

Skepticism and Science for Spiritual People

You might be falsely told that Skepticism and Science are for Atheists. This is not so – the method, which was brought us by Scientific Revolution, is for everybody. In Scientific Revolution, it was asserted that people need to have first-hand acquaintance with their facts, and check the reliability of their sources, and they cannot simply assume that out-wordly entities or their own authorities are always right. For this, certain methods were created or distilled out from the knowledge of the World, and the people fought to get those accepted in the society.

Skepticism in Forms of Thought

Skepticism of the Buddha

In Buddhism, enlightened person is told to gain the first-hand acquaintance with the basic facts of Buddhism, like the Law of Karma. Buddhism distincts that who learned in such way, is a Buddha – but for all the others, it constantly works to provide the philosophy to study the mind on one's own, and to neutrally watch until one understands the Truth.

Skepticism in the Christianity

The desert story of the Christ, where he wants to verify or make sure something about his Father, craving for first-hand experience into the fact he knows intuitively very well. The early Catholics were told to doubt about the existence of God, and through this doubt, to reach a stronger proof. The skepticism of a Christianity is mostly around doubting, whether God exists – as this is their most important fact that there is God, this is also their most important doubt that existence of God should be doubted. Through this method, they reach some first-hand conclusions about the World, probably seeing the synchronicities, order and mathematics of Universe and making sure that indeed, these are the things they mean when they say that God exists. Catholics used to go through deep philosophy about that.

I think in the era of Science – their belief is weaker and they are simply feared to do this. But maybe they became used with their fact.

Later, they failed with skepticism – they had first-hand knowledge of many attributes of Mind and God, but they could not find out, how those fit with some of the assertions of natural science. Men appeared, who spoke about morals in entirely authoritarian ways, and started to use their science and its conclusions for manipulation. We can see such manipulation also occurs in scientific circles, and that it has not much to do with the original work – if a science is used for manipulation, we must fight this manipulation and not the original science; in the original science the same facts might be studied and philosophized about in the scientific manner.

Skepticism in Spirituality

For Spiritual people today, the Scientific Method is achieved for many, by being free and open-minded, not depending on external authorities, and seeking for first-hand experience before they assert a fact. We do not have a church telling us the Truth, but we study each other's work and finally draw some conclusions we can use in our own lives; we are somewhat skeptical as we speak, without losing our faith.

Skepticism in Science

Science should be entirely made of it, but often we see they are not skeptic – skepticism does not only mean to be skeptical about what other believe, but it means to be open-minded and skeptical about what you believe yourself, and accept that you don't have the final proof about your work and all the conclusions. Dogmatic skeptic is a contradiction, but many science people think they already did all their work, and what they did not find is not there – as they are not sensitive people, but people with low imagination, mind not so fast to find the exceptions, and much of learnt knowledge they did not verify themselves, those people are not being skeptical at all.

Fighting about such tendencies, whether done by atheist, christian, Buddhist, spiritual person or any other, is the fight for Science. The Science is not a body of work of Atheists, but you can see they use this word as well as the related words like skeptic, as if those words were about their own “religion”. If this religion is not about ethics, diversity and union, it's indeed a false church, a paganism.

The Universities, Academies and often the Governments tend to make the same mistakes the Catholic church did, and behave from entirely authoritative position, also they persecute people, who have arrived to different conclusions – by kicking them out from their circles, attributing with diagnosis and all the illegal activities a diagnosis can allow you to do. Very often, they do not attribute the spiritualism directly – but in case of failures in material world, or in case you do not take the material “yes” as granted, they use your spiritual experience as if this was the first cause of your problem. Really, you need a spiritual doctor to attribute your causes and find a solution, which fits your rightful model of the world – your taxes need to go to such doctor and the government should pay this as much as they pay the skeptics their doctors, from your money. They have a large dept for spiritual people, by having removed spiritual scientists and doctors from their rightful positions where they are heard and paid.

Skepticism

Integrity

You have a certain conduct for the life, which is more important than the model of the world you base it on. You have to distill your basic points, and things like Ethics we can conclude without needing much spiritual experience – spiritual experience makes it only stronger and integral.

You need to understand the different levels of certainty and different senses and inner senses (like logic) by which you derive the Truth. Now, there is synchronicity of Truth – if it shows itself on one plane of existence, it's very likely that you find the same essence of Truth in another plane of existence; if you can verify it with your third eye – you can find reasoning, which leads to similar conclusions also on the normal, physical plane. The logic does not have to be same, but finally you prove the same strategies about life, and you can show that yours are not very different, or dangerous.

I am ready to have most of Spiritual Truth proven only by mathematics and basic attributes of reality, like Space, Time and Energy, or existence of beings, which can have good or bad deeds – by basic mathematical formulations, I can conclude that basic Truth about Spiritual Well-being would follow anyway. So, when I talk, I resonate with all those layers of my being, I'm compassionate to where others are now on their path, and things of my personal experience – I express that I sense

Truth in them, because it's my personal Truth and not an opinion, but I do not force others to follow that. My argument is based on that they follow their own experience and access to Knowledge, and thus remain being sane, skeptical and open-minded like I am with my own Truth; I am not overly positive – I can also do mistake in my higher visions, but Truth is there to be debated and argued about, and to be experienced more and more, it cannot be final. So where I have strong basis, I still show that this is my Truth, and make suggestions also about how others can reach this – but the central point of my argument is around what they can really follow.

I also do not want to lose connection to Truth when I'm not in some higher state of mind – so, I reason, with my more basic senses and mind to do logic, until I reach a philosophy, which can see Truth even in the basic things. This is also social – I can bring strong arguments about this Truth, and these are not just my own arguments, but verifiable facts. My Truth sees different Sources of Truth, like Senses, Logic or Extrasensory Vision, like being Synchronous – you might not have some of them, but my arguments still make sense. The most important facts about the Reality live very well throughout these Sphere. But for people with Higher Senses, I also provide the facts that certain truths, for me, are still experienced, even if I cannot be very social about them, or even if I don't trust them enough before I find them resonating with all other layers of Truth, where I have more access and more strict and rigid reasoning process, until the Truth becomes like fundamental mathematics.

An example – Rule of Karma

You can see that all religions, including Pagan religions, Christian religion, and Buddhist or Hinduist religion, agree that the consequences of your actions are larger than this life, occurring also beyond your current story, probably on Earthly plane of existence. This similarity is more important than the difference – Buddhist and Christian do not agree completely, whether this happens gradually moving up and down in levels of existence, and Viking religion, for example, has older system of virtues, which are more similar to crimes to today's standards. Atheism, on the other hand, agrees that similar virtues must be followed because those are beneficial to others, and serve the higher good. The important thing here is, that when you follow the logic of virtues in all those systems, even where the paganism has been developed today – it talks about Spiritual Warrior, which has the same Archetypes, but on much higher degree of ethics; so today, the Vikings would agree with today's standards – after they die, they probably go to place, where they can have the Spiritual Warfare to create better personalities for themselves, or fight for the common good like others do. We can see that in rules of science, the similar ethics to spiritualism is theoretically to be followed.

Here we have a range of different reasonings, even different images of the World – but we can see that by all the reasons, an ethical life would follow. In each of these systems, we can consider which information we have access to, and derive all the consequences; in the end, we arrive the conclusion, that we should live an ethical life. From that point, we can also continue our reasoning to show, which kind of Ethics can be implied, and how it resonates with the different vibrations of Truth in existence.

By solving all this, we are completely integral and we won't feel the pain when we hear the Truth of Science. The "Empirical" Scientist, as well, could go into reasoning of Mysticism and find out, whether the Grand Teachers really teach Karma as the Manipulation Law to Follow the Authority; whether the basic explanations about God even allow you to get to the point where you directly

conclude that the World must be Flat, and whether they made implications from Evolution Theory, which conclude something about Spirituality, which makes their own Evolution Theory definitely wrong based on the experience of others. A kind of Evolution Theory, which concludes that the path of the Evolution is random, and without Rigid Spiritual Rules, or Rigid Rules about Ethics, this theory is wrong – a spiritual person cannot say, whether the mistake is in the base theory or in the conclusions, but they can point out that this starts to go against their experience; for them, too, it's more interesting to study the original Evolution Theory and find out that mathematically, even in this theory, Good Species must win in the end – Evolution does not introduce some specific Law, which would be against things, which happen everyday; it rather does an overall optimization of Causes and Effect we see in very life, an overall optimization of Law of Karma, which, through Evolution, becomes Higher and more Integral in Life. Any other conclusion about Evolution theory is mathematically wrong, and the Evolution Theory itself would be disproven, it would be wrong – not completely, but the version you have, it definitely has mistakes, and thus for others to say that the theory is wrong after they have read your introduction, is completely correct – even if they are more correct if they take the reasoning to it's end; in such case, you are not making your argument yourself, but in this argumentation, they have to carry out both sides of the argument, and this you cannot expect from them. If God is Everything, the Theory of Evolution is None Against God – it's only a part of Everything, a Way of God, and the Universal Mind must definitely feel the Process of Evolution as something going on inside itself, where it raises many possible combinations, and disproves part of them, going on with what is left. This kind of sensation is called deduction – to say that evolution does not think is like saying that you do not think if you combine all the possible combinations or hypothesis, and disprove all but some; after, you would find a solution which would fit the hypothesis, which are left, having some risk that one or another will finally turn out to be true – also, you might have lacked an inspiration and then, you want to reconsider some solutions, where you did not see plausible possibilities for them to be true.

When you explain this, you can behave somewhat like you have all those limitations yourself, express as if you would not know the Truth – you can state that internally, you are certain in this or that, so that others have the chance to follow your search for experience and find those basis; but as a central line of your speech – you can express the doubts in your Truth as expressions of more rigid or more general, more available Sources of Truth, and you can express, how you still make something up with what you have got. Thus, a spiritual person can use the expression of a skeptic, or another expression, to resonate with another person and their limitations – you look kind of skeptic, limiting yourself to their limits or to limits, which are widespread in society, and you still conclude some important Truths; if you are lucky, you conclude all the Truth needed for harmonious co-existence. I can say this is possible ..well, from my own Truth (but I can also reason this) :)

Social Rules

Generally, if you are skeptic, you conclude a lot about your social relations.

- You conclude that people, who don't agree with you, might have made their perfect point and generally, they deserve to live. Still, you trust them more if they are skeptical, and it goes against the whole point when they try to create an absolute authority.
- You understand that skepticism is not only about reaching a truth, but also about letting others reach the truth. The people, who have more limited senses, more limited attention, or

who have done less work in finding things out – to be philosophically deep, you also work through your things assuming the limited senses of those people.

- You can see Buddhist method of Meditation is somehow perfectly fit for an atheist, who can also prove the positive effects of basic method. The effects are much deeper, and the reasoning behind the Buddhist meditation is much deeper, but it's generally aligned with all our senses, and with all our senses and limitations – we can still be quite sure we want to use some kind of meditation. The Buddhist does not need many out-wordly claims for their Science, and thus, it's quite safe to begin and it's not very suspicious for people, who haven't reached all the goods with the practice.
- You need to create life philosophy, which is not absolute nonsense for people with limited senses; which does not seem dangerous and self-destructive for them. You need to go through philosophy, looking it through many lens of limitations of senses, limitations of ability to imply and reason, limitations of gaining first-hand acquaintance with facts and experiences; you cannot appear very random and irrational for people with such limitations – so that they could not tell at all what you are doing at streets and in their homes, or why you are suggesting certain things or fighting for your policies. You need a complex philosophy of Truth and Goodness, also about your senses, which could apply in diverse world.
- You understand that when you teach people, it's about their limitations, not yours. With all your abilities, you might be very well-acquainted with basis of your Truth, you might see it directly ..but if you tell it to people, you are superstitious. For them, to get something out from the direct knowledge and freedom of mind, even creativity, they need to progress slowly on their path, appreciate the differences of others, and not believe what they have no personal reason to believe. So you might directly see good and bad energies – but they need a simpler theory of what you mean by good and bad energies, and how this affects their lives; they need their own methods to check, whether a person has good or bad energy, whether they are going to help you or endanger you, and what they can say for sure to help such person with bad energy. To be *neutral*, you need to work through your philosophy and see that with different degrees of philosophical argument, for some people you reach the point where they can directly see your fact, but for others, you can prove how your model of the world is not dangerous for them, and how they can cooperate with you without needing to mistrust their own senses.
- For people, who have more senses and ability to imply the facts than you, you need to ask correct questions to meet something, what supports their fact. Facts and life sciences – they are simpler if you can have more direct knowledge, but with less, usually you reach something so similar that it does not make a difference any more, it's not a point for battles and turning people down. You need to search for the simplest theories, and also simplest in terms that they do not expect what people do not have – you might be right, but if people cannot check anything you say, then should they believe you, they still cannot understand, what they believe, and thus they become rather dogmatic, with all the bad causalities.

Meditations of Skepticism

You need to see the knowledge as having many different degrees of certainty, and many different models on which you can base the facts. Your perfect knowledge can somehow handle between the models, without becoming dangerous, and being in alignment with different ways to perceive the world. It must seem more or less safe and self-satisfactory for many people; they need to see that you can serve yourself – otherwise, they need to serve you, and then they have their say in your life. Maybe people very similar to you are doing suicides, or getting their lives into bad states and demanding money, or they are making other burdens; maybe the way you express your religion could as well be used to make people become terrorists. You cannot avoid all that, but you need to work on more scrutiny and you need to understand – people less capable than you also have some responsibility in the society, and they need to notice the immediate danger and cope with problematic people, so you need to have distinct reasons, which apply on many philosophical planes, to show why you are not one of such people. There are people, who see these problems everywhere and who only believe in their own senses, seeing those as final and complete – you need to do something about this, but first you have to make sure that such people cannot accuse you.

Multiparadigm Way of Goodness

Your views on Goodness, the good activities, thoughts etc., need to be undangerous and somewhat efficient with the eyes of many people. They cannot help you if you are doing perfectly good moves, which look as absolute evil if they are not on the same level as you.

So you need to create a common vision of Goodness and Ethics, which is reasoned from the viewpoint of different types of personalities and their abilities. For example, you cannot base it solely on that you get paid after you die, but you can find out – in the fractal of the Universe, you can show that you also get paid in this world, and you also need to think about others; if it's a good deed, then there is an argument that you did this to others, even if you don't get paid after you die. In your expressions, you base your argument also on limited senses of others, so that you can blame them if they do not understand. If you don't consider the limitations of others – you cannot blame them, because they would lose their mind and slow progress, they would lose all creativity if they cannot decide about the facts themselves, and they would come back as members of a cult, because the cult is expressing like you. You need to look somewhat rational so that they go that in the end, they are not going to pay your bills – I think it's normal to help others, but when your bills are that you could commit a crime, or they cannot say how you are different from a cult leader, then you need to understand this and work through the facts until you reach a theory, which also solves on slower computers.

Limitations of Senses:

- **Limitation of IQ:** If you have higher IQ, you can see many benefits in society and your life, where other people might see none. You need to work to create simpler theories of not much worse nor much different conceptions; and you need to change your ways so that you are also completely on the wrong path when you follow these theories. Then, people with low IQ have less arguments to attack you or say you are looking like a snake, even if you are an angel, and they cannot protect their children without also being in avoidance of you.

- Limitation of senses: You might have born with better senses, or worked all the way up. People, who see or notice less, they might scared when you accuse others, for example, based directly on your senses. You need to go through all the way to also provide simpler or more direct sense data, and to go philosophically through different possibilities, and to do so with more easy and basic philosophy. You cannot base, for example, your self-protection on things they don't see at all.
- Limitation of imagination and ability to see exceptions: In many cases, people see only some possibilities, and they won't see the exceptions, so they miss you with somebody else. You need to see clearly, on different levels of thought and perception, how your actions could be seen and what is the chance of other people to also directly trust their senses and intuition, instead of relying on yours – there is no reason why they should trust you over another person, who is going to lie and manipulate.

Your good deeds, your habits and life skills – you need to find a middle way, which can be reasoned from many different viewpoints and abilities. Where your degree of certainty is low, you often make an assertion that you have not testified your sentence from all the viewpoints, simplified models of the world.

Multiparadigm Way of Knowledge

Knowledge, often, reflects itself like a fractal through different planes and levels; just as the Way of Goodness does. Each case you have deep Spiritual Truth, which needs a lots of deepness and vision – you can find out that on lower planes, similar Truth exists. You can think of “As above, so below”, a Theorem of Hermetics. The Truth keeps repeating in different realms – I call this a Synchronicity of Truth.

If it's true for people of High Vision, something very similar is true for people, who barely understand the world. You need to study this paradigm and understand that even for you, this is the way of philosophical scrutiny.

You need to give away the last and the best of your truth, asserting this more or less as if it was a hypothesis, but a very certain hypothesis for you. You need to explain, what are your risk management ways in case your hypothesis is false, and that you would not completely fail. For example, it's dangerous to jump down from the mountain to verify a certain religious viewpoint, and I think people have done it in waves of wishful thinking – but what they promised to the world, and where they took the responsibility, were not their actual outcomes, also they cannot prove that they did not hurt themselves by mistake. If they were skeptical, they would create a basis of world view, which can be seen as one possible Model of the world – you can create different Models, and this is a scientifically accepted thing; by scientific criteria, your model can give you more or less safe way through Life and Truth, and explain things around you being more or less simple and without distortion. It might be ready for advanced belief, but still quite safe and useful model without such belief turning out to be true. You can prove that such kind of model is simply your personal attitude, and it should not make others cautious. For many models, this is true – but it's not obviously true, and for some people, with where they are on their way, they have no way to verify this.

You need to show how you fit, for example, with psychological models of things around you – what if those things are merely an illusion? What if this is an illusion, how you interpret them? Also –

which psychological processes would imply the same kind of tendencies and thus make your strategy more or less acceptable?

Method of Doubt

You start with your own senses. But, you model also the simpler beings in existence, and you apply the doubt to those views; you can know that finally, they live in the same world and they cannot make their senses completely consistent without at least giving you some chance to be correct; the risk that you simply lie can still be quite big – but if you go into the end with philosophical scrutiny, and you express carefully how you see it being true, and how you see your sentence as communication, which also appreciates personal verification of others, less sensible than you, you slowly reach a point, where such skeptical person must be out of their mind to accuse you. They would only have the plain fact that they are not skeptical at all, about their own truth. Now, you can accuse them – they cannot accuse you. And this is, what you need to reach. From this point, you can fight for your Scientific Freedom – the skeptics, now they are the guilty, the sinners against science instead of you, and this is what you need for authentic fight for the non-dogmatic world.

How far you can get

I have concluded that mostly, it's very much possible:

- For ethical Truth, you can show that it does not need extrasensory perception to understand it, but it also holds mathematically as Basic Truth; but the mathematical clarity is low for many people – so you can show that it also exists to be understood with basic senses.
- For spiritual Truth, you can also show that at least, those truths are Good and if you create societies where they hold somehow, they are better; also that the general models of reality, if they do not have such effects immediately, they have them over time and the reasoning concludes into such effects. Also that you do not do it all only for direct good – but that you might get the same visions for long-term good of many people (spiritually, you can see many effects coming back very fast and very close; but if you can do less science, you see that they come back upon time, and not directly to you, but also into what you do to others).
- Visionary Truth – sometimes you get a *vision* that you are being true. With you it resonates with absolute certainty, and for real I think such visions are really equal to truth. But you need to cope with people, who do not have or who do not believe such vision, and also you need to get to the simpler basis yourself, to have it always with you, not lost in time – thus, you find the important basis and conclusions of your vision also from the realms of simpler logical and mathematical truths, simpler life experiences, and even simpler spiritual minds. You find the *right speech* about how to attribute your visions.

True Spiritual Skepticism

You also need to work with skeptical method of your own senses. You cannot know you are not inside a simulation, or that you don't sense a completely virtual world – in the end, you cannot say anything absolutely certain. But still you are certain.

So, with different senses of yourself, and to help others – with your past capabilities; you need to find *simpler models*, and more basic *experiences, theorems and equations*, which would reach similar truth – which is pointing you vaguely in the same direction, so that your more exact

direction achieved by the whole truth is only a few degrees left or right, also being a good fit to standard mistakes or standard unknowns.

Overall, you need to know that there are different degrees of certainty, and this holds for your deepest, most sacred senses – once you work through them with philosophical scrutiny, you start to see that your facts did hold, but you made little implications and conclusions here and there, which you cannot directly conclude; you can have much more neutral theories, with less facts, which still work well together with your original vision or the source of your knowledge.

With other spiritual people, you see that they are on their way, and they have not seen everything you have seen – you need to understand their basis, and evaluate very well, where is your theory located with this. Maybe you don't seem mad – but if they completely believe in you, they would lose their own scrutiny, and another dogmatic person would be born. After this, they cannot be creative – if they do not understand the solutions, and do not see the basis, they cannot progress with their own science; and finally, eating your truth, they know less than they would have known otherwise.

Being assertive

You cannot now become a person, who only has “opinions”. You have experienced things, and some of those experiences or other results of research are very strong. So you can show that what you think is not up to this or that skeptical criteria, but sometimes you have your own certainty, and you know others cannot check that.

To be authentic, you need to understand that this is also their responsibility to remain on their senses; they have to know themselves that when you are sure, then for various reasons they have to bring their argument, whether it's correct or not, and they cannot simply think it's true because you said this. They also need to be scientific about their argument as you are about theirs – they need to work through the fact that they also don't know that you are wrong, and thus their opinion that your point is an opinion – is an opinion also, you might have the first-hand grasp on the Truth.

So we need to understand that rather than hiding your sources of confidence, so that other people cannot have confidence gained from you – it's healthy if it's the confidence to look into where you pointed, and to do some work to maybe gain the first-hand experience of that truth. It's utterly important that when you are certain by all your means you can express as if it's certain. It's the responsibility of you and others to see that indeed, there might be a mistake, a clever exception you cannot see, a way for an illusion or a hallucination – even sane people have them – and that, indeed, whereas it's YOUR TRUTH it's not THEIR TRUTH. It's sick, positive thinking, if they assume that from your certainty of something, their certainty should somehow follow. And this is insane and sick if you cannot express where you have the first-hand experience, so that other people cannot consider that such first-hand experiences could be possible. It's everybody's own responsibility to make sure that they seek the first-hand experience and do not place their beliefs, even if those happen to be true such way, on the certainties of others. This is also important that it's very important for you to know, whether another person is certain or not, and how they are certain. They might say that they are not certain, but they really don't have a better thing to believe, or that's simply the best they got; or they might say that it's their deep conviction where they have the reason to believe so, but you do not.

Truth should not be seen as positivistic run to get more of it into you, and to believe it all. Truth is not so much about believing, but it's also about doubt and unknowing. So, what other people know very well – they can tell you, but you do not know. Then, you must build something out of what you have, and *not what they have*. They must be free to state their theorems are theorems, their axioms are axioms, and their truth is indeed their truth – how this relates to you, *is not that these are your axioms, theorems and truths*. What you can achieve is your personal verification, experience, logic and IQ, and the result is completely different – as you simplify your model, there can be even contradictions; it's better to work with contradictions, but the simplest ways you put your into words, might have a direct contradiction of others – but still, for both sides, it's the best thing for them to believe.

There is right to believe what you believe, but there are also responsibilities related to that, because finally we live in the same world and your belief can have effect on lives of others in numerous ways – so you cannot be completely sure that they must not have effect on your life, based on your belief. So, you need to become more skeptical, with a world-view with better fit to the environment of world-views, and you must see that truth is a highly personal thing, but still a truth. You express it with certainty, and you have clear right for this – it's not the work of others to check you to the end, and it's not complete failure if you still turn out to be wrong sometimes; it's the natural process by which you can awaken other people's interest – you show that by your experience, this path of seeking the truth is very fruitful, and that you reached the point of believing. Belief, it's somewhat strategic thing, and thus you reached the point, where it's already quite safe, and the opposing arguments do not make your logic false; but maybe you had direct experience of the truth. You need to express that, because by this expression, maybe others can find the direct experience – you don't say that this is your opinion; you only explain that with this level of philosophical scrutiny or this level of limitations of senses and mind, the truth cannot be verified; you are very careful to show different aspects of this, so if many people cannot reach there, you also need to show that if they take you by word, they instead understand wrongly and understand another thing, maybe a lie – so you cannot completely say that *what you say* is truth, but you can be certain that there is something truth behind what you said; and certainty itself is perfectly good thing – because you yourself are certain, and you are not that for others; you do not mean that it's their certainty – it's yours. So if they are not certain, it's an additional philosophy, these are additional layers of doubt, and philosophically they are very reasoned and important things, and going through them is important process of verification – but those are *their doubts*, and not *your doubts*. This is a healthy climate of argument, where certainties and doubts of different people can coexist this way. So I do not express all my truth in forums, where you must say everything is an opinion unless coming from authority – this is dogmaticism itself; when everybody has their own truth, they *literally* have their own truth, and not their own opinion, and this *literally* means that others, also, have to have their own truth and not think that I am, by arguing about my truth, somehow arguing about your truth – no I'm not, you have to build your best model yourself, and it must be an effective model based on first-hand experiences, which you have, based on your IQ, based on your normal or extrasensory perception and making sense to yourself; this is not your problem or thing to fight if I have different truth, because there exist no truth and lie – there exists your truth and lie, and my truth and lie. Those are not to be confused, and so, in some forum, we would expect that people can argue with emotion, with argument, by calling their theorems theorems, and by still remaining to disagree and accept each other later, passing with their different Truth and doing their different things with their different Truth. This, really, is a True Science, not the ones, which assumes that ultimately, there is a

conclusion, which applies to people on all paths, not relevant how far they have god. Personal verification is basis of Truth itself, and the models always simplify so that they might have contradictions with others – if you concentrate on the central argument and verification of your model, and know about such side-effects, this is not relevant to you. Also, a cleaner or housekeeper – they can have non-scientific truth about what they do, or one lacking the relevant science; as their models are quite simple and relevant to what they do, this is not very important. If they start to hallucinate about you based on their model, and make insane conclusions or try to alter your life – I call them heretics, they have violently attacked the Truth based on positive cognition about themselves. It's important what you can do and what they can do about that.

<http://spireason.neocities.org/>