**Bad Function**' in a more practical context. I would say I noticed it in its natural state but in that situation, the toddler wasn't crying because she was in *need* of something – she just *wanted* something.

The Bad Function is a natural process. A process that babies need because when they're hungry, hot/cold or in need of comfort, they're unable to make that explicit by saying something like: "I'm hungry, may I have some food please?" The only form of direct expression they have is the ability to communicate the sensation that hunger provides. Adults slightly amend the process, i.e. teach it's unacceptable to have tantrums but we don't encourage stopping the behaviour at the source. We're told to not have tantrums but not told how to stop the process that leads to the tantrum. Thinking about this made me formulate the '**Baby Theory**': adults feel bad only because they are continuing to run the same process that babies run because a baby has identified a problem internally or in the environment.

When this process was first used it successfully ensured the babies' needs were met. The baby started to use the same process to also get their desires met because of the success rate. A baby doesn't really have much to do except notice how it feels, what it does and the apparent changes this has to its environment. People object to this theory by saying that a crying baby doesn't always get their needs met. That's true because they may not get their needs met every time but they get them met enough to notice a connection.

I tried to tell the friends I spoke to the most and a few family members but nobody else seemed to see this connection. They still clung to their previous views in face of the 'evidence' I just discovered. A few people I spoke to said one of the reasons for continued disbelief was the fact that if it were true, someone else would've discovered it a long time ago. They thought bad emotions existed for another reason and because of that we seemed to be in different realities. I questioned how this was possible.

This made me realise that **belief was reality**. We were creating our realities around us based on what we thought was there. We perceive **universal reality** or the objective truth and make an **individual reality** or subjective truth out of it.

We recreate reality based on observation and logic. We have differing methods of logic assimilation so there is a lot of scope over what constitutes as truth, therefore, a lot of scope between the types of realities we are creating. Since we do create reality, I reasoned the word 'imagination' should be split into two categories, abstract and actual. Abstract imagination is what people usually refer to as mere imagination. We think something is real because our **actual imagination** has already made it real.

This is what I was choosing to do with my actual imagination in the same way my friends were using theirs to make real their reasons for the existence for bad emotions. 'Concrete' might as well mean 'evidence suggests this'. I noticed since formulating this belief that I could create concrete realities and be convinced about something until I heard more information that made me see the actual truth so I had to shift and make this newer more sensible reality just as concrete as the previous idea. I saw that we could apparently make anything real if it made sense to us. Truth or reality was only what made the most sense at the time. I learnt that once we've created a reality, we're biased towards it so will find it easier to think it more truthful than other things that other people think are true. No matter how absurdly far-fetched two realities could seem to each of the two different people believing them, each person could be 100% convinced of the concreteness of each of their own reality.

1992 – I realised that since belief was reality, we can only **symbolise** external objects and internal ideas. I started to consciously symbolise and used simple shapes to represent some of my ideas, primarily a triangle and a square. The three points of the triangle represented 'symbol', 'belief', 'emotion'. This was a very basic emotional/perceptual model of the **organism**. I used a square to show what I thought an adult's model should look like or what a more sensible view would entail. The extra point of the square represented 'control'.

My bad emotions reduced further. I noticed that incidents that usually caused bad emotions didn't come up as often or when they did, the feeling wasn't as intense or long-lasting. I conceived the **symbol of contention** idea. A symbol of contention is something you felt either good or bad over, instead of indifferent. I began to acknowledge this symbol of contention was just one symbol out of an almost infinite number of potential symbols in the now. I realised there were now less of them (and more symbols of neutrality or indifference) because I changed my perspective and apparently gained more control of my emotions and their triggers.

I imagined a simplification of person's normal emotional range could be something like -14 to +14. Every emotion a person can experience is somewhere in that range. My range seemed to be shifting since I believed the minus numbers were there for a specific reason. They seemed to shift before I saw the Bad Function when I started to gain a bit more control. After I saw it, they seemed to shift more. I still had 'bad' feelings because the Bad Function was so entrenched but it seemed as if my range had changed so instead of ending up at -2 if I was feeling +4 but then heard -6 news, I would end up at +3 because my

original +4 was now +9. I did question the value or difference everytime I appeared to have an emotional upturn but as you can appreciate, it was impossible to accurately determine or quantify. I just knew I generally felt better than I did and bad emotions did not affect me as much as they used to.

I conceived the idea of a perceptual '**block**', which is a 'now' that has been split into separate parts: a projection, a symbol, a concept, an emotion and an instruction.

The projection has symbols within it and those symbols range from important to unimportant. The symbol you chose to focus on – the symbol of contention – will trigger a concept. The concept is the idea you've associated to the symbol and it ranges from desirable or undesirable. This concept will trigger an emotion, which ranges from -14 to +14. Emotion triggers instruction and this compels you to act somewhere between the 'flee – relax – aggress' range. The instruction loops back to projection and so on. When you're in a good mood, your projection is generally brighter and this seems to make it easier to find more enjoyable symbols with more enjoyable concepts associated to them. The darker the projection, the more likely you are to find symbols less enjoyable, i.e. when you're in a bad mood, most things will tend to look worse than you otherwise might have perceived them to be.

Analysing the now to this extent made it easier to recognise the moment the Bad Function was triggered, the reason why and its consequent effect on my mood and actions.

I was with three friends one afternoon. I had spoken about some of my ideas to two of them but not the other. One of the two friends mockingly told me to tell the other about my Baby Theory. I did so in a vague way assuming he also wouldn't connect with the ideas. Several days later, this friend called me in an excitable state and said he had thought about it a lot and thought I might have been onto something. He and I further investigated the theory and why some people were able to believe it, make it concrete and others were not.

We reasoned that since we can make anything real, we must use some kind of 'yes' or 'no' switch when we're presented with potential truths. The 'yes' switch was called a '**symbol of reason**' (sor) and the 'no' switch a '**disparity in logic**'. Generally speaking as long as there aren't too many biases involved, if you heard a 'story' that had at least one symbol of reason, you could believe it and make it concrete. The opposite can be said for stories containing disparities in logic. If you were convinced about something, there was at least one 'inscrutable symbol of reason' (isor) within the story.

There were disparities in logic in most of the reasons most people gave for having bad emotions since you could have emotions about things seen on TV. My theory seemed to cover everything. You can have a bad emotion about a film or something that didn't take place because you're 'witnessing' an 'event' that you don't like and that's when the Bad Function is activated.

I started to see **consciousness as a 6<sup>th</sup> sense**. I thought if it wasn't, information from the other senses would be meaningless streams of data.

1993 – I started to read philosophy and psychology books to see if other people had discovered any of these ideas. From the books I read, I found some people

had thought similar things. I was surprised to learn that a lot of philosophers disagreed about a lot of things but the general consensus was that reality was subjectively created and protected. This confirmed the actual imagination idea. After I learnt that, I was confused over the fact that children aren't taught this in school as it impacts every area of our lives.

I came across a philosophical quote that tickled me and reminded me of my 'Why is God male?' question. One of the earliest Greek philosophers (supposedly circa 530–500bc) believed gods were created in their creator's image so if horses could paint and painted God that God would probably look like a horse. Another quote from around about the same time seemed to be more sensible than other versions of truth I heard. It was: "Senses are deceptive, the multitude of sensible things are illusion. The only true thing is 'the one' which is infinite and indivisible – no opposites." From that I understood 'bad' or 'conflict' cannot exist objectively. We think they can because not only are we able to create this illusion sometimes out of nothing, we're then able to make distinctions within it to whatever degree we want.

I was also interested in etymology (the study of the origin of words) and was not all that surprised to learn that this is also what the word 'universe' means: 'turned into one' or 'one thing, indivisible'.

There were ideas expressed, therefore made concrete by at least a few people that seem absurd now. For example, around 440bc, Empedocles, the influential philosopher who supposedly first discovered air was a separate substance also was the first to demonstrate centrifugal force; he suggested the survival of the fittest theory of evolution; he understood what eclipses were; he suggested that it takes light time to travel and that the Earth was spherical as opposed to being flat or cylindrical, which were the other common theories at the time. But, he also believed in mutants and had theories about half men half oxen beings.

Based on some of the things I read in psychology books about how we perceived and some of the observations I made, I realised that objects should look three dimensional even if they're on a screen or in a photograph. A real life object is three dimensional but it appears to be only because it possesses depth cues. The same object possesses the same depth cues on a screen or in a photo so it should appear the same. One of the most leading of these depth cues is supposition. This is when one object or part of an object overlaps another. If that occurs we assume the overlapping object or part is in front. Another important depth cue is size constancy. This is when things in the forefront of our visual field look bigger than things in the background. If we knew two objects were the same size but one was smaller than the other, we would assume the smaller one was further away than the other.

As well as these depth cues, other factors made objects appear solid such as light source and consequent shadows and shading. It's hard for the moon to appear anything other than flat when full as it appears to be just a round disc. When it's not full, the roundness is easier to detect because of the shading. Anyone of these cues or factors can make an object appear solid so the perception of more would be the equivalent of mounting evidence of solidness.

We give pictures or objects on screens a 'false flatness'. One way to overcome this false flatness is be aware of depth cues but also to recognise objects discontinue instead of blending into the air around them. Objects on any photos

are all the pictures contain. When looking at photos, it's easy to focus on the invisible air around the subjects instead of just the subjects in the photo themselves. This air should be just as invisible as the air between the picture and you. When looking at things on the television, focussing on that idea alone immediately seemed to make people or items look more solid. It also helped to regard screens as windows or the camera as an artificial eye, besides, that's precisely what cameras are.

After I conditioned these thoughts for about a week, what was previously deemed two dimensional automatically seemed three dimensional. Sometimes the three dimensionality wavered but images generally became more solid-looking.

I quickly realised the idea of something being two dimensional was impossible. An object having no height is the same as it having no width or length, which means it doesn't exist. I imagined the potential existence of something one dimensional and didn't know where to begin. In realistic terms, the idea of the two dimensional should be almost as abstract. In as much as optical illusions successfully fool most brains most of the time, pictures and screens should be constantly effective optical illusions.

The fact we can universally believe in something as surreal as a two dimensional shape, illustrates the extent of our ability to easily give abstract things concrete attributes. If two dimensional things did exist, they would be the 'windows' that we see objects through. So you could say that we see three dimensional objects through two dimensional 'windows'.

I studied the basics of logic and it quickly became apparent how logically unsound some beliefs were. There must be something other than logic involved in peoples' reality creation. After I asked myself what that missing ingredient might be, it was clear it was desire. If a version of reality was illogical but on some level desirable, people subconsciously used their actual imaginations to create that reality when the chances are, the reality is not as sensible as it could be.

I realised we shouldn't feel bad about anything. I thought I had just proved that bad emotions shouldn't exist, which means they should be stripped away from our experience, which in turn would mean that we should only be able to feel good. I reasoned that even if my ideas weren't objective, the fact that we can believe anything and make it true made me want to believe them all the more because of all the potential benefits. Another good reason to not feel bad is this feeling usually produces a state of mind where we can't deal with the event in the best way we could. So in feeling bad, instead of effectively working towards securing the best future, we can actually be making the situation even worse.

The more truthful my theories seemed to be, the more surprised I was that the Bad Function had not been discovered before, given bad emotions seemed such a large part of our experience. It appeared that we had made a series of misinterpretations based on this process whilst it also appeared we were surrounded by proof of its existence. We don't see the proof because belief was reality and we're seeing other things. I saw these misinterpretations were probably responsible for the creation of religions and other ideals that made it commonplace to take certain things for granted and ignore things that are potentially more sensible. A lot of these ideals often advocated committing so-



called justifiable bad acts, therefore causing or supporting the idea of a world where people will feel bad.

The fact that we had apparently misinterpreted this very important process prompted a number of changes in me and one of them caused me to start viewing the planet in a different way. I realised the planet was designed to make life as aesthetic and pleasurable or at least as comfortable as possible. Aesthetic place and growing good feelings are two of the things that could contribute to a **Paradise** realisation so that theory started to form. From that moment, I knew I was going to enjoy my experience no matter what. For example, I knew I was never going to be bored again. If I was, I'd know I was bored on Paradise.

I reasoned that we're all equal as we're all on Paradise. I previously thought other people might have more because of the importance placed on those things, i.e. money/physical things or social status. That idea might be difficult to see as it is but it might seem even more unbelievable when I say it also includes worst case scenarios such as someone with a severe mental or physical disability because there is a chance that person still has access to their good and bad drugs and that's what the 'value' of our experience can be boiled down to.

Another thing that pointed me towards seeing Earth as Paradise was the diversity and number of other animals. These animals exist and are naturally making the most of their existence. It seemed as if some of these animals' behaviour could be interpreted as enjoyment-orientated instead of functionality. Humans set themselves apart from other animals by referring to our so-called higher intelligence and capabilities but one of those capabilities has evidently included generating reasons for existing other than sensible enjoyment whilst existing.

I realised what belief being reality meant in a different way and worked out that **we don't believe things that are true – things are true because we believe them.**

The good feelings escalated to be honest at a confusing rate but I wondered if I could make them escalate further by thinking about them more often. I associated a lot of my ideas to colours and numbers so they would come to mind more often. I associated the bigger ones to ten colours and to the figures 0 – 9. This worked better than I thought it would because it meant I was surrounded by my ideas and that produced the next emotional upturn.

I started to think about ways of writing about the Bad Function so I could explain it to people more lucidly. I also resigned myself to the fact that people will most probably be biased to their version of reality no matter what. This caused me to stop debating my ideas with people as much. I realised I was probably at least a bit biased because I liked the ideas I was generating so tried to ensure I was as rational and open minded as possible. I was aware that believing something made it true whether it was universally true or not. My friend and I had a lot of discussions and continued to progress some of the theories together.

I told him about the three dimensional idea and he saw the reasoning behind it and immediately took the ideas onboard. So much so, he said it took him less than a day to change his perspective and automatically see all objects as three dimensional. It possibly took me longer because when I tried to condition myself, I was doing so questioning why nobody else had made the connection. That

reluctance to immediately accept something new simply because it was coming from me (and not a text book or anyone else) was already a trend but at least that would eventually give me more confidence that I believed something more sensible than the alternatives I had been exposed to. I knew I would investigate whatever to the nth degree before even thinking about telling someone else instead of having an idea based on whatever, making it concrete and then trying to 'force' subjective concreteness onto other people.

After I had read more philosophy books, I was still surprised that nobody else had noticed the Bad Function. I tried to find holes in it but seemed unable to. I still had 'bad' feelings but now everytime I did, they just proved my theory right because when it happened, I could easily identify the thing I wanted changed. I still didn't know if I was viewing emotions objectively but I did know I was onto something because of the emotional and perceptual changes I had undertaken.

I started to write notes on some of the core theories and soon found myself with lots of sheets of paper as I was generating different ideas frequently. I decided to write these ideas down in a book, cryptically called 'The book of ideas'. It had 140 A4 pages and the plan was to read at least one page of this book a day. I was now getting new ideas or expanding on old ones on a near daily basis. It seemed as if I was using those original counter concepts to break free from the perspective that assumed it was normal to feel good and bad about things. The ideas I was writing down in the book were positive counter concepts or **pro concepts** that guided me towards a way of mind based on the presupposition that feeling only good was the only natural and most sensible state.

I acknowledged a lot of people were somewhere in between the extremes of different schools of thought, i.e. empiricism and rationalism, religious or existentialist. Empiricism states you need to directly experience your truth to know it's true. Rationalism states you could reason truth. The existentialist perspective is one that maintains that existence is a random and insignificant experience. Everybody is a hedonist (pleasure seeker) but this is overlooked because of the different things different people constitute as pleasure. I now constituted pleasure as anything that made you feel good rather than bad.

I replaced the word 'hedonist' with '**pleasuredome**' as we seem to not only consciously seek pleasure but our subconscious processes are constantly geared towards trying to find ways to secure it. In the past, feeling bad used to be a way of doing that. So not only was this Paradise, we were pleasuredomes so if Earth was a neutral place, we had the power to turn it into a personal Paradise. This factor was the source of most peoples' bad feelings because what someone finds pleasurable to them sometimes has negative effects on other people.

I recognised the Bad Function so far had three discernible levels. The first and most natural was run by newborns and above and was triggered by an interruption in needs being met. The second was run by nearly newborns and above and was triggered by an interruption in desires being met. The third and new level was run by people who had been taught ideals and was triggered by an interruption in these values being met. Put in another way, generally speaking, the original use of the first level was to ensure existence. The original use of the second was to interact with a certain attraction or to secure comfort. The original use of the third was to change aspects of the world because you had just seen evidence that the world was not how you were told it should be.

I saw that everybody or most people apparently wanted their world to be as aesthetic as possible and to a certain extent this view of beauty was instilled within us. This is an apparent feature of the brain unless you strived to condition otherwise and subscribed to practices such as asceticism. This school of thought or way of mind seemed to place responsibility for suffering on the unsuccessful pursuit of pleasure so aimed to suppress these endeavours and abstain from worldly pleasures.

I realised people felt bad because they were unknowingly activating a Paradise protector to preserve that 'aesthetic' world. Even if this protector should continue to run in adults in the same way, since this view of Paradise is an unknown Paradise, the function is not going to be as effective as it should've been. If peoples' view of Paradise were based on more sensible things, the protector wouldn't need to work as hard as it does because those sensible things that constitute Paradise do not change. Instead of responding to a sensible Paradise, people have bad emotions often because they're responding to worlds that were programmed into them by their parents, teachers, peers, or anyone in authority. When individuals come across proof that the world isn't the way it's supposed to be (according to their programmers), the Bad Function will kick in. When I saw that notion clearer, the existence of racism made sense. Racist people were taught the world should be a certain way, i.e. a certain race shouldn't exist in the vicinity or at all so every time a racist person sees a member or members of the race they are prejudiced towards, they see evidence of an imperfect world. This will cause them to have negative feelings and they will choose to act on those feelings or not. To a racist, an aesthetic world is one where a certain race or races don't exist.

I gained a new perspective on time. I saw the days of the week, month and year as being arbitrary as opposed to something that was written in stone by someone who had a similar authority as the creator. Ironically enough I remember that time/date clearly, it was 5:03pm Thursday June 2<sup>nd</sup> 1994. I may still remember it because at the time I joked about it being the moment that time stopped.

The acceptance of time, days and dates had been programmed into us. That made me realise just how programmed we are as organisms. Babies are blank canvasses that run natural processes but those processes are overlooked or hidden by subsequent programming. People have difficulty seeing Earth as Paradise because a sensible Paradise has not been part of the programming. Instead, subjective worlds that fall far short have been. Our predecessors have intentionally and unintentionally 'manipulated' Paradise to the extent that it has become unrecognisable because we do not have a sensible understanding of it or our simple processes.

The word 'Earth' should be neutral but it seems to have adopted somewhat negative connotations because it's considered a place that naturally contains good and bad things. I knew we were all part of something a lot more special than we believed so I wished to unsubscribe from this 'Earth - good/bad - let's just cope as best as we can' thing. I told a friend about this, who said I was starting to sound mad. I made it clear that these are my delusions as much as he was entertaining his delusions that were more common. I did feel fairly isolated in my beliefs but I was fairly certain if someone asked me to I could lay out my arguments and show how they made more sense to me. This was instead

of believing things just because other people believed them without much question.

I started to make more of an effort to de-program myself from the things I historically believed then re-program myself with the things that seemed more sensible. Along with the twenty or so ideas I got from the first book, I had also written down quite a few philosophical quotes that seem to make more sense than the others. Most of these quotes revolved around the fact that belief was reality. A demonstration of the all-encompassing power involved in this process is illustrated by the quote: "The mind is its own place and in itself can make a Heaven out of Hell and a Hell out of Heaven." A lot of quotes revolved around lifting yourself out of a humdrum experience, such as: "We are [human beings] and our lot is to learn and to be hurled into inconceivable new worlds." and "The mind is not a vessel to be built but a fire to be lighted."

I became interested in neurophysiology, more specifically how **neurotransmitters** worked. I learnt that scientists had reportedly found a large number of neurotransmitters in the brain that are apparently unused. From my understanding, drugs worked because they either simulated or unlocked neurotransmitters. If this was true, I asked myself what we were supposed to be doing naturally to unlock these chemicals that are in our brain already? Why do we instead use alcohol and other drugs that could potentially kill us or cause other problems?

### **[the event]**

Something happened two days after this event and I came to refer to that day as 'Paradise Wednesday'. This has to be the most surreal thing to have happened to me. I remember thinking 'What...the...*fuck* is this?' three or four times throughout the course of the morning. I woke up feeling completely different but didn't put it down to anything at first other than the effects of a good dream that I didn't remember. The bed felt different but I put that down to just finding it really comfortable. Everything looked much brighter, things generally smelt nicer and tasted better etc. I didn't have to wonder about whether this emotional upturn was real or not because my normal seemed to have jumped by +10. Something had clicked and my ideas that previously seemed to be the things that dreams and Utopia's are made out of now had a magnificently concrete feel far beyond anything I would've imagined. It felt as if every sense had been significantly enriched, especially the visual field and my tactile sensations.

I wondered if I had unlocked an unused or 'phantom' neurotransmitter. I liked the idea but had no way of knowing. I did know my brain was obviously doing something different. I was apprehensive and assumed it was due to current mood so thought it wouldn't last long.

When I was more certain that my normal had changed more permanently, I couldn't wait to tell people that I had proof that life wasn't what we were led to believe it was. Existence was too [wonderful] to be summed up by the words we had created. I thought this when I realised the Bad Function was responsible for bad feelings/thoughts/actions in adults. I knew it when I discovered that not only is belief was reality but we create the reality we want to create. This was indescribably good. I was quickly brought back down to Earth when I remembered I had told people other things before. They didn't believe those things, why would they believe this? I had changed, not them. They wouldn't

believe this change in the same way they didn't believe the emotional upturns I had already tried to convey.

I tried to talk to friends and family again but as I thought they still didn't see it because they continued to be biased to their previous views. That made me realise just how important **acceptance** was because I had to accept the fact that people would not break free from their previous associations. This means they're not going to consider perceiving a subjective reality that's potentially more sensible. Out of habit, I had bad feelings but unlike my previous practices I didn't wallow in them knowing that was the not the best way to resolve the situation. The good thing about that situation was realising if I wasn't going to wallow in my bad feelings that my friends and family were not going to share in this unbelievably good but so far undisputed truth, I knew I was not going to wallow in bad feelings about anything.

April – my birthday started to make me think about general existence and the **luck** involved when sperms and eggs united. I didn't really focus on the luck involved in one's birth before but realised the odds are phenomenally low. If anything was different in my mum or dad's past there is a strong chance I would not have been born. If either one of them or both did something different before meeting, there's still a chance they would've met, found each other attractive, had sex, had a child, called that child Byron (if it was a boy) but it wouldn't be me. I'm a product of that specific sperm and egg union, which was a product of the precise timeline of everything that preceded me. If anything was different, there is a chance I would not have existed.

In as much as being born was a random event predetermined only by specific factors preceding the event, I realised that death was the same. It's a case of probability and nature. I thought back to bad events in history and realised if they didn't happen, I and everybody else affected by the altered timelines wouldn't have existed so from egocentric points of view they weren't bad events at all.

I understood clearer that 'bad' and 'good' didn't really exist. They're just opinions from an unknown Bad Function-orientated perspective. If I felt bad about something, I quickly acknowledged that this was simply because something was happening I didn't like. I could activate the Bad Function at anything I considered imperfect because that feeling and consequent behaviour used to lead to a restoration of perfection.

If this was true, it made more sense to feel good when you came across something you didn't like because this good feeling would act as compensation instead of a bad feeling that made the situation worse.

September – I finished 'The Bable' and tried to include as many philosophical ideas as possible. I had resigned myself to not trying to sway people by now so figured I would just write about my ideas. After I stopped generally talking to people about it, I realised that more people were willing to entertain different perspectives about life and my views were believed or shared by more people, at least to certain extents.

1996 – I started to re-write 'The Bable' and called it 'Platinum'. In the book, I equated finding out that belief was reality was 'gold' and developing that discovery and gaining more control of that reality was 'platinum'. I removed

some actual events and personal thoughts from the story and intended to get this one published.

1998 – Finished Platinum and tried to get it published but the few attempts I made were unsuccessful. I started to write another book that didn't have a philosophical base with the intention of getting that published first. I had a collection of short stories at various stages of completion. The first task was to try to merge these with a common strand.

I distinguished between Paradise and **HEAVEN**. I think a few distinctions can be made but the main one for me was Paradise was the place ('Earth' as us westerners called it) and HEAVEN was the dimension. So, if you were floating in space, you would no longer be on Paradise but you would still be in HEAVEN. I also considered the simple fact that the odds involved for us existing are almost infinitely low as proof that this is in fact HEAVEN whilst people continued to take Existence generally and then specifically their existence for granted.

I made a note of the more significant progressions I had made up until that point: 1) I thought it unlikely that we were being watched so we can do whatever we wanted. 2) We don't have to feel bad. 3) We shouldn't feel bad. 4) The removal of bad emotions would more than likely remove the motivation to commit bad acts towards other people. 5) The fact we do feel bad about things proves we're pleasuredomes and even if we weren't... 6) ...since belief is reality, if we believed we were pleasuredomes that would make us pleasuredomes. 7) We're lucky to exist. 8) We're on Paradise. 9) We're even luckier to exist as pleasuredomes on Paradise. 10) Paradise is in HEAVEN.

2000 – Work on the book was going slowly so I decided to give the story a philosophical theme after all and decided to name it 'The First Fatal Stab at Immortality'. Unlike 'The Bable' and 'Platinum', which spanned across seven years and focussed on two characters, this book focussed on one person and the time frame was just over a month.

2001 – July – I got my first tattoos (two cubes). Having these tattoos was the first time I publically 'displayed' my theories so to speak. Depending on how talkative I felt, if someone asked if they meant anything I'd either say: "Yeah, they symbolise an amalgam of my philosophical, psychological and theological beliefs." Or "No, I just liked the pattern." The sides of the cubes had specific colours, which represented six of the bigger ideas.

I thought about the lottery and people's general fascination or obsession with money because of the positive associations they had made to it. This was instead of objectively seeing the situation they were inconceivably borne into. That made me wonder what other people would've done with these discoveries. Well thinking back to some of my creative or eccentric endeavours such as associating ideas to colours made me wonder what other people would've done if they had found this. How dogmatic would they be? How would they try to show the world, if at all? Maybe some people had but they resigned themselves to the futility of sharing it with people who don't want to know but would feel the 'benefits'.

2005 – April – I finished the book, decided to change the lengthy name and replaced it initially with 'Immortality' and then with 'Psychoplasm', which is a word that meant actual imagination. This book was similar to the first as it contained a few of the same characters and a lot of the same ideas. Again, I

made a few attempts to find an agent who would take this work on but was unsuccessful.

Soon after completing this third book, I had a conversation with a friend/colleague about the purpose for writing. I said it wasn't to get published for financial gain, it was to share ideas. She suggested I write a website. I hadn't really thought about formalising all of my ideas in a comprehensive way before so focussed on what I thought the main ideas were and tried to describe those as lucidly as possible. I started to get ideas together whilst constantly refining them and adding details on a near daily basis.

I had a conversation with a friend and she distinguished between an atheist and an agnostic. I realised I was an agnostic as I believed that something created us, and I called that God or the Creator, I just didn't know what form she took.

July – Thinking about the agency made me change the name from 'God' to '**the Source**' as everything that had been created could be considered part of the creator. 'Source' seemed a more fitting distinction between everything created and the thing responsible for creation. If everything is part of the Source, objectively there is only one thing in existence and I believed that thing can have different names such as 'love', 'HEAVEN', 'existence', 'positivity' and 'perfection'. Objectively we are all part of that thing. If the Bad Function was a process that stopped as automatically as it started, **unconditional love/universal appreciation** would remain even if people didn't know about the process. If the Bad Function was more sensibly realised and then processed, the quality of this unconditional love and universal appreciation could increase.

2006 – March – I changed the name of 'The book of ideas' to the '9<sup>th</sup> Page'. The reason for this was imagining it could have been the 9<sup>th</sup> page of an instruction manual left by the Source as it contained a lot of ideas that at least seemed more sensible than the alternatives I had heard. The entire contents of the book could be boiled down to a few ideas that would fit on page 9. They wouldn't feature on the pages before because I acknowledged I was still probably falling far short of objectively describing important details of the organism, the place and the dimension. I had been adding to this book for eleven years so some of these A4 pages were full.

I realised because of the subjective nature of experience, some things could be viewed as opposites of the same thing at the same time, i.e. our realities were both real and fake. Some things could be viewed as good and bad. I changed my perspective on what I used to call good because it was a so-called bad thing that led to the Paradise theory because of the active nature of bad feelings instead of the passivity of good feelings. That brought on a change of perspective on one of my first beliefs, i.e. when I activated the Bad Function, I was just **pretending to feel bad**. This in turn made me realise that instead of things interchangeably being either one quality or another due to perspective, it was much more likely that objectively they were one thing all the time.

2008 – February – I stumbled across a site that gave you templates and allowed you to post 'web pages' for free. I figured I'd use that as a test for whether I wanted my own website or not. I became more industrious and worked more solidly to complete a rough draft. Since all my ideas were in the same place now, this web page would be the 9<sup>th</sup> Page boiled down to the constituent concepts.

After I had finished the website, it felt unusual having my ideas in such a public forum. It did almost feel as if they had become more concrete simply because I had published them to the entire web surfing world.

23/11/08: I was going out with someone but the relationship ended. This gave me the opportunity to investigate the idea that when we felt bad about things, we were merely pretending to feel bad. I didn't have much control over the feeling at base level, i.e. I found myself automatically pretending to feel bad because of the break-up but I would realise and then have more power to act in ways I felt unable to before. I also realised for the first time that a so-called 'bad' emotion felt good because I focussed on the intent of the chemical instead of its intended effect. These realisations were the most significant developments I had in a while. I had a few other developments so my writing efforts were directed to trying to find the best ways to incorporate these 'newer' ideas into the existing web page.

1/3/9: A friend asked me how to help her stop bad feelings although she had been trying for months. I thought about ways of explaining to her. I knew I could use my recent experiences to give her a more detailed analysis of what is actually happening chemically and motivationally when we have bad emotions. I conceived the 'magician/trick' analogy that laid the process bare. The analogy didn't seem to have immediate impact for her but it affected me massively in several major areas of my life and I decided to write an essay that showed the motivational and illusionary aspect of bad emotions.

The illusion that's created during the activation of the Bad Function is an extremely compelling one. We have been falling for this illusion our entire lives. I realised people found difficulty in seeing it because they had reached a stage of their life where the process had been set in stone. The longer you tolerate the illusion, the harder it would be to accurately see for the illusion it is. I knew the truthfulness compared to other theories about why bad emotions are there but despite that, before I conceived the above analogy, I continued to occasionally fall for the illusion at the motivation level. This development probably comes second to Paradise Wednesday in being responsible for producing the most dramatic emotional upturn. It seemed as if up until that point, I reserved belief on a few key things I had been telling myself for years.

My perspective changed on my universal equality idea and realised it really was universal so should also include other animals because they were probably using their good and bad drugs in the same way we were. We are all [**chemists**] trying to secure the best chemicals we can. All of these chemicals are under our ultimate control.

7/3/09: I had another perspective of a historical idea. That is one of the things we should've done whilst growing up is as quickly as possible strip away the illusion of 'good' and 'bad' so that we could cleanly experience the actual 'perfection' of Existence.

2/4/09: I saw that the usual concepts associated to the words 'Paradise' and 'HEAVEN' were vastly inadequate to describe the place and the dimension. Those are the closest words we've devised yet but those words come from a place infused with bad emotions without taking the real reason for bad emotions into account.



4/4/09: Another friend asked if I could write 10 steps to help her stopping bad feelings. I initially said in response, for that to be truly effective, you shouldn't try to *stop* bad feelings, you should try to gain a greater understanding of them and see what's really happening. I planned to write this anyway so began working on it.

19/4/09: I considered my existing web page and realised I'd prefer a website of my own as I could say exactly what I wanted to and go into much more detail and add pieces of work to it.

2/5/09: I stumbled across details of an animation technique and realised it was the closest model I had heard of how we create individual worlds based on a universal one. Writing about that was basis for another essay. I also used this essay to express quite a few of historical ideas that I had not really expressed before.

21/5/09: Finished the second essay, which outlines the reason why belief is reality and demonstrates how this is intertwined with my Paradise theory.

18/7/09: I got my second set of tattoos. This was prompted by the emotional development caused by ideas expressed in the first essay. I was going to wait until my 40<sup>th</sup> birthday to get marked but after my 38<sup>th</sup>, I couldn't help but notice the illusion of the importance of birthdays so I decided to not wait. The designs are two geometric shapes on each forearm close to the original tattoo. The meaning would be potentially hard to explain as they sum up 17 years of philosophical thought. To summarise, they remind me of twelve key things, four of which are examples that demonstrate Existence is objectively getting better every single moment in at least four distinctly different ways.

3/11/09: [www.thisisreallyheaven.com](http://www.thisisreallyheaven.com)