

General Principle of Psychodichotomy

Ma Curtis York

University of California , San Diego

(Dated : March 8th, 2022)

Abstract

The noetic motion of the origin of consciousness is postulated by many long before and after me. Until this day, not one theory has cemented itself above all its competitors. Presenting you the Principles of Psychodichotomy, a theory concerning the origin of consciousness. I provide to you an imagination experiment that proves consciousness cannot be solely in the brain. Our consciousness depends on something to compare to and that we can only compare ourselves to ourselves. I give a convincing argument for a binary idealistic theory of consciousness. This theory is analogous to the 4E theory of cognition. However, I differ in concluding that we can divide reality into emotion. As we fluctuate between Subjective to Objective and vice versa, what draws our attention must deterministically understand we would perceive it. Whatever mathematical law that governs our universe, it must be actively looking for perceivers like me to attract and repel. Drawing our attention (objective) when attracted, (subjective) emotional when we are repelled. Unconscious processes in the brain drive the fluctuation of conscious states. Attracted to the tangent of reality gives these two states a probability. I conclude that we live in a removable discontinuity and both objective and subjective states can define our existence. Further applications, i.e. mathematical models, mathematical philosophy.

¹ Electronic Address : mayork9876@gmail.com

I. The Imagination Bug

“ Creativity is not what can’t be imagined, it is creating what we can see but not tell.”

The imagination experiment below provides evidence for an “ bug” in reality. This idea would be tested through a facial perspective experiment. 1st and 3rd person. There are two basis behind this experiment. First is the unifying problem of consciousness. If the brain cannot unify its own visual stimuli, we can infer that it doesn’t comprehend its own existence. A testable experiment in which the brain is not the origin of conscious. Second, if we cannot piece our face together as we can do for daily objects .i.e. Cups and Bags. These objects are made out of topological geons. We can infer that we do not see ourselves the same as we see reality. So how do we know of our existence if there is nothing similar to us in what we see. Therefore, our existence depends on something to compare to. Colors could be compared because they are colors. You do not compare a color to a cow. Therefore, for us to exist, we must be comparing ourselves to ourselves in constant motion. We do this as a re-entry system, we perceive the world and the world perceives us. Conscious 0 and Conscious 1.

II. Experimental guidelines

Step 1 : Photo taking

*Take a photo of yourself using
the front camera.*

note : Do not use the selfie camera

Analyze the shape of your face, your features, its design and slope. 30 secs to 1 min.

Agree with the subject that the photo is an objective view of himself. > Step 2

Step 2 : Third person imagination

Imagine yourself from a third person perspective, using the photo as reference.

Note :

It has to be a precise imagination of your own face.

The usual method is to copy and paste the photo into your imagination.

Hypothesis : After this trial, the subject should be able to agree that a precise imagination of theirs was present.

Now, Tell the participant to forget the photo entirely but still keep in mind the location of their features and its design.

> Step 3

Step 3 : First person imagination

*Imagine yourself from a first person perspective, meaning in imagination the subject has to piece their face together. The subject has to piece their SKIN together***. On top of the skin are their features. Hence, unifying its own visual stimuli. A precise imagination must be achieved. It cannot contain any blurriness.*

Note :

- 1. Do it without any internal imaginative assistance, etc : mirrors, cannot copy and paste , cannot imagine a photo in front of you and looking at it.*
- 2. Pure imagination must be used to piece their own features back into one.*
- 3. The Features/ Skin should be in 1st person, rotated as to the way you are looking out, and pieced back that way.*

Hypothesis : A stopping power will prevent the subject from imagining its own face. They should not be able to imagine their own face, skin, or skin with features in a 1st person perspective.

III. Results

When a subject imagines his/her own face from a third person perspective, the subject can have a precise imagination of their own face. From a first person perspective, a stopping power obstructs the subject into piecing a precise face of him/her in their imagination. I have operated this experiment on 27 subjects. 27/27 could not unify their face in first person perspective, supporting my hypothesis. 8/27 of them concluded that they felt themselves dead - the feeling of emptiness inside during their trial. 27/27, had no disagreements.

Name	MBTI	Imagine status	Age	Sex	Reflection
Anson	INFJ	Cannot	21	F	No disagreement, felt she wasn't alive.
Vedant	INFJ	Cannot	16	M	No disagreement, felt he wasn't alive, "trapped in a cage" / looking out from a cage
Curtis	INFJ	Cannot	20	M	No disagreement, felt he wasn't alive. Saw nerves of himself. Empty inside
Raymond	ENFJ	Cannot	69	M	No disagreement, didn't ask further.
John	INTJ	Cannot	20	M	No disagreement, concluded the body as a vessel, felt he was dead,
Megan	INFP	Cannot	11	F	No disagreement, didn't ask further
Eric	ENFP	Cannot	20	M	No disagreement, didn't understand

					the feeling of dead, said it was too deep for him.
Kevin	ESTJ	Cannot	20	M	No disagreement, felt the emptiness in his imagination, his idea of dead
Coey	INTP	Cannot	15	F	No disagreement, also felt she was dead / empty inside
Gu	ESTJ	Cannot	43	F	No disagreement, also felt she was dead / empty inside
Eva Kwong	INFP	Cannot	50	F	No disagreement, said she was imagining so she must be alive
Meggie	ISFP	Cannot	58	F	No disagreement, said the person she imagined was not her. In her meaning that person is dead.
Tony	INTP	Cannot	21	M	No disagreement, felt the emptiness in the picture or the stopping for my terms
Guohao	ENFJ	Cannot	21	M	No disagreement, felt the stopping power.
Kana	INTP	Cannot	21	F	No disagreement, felt the stopping power. Asked how it's possible.
Risa	ENFJ	Cannot	21	F	No disagreement, reflected how she cannot do it.
Chris Lin	INFJ	Cannot	20	M	No disagreement, astonished.
Dars	INFX	Cannot	24	M	No disagreement , heard something similar before.
Kyros	INFJ	Cannot	21	M	No disagreement , astonished, had questions about it.

Antoni	INTP	Cannot	21	M	No disagreement, checked my logic.and agreed
Kegative_ Narma	INTP	Cannot	21	M	No disagreement, checked my logic and agreed
Terry	ISFP	Cannot	21	M	No disagreement, commented how the thing we try to imagine is not us.
ZZC	IxTx	Cannot	21	M	No disagreement.
Subham	ISTP	Cannot	21	M	No disagreement and agreed but argued there's another explanation.
Beach girl 1	XXXX	Cannot	21	F	No disagreement, felt the stopping power.
Beach girl 2	XXXX	Cannot	21	F	No disagreement, agreed with beach girl 1 that there is a stopping power.

IV. Discussion

Given supportive evidence by the experiment, we can conclude that there is a stopping power to us from imagining our own face in first person by piecing it back together like a puzzle. However we can imagine anything on this planet in first person. The interval we can imagine is any geometric topological shape combined. Etc. Cups, bags and bottles. The imagination “ bug” is hence our own face. We can here conclude that there is a fundamental difference in how we perceive ourselves vs the world.

Our own face on the other hand has a very interesting archetype. It is most directly related to the idea of the self. If the same photo you took in the experiment was compared with someone else's. It would take no longer than 5 secs to understand that it is you. That is the self.

But how does the self exist? To exist there must be something to compare to. Blue exists because there is red or orange. If one cannot compare himself to objective reality, then how do we exist? Therefore, for the self to exist, there must be a re-entry system. When we perceive the world, the world must perceive us perceiving it. Only by this mechanic, then we can compare ourselves to ourselves.

∴ I set perceiving the world as Conscious 0 and the world perceiving us perceiving it as Conscious 1.

Following this logic, our existence depends on what you perceive. You perceive the KN95 mask in front of you. The mask is one in the series that make you exist.

When we direct our attention to the world, whatever we perceive perceives us, this however does not require another brain to perceive us. It is quantum.

For what we don't perceive still exists continuously, as a perceiver, we have no ability to control the rise and collapse of matter. Our ability is to define existence through objective or subjective means.

Providing a more abstract approach, this dynamic system that exists creates meaning. Because of it, the self is created. What has meaning to us? What has meaning is only what affects us. What affects us is what we perceive. In this universe, we have no ability to control what affects us. You can affect another person, but casually what objectively affects you is never yourself. So in terms of Free Will, we do not have any. Following this logic, since what we perceive is never determined by us, not even the self. We can conclude here that we are in a sense "0" , or empty. Since consciousness , the brain, depends on something to perceive.

Consciousness cannot be understood until we understand the creation of matter. They are equivalent.

Furthermore, few of the participants reflected we fail to imagine our own face in first person because we haven't seen the inverse of ourselves. That is a factual statement. There is no point of origin in what we perceive. If one may ask you where is your middle, you have no choice but to answer that your middle is everywhere. Since the universe operates under rigorous mathematical laws, we can incorporate the idea of superdeterminism into speculation.

Summing up all ideas, it is clear that the universe perceives us perceiving it. However is it passively or actively perceiving us?

Have you ever been drawn to a source and suddenly coming back to realizing you just lost focus? In this final case, I speculate that the universe is actively perceiving us. When we are drawn to a source for example, we are distorted away from the tangent of reality.

When something draws your attention there are 4 possible states of distortion:

∴ Subjective state > Objective state (1)

∴ Objective state > Subjective state (2)

∴ Objective state > Objective state (3)

∴ Subjective state > Subjective state (4)

- (1) It occurs when you're in your emotions and suddenly something attracts you to perceive it. It feels like a magnet is pulling you in as you have no conscious control after realizing you have directed your attention towards the "thing"

- (2) You can be objectively observing a phenomenon when you suddenly feel remorse about it. Your emotions draw you in, repelling you away from objectively observing the phenomenon.
- (3) You can be objectively observing a phenomenon when another phenomenon gains your attention, this again feels like a magnet pulling on you, as you have no reason to stop yourself until you realize what you just realized.
- (4) Emotions fluctuate, you can be feeling one emotion a second earlier and the next second after some analysis or rationalization of emotion. You arrive at another emotion.

∴ We feel as if a magnet is pulling on us when we become objective, repelled away from the magnet when we feel our emotions. In essence, there are unconscious processes that we have no realization of that control every instantaneous rate of change of conscious state we experience. Changing conscious states is a gradual process.

∴ We can speculate that the world is actively looking at us. When we are attracted towards the tangent of reality, superdeterminism follows that the mathematics that drive the universe “understand” that I will perceive it. I will not get attention unless I know I will affect someone's perception. The act of knowing one will perceive you requires active “perceiving” by the universe on us.

Why? A better question, is the world different without you?

The world is no different without you, you will be replaced, however in a world with me, I will not be replaced therefore I inherently have meaning. Again, meaning is possible because of the perceiver effect. Therefore, the perceiver effect has meaning. The perceiver effect contains the self, our Subjective state, and Objective state. The perceiver effect is hence equally as

significant to any objective phenomenon. Tangent to reality, we gradually tend towards either state. Yet, the aftermath of such an act is always emotion. Emotion always comes after understanding.

In essence, we can divide reality into emotion but not logic. The perceiver effect defines our existence. Similar to filling in an input. I imagine us to live in a removable discontinuity, it satisfies us being perceivers and it contributes to the meaning generated by conscious 0 and conscious 1.

Further applications .i.e. a mathematical model or the derivative of conscious states could be calculated. Mathematical philosophy could also be applied.
