BABEL

THEORY

A Take On Ontological Idealism.

PHILO & SHOushuke

NOTES

The corresponding text will be colored as such:

Miscellaneous: That is, arguments not centered to the theory itself, but are necessary to understand it.

Conclusions: It will have been preceded by arguments of any sort.

This text will contain, both the history of the organization, and Babel. I will try to present it systematically, though it might be hard to understand at some places due to radical connections. The first part will be dealing with establishing a framework for the concept of "Babel", which will be the foundation for "Babel Key", an important framework for the organization itself. The second part will be for the entire lore behind the organization, and how it connects with "Babel." This might be a little dense, as it is meant to be a short manual.

Each set of arguments builds on the previous one, so read it sequentially.

References are given as such [see IV-2] which is the fourth (sub)section's 2nd paragraph.

Contents

INTRODUCTION

There was once a city where everything was just a little off. People felt it in the corners of their lives, that is when they forgot why they walked into a room, when they recognized a stranger they had never met, or when they dreamed of places they had never been. Familiar?

No one talked about it.
Why?
Because the moment you asked why the city felt wrong, something in the world would change. What's that?

A street that was there might disappear. A friend might forget your name. A store you visited every day would suddenly be under construction, or when the scaffolding came down, it was something else entirely…. Why?
you wouldn't ask anymore…. Why? No one questions "Babel"

None knew why. None even remembered who had asked before. Why?
But there was a rumor. "Babel Key". Nothing else.
It wasn't an object. It wasn't a place. It wasn't a person. What was it? A mistake.
Long time ago, before the first city was built, before names even had meaning, there was a man known only as Babel.
He was not born a king, nor did he inherit a throne. He was also not a royal, he… was named though.
He was simply there, afterall names always exist, roaming among people who could not remember when he arrived.
Babel was different from other men. He never forgot.
He never misspoke.
He never lost his way.
It was said that he knew all things, past, present, and future which were not spoken.

When King Babel entered a village, things began to change.
Roads led to places they never had before.
Old houses became new overnight.
How? Names bring happiness, right? People would wake up and then loder that the father they had known their entire life that never existed. Why...?
And yet, they never questioned it.
Because questioning meant remembering. And remembering is dangerous, don't you think?
One day, a young girl, braver, or more foolish than the rest, stood before King Babel and asked, "Why does the world change when you arrive?" She always loved asking questions.

King Babel smiled, the teeth were too white, as if they had never bitten into anything real.
"Because the world does not exist until I speak it."
The girl did not understand.
Why? She is a little girl, after all.

So Babel reached out, and touched her forehead with one long finger as he whispered a name she had never heard before.... No one knows what Babel whispered.

She remembered.
She fell to the ground, as she screamed. What did she remember? I don't know.
The people of the village came running, but they did not know who she was.
Her name, her face... Who's she?
The girl was gone. Where? Perhaps, hell, as those named are happy, and go to heaven. Not her though. King Babel walked away, searching for some other place, obviously which did not exist. After All, Babel is the one who brings worlds, no?
Though, sometimes, on nights usually, when a word feels like it is there just at the edge of your tongue, hoping to be remembered...
Be careful.
As if you say it aloud, and if you try to remember too much...
Babel will hear you.

That was a story.
Maybe, it's true. Maybe not. In one such reality, Babel was caged.

Basically, to say...
The Babel Key is not an object.
It is a door.
A door to something older than the world itself, perhaps.
It was a door to Babel.

The question of whether babel was a person, or a name to fill, is
unanswerable, because this is not a good question at all.

The Linguistic Determinism Of Reality

I will argue for two main premises which I will be using throughout this self-reference manual. Before that, I would like to say that this is based on ontological idealism, and derives quite a lot from it, though this is not entirely synonymous with it at all.

It also does derive from Berkeley's subjective idealism and Kant's transcendental idealism.

The fundamental premises are:

Premise 1: A phenomenon exists only if it is describable.

Premise 2: That which is not described is indistinguishable from nonexistence.

The Primacy of Language in Reality Formation

The reality shall be treated, as in knowing about it, not as an independent construct, but as a result of linguistic determinism.

Let me talk a little more about the relation between language and reality. Philosophers talk about reality either being an independent structure, or that it exists based on perception.
The Babel theory suggests that the latter is true, and throughout this manual, I will provide some arguments.

Linguistic Mediation [I]

I will argue why even at the most basic perception, we do not perceive raw reality.

The human brain does not process all sensory input, but it filters on the basis of survival, and even without words, humans used to categorize their experiences in primitive ways such as danger, safety, edible, or inedible. These categories, technically, were proto-language, making the reality comprehensible. We can talk a little about the fact that our senses electromagnetic waves into "sight", compress air vibrations in the form of "sound".

Patients who suffer from aphasia(language impairment caused by brain damage) usually lose their ability to recognize complex ideas, and not just the ability to describe them, but to even think about them coherently.

Even before language truly developed(which I am, for example, am classifying as different from linguistics in its purest form), we had mental sketches of preverbal linguistic constructs. Even if words truly don't exist, we still do think in 'structure', as evident from the fact that even deaf individuals who were not taught language, developed forms of linguistic framework. Even early thoughts were not raw, as humans did associate gestures with specific consensual interpretation.

If, for example, someone says we do perceive reality 'raw', that is without any categorization, it leads to issues like the fact something can not be experienced without any categorization. For example, If a person perceives

light and dark without any real means of differentiating between the two, does the one who perceived it truly can be said to have "seen" anything?

If reality is accessible without any reference point at all, what did they even 'see'? So, if an organism perceives but cannot process it in any structured form, the experience is functionally equivalent to nothing at all, and as such perception without distinction is indistinguishable from non-perception.

Supported by **Sapir–Whorf hypothesis.**

Historical Revisionism [II]

If reality would be absolute, the past would be immutable. It is not, as evidence can be fabricated such as to support their arguments. Now, the thing to note is, ultimately, it is not what "happened" which determines it, but what is known to you. If you never saw my dog, never known his smell, touch, my dog does not 'exist' for you?

The collective memory, as I would argue, is malleable, that is dominant narratives will change it, for sure. Here is something for you to think about, if a society filled with persons coloured purple, remembered something 'X' that happened, but over generations, that is not what the narrative is even about anymore. Let us say, the green generation is the newer generation, who will believe what happened, as not "X" but maybe "Y", for them. The reality can retroactively be changed, as through the intentional change in the linguistic framework over time.

One great way to understand this is how those scientific dogmas are now treated as archaic superstition, and this applies to everything beyond just history as even scientific truths are vulnerable to linguistic restructuring.

See [I] to really understand what I mean by 'linguistics' here, it is broader than the usual definition, if you are perhaps confused by the term's usage.

Hence, perception influences history's perception itself, and changes 'reality' for us. After all, perception is tied to ourselves, much more than it even is for reality.

Linguistic Variation[III]

Different languages partition the same reality differently. One example is the Pirahã tribe in the Amazon has no numerical system, just vague quantifiers, so 'their' [See II-1] reality does not allow precise counting. One more example is the hopi people, who do not have a clear distinction between past, present, and future, and as such, they perceive 'time' differently from indo-europeans, for example. In the same way, cultures with no concept of 'self' will have radically different conceptualization of identity.

The perception of time is again different in the context of Mandarin where it is said to be 'up' and 'down', basically a vertical linear time progression compared to English, this makes a difference in perceiving it mentally.

Certain words do not have a direct translation to other languages, so if the word were to disappear, a construct would disappear too, large for sure even though common concepts exist too. One such example is "Mamihlapinatapai" (In Yaghan, an indigenous language of Tierra del Fuego), in simpler terms, this is the unspoken mutual understanding between two people.

If the perception is based on a linguistic framework as I showed above, then reality in itself, is dictated by linguistics. It also means if these 'realities' can not be accessed without these words, then words themselves define the boundaries of reality, so to kill a language is to kill a 'reality'.

The Linguistics As a stabilizing Medium

If reality is unstable until described as I argued above, then language is a means of solidifying existence, or I will be using the term "stabilizing" medium. I will be providing arguments for this.

Causal Fixation[IV]

Once something is repeated enough, it becomes immovable as a reality. It seems clear from [II].

A law is enforced, because it has been stated since forever. It is a structure existing through constant moving, and if the 'law' is stopped being spoken, thought about, or written, the law ceases to exist.

Historical events are perceived as 'real' due to the constant argumentation, or that it is being continuously taught. Events that are omitted from history books or recontextualized through new terminology experiences a shift in the existence in its whole. [see II-1]

A person's identity is maintained because they are consistently referred to by name, so the moment a name is forgotten, the presence in reality disappears. This is why erasing a name from records is basically also erasing a person's existence. [see III]

So, if reality is 'limited' by linguistics, it means anything without such a form is undefined. This raises paradoxes such as that if a concept has no name, does it even exist? Or perhaps, if an event was never recorded, did it really happen? A popular example of this is the, "If a tree fell in the forest, but no one was there to perceive it, so did it really happen?". If a person is

forgotten entirely, do they exist in any meaningful structure, considering they have been stripped of it.

As such, 'reality' is not true, and is reinforced through constant linguistic change, which is our perception of it. [see I]

ONTOLOGICAL INERTIA[V]

This is a strange thing to name it this way, but it made sense. I will argue for the inertia of concepts.

Once a 'reality' is established , it resists change, and hence prevents reality from dissolving. Paradigm shifts are always resisted because they threaten linguistic reality, that is when a new scientific theory comes (such as heliocentrism, evolution, quantum mechanics), people resist it not because of evidence but because it disrupts the 'linguistic stability'. I argue that the rate of this resistance increases as 'reality' is 'fixed' more.

Such as the geocentric model persisting for centuries despite contradictions, or that the theory of phlogiston (a substance which was said to cause combustion) lasted longer than it should have, because it had a naming system that did certainly stabilizes its existence.

Religious concepts persist for centuries, because they are reinforced through rituals, and related, so even when belief systems decline, the words will not die, that is it allows the ideas to persist in cultural memory. [see IV]

In simpler terms, when something is named and used a lot, it becomes difficult to erase, such as the fact that the concept of "evil" is still there despite the scientific advancements in psychology, psychology, and in formal ethics.

Basically once words create a 'reality', they resist dissolution, no matter how much evidence contradicts them.

Linguistic Decay[VI]

As I argued, how linguistics can preserve a 'reality' [see IV, V] , it can destroy a 'reality' too. That is simply because language is not just the reflection of thought, but the infrastructure of the thought itself. So, if a word dies, the concept starts decaying.

The concept of 'privacy' appears alien to those cultures which do not have a direct translation of the word itself, and hence the idea starts to struggle to exist too. Civilizations that lose the numerical system, will never achieve higher mathematics, this is a direct result of the version of a concept decaying.

So, if a word dies, a version of the reality dies too, and if a word is erased from everywhere, every memory, and record, then it effectively never existed at all.

THE SPEAKER

The first observer would have to describe the reality itself. Was the first observer the first human?
"In the beginning was the word" - Genesis. This line explains that before anything was "word". In other examples, such as "Brahman Spoke The World Into Existence".

The first observer was the first Babel, it is unclear since when he existed, but it is said he existed since the concept of perception existed. I will explain about this more later on.

The Triarch of Ruin

The loophole structure, when it was created, experienced a strange phenomenon called the recurring reality. It was done as the 'God Of Death, and Balance' interfered in the creation of this specific universe.

The loophole structure, on its own, is a collection of infinite spatial space universes , infinite collections of timelines, and parallel realities. It is just one of the infinite structures.

The first Babel was said to exist since the creation of perception in the structure itself, as explained.

Before that, let us define two spatial spaces.
The first one is the pale horizon, an infinite 4d structure, said to hold connections of consciousness to humans. It is a cognitive 4d structure. Each step is the pale horizon means, abstractions from the current reality, and more cognitive increase. There can be infinite steps which can be taken. The human cognitive limit is defined in just 15 steps.

A Babel is said to virtually access the pale horizon, and can move much further. A babel is said to be someone who has gone much further in the Pale horizon, and has the structured access to the '3D' world, and is hence, able to impose interpretations, and that is how a Babel imposes order on the reality.

Since, more than a single enforcer of imperfections can not exist, basically, at a time, only one Babel can exist since having two causes a disturbance in the pale horizon, as it then rejects such an existence, as it marks everything flawed.

The other spatial space is the 'Beyond', an infinite 5d structure containing the infinite 4d pale horizon, every pale horizon is connected, yet different, but every thing leads to the same 'Beyond'. The Beyond is what causes a reality to exist at all.

The Beyond rejects any revolt, as in interpretation in the simplest form, which is what a Babel does, so if a Babel crosses the Pale Horizon, he is said to cause a silent catalyst.
A silent catalyst rewrites the reality, and the Babel is thrown in Beyond's end, and a Babel ceases to exist.

Though, I did say "Babels", only two babels have ever been in the entirety. When the first Babel, also the first observer, interpreted reality, the catalyst began, and the reality got rewritten. During this time, a group of scholars prepared something called the "Aeon Codex". It survived the rewriting of reality, which should have been impossible. Though, it did lose its part, and became a fragment.

In 2CE, some people discovered this document. These people called themselves the first keepers of this knowledge, though as I said, it is unsure how much time after the silent catalyst was this timeline exactly of, perhaps a billion years. These people later created the Aeon Mandeta based on the name of the document.

The Aeon Mandeta then were on the lookout of containment, as the only way to truly stop a silent catalyst to ever happen again, is to contain a Babel.

King Babel[see introduction] was the one contained, the second Babel, as I said, it is now known the time period between the first Babel, and the second Babel, it can be anything.

The Mandeta is not righteous, it conducts social experiments, which it calls the best for stabilizing the society, though the Mandeta needs control, and has several protocols, such as protocol A, which was mainly for controlling literal wars, by playing on both sides, all while remaining fully concealed.