

Conflicted vid essay relates to love, which relates to truthism, which relates to love:

We, mankind, need to closely examine the things we deem as divine, if we truly want to get closer to god. I have a strong feeling that the pursuit of knowledge truth and a lifestyle of love (like how many of these “divine” prophets & Sai Baba lived) are divine, yet they don’t seem to be deemed divine in all these various global religious teachings. You know why I think all the religions are not getting the full picture of everything? Cause... People did complex engineering thousands of years ago, right? But how come? They didn’t know  $f=ma$  and all these exact physics equations, so how did they do engineering with that complexity? Well, because they had a general intuition, rule of thumb, and good-enough qualitative understanding of how the rules of the universe were, good-enough to do basic complex engineering. I believe it’s the same way with religion. All these religions are right in ways about approximating the divine in our universe, but they don’t get the full picture. I think if we really wanna get closer to god and see the divine, we need to closely define/examine what we see as “godly” in our universe. One reason why I think truths from the universe (like science) are divine is because everyone seems to agree on them. There unanimous approval that these truths right, which is so unlike other things in the world like politics or social stuff. In fact, anything dealing with subjective truths is what usually doesn’t seem divine. Usually any social interactions and stuff like politics is what deals with conflicting subjective truths. Maybe this is how we **morally advance** if everything is subjectively true to us humans, maybe this is where the universal law of **love** comes in. **Love** is how we morally advance if we are all conflicted, subjective beings, and love is the objective law/creed by which we treat our subjective perspectives as objective. Every law should be based on the principles of love. One big problem with truthism is that it doesn’t address subjective truths...which is where love comes in! Truthism is with the objective universal truths, and love compliments this by being the “objective universal law” of subjective truths. Truthism and love compliment each other in this way. It’s funny because one thing in the back of my mind was that I was trying to connect truthism and love cause the 2 philosophies seem right, but I just didn’t get how or if they related to each other. I guess now I see the connection between the 2 schools of thought.

1=1; This is this, 11/17/2024

Life is just about perspective. That’s what Kendrick said in the Heart Part 5. Why did he say that and why does it actually seem...kinda right? Stokes theorem, greens theorem, fundamental theorem of calculus are all just different ways of saying the same thing (different perspectives), and most of math is just like this, different ways of saying the same thing, and equating them. That’s where we get all these beautiful formulas from. Math looks so complicated, but really it’s so stupidly simple. They’re saying a table is a table, just with different perspectives, what’s one the left and right side of the equal sign. Physics is the same way too. If I explained Newton’s laws and relativity to a little kid, they’ll laugh at me for telling them something so simple; of course an object won’t move unless something pushes or pulls on it. The beauty and usefulness comes from the math behind it, equating those perspectives

algebraically. The complication of math and life comes from the tons of perspectives there are. Math provides a way to equate these perspectives (the equal signs), which is what makes it so elegant, beautiful, and the perfect language. But life is a little more complicated. That's why wars, bloodshed, and all these terrible things happen, when the perspectives can't equate each other. We need to accept that there are other perspectives, and we need to learn from them, only then will we get to the truth, which is quite anticlimactically simple,  $1=1$ . Yet, it's so powerful. Plato's cave and the blind men describing the elephant are the same thought experiment in essence. Asking if math was discovered or invented is the same thing as asking if reality exists outside our mental perception of it? I actually didn't get the full picture when I told Tharun that I found the answer to math being discovered or invented. I was right, but not the full picture. Just like how Newton was right in physics, but he didn't get the full picture. Humans create the tools in math, but those tools create the structure, that we later discover. So essentially, in math, we discover the structure that was created by our mathematical tools. We both discovered, and invented math, somehow. This is a pretty crazy conclusion to come to, but it makes sense. I'll give you more evidence as to why I think  $1=1$  is the biggest truth there is. Let's play a game. Let's start off with a horse, and you have to convince me that it is basically the same thing as something else. You might say a horse is just a really big, fast human. Then, you might say a human is just a chimpanzee that thinks he's smarter than everyone else. Then, you might say that a chimp is just a fly with a bunch more cells. A cell is just a small biological computer. A computer is just a bunch of metals glued together with adhesive. See how far-stretched that got? Does that mean, by our logic, a human is basically the same thing as a bunch of metals glued together? Sure, it does, if you look at it from that perspective. You're not technically wrong. But what is the one truth that we know for sure, that's not that far-stretched at all. A human is a human. You can play this game for anything, and the most true statement and thing that is definitely true in the line of steps in the game is the first/zero'th statement.  $X$  is just  $X$ .  $X=X$ . That is always true. You can view it in different perspectives and change that equation and you might get something like  $1/(1-X)=1+X+X^2+X^3\dots$ , which looks more confusing. But at the end of the day, all those identities came from the one true statement that  $X=X$ . There's a reason why they're called god's children and not god's adults. Kids experience and live divine the most. That's why I believe god is just a more knowledgeable and mature kid, which seems dumb and like a common sense statement, but that's probably a sign that is the truth. It's exactly like that meme with the normal distribution. The noob at the beginning and the master at the end of the distribution of skill are basically just saying the same thing. It's just the guy in the middle of the journey that's confused with a misguided outlook. That's why I believe it takes a master to teach the noobs, not the guy who's still confused in the middle of his journey. We seem to

marvel at the way kids look at the world, how they view it so simply, yet they still make their life so beautiful and nice. And god is probably the same as those kids since he just looks at the pure truths( $1=1$ ), not the extra stuff. Kids already probably experience reality the same way god sees it, as seen with how simply and elegant they view it. Kids just see an apple as an apple,  $1=1$ , the ultimate truth. At the end of the day, it's undeniably true that an apple is an apple. Reality is pretty simple( $1=1$ ), we just make it complicated( $e^{i\pi} = -1$ ). Reality is so simple,  $1=1$ , and we can leave it like that and continue to experience it's divine beauty by simply living like a kid. But we also try to understand it and that's where the complication comes in. It's not a bad thing that we try to understand reality. It actually makes our life better cause now we know how to prevent diseases, can eat clean food, etc. But there is a lot of confusion since there's a lot of perspectives on the world, and we're still trying to find out how to accept them and equate them all.

just add more stuff below; add to the ideas on the table.

Thoughts:

