

I have been thinking about working on a technical thesis for the back bone of ending life. It revolves around consciousness.

I think memes work and people don't necessarily need to understand deep axioms, but it is important. I have seen some people deface arguments on face value without delving any further. Some people need to be tutored apparently that feelings, badness, experience and consciousness are significant in and of themselves (or the source for all significance or anything related to a 'thing' that can be called significant*) and not who is experiencing them that is important.

*Does language fail or do we simply have to think harder and be honest with ourselves?

All I have to do is say it and should (automated by badness) is now a reality.

Consciousness is the only premise that can be proclaimed.
The observer cannot dissect his / her observing, so they shouldn't assume they are the only observer.

If you want to proclaim rocks (non-feeling objects) or abstract concepts have value in and of themselves, it can no longer be sampled or tested.

There are no brains, nerves and neurons (sampling / modeling devices) in anything else in the known universe besides life on Earth.

Definitions:

A feeling is a feeling. No-thing is no-thing.

Illusion isn't the same as feeling although we would not be aware of illusions without feeling. An illusion is an illusion regardless of whether you are aware of it. 'note at bottom

This wording may sound strange but it is the most technically accurate I have come up with in regards to English language.

-

What you call it is irrelevant. A lie, a deception, no-thing, nothingness, your experience remains. If you deny that, I can eject you from the game.

Nothingness implies nothingness. Feeling is simply feeling. Non-feeling is both incomprehensible and illogical to deny, but feeling is -just- feeling.

Feeling is nothingness but it's also not non-feeling. It is something that cannot be described but doesn't need to be since you can taste it. Non-feeling is incomprehensible to experience. Non-feeling-nothingness is irrelevancy in and of 'itself'. Non-feeling is not synonymous with non-illusion because it is an adjective alone OR non-feeling does not necessarily imply non-illusion (inference-science

= objective apparentness / independent illusion of observer). Nothingness can at least be logically understood through deduction². ²further below

It's a lot of word games to say acknowledging consciousness is correct (good and or should be done) and to take it seriously.

The context of consciousness has you locked in. Once you are dead, there is not even the conception of a 'you'. This alone obligates one to be aware of life on Earth.

-

On lies:

There is no such thing as a falsity by itself. What is truth without a lie? If the apparent correctness is a lie and existence is an impossibility, there is no truth. A lie is no longer just a lie. [premise error]

A sampling device is a sense organ that interprets apparent reality through the manifestation of consciousness.

More theoretical (not entirely thought out yet):
Consciousness is a deception; a trick so good, it works.

More word games:
If consciousness is a lie then the lie 'matters'.

A trick that works is effectively the same as it's not (as if it were not a trick).

-

We all have the same goal and that is to avoid pain and be comfortable in an ultimate if not immediate reactionary sense. You will demonstrate that if you are conscious. Attempting to prove otherwise would only prove desire to be right which invalidates authenticity = to the above statements. Pain for the sake of pain does not happen. Ever.

Pride in pain is the highest level of stillness. However, if you truly chase pain, you would do it regardless of my words.

Pain for the sake of pain is an oxymoronic statement because we are designed to do things out of desire (which implies fulfillment / relief**). It is much more painful to suffer because you do not want to.

****Hell thought experiment:**

There are only so many ways to torture someone or yourself, so many ways to feel pain and increase it. The duration of the punishment is then required for the hell thought experiment. If there is no notion of accomplishment (pride or other feeling of reward or relief), there is no desire to push or pull.

The notion of accomplishment (pride) is enough to push through pain perpetually. Desire is proportionate to perceived reward but this thought experiment works only because it would be a forced / fantasy circumstance.

To suffer for eternity in self-pity would not be equal to valuing sameness (sense of self, even if there is no self); non-reaction to pain.

Psychological and physical masochism:

The sensation of being saved from dying or coming close to death or inflicting pain deliberately and then releasing it can produce (I believe) a greater reward of relief through an endogenous (or endorphin) like response from the body: e.g. suffocating yourself and then taking a breath before it injures you.

In terms of emotions like unworthiness, worthlessness and guilt, inflicting pain as punishment would / could be desired to relieve the psychic turmoil.

These are just examples but I believe demonstrate pain is never done for the sake of it. But please don't be a sisyphus and get addicted to the rise and climb of things only to get back in the pit again (even if you're good at getting out of pits). What you want is perpetual motion like a photon.

Metaphor:

To be light is to move on always.

Point is the 'goods' are built out of the bads (are thus 'tainted') and not truly good; you need a hole dug to be able to fill it up.

The w-hole is badness incarnate.

There is no 'golden egg', so to speak, as innendham has said.

Asymmetry technicalities:

There is only badness and the relief from badness (that is a -conditional- good). Without life or unless in a pristine utopian state, there is simply zero.

To push through badness for Utopia is less effective than simply ending badness. Only possible way for this to be false is if you are -damn- fucking certain we are close to it. I have heard VR (virtual reality / 'brain in a beaker'), transhumanism and the 'singularity' used to claim this. Even if this were true, the wild-life on planet Earth remains and is still a failure by itself.

When someone says it is 'good' there are no Martians or Plutonians suffering or that preventing harm (birth or injury to life already here) is 'good', it simply means the recognition is a relief that no bad took place.

In regards to the 'net deficit':

This simply refers to the immediate circumstance of all lives' on Earth conscious welfare (harm / blood footprint); if you were to take the sum of all feeling and total it.

Since you cannot literally do this, you can only guess that it is -very- fucking bad based on the the asymmetry and above statements; let alone one pig or cat being tortured.

It is fundamentally flawed.

Once -all- consciousness is obliterated there is no bad. Badness in past events affects only those who get the 'report' (acknowledge) badness took place. The purpose is to acknowledge it and respond appropriately: never have it happen again where feasible.

Regards to DNA (evolution/ origins and function of life) | unintelligent design:

If pain did not motivate, consciousness would be useless to DNA for replication. We have evolved up until this point precisely because it has worked. Like Gary (inmendham) has said, 'the universe threw up on itself' by allowing us the faculties of critical thought (logic). It was a blind unintelligent force that brought us here and gamed us for no purpose - just a chemical (biological) process - the function of replication for the sake of replication. All have thus far gone non-deliberately (extinct), but we can go for ourselves (and all other sentient animals***) now out of dignity and respect for suffering - the greatest opportunity!

Replication for the sake of replication:

Organisms that have been around for millions of years and have not significantly changed, I believe demonstrate that we only change if reproduction can be improved or is threatened.

*** since animals cannot volunteer to opt out, I think the best way to look at is stopping someone who thinks they are accomplishing something by hitting themselves in the head. It may be against their understanding but it still prevents harm. It would be one thing if it was one or a few beings, but there is an entire biosphere without us still in a bloodbath of survival.

It should be ended peacefully and gracefully (red-button scenario) as possible.

Further clarifications (On Truth and Value):

Value is a unit representing a negative factor, relational to suffering.

Goals and accomplishments:

Since the default state of life is deprivation, and to suffer for the sake of it is impossible, our only goal ultimately is to flee. There are no free-lunches, so to speak, but pain is usually easy to encounter.

Since we cannot choose to define our base goals, the denotation of suffering as negative is true and non-arbitrary.

Accomplishments cannot be defined as failure because they are tied to logic and desire; they are the necessary conclusion of ending badness.

On a bare level, suffering is repulsive (negative) in nature; to avoid the mortal (frail) state of stillness (slow decay of our bodies) wherever feasible.

Escape of the w-hole:
We chase after our desires by going through more pain to acquire greater relief.

Raw nerves and neurons:
If all we were was nerve endings (glued to a neuronal core) that could not be sedated (inflamed), the inclination would be to twitch and or drop dead.

Clever tricks (dissected):
Pain (and deprivation) alone is not a good enough motivation so we are given the illusion of 'good' through removal of badness.

“Oracles”:

Problems arise when concepts like truth and value are given entity like descriptions ('things themselves').

Truth is correctness relational to objectivity; it is not just one or the other necessarily; for in the case of consciousness, it is still correct (fact) to say 'a feeling is a feeling'.

So then, truth is also what cannot be deduced or broken down any further.

-

There is apparent correctness. Error averted. Deny your own experience if you wish; don't impose on mine.

If you have no notion of badness and want to impose it aggressively or through negligence (seeing evil-doing nothing / being passive), I now have permission to forcibly eject you from the gameboard.

-

The word "thing" is an error code in language. In my experience it is a reference to the concept of a first cause or beginning to everything apparent.

Logically I can deduce that there is no true (fundamental) beginning (start / inception) of 'anything': a void remains a void because it is a void.

² Without premises (evidence / apparentness) or inference (guesswork based on observation - e.g. 'if that is true, this must be true'), the only logical tool left is deductive reasoning (deconstructionism) - taking assumptions apart.

I have written further on this stuff and can clarify further if you wish. Only real language issue is that the word "apparentness" is a bit hefty to use over and over but I think should be (it suits the function of representation) used for technical mastery.

-

Final notes:

Some people may use the concept of infinity to say 'it just is' and while no beginning and end works verbally, it only implies that there is an endless illusion within illusion - and cannot be observed.

This is different than using the word 'thing' however which is connected to the word 'existence'. It implies -only-, only, illusion.

-

¹ Apparentness (illusions) can be inferred through observance and deducted to be apparent even when not observed. This is most of science. ‡

Quantum mechanics to me simply means we have more to learn. I think it would be very bad to do away with all that is previously known about cause and effect (mechanics) and assume awareness makes reality so.

Just because you haven't figured it out doesn't mean you have an excuse to proclaim assumptions as truth.

If you never tasted consciousness you wouldn't understand it. If you can't understand something that doesn't make it untrue - you just have more to learn.

Opinions are not necessarily facts. If someone thinks it's okay to hurt someone, that does not make it okay. You need evidence. There is a truth that can be discovered.

The goal is to develop an opinion that is correct.

Using intuition alone leads to theories of statements that are not necessarily true (gods, flat Earth, aliens, ghosts, hearsay etc.), that is why deduction, inference and established facts (evidence) through observation and testing (experiments) -must- be used to testify (prove) objective apparentness.

‡ I am still working on the wording here. I wanted to imply non-realness opposed to the idea of 'things themselves'. "Apparentness" fails when being used independently of observation. "Illusion" is good but bizarre in a non-visual manner of usage.

Newer ideas to describe 'objects' as we know them: w-holes: objectivity: pieces and parts: sums of parts: gestalt.

Word coinage (hypothesis):

W-hole: an 'object' that is apparently complete (inference of science) but incomplete through logical deduction; absence of a first cause or 'thing itself'.

W-holesumness: fragmented.

The w-hole is greater (other) than the sum of its parts and equal to the collective (composition).†

An 'object' cannot exist to cause itself. Cause is no-thing without a prior effect. 'First' "anything" is oxymoronic, illogical and an error in language.

Synapse-syntax-lapse: an expression of expressionless (neuron 'misfire') when comprehending non-feeling-nothingness.

† Consciousness is consciousness. W-holes and consciousness are categorically disparate.