PROOF OF LOVE

Proof you are cared about and that Love can be real

by Vijay Kher

NOTICE

The purpose of this book is to make your life better. If you have any problems, this will solve them. If you see any problems in the world, this will fix them, and prevent them from ever coming up again.

The method used in this book is purely logical, and does not rely on arbitrary, story, or faith-based statements. Every concept and idea will be linked to a singular premise—that every action comes from either a fundamentally caring or uncaring motivation.

The information presented is not found in any common culture, and may affect you on a fundamental level. This is the same risk that anyone takes when opening themselves up to any outside influence. However, since this book is written in your interest, I am telling you now.

This book is not against any person, group, religion, government, monetary system, or power structure, legitimate or otherwise. It is my interest to help every individual achieve what it is they truly want. If you are interested in the divine, then it is my intention to help you get closer to God. If you are interested in becoming more powerful, then this book will help you become as strong as you possibly can be.

Although the arguments I present can be of great mental and possible physical benefit, they are not a substitute for professional medical help. If you have immediate health concerns, please see a licensed doctor.

While this book is written in a general sense, it solely describes how things work with me. I do not know for certain how things work with you, and as far as I know, everyone could be completely and absolutely different. However, if you believe that any two people are similar in any possible way, then everything applies.

This book is downloadable free of charge at https://www.proofoflove.com without any restriction or access barrier. If you find the information valuable and wish to pass it along, please do so as long as you do not modify the contents, charge a fee, or use it to make a profit. If a work is truly created in the interest of others, and it can be free, then it should be free. And if a work is restricted in some way when it doesn't have to be, then on some level, consciously or not, it is promoting a philosophy that is not acting in your interest.

THE ANSWER TO EVERYTHING

This book is about what we can know to be "absolutely" true. Not "maybe" or "seemingly" or "possibly" or "probably" or "sometimes" true, but what is actually true, all the time. This is necessary if you want to get the real, final answers to any problem we might encounter, in any possible situation. I am an absolutist, and it's likely that you are too.

Do you have an idea of what is "good"?

Or an idea of what is "bad"?

What is "right"?

Or "wrong"?

"Evil"?

If you hold any positions on any these things, then you are making an absolute statement. Even normal society in general expects people to know the difference between "right" and "wrong", and if you don't then it's possible that you'd be classified as insane.

We are all absolutists. If you think anything should be one way or another, or better one way or another, or valuable in any particular way, then you are making a judgement call on the fundamental nature of the universe. You may not consciously see yourself making such a claim, but the proof is in the action itself. Maybe you've never tried to analyze where your views came from. Perhaps it was an unconscious thing, or maybe even instinctual, but however you came to your understanding, it is still "you" who did it, however that is defined.

But it goes further than that. If we take a look at this situation we're in (where we think we know something for absolutely certain), then there are further implications we may not want to address. If we have the notion that something "is the right thing to do!", or "oh no, that's bad!", then the meaning underneath that is the belief that "in this world, this is the way it is!". It doesn't even matter what the view is that we're talking about, but just the fact that you have a view at all implies that you know, for certain, the absolute truth and what really matters in our world. You, in fact, by making any value-based statement, are claiming to know everything.

You cannot claim to know anything without claiming to know everything. This is because any claim has embedded in it a statement of what is valuable in this world, objectively. When holding any position, you are making a statement of what life is really about. A lot of followers of different religions don't have a problem with this, because their sacred books claim to reveal the nature of everything. But the claim to know everything is something most people shy away from, though if you look beneath their views, choices, and values, it is clear that they believe they do. Taking responsibility for your actions is the first step towards a more caring world.

Okay, let me stop right here. I know this book is called PROOF OF LOVE, and it is supposed to show you how love can be real and that you are truly cared about. We will get to that. Solving all the problems in the world? By the end of this book, we're going to get there. I wanted to first put forth the idea of how everyone at least unconsciously claims to know the truth, because that gives us all a basis to start from. Even people who claim "there is no such thing as objective truth" are making an absolute statement. As I said in the NOTICE, everyone could be different, and I may never be able to truly know anyone else's perspective, but if you take a step back, what I just said could be a valid, objective take on the nature of our reality.

Unlike other people who make absolutist statements all day yet deny the responsibility of acting like they know everything, I am claiming to have all the answers, and am detailing them in this book. I am not saying it is going to be easy, or simple, but it is going to work. And not only that, but you will be able to see how every other position is wrong. Do not expect this understanding to be a quick fix, or minor amending to what you think right now. I will be challenging every facet of your existence at its most primordial level. It is likely you will not be the person you were before reading this. But remember, the problems that currently exist in the world are there because of the way it already is.

All problems begin and end with how each individual person defines who they are—their self-identity. There is no requirement for their definition to make sense, or be in alignment with the truth at all. The purpose is merely to provide a feeling of security and knowledge in a chaotic world. Different people have vastly different value sets depending on what they are willing to accept as conclusive information on which to base their understanding of reality. For example, many children automatically take whatever their parents tell them as the truth (like with Santa Claus). A religious person will choose to believe in the revelatory story that makes sense to them, which, as far as I know, could be true, or possibly false. Scientists go to extreme lengths and use rigorous experimentation and mathematics to develop theories about the nature of the universe. But there is a difference between an idea being possibly true, and knowing for certain that it is absolutely true.

A belief is an idea that is held to be true that must be taken on faith. The amount of evidence necessary to make the jump in logic (going from something being possible to being the absolute truth) differs based on the individual. The child believing in Santa Claus just takes their parents' word for it. A religious believer finds the story and the meaning or philosophy behind a story to be a compelling explanation of reality and has faith that it is the truth. The scientist can get as close to a "theory of everything" as possible and apply that model of understanding to the world. But does any of them actually know, for certain, that their findings are in fact absolute?

A person can be lied to. A story could be false. And any intellectually-honest scientist will admit, even as far as they could possibly take their research, that a leap of faith is necessary to go from abstract modeling and theorizing, to viewing their findings as objective truth. Why are these people okay with jumping to conclusions when their reasoning doesn't warrant it? It's because their motivation in using these methods of understanding is not about realizing the truth, but in the feeling that they know, that they have a grasp of the situation. The feeling of security

of knowledge. Whether they are aware if it's possible or not to ascertain the truth through those methods, they think that they have achieved it.

And there is nothing wrong with that. But what it is not, is caring. Why is it not caring? Because the individual has to make a choice to betray the limits of their methods, to look past it, to just not worry about it, and gain the incentives they can from it. The individual is the one who makes this decision, consciously or not. Let's take a closer look, it won't be too complicated, and I'm just trying to make it simple here. Let's take the Santa Claus example, but it doesn't matter what the subject is, the methodology no matter the case is always the same.

So in the beginning, you've never heard of anyone named Santa Claus, who gives away presents and whatever else. Someone, perhaps a parent or a friend, then tells you that "there's this guy that knows if you've been good or bad this year, and will give you some presents based on that". Pretty much all of us know the story, I'm not trying to be patronizing here. Okay, so first you've never heard of it and then somebody tells you. Well, it could be true, according to them, if we were to trust whoever was telling us. What could also be true, according to the way that the information was presented to us, was that they were just making it up, and were trying to trick us, or lie to us, or manipulate us. Both of those possibilities in this situation could be true, for all that we know. At this point in time, it is the **individual**, who chooses what to believe. Somebody could believe that the Santa Claus story is true, or somebody could believe that they were just lying to us, but the **most** accurate representation of the situation is just to admit that we don't know which one is true, and that they are both possibilities (let's just leave out the "believing it makes it true" for right now).

A person who would believe it's true would be ignoring a reality where in fact, they were just being lied to. A person who believes they were being lied to would be ignoring a possible reality where there actually is a Santa Claus. Remember in this sample situation they do not know which is which, since they are starting from a neutral position. Why is this important? Because **we all live in this reality** they are ignoring based on their individually chosen belief. This person who believes, or disbelieves, instead of having an expanded *awareness* of both possibilities, is only relating to the world and **us** from a filtered point of view. From a point of view that only has to do with their own individual choices, which they made for their own reasons, all emerging from their primary, internal motivation. They do this not because they care about **us** in **reality** or anyone else, but for their own selfishly-reflexive reasons. It doesn't matter why, but the choice to believe, to make a leap in logic, to ignore reality, a person only does for themselves. It cannot be caring.

But like I said before, that is completely okay. There's no reason anyone has to be caring or have an interest in reality, and I am not faulting anyone dealing with life. And that is all caring is: interest in reality, but this honest interest has to start from the very basis of your being. We can't have any beliefs in Santa Clauses and claim to be caring. One could imagine a pro-Santa-Claus army and a Santa-Claus-is-a-lie army fighting it out where they both think they are doing the "right" thing. I imagine this fight is still occurring in the schoolyards every year. Again, this is not me saying any possibility is false, just that the belief in something when you do not know,

and cannot know, is an uncaring action against us all because it is dismissive of reality, which is where we all exist.

Well, you might ask, if a person doesn't know either way, then why do they choose to believe? Because there are incentives to believing it. It's completely reasonable, but not rational. If you believe in something like a Santa Claus then you feel like you have knowledge about our world. Starting from the neutral position I mentioned, believing in the story makes a person feel like that they have an understanding about what is going on. What's the other side of it? Some people are saying he's real, some are saying he's not, some people are possibly lying, some people are saying if you believe it then he's real…total chaos, with potential possibilities everywhere. How can anyone know anything? Having a firm position brings a sense of security. Sure there are reasons to believe your parents (or whoever is telling you) about Santa Claus (or whatever else), I mean they've been helping you before, they've told you a lot true things, right? They brought you up, they raised you, shouldn't that be enough evidence to just go with? Like I said, reasonable, but not rational. None of those things are linked to the current predicament, and one of the possibilities that individuals must contend with is that anyone could be making anything up at any time.

Like I said before, there are things to gain from jumping logic and choosing to believe, but to do so is a denying of the reality we live in, which is chaotic with seemingly infinite possibilities. The most important observation to make when considering this Santa Claus dilemma, is that the individual making the choice to believe, not believe, or simply be aware and conscious of the possibilities is that **the decision is made before the situation was presented**. The individual's primary motivation determined if they were willing to forgo reality and the truth, and be okay with making the illogical, purely self-interested jump to believe. The person already thought it was fine to interpret the world this way. This person had, and has, a fundamentally uncaring motivation.

The motivation determines it all. A person on this side of the world who has the willingness to believe, or want to believe, in Santa Claus, is no different psychologically than a person on the other side of the planet using the same thought process to believe a completely different story. The factors are the same. They get the details from outside, perhaps a person they have chosen to trust, or a book, or whatever, and they choose to believe in it because it appeals to them, it has incentives for believing to them, and not because they know that it is true, or representative of reality. The incentive is a feeling, a sense of security and understanding. And just because something feels true, does not mean it is true. Plenty of people at one time believed in Santa Claus. Later in life, plenty of people believe that they were wrong. Again, it doesn't matter what the story or idea is, if it is transmitted in this same way then a person who believes in it is doing it for uncaring reasons only.

I know you may have heard some of these ideas before, and I know I'm not writing in the most sophisticated way, but I'm trying to write in a way that people can read, and hopefully understand. I don't care if academics don't find this book to be structured enough, I'm not writing for some type of reward or status. I am writing with the hopes of helping you, if I can.

THERE IS NO PATH

There isn't any. None. A lot of people and disciplines have this idea of doing certain arbitrary things in a certain order will grant you peace. Like if you meditate you can reach enlightenment or gain some type of spiritual progression, or karma, if you do the right things.

Nope. Not true. Sure, if you practice "mindfulness" you may calm down but that doesn't change anything at your base, it doesn't change any of your motivations. The things you are doing right now emerge from your operational philosophy. If you meditate then you might be able to subtract the stress that has been accumulating, but later on it will just build up again. Thinking there is a progression to truth is like counting to infinity, you will never get there.

If you want change, it has to come from your deepest levels. A lot of people think that people can't change. I am not sure either way, but if it's possible it has to come from the absolute base of your being, before any external influence is considered. The branches of the tree emerge from the root, and starting from the outside will never solve anything.

Like I mentioned before, when considering the nature of this world, everything begins and ends with the creation of our self-identity—who we think we are as individuals. Pretty much everyone I have ever seen seems to use a scientific methodology to create this understanding, which can be a totally unconscious thing, before anything is even considered on a conscious level. So what do I mean by that? They use the scientific method. It doesn't matter if people believe in a certain religion, or are atheist, or whatever they consciously choose to say defines them, I'm talking about the base, and for virtually everyone that I've known they are primarily observing and reactive.

Okay that might not make sense yet but let me get into a little background. Let's say we want to analyze a pattern in order to figure out what's going on. And why wouldn't we? Coming from a neutral position, it seems like we are bombarded with information from the outside world. Light, sound, touch, smell, all that stuff. It is a stream of endless, unmitigated chaos, completely unordered and indiscernible—what in the world could be going on? We can get even more general with it before going deeper. Let's skip all that "sense" stuff for now.

Let's say we look at the horizon and we see the sun coming up. And then, let's say 24 hours later, we see the sun coming up again. And 24 hours later it happens again, and so on and on. We can theorize that "Hey, this seems to be happening over and over, it's already happened a bunch of times so I'll go ahead and guess that at the same time in the future, it's going to happen again". That's the scientific method. It's what's called inductive reasoning and by definition it absolutely cannot bring you to the truth, ever. If you want to look it up it is quite the "scandal" but I won't get into it here, and don't expect any scientist to forwardly talk to you about it when making sweeping generalizations on human nature and telling you how to act.

But it seems like it works right? The sun came up every time we checked so it seems like it'll happen again, what's wrong with that? Well, with this type of reasoning, the individual is limited to the information or data that is already presented to them. If the sun comes up at the same "time" 100 "days" in a row, then on day 101 it seems like it should happen again. But what if on day 101 it didn't happen. We're just talking here theoretically of course, just some made up example. But what if it didn't happen? The idea that the sun comes up at the same time every day would be proven wrong, because on day 101, it went away from their guess, analysis, or *expectation*.

So keeping with this same example, the new theory would be, "after 100 days of the sun rising, there will be a day where it didn't rise" or something like that. This statement of expectation is a "model". It is an idea through which we interpret reality based on the past data we have, analyzing it, and making a prediction for the future. But wait a second, wasn't the first theory wrong, where the sun was supposed to come up **every** day at a certain time? The *expectation* seemed to work perfectly until day 101 when it didn't come up at all. Man, we thought for so sure we knew what was going on, and then it didn't work the way we thought. The whole time before day 101, our idea of the sun coming up every day was false! On day 50, we thought we had it made, it worked so well without fail. Up to that point, our first theory never let us down, and we felt we knew exactly what was going on.

This is how science works. You take in the data (the sun coming up), analyze it (it seems to come up everyday), and make a model, or expectation (based on what we've seen, it seems like it'll come up every day in the future). However, whatever model or expectation one makes is limited to what they have already seen, and *new* information in the future would force scientists to reassess what they previous thought was accurate. So when considering the truth about this fake sun experiment, they were completely wrong the whole time thinking that the sun comes up every day. But only on day 101, when the sun didn't come up, did they realize it. Then what if on day 202, it came up twice? They would have to readjust their expectation again.

If you ask any honest scientist, this is why they can only talk about scientific findings in terms of models and theories, not truth. They can only make "best guesses" and at no time is it verifiable that their expectation is correct. Any scientist who conflates their findings with truth is **lying to you**. Remember, this book is about absolutes. What we can know for absolutely sure. The truth. When a scientist talks about people and the universe and reality in terms of absolutes, they are actually followers of a faith-based religion, where they must take a leap in logic and equate their models and expectations with infinite truth. Any scientist who is talking in absolute terms instead of saying things like "the data suggests" or "it seems like" is someone you cannot trust because they are not accepting the reality that their methods are not verifiable and are always subject to change. People's values are never relative, they are always absolute.

I want to be clear though that the scientific method does help us understand part of reality, but never the whole truth. It doesn't matter how far and intricate and complex the analysis is, the methodology will always fail. It is the ultimate expression of counting to infinity, it can never get there. The path is useless.

Okay so scientists use reasoning and create models through which they look at the world. "The sun's coming up tomorrow, oh good". This is a filter through which an individual views reality. They have this idea of what's going on and are placing it on top of the world. Can you start to see the problem here? The idea was false, and on day 101, the expectation was shown to be incorrect. The point that I'm trying to get at here is that a person who is using a model, or filter, or expectation in terms of interpreting the world is **never** actually connected to reality, they only see things through the filter of their illogical idea. On day 50 it seemed like everything was fine, the sun was coming up fine, and the person thought they had everything figured out. This is the sense of security in chaos, and the person was willing to forgo interest in the truth, interest in the reality of the situation in exchange for a feeling like they know. It doesn't matter that even if on day 101 the sun actually did come up. It doesn't matter if the sun kept coming up every day forever. The methodology that the person is using to interpret the world is **uncaring** in that their "feeling" of understanding is the only thing that matters. They are interacting with the world through their expectations, without interest in seeing or appreciating how it is in real time.

Let's do another example. Let's say you're in the checkout line in the store. If there are a few people in front of you, you can usually pay for the items you want to purchase within five minutes. All of the sudden the line doesn't seem to be moving. The person a few spots ahead of you is using a bunch of coupons and is taking extra long. Once that person is through, the person behind him wants to pay by check, so that takes more time than usual. And when it's the next person's turn the cash register breaks, and they have to call a technician to come fix it. When it's finally your turn, maybe even the power goes out. If anyone has been in a situation similar to this, it's easy to see how one can get frustrated for any number of reasons. I mean the store might even pride itself on having good customer service and maybe even guarantee it, and every other time you've been here you've gotten through the process pretty quick. People can get frustrated, people can get mad. But let's look at this situation similar to before. We have the model, or expectation, of getting in and out of the store pretty quick. The long line and mishaps deviate from what we're used to. One might even say they'll "never go there again". The emotional *reaction* of frustration comes from one's expectation being crushed. If a worker at the store told you when you walked in that it would take extra time to checkout than it normally would, then a lot of people wouldn't get as frustrated because they'd know what to expect. But when you *believe* one way and things turn out differently, emotions arise since reality doesn't match up with your expectation, or how you want things to be. If possible, imagine being in that checkout line getting frustrated because of all of the things that happened. It'd all be just messing up your day. Perhaps when you get to the cashier, you complain to them about the whole situation. Maybe you have negative feelings about the customers in front of you who were writing checks or using coupons. Maybe you'd be in a bad mood just simply standing there waiting.

This would all be because you are relating to the world in terms of the expectations, or filters, you have placed over it. The reality of the situation is that anything could happen at any time. Maybe even an earthquake or terrorist attack. The fact that you expected to be out of the store in five minutes would be your own falsely created idea, and not to be harsh in any way, but

your own fault. Remember I am here to help fix the problem, and I am not disparaging anyone for anything. I just want to provide a solution if you are looking for one.

The true thing I want to express, and the source of the issue, goes further than that. When you are frustrated and perhaps having negative feelings toward the other customers or employees who held you up, you are not interacting with the world as it is, but from the stance of how you want it to be. You are looking at your own model, and then comparing everyone and everything to it. You are not having a primary connection to anything real, and the model you created of "how the world should be" is the fundamental focus in your life. It's like a reflective idea, created by yourself, and only for the benefit of yourself. I like to use the term "selfishly-reflexive" when describing situations like this because they only really have to do with the individual themselves. Anyone, including myself, who is acting like this, such as with the frustrated person in the hypothetical "checkout" situation, would not be operating with a **caring** motivation. The world is being compared to your expectation, or being filtered by it, and you are actively not trying to align with reality but trying to align *it* to what you want it to be. And that is uncaring towards everyone involved and anyone else who could possibly be involved (like if you were in a bad mood and then took it out on whoever crossed your path, or got in your way later, etc.). You aren't respecting reality as it is, nor other people, because we as individuals are all part of reality. From the perspective of another person who was looking at the world more objectively and without expectation, the frustrated person to them would look like somebody who wasn't in control of themselves, but instead was acting rampantly, and solely in reaction to the circumstances going on.

And even further than that, even if you were right, and you got out of there in five minutes you *still* were not interacting with reality truly, you *still* were looking at the world and others only through the filter of expectations, and not seeing other individuals as they really are. In this "ideal" situation, you would be in a good mood and would continue going about your day. However, the respect for reality and the others in line, and the cashier, etc, would *still* not be present, it just happened to be that your expectation and needs were met, and your model/filter/expectation was *affirmed* and seen as correct. Even though in this "ideal" case everything worked out, and you may have had pleasant or nice interactions with the other people in line and the cashier, it still had nothing to do with caring or true interest in those other people in reality because you were still primarily a slave to the whims of external forces. The mode of operation you were enacting was still uncaring towards reality, and you were *still* operating in the mode of seeking to have your expectation fulfilled. Whether they were fulfilled or not, you would not be valuing people for who they are, but for what they can do for you. Even if everything worked out for you, you would still only be one power outage away from a negative emotional reaction.

In the "checkout line" scenario I was mainly talking about frustration and anger, but all emotions arise in the same fundamentally reactive way. If your favorite TV show got cancelled, maybe you may get upset or sad. You thought it was going to continue on, but all of the sudden it's not there like you expected. If you found a $20 bill on the street, it's possible you would get happy. That's because money (or anything valuable) is usually not just lying around, so you don't

expect it to be. If you are watching a horror movie and everything seems calm, if something were to jump out on-screen, you could possibly get startled or scared because the expectation of safety was set up, and the filmmakers broke it on purpose. One thing in common in these situations is that the individual does not appear to be in control of their own state of being. They are merely reacting to things that are happening to them. However, even before these things or stimuli happened to them, they *would* be in control of how to interpret reality. You won't get scared during the movie if you are aware that something could pop up at any time. You won't get sad if your show gets cancelled because even if it was promised, from our current perspective, the future seems uncertain. Don't count your chickens before they hatch, right? In this more accurate view of reality, people are also able to appreciate what they have, instead of looking towards what they don't. If it's your favorite show that got cancelled, at least you have had the "good" seasons and experiences which occurred in reality, and aren't focusing on concoctions of the mind, which may or may not come to pass. Meditation and mindfulness exercises might calm you down from negative feelings, but they do not get at the source of the problem.

The inductively-created filter/expectation-structure placed over reality by the individual for the purpose of feeling secure in their understanding of existence is exactly what several different cultures call the "ego". I'm not talking about the psychoanalytic term but the more commonly used spiritual one, though rarely defined. It is always referred to as an illusion, because it is not real. People who care more about feeling secure choose to take a leap of faith, a leap in logic to believe it is real, but like the scientific method it is based on, it can never be representative of the whole truth, by default. It can help us understand parts of reality, from certain finite or limited perspectives, sure, but never the whole thing. And like we started out, you can't say that you know anything, without the implication that you know everything.

Maybe none of what I've said so far seems too new, and you may have heard bits and parts in other places (like Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, etc.). Now we get to the real topic of the book.

Remember the "sun coming up every day" example where we were trying to figure out the pattern of the sun by observing what was going on and then creating a theory on how it behaves, only to have it collapse when contradictory data came up? This false and failing process of inductive reasoning is the same method most people use to define their self-identity—who they think they are as a person. And if you were to ask me, I would say that it primarily happens unconsciously. From the very conception of our being we are bombarded with information. It could be sensory data, like sight, taste, smell, touch, pain, etc. It could be social data, such as who you are around, what other people think of you, or your spot in society. It could even be moral data, such as what is the right thing to do, what is of value and what is not, or the consequences of different types of action. This information is all processed in an inductive, scientific way. By that I mean the individual observes reality and creates patterns and different behaviors. For example, if I feel a hunger pain, I eat and it goes away. If I put my hand on a hot stove, it hurts so I pull it away. Or even "if I act or look a certain way around others, they will like me, or find me to be valuable". What do all these behaviors, views, and methods of

interpreting information have in common? Just like the emotional responses we talked about earlier, they are all passive, observational, and reactive. The person at their base, is doing nothing at all but letting the world define who they are. It is up for question whether or not they even exist. In fact, there is no difference between a robot and a person with the capability of free will —the capability to act independently—who *chooses* to be purely reactive to the world around them. And free will is exactly what is at stake.

It's not hard to see why determinism is so widely popular among scientists, if you look around it seems like everyone is solely reacting to the situations they are placed in. They seem to be defined by their physical reactions to the environment and their body. No one seems to be making any independent choices at all. But again, they are wrong here. Next time you hear a scientist talk about consciousness and human nature, remember to listen for them talking with certainty, or in absolute terms. Remember that they have no right to do so. The ones that I recall sound like they've tricked themselves more than being actively deceitful. Let's take an example.

Let's say a scientist studying consciousness observes one thousand people to see how they react to a certain stimuli. Let's say they pinch them and it hurts, or they show a horror movie to startle them, it doesn't really matter what it is, they are just testing for reactivity. Low and behold, all one thousand (or million) have the same reaction in the experiment—the monster in the movie jumped out and they got scared or whatever. The scientist then says "look, this study conclusively proves that human nature and the human mind acts in a reactive way and humans have no choice in this situation, so I'm recommending horror movies be banned" or some other nonsense. Is that really what's going on? Is that really what the methodology shows? Is his passive, observational study really making a claim on the consciousness of a generalized group in nature, or is he *really* only testing a bunch of individuals, who have chosen their personal ways of interpreting the world freely, and they all just line up because their ways of thinking are similar? Which interpretation is more in alignment with reality? Calling it a random sample would also be wrong, because they are making the logical jump in saying everyone is the same while only testing particular individuals. What right does he have to make an absolute statement when he can only comment on the data? It doesn't even matter if every single person who ever existed interpreted external data in an uncaring, purely reactive, passive, and inductive way, it does not discount the idea that every individual has the choice to be more aware of the possibilities of reality, without relying on creating and believing in expectations to feel secure. Some studies claim that consciousness is a trick by showing that a person has chemically made a decision before they consciously think that they have, but that is also meaningless, their unconscious self is still "them". I know this is sounding complicated, I will try to simplify.

By the way, before I continue, on the first page of this book, I said that if you believe that any two people are similar, then all the ideas in this book are applicable to you. This is like the scientist above who is making claims about "human nature" or groups of people. Does he really know? I don't know if anyone is similar to me at all, I can only see my perspective. But if you are somebody who believes in human nature, or that people are similar, you have already made

the jump in thinking that someone outside your individual experience is similar to you, just like the scientist did. This book is about trying to remedy the problems created after doing so.

Let's look at the different angles of this. A robot does not have free will and everything it does is entirely determined by its programming. It is solely a physical reaction in the universe and does not have an independent mind. If all beings were like this, then determinism is true, as well as physicalism and fate. Basically it means you have no choice, and don't independently exist.

Then there is the possibility of the "egoic" person, who defers to everything outside of himself to tell him who he is. The only "freely willed" choice this person ever makes is to not do any independent action at all, and solely react to the information presented to him (sensory, social, etc.). From an outside, observational perspective, this person would look exactly like a robot because all they would ever seemingly do is react to their internal and external environment. I'd say most scientists I've seen would jump to the conclusion that based on their observations, human consciousness is an illusion. They are extrapolating to an infinite truth about our existence based on the choices of select individuals. That is an intellectually dishonest, disrespectful, reckless, and fundamentally uncaring view even if they sound intelligent. Again, what is more likely, that they can take finite observations and jump to infinity, or simply take their observations to the limit of what they can tell from them? Remember, the store customer getting held up in checkout line doesn't get frustrated if they know that anything can happen at any time (the infinite awareness). And the person operating on an expectation-structure (or scientific conclusion) is uncaring towards everyone regardless of if they get held up in line and frustrated, or contentedly cruise straight through.

And here we must talk about a 3rd angle that science cannot test. If a person is caring, and has a true interest in reality, they are open to all possibilities that can exist. This includes the option that you yourself can be actively aware, and not just reactive, and have agency, and an independent will. The type of possible individual above also had a will, but they only used it to deny their own existence. In this 3rd angle, the individual can choose to be open and without structure, because the motivation for security is not there, only the interest in caring. They would exist in the chaos of possibilities, but it wouldn't matter because they would also know that the security gained from a reactive, observational mindset would be objectively an illusion.

There is a tradeoff between the open, caring mindset and the inductive, uncaring mindset. The uncaring mindset gains an illusory "feeling" of security but loses any possibility of connection to anyone else. The unconscious, false sense of security and feeling of "knowledge" is the incentive to the uncaring, reactive mindset, otherwise nobody would do it. There is nothing you can know for absolutely certain from this point of view, but you can trick yourself into thinking you know. For the child, the data set of the parent telling them is enough. For the religious believer, the community, texts, emotions, and history is enough. For the scientist, inductive theory, mathematics, and experimentation can be enough. But for none is it a way to knowledge of the absolute truth. For a person who has chosen an open, unstructured mindset, there is no sense of security, but you can know for absolutely certain that you are interacting with

the world and others in a caring way. This may be the only thing that you can ever truly know. Love is not an emotion or feeling, but a way of looking at the world.

Thought cannot bring you closer to the truth, nor can experience. Thinking is an abstracting element that is only used to create expectation-structures. A robot can think, or process information. Descartes' old saying "I think, therefore I am" is incorrect. A more correct version is to say "I do, I am" to represent that you are a being of choice, action, and awareness. You are the one creating yourself. Experience is like counting to infinity, useful, like science, but also primarily reactive. Only the expansion of awareness can bring you in alignment with reality. Being open to all possibilities would be the most caring way to be, but even that is not necessary. All you have to do to be caring is be conscious & honest about the limits of what you can know.

What I meant when I called this chapter "THERE IS NO PATH" is that the idea of change (or "story") is illusory. If you look at the mindset that uses inductive reasoning, even though the created theory over time can be refined with more and more data, the nature of the method determines its limits. The amount of data doesn't matter, you're always stuck with an incomplete, finite answer. Again, I'm not against science, but only absolutism through science, which is impossible. The information gained from learning through scientific methodology is valuable, and is included as one of the branching possibilities of a more open, caring mindset. Yes, you can't count to infinity, but infinity does include all possible numbers.

3

EVERYONE IS PERFECT

It is my personal viewpoint, though most people do not seem to agree, that everyone is perfect. The reasoning is that we are all part of the truth and exist in the same system, and thus have equal value as individuals. This is not to say that people are equal in any other way, if only simply because we have different bodies and do not occupy the same space. To me, there is no need for comparison between individuals, and the reasoning if you *were* to compare would only come from an uncaring place. I can understand if people have the common idea of "nobody's perfect", because they are comparing somebody (maybe themselves) to an idealized apex of being, but what is the reasoning to think that they are not good enough as they are? I am not putting down the idea of improving yourself, just the devaluing of individuals as unworthy.

Let's take sports for example. We have the 100 meter dash in the Olympics, and somebody wins first place. So what? As an individual, one person ran 100 meters in this time and won first place, and other people ran at their other time. Okay, that's great, but why the interest in comparison? As you might have guessed, this falls right in line with an inductive, expectation-based value system that doesn't care about who the individuals are, but only what they can do for you. Though many of these athletes want to be role models and express views on social justice causes, their livelihoods and professional concentrations promote concepts of discrimination and social hierarchy. They feel like it means something to be the winner. But a more objective, caring view is simply that each athlete performed at their own level, and that's great for each of them.

The same goes for any type of creativity or art. On one hand we may have the most famous work of a master renaissance painter, and on the other you have a child's finger painting. There are differences in the level of artistic integrity and content between the two but both should be able to be appreciated as valuable if we are caring about the artist and not just what the artwork subjectively and reflexively does for us. Both works and artists are part of reality.

If we take a look at a few social situations on a more normal level, things might be easier to understand. We've probably all heard of the concept of a bad hair day, or have had blemishes on our faces. A person who treats you differently on a day where you are not living up to an idealized form is treating you just as uncaringly on a day you may be looking "better" as well. They are looking at you and treating you in terms of what you can do for them, and of course I'd advise caution when dealing with people like that.

But it goes further. The whole concept of a bad hair day or good hair day is in alignment with an aesthetic (or sense of beauty) that is treating you like an object, that is unconcerned with who you are as an individual. The entire identification of a person through their physical form against an ideal can be thought of as objectifying. Just by identifying yourself as your face, or body, you are promoting an uncaring philosophy. A lot of times people want to be identified by what they look like. Hollywood stars in general capitalize on readily-identifiable, symmetrical, cartoon-like facial features. If one is open to all possibilities, then you should have the ability to see others simply as beings of energy, without any pre-defined form or comparative analyzation, and if you cannot, then that is on **you**.

Many people use makeup to adjust their facial balance to one more aligning with a certain look. I'm not saying you shouldn't do it, but it is unnecessary and puts out the uncaring message that people are not good enough simply as they are. I am not talking about makeup for art's sake or just for fun by the way. The same also goes for people who use certain "angles" when taking pictures in order to hide certain things about themselves to make themselves look "better". Is this type of action promoting a caring philosophy towards others, or one that is not? The answer is one that is not. I personally have a bent nose, giant white spot on my front tooth, and even thinning hair but I will never get them "fixed" (except for medical reasons) or try to hide them, because I don't want to promote the philosophy that it matters. I am not willing to promote the idea that there is anything wrong with the way I am, nor is there anything wrong with you, exactly how you are.

On the flip side of that, if a person is using makeup to accentuate their appearance to more align with popular cultural norms centered on a physically based identity, then you are literally promoting a philosophy of objectification, uncaringness, discrimination, division, and hierarchy to everyone you come into contact with. The same "micro-aggression" can be seen if a person uses their clothing to align their body to a certain "idealized" form. I'm not saying there is anything wrong with a person doing either of these things, just that it is an uncaring action, and the person who is doing it is giving up their state of mind to external forces beyond their control.

If people are looking externally to others to determine their value and self-worth, then just one person promoting a different way of looking at things could alter their way of thinking (like the sun not rising on day 101). What if it were more people? The difference between the two mindsets in the previous paragraphs is representative of my whole philosophy. The makeup wearing person gains their self-worth and values through comparison to others and the taking in of external information. A person who is caring is more concerned with the philosophy they are putting out. The creation of each of these individuals' mindsets starts from their absolute base—their fundamental motivations.

I have noticed that when people are asked who they think they are, they mostly describe themselves as falling into several groups, such as race, religion, sex, age, family status, and ethnicity among others. What they usually do not say is that they are the ones who choose to identify as those things. They as individuals are determining how to define themselves, and they are the ones drawing the lines. At what point do you draw the line at race, aren't we all from potentially the same genetic line, or even possibly the same divine being? The same goes for family, the individuals themselves choose at what genetic distance the relationships don't matter. Plenty of people think national borders are imaginary lines and post-adult age as only a number.

I personally do not identify in terms of groups but rather as the existent awareness itself because all those classifications do not logically make sense to me as I am an individual before all. There is no need to compare or group unless you are letting the external determine who you really are. Again, choosing to let others define you denies any possibility of free will.

If you identify yourself by your facial/bodily form and determine your self-worth by external comparison or from what others think, then you are operating on the passive, scientific, and uncaring mindset. Maybe I should have brought this up earlier, but the method upon which one interprets our world also creates that individual's value system. If one defines themselves with their physical body as their base (as opposed to their conscious awareness), then of course death would be the ultimate thing to avoid because all the data that you are taking in says that physicality is the end (and that is all you are doing, taking in data, not giving anything out or caring). From this passive mindset, an internal spiritual existence does not look like it exists. Conversely, for an individual whose conscious fundamental base is a wide and continually expanding awareness without any solidified structure, there is no certainty that death is the end. In fact, the possibility of operating in this mindset itself provides evidence that the existence of consciousness is inherent to the nature of the universe. Not only does it remain a possibility that a non-reactive essence does exist, but that it is inherently coming into fruition continuously. Even if your "spirit" loses its memories or potentially gets re-organized with other matter, an independent non-reactive mindset is not only possible but perhaps the ultimate nature of all life that we know of, and perhaps even more that we don't. With this in mind, all individuals of all species would be valued for who they are, as they all possibly have an independent spirit similar to our own. Less complex animals might behave more simply and are perhaps limited to the capabilities of their biology, but they may still have the choice to interact with the world as independent beings.

For a physically-based person, happiness and fulfillment would only come from the external, and as we saw in the "checkout line" example, they'd be completely subject to their instincts, emotions and environment. They would only act to satiate themselves and minimize the effects of those things. However, since their mental state is reliant on things outside of their control (due to their own choice), the social, material, or sensory things that make them happy have to be continuously up-kept or affirmed to sustain their illusory benefits. A drinking, eating, or shopping problem, jealousy, envy, or stealing…it all comes from the same base. To be in control of one's own social status in the hierarchy, you have to reach the top, and even if you get there, you have to continuously keep fighting for your position. It almost goes without saying that their actions would only be about what is "good" for themselves, not anyone else. Also, a person with this mindset is inherently atheistic, whether they consciously considered it or not.

When I say that everyone is perfect, it is an inclusive statement that not only everyone matters, but everything in reality matters. One may be taken aback by the beauty of a flower, but it could not exist without its stem, its root, the soil, the fertilizer, the earth and the rest of existence with it. Any other excised definition would be inaccurate. One may be in awe of the stars in the galaxy, but the same greatness should be able to be recognized in the most "mundane" of objects, as they (and we) all concurrently exist as a part of the same system. And that is another point I want to bring up, we as beings on this planet are not an accident or speck of irrelevance, the world would not exist without us. It is inherent and fundamental to the nature of the universe that life and consciousness exist. It could not exist any other way. If there is any meaning in the universe, you are part of it. And if there is such a thing as a meaning of life, it would be all possible meanings of it.

I want to go back to discussing the type of person who chooses to define their existence by bowing to external influence. I've already mentioned that their value system would be predetermined, but I didn't mention that given any particular situation they are in, their actions would be entirely predictable to an open, awareness based person. They could never betray their values as long as their base is the same. A lot of people might call it judgmental to see things this way but it is actually one's openness to reality which can see the psychological mechanisms at work in real time. And of course the individual who is bowing to external influence could at any time change their methodology to an open, caring one as well, and that would be apparent as soon as it happened. What is actually judgmental is for a reactive person to interpret and interact with the world and others through the filter of expectations. They would be so judgmental that they would never accurately see or be interested in recognizing anyone else at all.

4

SOMEONE WHO DOESN'T CARE ABOUT THE TRUTH IS SOMEONE WHO DOESN'T CARE ABOUT YOU

When it comes to truly caring and having an interest in reality, it always has to be unconditional. Any time there are conditions or limits placed on others, it always reverts the motivation back to self-interest, because it is the individual who is choosing for their own

reasons to do so, and not for anyone else. I know I've been using the term "selfish" pretty regularly in this book, and while some people may argue that every action anyone takes is technically selfish (because no matter what, it's what the person wants to do), the question is, what is the definition of the "self"? For a reactive person who is merely creating their definition by observing what's being told to them by the outside world, it would be limited to their physical body. This seems to be how most people commonly think. However, the definition I myself am using includes all of possible existence, because if you don't uncaringly draw lines, then everything, in some way, is a part of who we are. Everything has something to do with the truth about reality, and we are part of it. So there you have it, actions that are technically "selfish" do not have to be uncaring if you include everyone and everything in your understanding of your "self". And not only that, but what way of looking at reality is more accurate, the one where you are scientifically observing, which can never lead to true understanding due to the failure of induction, or the one where you are open to all possibility? The first method could never work from the start, while the second is all reaching—it's pretty obvious which makes more sense.

I started off this book asking if you had any notion of what is "good" or "bad", or "right" or "wrong", but if you take a closer look at those words, they don't have any inherent or preset meaning to them. They are always used in reference to something else. For instance, somebody might say it's "good" to "not say anything at all if you don't have anything nice to say" while somebody else might think it's good to "speak the truth even if it hurts". Depending on the situation these two prescriptions could be entirely at odds with each other. They both in some way sound like they make sense, but what exactly is the commonality between them? What they share is that the supposed intention of the speaker is to be *caring* towards the other person or audience. If the speaker doesn't say something nice, then the listener could possibly get upset. But also if the speaker avoids telling the truth, then the listener could get hurt later because they are using incorrect information. Whether the logic of both pieces of advice makes sense or not, the reason why they are prescribed is because it is implied that those actions are the *caring* thing for the speaker to do. If you analyze any rule, any law, or any societal norm, that is what it always comes down to—what is right and good always equates to what is *caring* towards others, and what is wrong and bad always has to do with what is *uncaring* towards them. Just think about it. Take any law, such as a traffic signal—it would be wrong for someone stopped at a red light to have to wait super long for their turn to drive because it would be uncaring towards them. One could argue instead that it wouldn't be "fair" for the stopped driver to have to wait more than others, but why do things have to be fair in the first place? Because it would be uncaring to not be fair. "Fair" or "just" are just other words that don't get to the bottom of the issue. Would it not be more accurate, efficient, and need I say it "*caring*" to use the "caring/uncaring" dichotomy instead of the "good/bad", "right/wrong", "fair/unfair" or "just/unjust" instead? Keep trying to think of another example where what I'm saying doesn't make sense. What about always being on time, not stealing, nor punching people in the face? Again, those would be because it would be uncaring towards others. The concept of "caring/uncaring" gets to the bottom of the issue and are completely defined ideas within themselves, while "good", "right", "fair", "just" and their opposites all need to be qualified. The reason why people don't automatically use the more correct terms is because in some way, consciously or not, they don't really care about others.

Let's take the idea of "compassion". It is usually seen as a virtue when talking about how to interact with others but it is a word that completely misrepresents what it intends. Somebody could say that someone "has a lot of compassion", but that is only a passive description of their character. Wouldn't it be more accurate to say that that person "cares"? Think about it, what makes more sense, "Johnny has a lot of compassion" or "Johnny cares"?. The "compassion" line is wordy and roundabout whereas the "cares" sentence is more direct. This is because caring is an act of will; it is something you have to do, and not a quality you have. Compassion is just the facade of caring within a self-imposed limitation, which is not a virtue at all. A compassionate person is reactive to the circumstances they are surrounded with, and if that reactive person is around somebody else who is having a hard time, maybe they will empathize with them. But "empathy" is not the same as caring, it is social agreeability, which could just be affirming the same values which caused the problems in the first place, and not fixing them. The caring thing to do would be to provide the answer to solve whatever was bothering them in the first place.

Before I get into this next part, I'll just go ahead and say this, virtually everyone seems to be objectively uncaring. So if this applies to you, you are in no way alone, nor do I think it is a big deal. I will also say beforehand that any damage or negativity you may have caused while operating on an uncaring philosophy is negligible because a true connection did not exist and the only things that could have been affected were illusory or fake. I'll explain later.

Personal romantic relationships in general seem to be based on uncaring needs as opposed to the valuing of each person authentically. While the needs of each partner are met (emotional, physical, and otherwise), the relationship appears to work, but when that changes, it is likely to fall apart. This is because at least one of the members of the relationship doesn't have, and never had, any real interest in the other person, and were only interested in what they could do for them. A truly caring relationship would be based on giving to the other person instead of focusing on taking, which, again, is a microcosm of both philosophical mindsets. The motivation for all actions are based on the individual's most primordial motivation, and everything they do would necessarily be in alignment with that. If a person is emotionally hurt after a breakup, or even during the relationship, it is because reality does not match up to what they want it to be. They may want it to feel like the way it was in the past, or they wish that the other person was different, but those reasons only show that they are not authentically interested in their partner in the way they are now. They just want things to be the way they prefer for themselves, and their state of mind is not caring towards the other person. If the person whose relationship ended had been truly caring, he would be happy that their previous partner now exists in a place that is better for them. They would be happy that the person who left is happier, if they truly cared about them. If they are hurting it is because they have lost something, but that something could only be a reflexive fantasy and would not have to do with anything real. Were the person who is hurt decide to switch to an aware and caring mode of being, they would be able to connect with another similarly minded person and possibly enter into a relationship where each individual would be truly concerned and giving to the other, if they so chose.

At the end of the previous example I mentioned how a person could switch to a different mode of operation at any time, specifically from being an uncaring, reactive person to a caring, aware person, or vice-versa. Though I can't say for certain, this seems true for everyone. Any singular individual can waver between these two modes of operation depending on their mindset and motivation in any given moment. I know that I have the ability to become unconsciously reactive at times but it is my own fault to allow it to happen.

The romantic relationship explanation can be used as a prototype for any kind of relationship since generally speaking, most people do not seem to be truly interested in giving to others. Parent-child relationships can be truly nurturing, but also could be another type where different needs have to be fulfilled to keep the peace. Normal friendships, sibling interactions, and even pets could all be needs-based instead of caring- or giving-based. We've all heard of the kid who wants a puppy but doesn't want to take care of it—a pretty clear cut example. Perhaps the most important point to remember is that when people are uncaring, they only interact with others through a filter of their own expectations and an abstract interpretation of reality, and not how they actually are. They do not have the ability to even connect with the other person at all. But as long as each side is fulfilling the role that the other has left open for them, everything appears to work and people can *feel* as if they are actually having an intimate interaction.

Though these types of un-interested relationships seem to be widespread, the good news is that I am not suggesting that they all break up or anything of the sort. The individuals in them still deserve to be cared about and loved, because everyone is of value and we are all here together. I am only saying all this in hope that it will help foster a deeper connection.

5

MORALITY IS A MIND TRICK UNCARING PEOPLE USE TO THINK THEY ARE GOOD

Just like the previous section on relationships and how they seem mostly based on the fulfillment of needs and desires instead of true interest in giving to one another, "morality" is another concocted, reflexive concept used with nefarious and dubious intention. Similar to the idea of "compassion", it sounds "good", and maybe it fools those who refuse to investigate it, but ultimately, it is a meaningless and relative concept for people to feel better about themselves. It's basically a person's subconscious giving themselves the "okay" to being fundamentally uncaring.

There is no limit when it comes to caring. It is not logical to only choose to care about the lives of those you are exposed to or are in contact with, without consideration of all others who could exist in all of possibility. A person could be *more* interested, but why would they do that? They may be too scared of actually having to do anything. When looking up the definition of morality, it always refers to ideas of what is "right" and "good", which in turn depends on an individual's belief system. It could mean anything from devoting your entire life to helping the starving, to just thinking about doing something about it, whenever you "get around to it". Each individual is the one who draws the line when it comes to who matters and who does not, and what is necessary to do and what is not, and because it is such, that determination is not done in

the interest of anyone else, but for themselves. It is a conditional love where the primary benefit is for the individual actor to think they are living a proper life, and in that essence, it is coming from an uncaring motivation.

Take for example giving money to charity, why is that the best thing to do? Is it moral to give to just one cause? Couldn't they do more for more people? What is the ultimate thing that could help everyone the most? Why not do that? People in general aren't concerned with that, they just want to get on with their life and think they are doing a good job. Only when they are placed in a situation where they cannot reason away their inaction are they forced to actually do something.

The question that needs to be asked when trying to help others should be "why is that caring?" You may have to repeat the question to yourself over and over until you reach the root of all created values in order to actually solve problems and talk about anything real. Contrary to what people might think, it probably only needs to be asked about five times before getting to the root of any issue, but unfortunately it seems like most people never even get to question two.

Much like the concept of morality, "human rights" do not exist. They are purported to be a list of freedoms that common society deems everyone should have, but it is only because they would feel bad about themselves if they were to do any less. It does not seem like anyone is guaranteed anything in this world and to be honest, people should value whatever they have, even if it does not meet the baseline of what a "normal" life should be. If a person has a terminal childhood disease, is their life worthless? It is only through comparison that that life may seem inadequate, but as a chance for spiritual freedom and existence anyone would be lucky to have it. This is not to say that I would not prefer a population of healthy, thriving individuals, but just to show appreciation that we are lucky to have whatever we've got, and to not take anything or anyone for granted.

6

HATE DOES NOT EXIST

I know what you are thinking but just hear me out. It is impossible for anyone to hate anyone else on any real level, because the "hater" has to accurately identify the person they are "hating on" first. Otherwise, they are just reflexively acting against a construct they've created in their own mind. In order to hate another person, you have to see the person, and if the "hater" is not interested in "reality", then who they are acting against has nothing to do with the receiver, other than what the originator wants to see. If the originator saw the person accurately, then he would see them as connected to himself in this shared world, and hating that person would be the equivalent of hating himself and all of existence, which is only a pitiful, pathetic, depressing, and unfortunate situation for them to be in. While I can only speak for myself, people seem to be independently existing wills, and if you think that they are not, then maybe you are denying your own existence.

I can see how that sounds confusing so let's take a specific example. Let's say there is the "hate" perpetrator who self-identifies as a White supremacist and the person sends a negative note to the victim, a person from a "race" he doesn't like. It doesn't matter what it says, just something negative because he reacted to the stimulus of being around somebody he thought was of less worth. Okay, so the perpetrator sends the note and the "victim" reads it. So what? What literally just happened here is that the "hater" saw the victim, objectified him and acted according to his preset programming. The hater has no idea who the victim really is, he can only see him in terms of some abstract filter, some inane model, and that is who he is interacting with, not the victim as an individual in reality. The perpetrator can never do anything to the victim, he is just interacting with his own idea. It is impossible for him to hate the true victim, or anyone else in reality. If you can see the person as they are without expectation, that itself is to be caring about them. That would be the opposite of ignoring his existence completely.

So people can only "hate" their own concoctions in their own mind. If the victim operated in the mode of open, caring, awareness, he would see that the hater wasn't talking about him at all. He could see that the hater seemed trapped in his own mind, interpreting his surroundings through a system that doesn't, and could never, make logical sense, nor bring truth. He could see that it is actually the hater that is the one in the unfortunate situation, who cannot help but react to what the world is throwing at him. The victim knows the hater's action had nothing to do with him personally, but only the hater himself.

There's an opposite side to this same situation. Let's say the "White supremacist" hater crosses paths with another "White supremacist", which he might consider his good buddy. The **exact** same situation would occur with the exception of maybe it was a positive note this time. Maybe even the receiver of the note would like it. But the details of the encounter is exactly the same, objectively. The facts remain: the hater saw the buddy, objectified him and acted according to his preset programming. The hater has no idea who the buddy really is, he can only see him in terms of some abstract filter, some inane model, and that is who he is interacting with, not the buddy in reality. The perpetrator can never do anything to the buddy, he is just interacting with his own idea. It is impossible for him to like the true buddy, or anyone else in reality. If you can see the person as they are without expectation, that itself is to be caring about them. That would be the opposite of ignoring his existence completely.

We can flip it one more time, but this time we see things from the buddy's side: He gets the note, he likes it, etc. He is happy to see the original hater and fellow self-identifying "White supremacist." The analysis of the situation plays out just the same: the buddy saw the hater, objectified him and acted according to his preset programming. The buddy has no idea who the hater really is, he can only see him in terms of some abstract filter, some inane model, and that is who he is interacting with, not the hater in reality. The buddy can never do anything to the hater, he is just interacting with his own idea. It is impossible for him to like the true hater, or anyone else in reality. If you can see the person as they are without expectation, that itself is to be caring about them. That would be the opposite of ignoring his existence completely.

Neither of the "supremacists" are relating to each other on a real level, though they may think they are. This is the same mechanism that either of the two people in a common romantic relationship use. Neither are usually caring about the other, but instead are interested in getting their needs fulfilled. This is also the same mechanism going on with the two different instances in the store checkout line. The first instance is when the person got frustrated because their expectations didn't get met (akin to the hater/victim example), and in the second instance, the person was happy when they got through it very fast (like the hater/buddy example). None of these people are interested in reading reality as it is, but in interpreting existence through an inductively-created filter. They are reflexively, and reactively acting out according to the external situation they are given, and the internal desires they want fulfilled. If an outside observer who is open and interested in reality is looking at any of these situations from a neutral position, they would be able to see all of these individuals' expectation-systems being created right before their eyes. Their choice to do so is not previously made, but continuously kept, and they have no choice but to be limited to their predictable psychological pathways.

Okay at this point I will admit that a negative "note" is not the worst that could happen. In extreme situations, the victim might not even leave the confrontation alive. This is why I am trying to explain all this. These so-called "perpetrators" should not be shunned out of public life and social media, because like so many others running on similar, more "publicly acceptable" fundamental philosophies, they seem to be stuck in their system of thought, and in that place, true connection with others can never be real. True knowledge to them also can never be real, and they are always doomed to be reactive to the external situations thrown at them. Yes, they have chosen this incorrect method of interpretation which entraps them, and even if they only chose to do so on an unconscious level, it is still "they" who do it. But the realization of the falsity of this method is the solution that will stop the reaction to past problems, halt any that are currently occurring, and prevent future ones from starting in the first place. Everybody wins.

7

THE MECHANISM OF OFFENSE

Let's go back to the situation where the hater gave the victim the negative note. Again, it doesn't matter what it said, but let's suppose that it was the most offensive thing ever. The victim was aghast! He wanted justice! How dare the perpetrator do that! We need to take the hater's right to speech away! Let's ban him from the platform!

Okay I'll stop right there, and I will justify this, but if you are ever offended by anything, it is always your own fault. This is because it is the receiver who gives away the authority over themselves in the first place. There is no reason to care about what anyone else thinks, unless you are operating on a passive, reactive mindset and thus the only way to have any power in your life is to make sure you have tyrannical control over all the external influences upon which you base your sense of self. This type of person's self-worth and self-esteem are also ascertained externally, but their self-identity (and the way it is determined) comes first, and that definition in this case has been chosen to be taken from the outside. To the "victim", the person who sent the

offensive note is automatically viewed as the purveyor of ultimate truth, even though they were obviously uncaring, and if you think about it, would be just as clueless and reactive as the victim when it comes to determining anything about anything. Again, if you give up power and authority over yourself to others, then that is entirely on **you**.

So the situation goes like this, the White supremacist gives the victim a negative note. The victim becomes offended because "how dare he insult him". But the victim himself in this situation is the one that gives value to the perpetrator's note. Who does he think the perpetrator is, the end-all be-all truth speaker of the universe? Why does he give so much weight to some guy who obviously interprets the world in a simplistic, uncaring way? It is because the "victim" also uses inductive reasoning to gain an understanding of the world.

In this case, the data set is created socially, so if someone has a particular point of view, that counts as one vote that they are right. Let's say that you have 100 friends who think very positively of you, but if person 101 says something negative, the whole inductively formulated view gets destroyed. Person 101's **opinion** in this case is taken at as an absolute fact. Who is the one giving it the weight of being a fact? The receiver, and that is his mistake because he is not interested in realizing the limits of what he can know. He doesn't care that his methodology doesn't make sense as long as it *seems like* it works for him to attain a feeling of understanding and security. This is why sometimes if somebody is popular online, they won't respond to the thousands of comments saying good things about them, but instead have a hard time getting the few negative comments out of their head. All the passively observed data must be accounted for if one were to try to hold a scientific model as true. From this mindset, just the presentation of any diverging viewpoint would wreak havoc on the victim's well-being, so they would uncaringly need to control anything anyone could say. Coming from a neutral stance, the victim should be able to see that the hater wasn't even talking about the real him and was only referring to an idea in his own mind. But instead, the victim in this situation chose to give his own internal power away, and allowed the external to define him, because he is also uncaring.

You might say "sure, I am giving authority over myself away, but stopping the feelings that come up when I'm insulted isn't as simple as realizing this". You're right, it's not that simple. The realization that you are giving authority over yourself away is just a branch of the problem. The root of it has to do with one's primary motivation, and that is where the change needs to take place in order to be unaffected by what others think. You have realize that the answer is to be primarily concerned with giving out from your base and not solely with taking in. Incentives such as the feeling of knowledge and security gained from a "taking" mindset are illogical and illusory. The incentive of a primarily giving/caring mindset is independence from external influence but still a connection to reality, with a more accurate understating of the truth through the awareness of all possibilities, and greater (though incomplete) knowledge of the self.

Let's consider another situation. Say you're driving on a 4-lane road and you're following all the rules simply coasting along. Then all of the sudden some crazy driver comes out of nowhere and cuts you off, clearly breaking the law and almost gets you into an accident. Offense is **taken** again, but now it's road rage. How dare he do that to me! We have to even the score!

Why does this feeling arise? Again, it had to do with the expectations the safe driver had being broken. When driving, you're supposed to follow the rules. We're expecting other drivers to be reasonable and safe. Then all of the sudden this crazy driver almost kills us all! Sure it was unsafe, but maybe we also had the expectation that people were going to follow the law, but the reality of the situation is people are capable of doing illegal things at any time. Sure, what he did was dangerous. Sure, it was illegal. It may even have been actively insulting. But the emotional response and outrage was due to the safe driver's expectations being shattered. If the safe driver was more aware that crazy drivers can break the law at any time, not only would it make accidents less likely to happen, but also whenever something bad were to happen, he would not feel anger and the need to get back at the offender.

The most observant thing to realize in this situation is to consider the mindset of the crazy driver. If their illegal antics were not simply an accident, then the person was almost certainly acting with an uncaring motivation. And again, it is likely someone who is trapped in his own world of negativity, reacting emotionally to external things outside of his control. This is not someone who is capable of giving an objective observation, or even seeing other individuals as they are. The crazy driver is one that could use some help, instead of hurt, if they were interested in such. And the safe driver, along with all other drivers on the road, would possibly benefit as well from helping the person who is having a hard time.

8

ISSUES DO NOT EXIST

Politicians, commentators on TV, and even regular citizens are fighting over issues every day. Immigration, abortion, the environment, taxes, war, the economy…you name it, they're talking about it. People fall into sides like the political left or right, and are out in the street assembling for the causes they feel need the most attention in the given moment. However, as many people freely admit, not many minds are being changed one way or another.

If a person is caring, and interested in the truth about reality (which includes caring about others), then one should never agree to disagree. If you want to solve problems, there must be openness to all sides of the argument, and an honest consideration of opposing views. That seems rational enough, but I suggest that if people really want to have an honest discussion and get to a real solution, then the **only** thing worth talking about is fundamental philosophies.

We should not be looking at the branches but directly at the root so as to see if the source of where particular views emerge from are valid. It is my contention that every view, statement, or action that anyone makes is an expression of a singular, fundamental, and ultimate philosophy. When people are arguing "issues" they are not really talking about anything. Based on what is at the bottom, the branches will automatically change and fix the problems at hand. Working your way down the branches only shows that you have the wrong motivation, and the person's mode of operation and value system who is doing so is completely apparent. With anything anyone does, they are affirming the values underneath it.

You cannot talk about abortion without discussing what is the nature of life. Saying you are pro- or anti-woman doesn't change that. You cannot debate immigration without talking about what are the basic needs every person should have, here or across the border. Is waging war justified to save lives? Is it right to take taxes from hard-working, productive people, and if you believe so, why? All views must be justified to the greatest degree they can be unless you are holding them solely in your own interest.

We can all look deeper. To fix problems we have to come to a consensus at the most fundamental level we can reach, and that will stop problems from occurring on more emergent levels. Do you want to save babies, or save women, or do you just want to mess around and think you are doing a good job? All scientists must be open to debate, and using the excuse that they don't want "to legitimize certain views" only makes their own particular view look suspect. If you are an expert purporting a view on any subject and do not wish to debate, or if you are an activist or debater but do not wish to look deeper than just the branches, then you are complicit in creating the current situation and not solving the problem. But not only that, you are also contributing to the mischaracterization of other problems.

If people *are* debating on the level of superficial, emergent issues without getting at the philosophical base of things, what they are actually doing is agreeing with each other that things *can* be divided into issues in the first place. This is like how the "Santa Claus is real" faction fights against the "Santa Claus is a lie" faction without ever possibly coming to a sensible agreement because both sides reach their views through the same uncaring method, and both sides are unable to say for absolutely certain what is the ultimate truth. Both sides could be seen as different surface-level takes on a singular issue, and both mindsets are unverifiable and a complete waste of our time, if anyone actually wants to get anything done.

9

SOCIALISTS/COMMUNISTS ARE AGAINST LIFE BECAUSE THEY TALK ABOUT SOCIALISM/COMMUNISM INSTEAD OF CARING

Let's try to envision the most caring society. Maybe all individuals would be of equal value because we are all part of the truth, and here together. Sure, we should all have our basic needs met, such as food, water, shelter, clothing, healthcare and the like, because it would be uncaring to just let people suffer on their own. Materialism wouldn't be valued and maybe people wouldn't be interested in superficial, trivial things, or maybe they understood that the social status/hierarchy created from having exclusive, expensive stuff wasn't real, and they didn't want to promote that uncaring way of seeing things anyway. Everyone would have the same access to everything, and would be given to based on their needs. No child left behind, because that would just be really bad, wouldn't it? Oh yeah, let's not forget we'd have the healthiest food, and the most truth-speaking media to keep us informed and safe because they would be actually working in our interest. The most efficient operations, no traffic jams, no supply constraints, no famine, no manipulative politicians, everyone has a voice, etc. You get the picture.

Sounds great doesn't it? Sounds a lot like a communist utopia right? Right! And it sounds great to me! There's only one problem—somebody has to do the work. And they have to want to do it infinitely. When it comes down to the right/left political scale, or the capitalist/socialist debate, or conservatives vs liberals (by USA definitions), there are only four way of looking at it:

There is the "selfish", uncaring conservative who says "I made it, I should have it".

Then there is the abstract, philosophical conservative who says "if you made it, you should have it" (which is a general principal that goes for anyone).

Then there is the "selfish", uncaring liberal who says "they have this, why can't I also have it".

And lastly, the abstract, philosophical liberal who says "everyone should have this".

A selfish/uncaring conservatively aligned individual is only thinking of his own personal situation, and his arguments would only be made to protect himself. This type of individual could be susceptible to corruption because his motivation only goes so far as to fight for his own interests, and there is nothing stopping him from lying and scheming when it comes to dealing with others. Whatever this person has to do achieve his goals, or retain his state of mind, is what he is going to do. A typical flip-flopper or untrustworthy person.

There is also nothing stopping a selfish/uncaring liberal person from doing whatever is necessary to gain for themselves either, by any uncaring means. This type of individual is also not devoted to any logic, rules, or equal treatment in any way, though they may act like it when it is beneficial for them, or someone they are allied with. This person will even consciously try to bind you to a logical argument, knowing that he won't live up to it himself. Whatever they have to do to get what they want from others, they will do, claiming unfairness. A typical flip-flopper or untrustworthy person.

An abstract, principled liberal sounds like a person who could be caring, like if they proposed "everyone should have housing, healthcare, education, and food", which appears very giving, but who is going to provide those things? There is a great difference between saying that and actually getting it done. We don't have the ability to give everything to everyone. A house, a car, whatever, it all has to come from somewhere, and the bottom line is that somebody has to make it and put in that work. But what if they don't agree with this type of liberal? What if they don't want to put in the work? Where's the goods and services going to come from? One way or another, sooner or later, this type of individual is going to make demands on others and **force** people to do it. Whether it's labor, or taxes, or re-education camps or classes, this type of person is only interested in their idealistic view being put into place, not people. If some random individual fundamentally disagrees with some healthcare service (like abortion) that they are forced to pay for with their tax money, and they refuse to pay it, they're getting fined or going to jail. That's the essence of this type of supposedly "giving" liberal. If a person like this wants free healthcare and college education for all, then **they** should be the only ones paying for it.

Remember this is about principle, not about what is fair. They might say "it's not fair unless everyone pays for free college education since they all benefit from it" or whatever else issue, but that's not the original point they were making. Who should have what and who should pay for it are two completely separate issues. If they say it's right, then they should be the ones paying for it. The only reason why an individual would honestly want others to not suffer is because they care about them, but you can't care about one person while being uncaring towards another. If this is the case, then this type of individual's beliefs are only about themselves, and they are the oppressors. Another way you can tell what this type of person is all about is because they always talk about the end result, the "free this", the "redistributed that", the defunded or deplatformed "whatever" but never focusing on **why** people should care, or the value of people themselves. There are a lot of selfish, uncaring liberals who pretend to be this abstract, principled type as a scam, but even this type is not a respectable way to be because they don't respect all individuals. Advocating the results solely invokes the pathway of oppression. They want to think they are good but they are the ones against life. You cannot be respectful of some and not others.

The only position with the possibility of caringness is the abstract conservative, because they are respectful to all individuals across the board equally. "If you made it, then out of respect for you, you should be able to keep it". Freedom giving, individual valuing, fair. Is the abstract liberal interested in giving freedom? No, they aim to use a certain set of people to produce things for a different set, it is the opposite of freedom. Does even the best liberal person value you as an individual? No, they judge and classify you, and only look at you in terms of what good you are to them and their worldview. Are they fair? Of course not, they are fundamentally divisive and it is by their rules which one must play by; they aren't interested in anything that would have to do with you. And how do I know they are not interested in you? Because, believe it or not, the only way to a workable, sustainable communist utopia is through the right.

Unless based on a purely volunteer-system, socialism mandates the use of force, always. But let's think about it from the honest, abstract conservative point of view. Let's say an individual has chosen to be a caring person, what would they want to do? To help others if they can. And what if there was a lot of people who also had the same motivation? Then they'd all want to help each other, in the best way they can, voluntarily. They wouldn't want to force others to do anything they wouldn't want to do, but since everyone has the rest of the population's interest in mind, they would automatically do the things that make the most sense for the community, and feel fulfilled in doing so. And why is that? It is because they are truly respectful and valuing of other individuals. They are willing to do what it takes in the best way they can, and happily at that. They are all individuals, and have chosen to be caring towards others on an individual level, but are working together as a community, non-competitively. There is no divisiveness here, no forced redistribution of resources or wealth, no war, and no conflict or resentment. But if one were to adopt the worldview of the supposedly caring liberal, you would get nothing but that. The evidence? Take a look around. Show me the social democrat who isn't talking about being oppressed or taking away from others, as well as show me one that is talking about caring. Do you really think, or do even they really think, what they are proposing is going to work or is sustainable? How much pushback do they need in order to see otherwise?

There should be **none**. But all we get is dissent, oppression, conflict, and collapse. This is obviously uncaring and bad. This is obviously against life. For anyone who votes liberal, consider this, you voted for a politician who out-and-out advocates acquisition by force and stealing from certain individuals, but for some reason expect them to be legitimate with you? Come on. There is nothing in their character that would suggest they would treat you fairly, and everything in their character telling you that they would not. For some reason you are trusting a gangster to work for you. They do not ask the doctors' permission for unlimited healthcare, or to agree to their terms of service, nor show them respect for all their years of hard labor and studies. Universal healthcare for all is a policy I can theoretically agree with, but I would not force any doctor or provider to comply, and perhaps only those who support it should pay for it. Again, if it's about the principle then it doesn't have to be fair.

However, this does not imply in any way that a capitalist system is inherently best for the people, but at its base, it is more respectful towards the people and individuals in general. I know that it is based on competition, and profit, and social stratification, but it is an economic system that is more in line with people's generally uncaring motivation. It is uncaring of **us** to expect people to care, but capitalism can be boiled down to "self-interest incentivized by benefitting others". Yes, there can be corruption, and trying to extract the most money possible with the least quality, and also toxicity and poison, and manipulation, but the power always remains with the people to demand more from the companies, and pass regulations/protections. They can demand financial transparency for their patronage, and health quality guarantees in their food, and confirmation that slave, child, or compromised labor are not being used, or they could withhold their consumership, which would force the companies to conform or go out of business. Other companies would be created to fit their demands. They could create consortiums to interact with these companies, which could be held in check at slightest degree of compromise.

Protections for the public in the form of legally-binding regulations should also serve the people's overall interest in order to maximize freedom. I know this is a simplified explanation of our current system, and uncaring types of conservatives have all the angles figured out, but even so, in a capitalist society, the power always remains in the hands of the people. If you have a problem with a sports star making a $100 million or the team owner possibly making even more, the problem doesn't lie with them, it lies with the people who value their work so highly. It's not like the team owner *wants* to pay the star that, the fans make him worth that much. The only difference between him kicking around a ball on tv with millions of people watching versus the same player messing around in his backyard is the people who think it matters. The people are the ones with the power to demand, and like it or not, are the ones to blame if things aren't the way they prefer. Nobody told anyone to sit around and expect to be given the best of everything, or even what's good for them, or their children etc., it is up to individuals to demand it. The uncaringness of the consumer is no different than the uncaringness of the producer.

Notice that I am neither for nor against a capitalist or socialist system theoretically, as both would work with individuals who had a caring motivation. Any system of government can work if the people believe in it, and each other. In a workable socialist system, the people would

do what it takes to keep everything running optimally, voluntarily. And in a beneficial capitalist system, the consumers are capable of keeping even a crooked producer in check. But if they are apathetic, it is likely that the worst would make it to the top in the capitalist system, but that is also the result of a choice made by the consumer—they have traded off their personal power in exchange for the ability to live a flippant, ignorant, and irresponsible life prone to infiltration and subversion. The universe is doing nothing but giving them exactly what they want.

In a socialist system run by uncaring individuals, the problems with the power structure would only be exacerbated, with more sweeping oppression and exploitation, and less respect for individuals and freedom. The people's voice could only be heard in this system through dramatic revolution, and could be quelled by military force with ease. The reason you can know for certain that a socialist or communist system would never work in this world is this: because they talk about socialism and communism instead of caring. They are all about the system and not at all about the people. Were they to be promoting caring for each other and the general public liked the message and the incentives that come along with it, then a socialist or communist system would occur organically. But they aren't talking about that, they are talking about the system, and never a philosophy of caring. An ideology of victimhood yes, but not an ideology of providing or creating. They are always talking about things that happened to them but never about the things they can do. And in this country they have the freedom to create a subsystem of their own ideals for the people who wish to take part, but instead they focus on forcing the populace to comply with their demands. Caring and active oppression have nothing to do with each other.

10

THE MOST CARING IS THE MOST JUST

I do not agree with democracy in general, but it is the best system that is in practice right now. This is because it does not make sense to vote on the truth. The truth is the truth regardless of how anyone feels about it, and a voting majority will not change it. Perhaps the ideal form of government should be the system of philosophy that people can agree is the best for everyone, where anyone with a better idea can improve it. No need for votes, if someone can make the system more caring, then that is what should be implemented for the betterment of all, and everyone would acknowledge that it would be in their best interest. In a democracy, a vote can be seen as a unit of oppression, and a majority vote could be seen as mob rule. Ideally, the most caring system would be the most just, with an ever-expanding reach to the limits of what can be known. It is not necessary to have an absolute knowledge on all subjects, but just to do the best we can, given the circumstances, with the intention to always do better.

Thinking that it is okay to agree to disagree on this level should be avoided as well. If both parties are interested in the truth, then both should be open to try to understand the other. Even if the positions that they each hold are valid, then they can agree upon a new singular position, where both stances are combined. Perpetuated disagreements reveal that at least one of the sides is not interested in what the other has to say. A singular position should always be the goal while still remaining open to any and all new ideas.

Another idea I would like to purport is that unlike what is commonly thought, everyone is creating the system of government all the time. Some people like to refer to the Constitution as the basis of the United States government, but the people were the ones who gave it power and supported it throughout the years, and also in the present day. People who don't follow politics are also continuously creating the current system, but they are just giving away the power of their voice. Everyone is a founding father of now, so to speak, whether they are active or not. But if you are not speaking up, you are by default upholding the status quo, and supporting whatever policies are produced by the government, without regard to if they are caring or not. If you don't like the laws or rules being passed by your leaders, it is up to you to change and challenge them, as well as to vote to keep them in their positions or throw them out.

I am not a science denier, but any scientist who speaks in terms of absolutes cannot be trusted because they hold an uncaring way of thinking. Contrary to what is normally proposed, there is no reason to trust them automatically, but only reason to distrust them by default, since they have chosen as their profession, as their life's work, a system that doesn't bring us closer to the truth, nor have they chosen to present a philosophy that would be universally helpful. Models and guesses are not the same as absolutes. But once fundamental values are agreed on, then science comes in to be useful. When dealing with scientists, they should prove to us why they are right, and then also prove why we should listen to them. If you think my stance is too extreme, look up how fast many in academia cave to social justice pressure to restrict speech or have their colleagues fired. How many do you think will risk their careers and licenses if they disagree?

The same goes for the media and internet content creators. If they are telling us a story, they should prove to us why they are right, and then also prove why we should listen to them. We cannot take it for granted that they are telling us the truth. If they were truly interested in helping us, they would promote the correct philosophy, instead of one that is basically "take our word for it, though you can never know". And I'll add this here just in case: just because some ideas and numbers are put in a cleanly designed cartoon or infographic doesn't mean they're true, and anything you see on the internet can be just as fake and propagandized as anywhere else.

11

NO LIVES MATTER EXCEPT THOSE YOU CHOOSE

Black Lives Matter. All Lives Matter. All Black Lives Matter. White Lives Matter.

Since when?

Since when has anyone who's said any of these things ever really cared about anyone? There have been, and still are, people struggling and dying not only across the world, but across the street. It may even be yourself. But now all of the sudden people say they care?

Just as a reminder, I told you that I want what you want. I told you that I have the answer. I told you that whatever you want to get done, we're going to get done. Please hear me out.

Classifying individuals into groups, and the motivation to do so, is what is creating the problem. The perpetrators are doing it, as well as the activists. The solution is to get rid of the unnecessary and uncaring classification by enacting a truly caring fundamental motivation.

Remember the explanation of how the two "White supremacists" aren't actually acting in the interests of each other, but only in their own? Same thing applies here. There is no real "Black" group, only individuals who choose to self-identify by external observations and influences. Again both sides are doing the same thing, the perpetrators are doing it, and the activists. (The victims are likely doing it as well, but they are not being attacked by their own choice, so we can leave them out for now.) They are all labelling others however they want in a discriminatory and non-individual way; they are not going around and asking everyone that they think might qualify for their grouping whether they should be considered to be a part of it. Even if they asked every single potential individual if they identified in the same way, and they agreed, there would still be no connection between them, just a common interest, and they would only be aligned as long as it made sense. For example, "light-skinned privilege" is already another cause for concern within traditionally-unified groups, with different perpetrators and victims. And if they claim that anyone of a certain skin color or ethnic origin automatically falls within their group, then they are only creating definitions and drawing lines based on what others think of them for their own benefit. A person cannot be caring if they are deferring all power to someone else. The purpose of "Black Lives Matter" is to say that they care, but beneath the surface it is a statement of disrespect, even if the victims or activists do not understand how or why.

"All Lives Matter" may sound like it makes more sense because it seems to respect people as a whole (though not specifically as individuals), but it is clearly only a reaction to the BLM movement. If people really thought "All Lives Matter" then they would not be negligent of anyone anywhere, at any time, and along with that, they would have dedicated their lives to acting in the way that would help the most people, and respect them on an individual level, always, without classifying them into groups. I don't see anyone doing that.

The even more reactionary slogan of "All Black Lives Matter" is another response to the original saying with the intent of spotlighting the even greater number of Black lives lost which are seemingly being ignored by the original protest. Truly a combination of the first two mottos in intention, but it still utilizes the same dividing classification mechanism which led to the initial problem in the first place. Groups can be seen as separate entities, but when everyone is an individual, at the very least they can all be cared about or ignored equally. "White Lives Matter" promotes grouping as well, just like the original protest, but is also a reaction, and also creates animosity from people who have classified themselves as a member of a different group.

It doesn't matter how you define yourself, "your people", or family, or race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, etc., but the thing that matters is that you are the one drawing the line, not anyone else. Whether consciously, unconsciously, subconsciously, it doesn't matter, it is still "you" who are doing it. It is your decision wholly, on an individual level. You are the one choosing who appears to matter and who does not.

A saying that would be more in alignment with reality is "No Lives Matter Except Those You Choose". This would account for the "All Lives" that people ignored while also recognizing that the responsibility is on them to live up to their words, in all possible avenues of action.

If "White Silence is Violence", then is not the mischaracterization of the situation also violence? At the very least it is an affirmation of an uncaring philosophy. The whole "White Silence is Violence" slogan is nonsensical in relation to the BLM movement anyway, because by its own rules, saying one thing on one topic is silence on every other topic, and thus violent in every other area of concern. The only answer is to say the thing which can solve all problems, which is what I am doing with this book. Every other individual has the power to do the same.

All other topics related to BLM and critical race theory are inherently divisive and problem causing as well. Take affirmative action programs or a diversity quotas. Basically, it means giving an individual from an "underrepresented", "protected" "group" preference over somebody from an "overrepresented", "oppressive" "group". In simple terms, help the minority over the majority. And this is suggested because of the view that it is inevitable and absolute that an individual from the minority group is going to be discriminated against by the ones in power.

I'm sure it happens all the time. I'll even give in "for argument's sake" to the idea of "unconscious bias", whether scientifically demonstrable or not, because people clearly do things without thinking and instead react purely on emotion. However, these programs do not respect individuals on either side—the alleged perpetrator or the victim—because the inductive basis for the initial classification/grouping of individuals is uncaring and not in alignment with the truth, thus generating resentment instead of cohesion. I can see that individuals in "power" can be uncaring, just like individuals not in "power" can be uncaring, but what is the best solution? What is the caring one? Again, the reason why these programs exist is supposedly to be caring, but because they don't respect any individual generally, they're not a solution for anyone, but the facade of one. The ideal solution would be to promote a caring philosophy and way of looking at the world in hopes that it benefits everyone involved. The solution would be to value people as individuals, not only because it is the only coherent, truth-aligned viewpoint when it comes to interpreting reality, but because that would inherently destroy the idea of minority and majority, eliminating the possibility of prejudice. The other option, which is being promoted in the mainstream right now, is to side with an inductive, passive, externalized identity, which is uncaring and illogical when it comes to ascertaining fundamental truth. Clearly this view is causing division and problems. I am going to say this because nobody else can or will, but is it possible to say "Black Lives Matter" and truly be caring towards the individuals the movement is purporting to help? The answer is no. The phrase is an oxymoron because filtering individuals into a "Black" group is uncaring/objectifying from the start, but the supposed intention is to say that you care about them. You can't have it both ways. Again, I am providing the real solution.

Another common concept people bring up when it comes to politics is to describe things in terms of structures or labeling (or seeing) things as "the world". Such as if someone had said "the world is against me". These things do not exist. There is no such thing as "the world", there is only a population of individuals who come to their fundamental philosophies individually.

Their views may be similar or even virtually identical (though they are still separate people), but to describe them as a group would be disrespectful of their existence. Ideas such as "White privilege" are similarly illusory because the accuser is the one disrespectfully labeling individuals with their own individual philosophies as a group without cause. Uncaring people may *seem* to prefer someone over another, but a discriminatory interest is never caring towards any person involved in the situation. If a "White" person picked another person because they are "White" while skipping over a person of another "color", they still picked them because of an irrelevant detail, not because they actually care about who they really are. Both selection options are objectively not given respect as individuals. Promoting the idea of "White privilege" will only cause more injustice and is not the solution, it only affirms an arbitrary divide.

Forced diversity is also a bad answer. Although including people from varying backgrounds may provide more ways to look at solving a problem and thus possibly be more productive, it similarly is uncaring towards all the individuals involved. Only externalities are being looked at, not anyone's personal existence. And not only is that disrespectful towards all, it is not the best answer to the problem. Promoting a caring philosophy where the individual is open to all possibilities would provide more openness to take on any task at hand from many more angles, independent of time, than any experience-based background would provide. After all, an "experience-based" background is the same as an inductive data set—it is limited to what has been presented to the person, and that individual has no interest in whether their background is accurate to the truth. The past is also an illusion, a caring individual would have to always be responsible to reality in the present and not a construct in their own mind, similar to a mental filter, model or expectation-structure. People can claim that epigenetics programmed their instincts, where a parent's reaction to stimuli is passed down to the child who never experienced it, but again, if you believe that to be the absolute truth, you have to prove that determinism is real and the foundation of our (or at least your) existence, which inductive reasoning can never do, and never in a caring way. If you can't do that, then you just want to think that that worldview is true, which would also be denying of your own consciousness and free will.

And while we are here, I will reiterate that equality does not exist. Individuals are of equal value because we are all a part of reality and are connected to each other, but none of us are ultimately alike even if only due to the fact that we occupy different space. Comparison between people is unnecessary, we can just be valued for who we are. We are all part of objective reality, and it is uncaring to simplify it down. The answer is the expansion of awareness, with the goal of being conscious of all possibilities, and not a more refined, abstracting filter placed over reality, causing more separation, such as what is being uncaringly promoted by intersectional feminism. Do you want to just mess around thinking you're right, or actually solve the problem?

To all the social justice activists, I say instead of deconstructing to power, deconstruct power itself and analyze where people's value systems come from. You are essentially operating on a determinist belief system which highly values materialism and illogically denies your own existence. All injustice goes away when people are valued for who they are as individuals, and not by their external characteristics. There is no "they" or "the world" or "White people",

everyone is an individual, whose individually chosen philosophies line up to look like they are together, but they are just as uncaring towards each other in the group as those outside of it. This is an absolute. Inclusivity is a great idea, as long as it is about inclusivity of individuals, and not based on group identification, which is many steps down the psychological pipeline, please aim to do better, I know you can. Equity is uncaring because it implies force. If you use force, then it is logical to expect force back, I am providing you a much better solution. Choosing the wrong answer means you are complicit in creating more problems. Don't deny free will by trying to ban words and books, realize they are not authority voices, and if they are in fact wrong, then know the authors are actually imprisoned by their own operational philosophy. Even monsters deserve to be cared about. Be wary of using your platform to spread the wrong idea. The best use of it is to solve the most problems, for the most people, which is what I'm trying to do with this book.

No lives inherently matter in this world, except those that we say do. It is our caring interest that can value them as individuals for who they are in reality, and not as superficial groups gathered for objectively arbitrary and selfishly-reflexive reasons.

12

THERE IS ONLY ONE TENABLE POSITION

The reason I seem to keep saying the same thing over and over is because there is only one solution to any given problem, be it the environment, racism, class inequality, oppression, corruption, starvation, crime, bullying, etc.—these things happen because individuals have a fundamentally uncaring motivation. There is no way to make people care, they must choose to do so on their own. I did my best to describe the incentives and negative consequences of living a caring or uncaring life but each person decides which way is more worth it to them. I've tried to lay out some new ideas you may not have heard before, and after this book, I will try to continue.

One concept I mentioned earlier is that if other people exist, they exist in reality, and that those who are not interested in the truth are not interested in you. The same could be said for any possible God. If God exists, he exists in reality. And if you are not interested in understanding the truth of our world to our maximum ability, then by default you are not acting caringly towards any potential God. I am not making a statement on the veracity of any religion here because I simply do not have the information. Most if not all religions are presented as a historical story, and like any story, they could be true or false. For the record, I will even go ahead and allow the possibility that they could all be true simultaneously in a different way for each person in existence at the same time, but even so, the point I want to make is still this: if you are not looking at reality with as honest and caring of a view as you can concerning the validity of your methods of interpretation, then you do not care about any possible God. I will also give the caveat that maybe the true God isn't concerned with that, and only wants people to follow the possible prescribed word. Maybe all of what we perceive to be unfairness and negativity in many of the texts is exactly what's going on. That may be what God is exactly about, but I am asking the question of what are you about? God may not be interested in someone who is fundamentally

caring that doesn't fulfill some other requirement, but who is it that you want to be? I personally do not see how I can be faulted for trying to be as caring as I can, but if I am deemed unworthy, then it would have to be because I choose to be caring being. You cannot believe in a story and also be caring about God. We do not know if the stories are true or false, but the absolute truth about it is that if they are believed to be accurate, then we are enacting a filter upon reality (where God necessarily must exist), and are only looking at ourselves and not connecting to him. Again, this might be exactly what God wants, but it is not based on caring or love. Awareness of reality is the same as prayer or worship, in its purest and most fundamental form.

Some people have said that life is a choice between love and fear, but that is entirely wrong. One cannot fear anything until a value set has already been created. Fearing death is an affirmation of a deterministic, atheistic mindset. If you don't know for certain that death is the end then you have to remain open and uncommitted, and one way cannot be judged as better than the next. However, it is logical that the illusory, false sense of self (or "ego") would cease to exist at the point of death. All it ever was is a constructed reaction to the external world, but that is not who we are at our most fundamental level. We are the consciousness that either chose to passively accept reactivity as our identity, or actively choose to expand our awareness by caring about reality. And the only evidence on that deeper, primordial level that we can ascertain is that consciousness is an inherent property to our existent universe, and would thus remain, in at least some nebulous form. Fear of the unknown itself is for people who above all want a feeling of security over truth. The unknown for a person with a caring mindset is an opportunity to spread love. Nothing that exists in reality is not of value, it is as much a part of us as we are it. We are all here together and it could not be any other way. Any lines between people or beings are arbitrary and done for uncaring reasons. Some say that all life originated from one single cell, so even from that perspective we are all family. And even if not physically, then primarily in spirit.

Remember how I talked about there are no such things as "issues", and instead people are really only debating the foundations of their personal, individual philosophies? Well, it goes much further than that. Along the same lines as that concept, it would also make sense to say that all language and action is reflective of a person's fundamental philosophy. That's all that anyone is really promoting when they say, or do, anything. It doesn't matter if we're talking about the way they look, the values they hold, what they choose to do with their lives, or what they are talking about, regardless of if that individual person is conscious of it, or takes responsibility for it, they are underneath everything promoting, debating, or proffering their way of looking at the world. From time to time it may look like they are saying different things in different areas, but there will always be a commonality at their base. What is more caring and respectful towards this person, to only take them at superficial face value, or to include the way they think and operate as well? The latter is the totality of who they are, and if you actually care, then you have to view them and the universe in this way. The words "truth", "knowledge", "beauty", "power", "love", "caring", and "existence" can mean wildly different things to different people, but to someone who is open and aware, all those words actually mean the same thing. Going even further, to abstract any part of the philosophy presented in this book would be to misrepresent it.

THE END OF HOPE

When it comes to solving the problems of the world, "hope" is often seen as a virtue, but if a person is operating on a fundamentally caring philosophy, then not only is it unnecessary, but actually a quality that would move us away from achieving our goals. "Hope" is something one looks to when they don't have the answer, when they don't know how things are going to be, but by realizing the philosophy presented in this book, and implementing it into your life, then you can see that there is nothing more needed for change.

All problems are created by the self by deferring our power and agency to others and our environment, which disconnects us from the fact that we are in control of our own lives by choosing how we interpret the world at our deepest level. It seems like the vast majority of the planet's population have fallen susceptible to this way of thinking, which has caused and will continue to cause problems and issues the world over. The good news is that all the seemingly bad effects are not a big deal and only affect things of illusory value, so no reason to feel bad about it, nor is any forgiveness necessary. Also, the passive way of interpretation objectively has no connection to truth, only the feeling of security. All definitions, divisions, and drawn lines created through it are not only objective misidentifications, but are uncaring and only have to do with the individual himself. Nothing ascertained from that mindset can be real, and the entirety of that individual's existence is confined to a selfishly-reflexive fantasy.

The proof that love can be real is that you can exist as a caring, independent, and aware individual if you choose to be. It is simply a realization that love is possible in this world at its most fundamental level. You have to be your own proof, nobody can show it to you, nor would you be able to recognize it while running on an uncaring philosophy. The proof of love is that in the universe we live in, with the type of consciousness we have, that caring action is the fundamental factor in our existence and reality. But given that, I am here too, and I do care about you, and because of that, it is my interest to send out this message, in the hope that it may possibly help anyone who may come across it. I don't know if it will, or can, but maybe.

A way to bring a positive and helpful energy to the world without changing a thing is by just being appreciative of those around you. Just trying to make their day better out of respect and caringness can show them that the world is not all bad, regardless if they are trapped in that mindset. Not only would it potentially open up the possibility of a caring world, but they may pass it on as well. If enough people act this way towards the others around them then everyone connected to the social system could potentially change, and the apparent systems built on individuals' everyday actions and affirmations could embody a more caring outlook as well. The karma attached to being caring or uncaring is instant, you either live in a world where love can be real by personally having a caring outlook, or are trapped by an illusory sense of self where you have no power, and any true connection to others doesn't exist. There is no need to hope the world changes towards a certain way when the simple choice we can make to care is all it takes to make it happen. By taking great responsibility when determining how to interpret our world,

and our lives, can we gain great power. With fundamental caring action, we can transcend any situation, and triumph over any possibility. The way is not ambiguous, nor unknowable, hidden, discreet, or locked away, but it is right in your face if you are willing to accept it. The reason I wrote this book is because in this possible world, at this possible time, it is the most caring thing to do to help the most people. It is not up to me what you do with the information I've presented because it is our world, not mine. I will leave you with this: Do not get sidetracked or addicted to the search for contentment or happiness, to exist is to be independent of such things, attachments, needs, or desires. Those things are supposed to work for you, not you for it. We can only relate to each other through the truth, and only when you take full responsibility for yourself are you able to give.

This is not the final version of this book, but given the current state of the world, it seems necessary to place online as soon as possible. An audio/video version will follow shortly and then an "annotated" audio/video version where I will read the book and expand on the concepts paragraph-by-paragraph, it is much easier for me to do that than to write it out, and will be easier to understand. Those versions are what I am currently planning to do immediately next but I will also be posting video essays on expanded topics along with mirrored transcripts and podcasts. Please check proofoflove.com and VijayKher.com for updates. Thank you for your time :)