Proof Copy ([8$_E$/2] in the process of completion)

Dr Jan Pajak
Totalizm
i.e. the philosophy of morality, peace, progress, and hope
Volume 1:
Practicing totalizm

Second edition, Monograph, Wellington, New Zealand, 2009,
ISBN 978-1-877458-80-4

This monograph is a scientific report from results of the author's research. For this reason all parts which have documentary or evidential value are presented accordingly to standards applicable for scientific publications (reports). Special attention is given to the requirement of repetitiveness, i.e. that on the basis of this monograph any professional scientist or hobby investigator who would like to verify, repeat, or extend the author's research should be able to recreate his work and arrive at very similar results and conclusions.

All correspondence to the author of this monograph can be directed to (valid in 2009):
Dr Jan Pajak
P.O. Box 33250
Petone 6340
NEW ZEALAND
Home tel. (2009): +64 (4) 56-94-820; E-mails: janpajak@gmail.com or pajakjan@yahoo.co.nz

<u>ABSTRACT</u> of volume 1 of monograph [8$_E$/2] "Totalizm", ISBN 978-1-877458-80-4.

If this is the first description of a philosophy that you hold in your hands, you make an excellent choice. Some people believe that we should try everything in our lives (at least one time - so that we know how it tastes). You started with totalizm (i.e. "totalizm" spelled with "z" – which should NOT be confused with "totalism" spelled with "s" that is just a version of "totalitarianism"). Totalizm is the most moral, peaceful, rewarding, progressive, modern, positive, constructive, open, clear, and truth promoting, philosophy on Earth. In turn this monograph contains the best description of totalizm so-far. So you started from the very best!

I should be honest with you: I am a doer not a philosopher. After you read subsection L4, which describes my life, you must realise that I am used to do things - thousand and one things! So I more know how to do, than how to write about it. To make it even more unusual, I have a technical mind, and a new philosophy is the last thing on Earth that I would ever expect to create - if the choice of what I should do, belongs solely to me. I used to be a professor of computer sciences at some stage of my life, and I was also a professor of mechanical engineering, plus a sub-lieutenant in military sappers, who dispose mine fields and build bridges. My way of thinking is very strict. So is also my philosophy. What I am doing is not intended to produce mountains of empty words, but to yield unambiguous, clear, well-defined, measurable, and fast results. Totalizm is exactly like that: it gives very clear instructions as to how one should lead his/her life, and explains all principles, so that one exactly knows what, and why, is doing. If one follows these instructions, and understands these principles, one reaps well-defined rewards. By the way, totalizm is the only philosophy, which was not "invented", but it is an applied outcome of the Concept of Dipolar Gravity (chapters H & I).

So are there any results and rewards that one should expect to reap from living the life according to totalizm. Yes! There is a lot of them. All well defined, and all to appear in this life-time - some of them almost instantly. This may shock, as many philosophies do not define their rewards, while philosophies of some religions promise rewards only after one dies. Totalizm is different. It provides a list of well defined rewards (see subsections A2.4 and F2), which are achievable - if one practices this philosophy. For example, consider happiness. Without knowing it, probably you follow currently the destructive philosophy of our civilization (i.e. parasitism): how frequently it made you happy? Can you indicate now, without a long hesitation, a case in your life, when you were really happy for longer then a few hours? In comparison, because I follow totalizm, in chapter E of this monograph I exactly describe the case, when I was "nirvana-happy" continually for around 9 months! Or can you, again without a long hesitation, name anything that our civilization provided you with, that dramatically improved the quality of your life? Again, I can do this easily: for me this is the philosophy of totalizm!

With philosophies is a bit like with our lungs: everyone has them, and continually must use them in order to live, although not everyone, and not at all times, is aware that they do exist and that he/she is using them. After all, independently how the word "philosophy" is defined in expensive books, in the everyday practical application it means "a collection of principles and rules which one follows in his/her life" (note a paradox with living: even if one does not follow any rules, still one lives according to the rule "to not follow any rule" - means one follows a "primitive parasitism" described in chapter KA of this monograph). Therefore, even if one is not aware of doing this, one still follows some kind of philosophy in everything that he/she is doing. Only that usually the philosophy that one follows is unstructured and non-formalized: it just represents a medley of rules which either are outcome of ones emotional responses, or one picked them up from the society in which he/she is living. So usually one follows a chaotic philosophy of impulses. In turn, if one analyses where such a chaotic philosophy leads him/her to (this is done in the text of this monograph), then one realizes that it leads either to nowhere, or downhill in the moral field! The point which I am trying to make here is that, since you already follow a chaotic philosophy which leads you to nowhere or downhill, why not try to practice totalizm, which gives you the clearly defined benefits and rewards.

Totalizm is a "result-oriented" philosophy. So you should not be surprised that also this monograph is very result-oriented. It is put together in a "know everything" fashion. This means that it provides the fullest information about totalizm, or relating to totalizm, that anyone possibly may wish to know. It occupies 8 volumes of this monograph. This volume is the introductory, and the most important, part of the descriptions of totalizm. It explains everything that one needs to know, to effectively practice totalizm in his or her life.

CONTENT of the monograph [8_E/2] "Totalizm", ISBN 978-1-877458-80-4

Volume 2: Understanding totalizm

should kill with their own hands, whatever they eat

Volume 3: Nirvana and other benefits of totalizm

Volume 4: Counter-world in the Concept of Dipolar Gravity

Volume 5: (Other) intelligent virtual world in the Concept of Dipolar Gravity

Volume 6: Let us get to know God

Volume 8. History of totalizm

R-130   R. ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Notes:

(1) Before this monograph was formulated, a significant proportion of topics addressed in it was already discussed in Internet on web pages of totalizm. These web pages of totalizm should be accessible even today. Therefore, during addressing topics which are also discussed on web pages of totalizm, by each of these topics provided also were names of web pages on which this topic was presented. So if the reader wishes, he or she can additionally review this topic in Internet. In order to find addresses of web pages with given topic, it is enough to write the name of given web page as the keyword for a search engine, e.g. for www.google.com . For example, in order to find address of the web page named "dipolar_gravity.htm", it is enough in the search engine www.google.com write the keyword "dipolar_gravity.htm" (but without quote marks) and then visit one amongst web sites that will be listed by this search engine.

(2) This publication is a subsequent volume in 8-volume long scientific monograph [8e/2] by the author. Each chapter and subsection of this series is marked with a next letter of alphabet. Chapters and subsections marked with letters other than these provided in the list of content above are positioned in different volume of this monograph. The full list of content for all 8 volumes of monograph [8e/2] is provided in the first volume.

(3) A Polish language version of this monograph [8e/2] is also available. Therefore, in case there is any difficulty with accessing an English version of this monograph, while the reader knows the Polish language, then it could be beneficial for him or her to read the Polish version of this monograph.

(4) Both language versions in this monograph [8/2], namely English and Polish, use the same illustrations. Only captions under these illustrations use a different language. Therefore, if illustrations for the English version are difficult to access or unreadable, then illustrations for the Polish version can be used equally well. It is also worth to know, that enlarged copies of all the illustrations for this monograph [8/2] are made available in the Internet. So in order to e.g. examine enlarged copies of these illustrations, it is worth to view them directly from the Internet. To find them, the reader needs to find any totaliztic web page which I authorise, e.g. by typing the key word "**totalizm**" to any search engine (e.g. to www.google.com), and then, after running a totaliztic web page, the reader needs to run from it the web page named "text_8_2.htm" available on the same server, or choose the option [8/2] from the menu of that totaliztic web page. Note that all totaliztic web pages allow also the uploading of free copies of all volumes of this monograph [8/2].

(5) The update and amending of this edition of monograph [8/2] is going to progress gradually. Therefore after some time, this monograph is going to be available in even more updated and perfected formulation of it. In turn when this monograph is perfected to the level which the author considers to be sufficient, the subsequent volumes of it will be inserted into monograph [1/5]. Volumes 4 to 6 of this monograph become then volumes 4 to 6 of monograph [1/5], while volumes 1 to 3 of this monograph become then volumes 7 to 10 of monograph [1/5]. Parts of the volume 8 of this monograph become then inserted to volumes 1 and 18 of monograph [1/5].

(6) To improve the structure of this monograph [8/2], and to make it easier to read, the order of chapters and subsections from various volumes was slightly changed in relation to this order that appeared in the first edition of the same monograph [8].

<u>Chapter A</u>.

PRACTISING TOTALIZM IN OUR EVERYDAY LIFE

It took me 63 years to earn totalizm and to crystallize this monograph,
but from you it requires only one weekend to glen benefits that it offers.

Our physics explained to us quite well, why e.g. climbing stairs is so difficult and so effort consuming. According to laws described by physics, each time we climb stairs, we need to move uphill in the invisible field called "gravity". Thus the work of overcoming the action of this field, is the source of our effort and difficulties. But our science so-far did not explain exactly **why doing moral things is so difficult**, and why it also consumes so much human effort. (For example, consider how difficult is to tell truth. After all, telling truth is the essence of every moral behaviour.) This answer provides only a new philosophy called **totalizm**. According to totalizm, the reason why doing moral things always consumes a lot of our effort, is exactly the same as the reason why climbing stairs is consuming a lot of energy - namely the presence of an invisible field. Totalizm states that apart from the invisible for humans gravity field, the entire universe is also permeated by another kind of invisible field very similar to gravity, which totalizm calls the **moral field**. This invisible moral field causes, that every action that we take in our lives, depends either on climbing uphill in this field (and thus such action is "moral"), or on sliding downhill in this moral field (and then such action is "immoral"). Therefore the fact that there is such thing as this "moral field", causes that everything that we do has a definite moral polarity - means is either moral or immoral as it climbs either uphill or downhill in this moral field. Of course, from physics we already know that whenever there is a field, there are also laws which govern the motion in this field. Therefore totalizm discovered, that the existence of the invisible moral field is also the reason for a new type of laws to prevail in the universe. These new laws remained unknown to us until now. Because their action depends on the defining of principles which govern the motion of our actions in relationship to the moral field, totalizm calls this new type of laws with the name moral laws. Moral laws are so designed, that everything that is moral represents obeying these laws, whereas everything that is immoral represents disobedience of these laws. This makes practicing totalizm very easy. All what is required to practice totalizm, and to harvest plentiful rewards that practicing this philosophy opens for people, is to pedantically obey moral laws. To make this practicing of totalizm even easier, every person has a "build in" organ, which is an encyclopaedia of moral laws. This organ is popularly called **conscience**. Therefore many so-called "**intuitive totalizts**" practice totalizm without actually realising it, simply because they obey whispers of their own organ of conscience. Perhaps even you, the reader, belong to the group of "intuitive totalizts", simply because you do in your life whatever your conscience tells you to do, means you practice morality and peace, always try to tell truth whenever you can, be honest, helpful, trustworthy, etc. (i.e. do NOT lie, steal, fight, harm, kill, etc.).

In spite that the gravity field and moral field are both invisible to human sight, there are significant differences between these two. For example, the gravity field acts solely on physical objects, thus the climbing uphill in it requires giving out a physical effort. On the other hand, moral field acts also on non-physical objects, e.g. on thoughts, intentions, feelings, etc. Thus the climbing uphill in moral field requires putting the mental (intellectual) effort. Furthermore, both these fields run differently. Thus in some life situations e.g. the path uphill in the gravity field may simultaneously be a path downhill in the moral field.

The most vital attribute of moral laws is that they have **rewards** and **punishments** written into their operation. Therefore each time we are obeying moral laws in our actions - we are lavishly rewarded for this obeying. In turn each time we break moral laws - we are severely punished for this breaking. Unfortunately for people, these rewards (and also punishments)

that result from the action of moral laws NEVER take the form of material goods (e.g. the influx of money). They always are non-material, i.e. take the form for example of the feeling of happiness, the satisfaction of self-fulfilment, peace of mind, lack of stress, finding a loved partner, loving and polite children, nice neighbours, lack of problems at work and in life, etc. Therefore the majority of people do NOT notice the existence of these rewards. After all, in the present times by "rewards" people understand almost exclusively materialistic gains, such as an influx of money, an access to sensual pleasures, a power over other people, etc. But these ones were intentionally excluded from the pool of rewards that are granted automatically just because of the fulfilment of moral laws. (Of course, we can still gain these materialistic rewards through a goal-oriented moral work aimed at accomplishing them.) It is because people started to disobey moral laws lately on an ever increasing scale, that the life on Earth is starting to be so difficult and so full of suffering. Of course, in order to intentionally obey moral laws, one needs to actually know that there is such thing as these laws. Therefore totalizm informs people about the existence of moral laws and teaches ways how we can obey these laws in a methodical manner. People who cognitively learn about moral laws and obey them methodically, are called "**formal totalizts**". Otherwise then "intuitive totalizts" who obey moral laws just by listening to whispers of their conscience, such "formal totalizts" learned cognitively why and what they are doing, so they are not moral just by intuition, but by a methodical acting. This in turn allows them to intensify countless benefits which they harvest from living a moral, peaceful, and productive life.

Totalizm is already quite a successful philosophy. This can be noticed from the number of references which indicate totalizm in the Internet - e.g. **check the keyword "totalizm" in www.google.com**. This happens in spite that it also has a lot of enemies. Actually from my experience to-date it appears, that everyone who encountered totalizm and took a time to find out what exactly it is, either starts to love it, or starts to hate it. However, even that there are numerous individuals who do not appreciate this philosophy, still it managed to establish itself, and there is a lot of people in the world who already practice it voluntarily on everyday basis. Actually, at this moment of time totalizm seems to be the most successful out of all new philosophies created and disseminated in 20th century, and the only new philosophy that appeals to "an average person from a street".

A1. Here is a brief initial information regarding totalizm

Everyday living depends on acting. In turn the essence of our acting always in the final effect boils down to making a choice between several possible alternatives of what we just are doing, for example to a choice whether we should eat ourselves the last sweet, to give it to our younger sibling, or to keep it for tomorrow, whether a paper from sweet throw to the ground, throw to a rubbish tin, or put to a pocket and forget about it, whether do a given work right now, leave it until later, or ask someone else to do it, whether drive by a car, use a tramway, or go on foot, whether to take a shortcut, or go around, etc., etc. Although in our lives we continually do countless such elementary choices, all of them in reality boil down to two possible alternatives. Namely, whatever we are intending to do is either going to be "moral" from the point of view of moral field and moral laws, or it is going to be "immoral". In this way every day we make thousands of choices between a "moral" acting, and "immoral" acting. Normally typical people do not even think which of these two alternatives they are choosing. They simply do whatever in a given moment of time they feel like to do, or what seems to them to be more beneficial for them. However, the philosophy of totalizm states, that such a random choices lead to the life which is also full of random events. This is because when one wishes to lead a life which is consistent e.g. in its level of happiness, then one needs to show also consistency in every his or her action. Totalizm this consistency expresses in the only principle which is composed into this philosophy. (This only principle of totalizm is described in the next subsection A2.) Namely, totalizm states that "**everything that we do we should do in a**

pedantically moral manner". This means that in every, even the smallest our action, in which we are making a decision about the alternative of completing this action, we always should choose this alternative which is "moral" (according to the totaliztic definitions of what is "moral"). Of course, the manner on which we choose the action which is "moral" totalizm leaves to our discretion. If we are NOT good in theory, and thus we do NOT wish to remember from descriptions of totalizm principles which tell us what is "moral" - then we can practice so-called "intuitive totalizm" and simply listen to our voice of conscience when we make our choice. In turn when we learned a bit of totalizm and know principles of choosing whatever is moral, then in making our choices we can always utilize the formal methods of totalizm.

The above explanations reveal what is this „totalizm". And so, totalizm is a new moral, peaceful, progressive, and constructive philosophy that was developed as recently as in 1985. Although the comprehensive defining of this philosophy is carried out in separate subsection C1, for the consistency of presentation we start this chapter from explaining here a condense **definition of totalizm**. According to this definition, "**totalizm is a philosophy of everyday living, which teaches us how to gain access to all important qualities of life, such as happiness, health, pleasure, peace of mind, self-fulfilment, respect of others, etc., through the increase of our 'moral energy', means through the increase of the form of energy which we accumulate when we climb upward in the moral field by obeying moral laws and which we must spend whenever we try to accomplish anything**". This definition reveals that although totalizm calls itself a "philosophy", actually it is more related to strict sciences such as physics, mechanics, or computing. This is because it utilises newly discovered phenomena of nature, such as moral energy, moral field, moral laws, etc., to define with their assistance the most productive principle of our conduct and most beneficial principles of our living. These newly discovered phenomena which totalizm utilises, are explained in more details in subsection A13 below. But in order to make the above definition understandable already here, we explain them now in other words. Totalizm is founded on the finding of the Concept of Dipolar Gravity stating that all our accomplishments are governed by appropriate energies and by configurations of appropriate fields. Thus all qualities highly sought and mostly appreciated in our lives, such as our creative capabilities, accomplishments, happiness, health, peace of mind, self-fulfilment, respect of others, and many more, we must "buy" through paying for them with a special form of energy called "moral energy". This energy allows us to "buy" practically everything that we wish to have or to accomplish in our lives. Means, whenever we feel happy, experience pleasure, accomplish or do anything in our life, etc., it always boils down to the consumption of a portion of our moral energy, similarly like in physics all types of work consume physical energy. Of course, in order to be able to "buy" ourselves anything with this moral energy, we firstly must accumulate it. Because the "moral energy" is simply a form of energy which we accumulate while we climb upward in the moral field, practically we acquire it by completing in our lives actions that lift us upward in this moral field. The moral field is very similar to gravity field, except that instead of acting upon masses it acts upon intellects. It causes that every our action has a definite moral polarity, means it is either "immoral" because it slides us downward in this field, or is "moral" because it lifts us upward in this field. So an increase of our "moral energy" totalizm compares to an increase of potential energy in physics. Namely, it states that we need to put knowledge and effort into practically every our action in order to make this action to lift us upward in this moral field. (If we do not put knowledge and effort into our actions, they may accidentally slide us down in the moral field, instead of lifting us up.) In turn this climbing upward in the moral field is accomplished if we obey so-called "moral laws". Thus, the only recommendation of totalizm for everyday living states that "whatever you do always pedantically obey moral laws". In this recommendation totalizm closely copies physical sciences. After all, physical sciences also state, that in order to accomplish anything in your life, you need to obey laws of nature in everything that you are doing. So the only skill that one needs to master in order to apply totalizm in his or her everyday life, is to learn what these moral laws are, and how to obey them. In turn by learning this, one learns the way of a continuous increase of all one's

capabilities, potentials, and desired qualities of life, which stem from the amount of moral energy that one managed to gather and is able to spend for accomplishing goals that he or she desires. Several simple rules, which totalizm teaches us, unlock our access to countless benefits that the conversion of moral energy into our accomplishments can bring to us, and that are listed in subsection A2.4 of this monograph.

This chapter is the most important part of the entire monograph. It teaches one, how to apply totalizm in ones everyday life. The knowledge which allows one to effectively implement this philosophy in one's everyday life represents the most essential part of totalizm. This is because totalizm is strongly oriented towards accomplishing results (if possible, instant), (Actually, people who adopt totalizm in their everyday lives, thoroughly learn everything that is contained in this chapter, so that they know "by heart" what to do in all situations that they meet in their lives. For example, they read this chapter again each time a new, improved version of this monograph is issued.) After all, what would be the point to know everything about totalizm, but not being able to apply it to solve situations from one's everyday life. This is why this "applied knowledge" of totalizm is presented first. After one finishes reading this chapter, one obtains a very clear idea as to **what** totalizm recommends that you do in your day-by-day living, and whether you would be able to do it (i.e. whether you are ready/prepared to practice this philosophy in your everyday living). Of course, after you learn what to do, you still need to learn **why** you should do it, instead of doing, for example, something completely different. After all, totalizm is a philosophy of intelligent people, and therefore for everything that it recommends, it also explains exactly where it comes from, and why it should be this, not something completely different. In order to learn this answer "why", and thus in order to clearly and entirely understand totalizm, you need to read also at least volumes 2 and 6. But you do it later. Now check whether you are able to cope with "what".

Totalizm should be especially recommended to young people, who had no, as yet, opportunity to tarnish their karma registers, and to attract immoral habits. If they start to obey moral laws right now, their life is going to be enriched, by saving them from many unpleasant experiences and mental pain, that they would need go through, if they previously accumulated unpleasant karma. For such young people totalizm can be a door to a moral, peaceful, happy, and fulfilled life. Of course, totalizm is also useful for older people. Although it does not allow to painlessly neutralize the bad karma and moral problems, that they may already accumulated, it still indicates how to heal whatever they already brought at themselves, and also provides them with tools for saving themselves from even deeper troubles. Furthermore, it paves the way for enjoying the multitude of moral benefits that totalizm is going to bring to them. Of course, in future totalizm can be also extremely helpful for group intellects, such as institutions and entire countries or civilisations. After all, it teaches how to build up morality, peace, justice, well being, and unlimited wealth of all their citizens.

I must admit that when I was writing this chapter and volume, I was aware that I am facing an extremely difficult task. After all, it supposed to be a manual on "moral medicine" - as such a manual, it should be informative, specific, and effective. My main concern was not to fall in the "philosophers' trap", meaning not to formulate this chapter in such a manner that when deliberated on paper, everything looks good and wise, but when comes to actual applying it in the real life, it turns out to be completely useless. As we know, philosophy is very prone to this trap, because "everything can be disputed, but not everything can be applied, and not everything gives the results we desire". I tried to avoid this "philosophers' trap", by repeating in this chapter only these tools and methods of totalizm, which from the implementations of previous presentations of this philosophy, already proved themselves to actually work in practice, and also by using examples, which in fact did happen in the real life, either to myself, or to someone amongst followers of totalizm (and which were solved successfully). Still, one of the rules of totalizm states that "everything can be further improved". Therefore, if after reviewing this chapter and applying it in real life situations, someone finds better examples than these described here, or someone notices that a tool or method outlined here is still not explained well enough, is ambiguous, difficult to apply, or that some moral

cases from the real life still cannot be solved on the basis of methods and tools provided in this chapter, please do not hesitate and let me know, or please do ask questions. Such constant interactions with the real life will help the descriptions that follow to be improved further for a next edition of totalizm.

These people who analysed various other philosophies (or religions), probably noted that authors of some of them are instructing the universe how it should work and what morality should prevail in it, to allow a given philosophy (or religion) to rule over the world. After all, they introduce their own principles, requirements, and behaviours, which do not coincide with true moral mechanisms of the universe, but only guarantee a given philosophy or religion the domination over others. Totalizm definitely differs from them in this aspect. Its purpose is to research and to report objectively the true laws and mechanisms of the universe around us, not to declare its own laws, or to deepen its own sphere of influence. **Totalizm scientifically investigates the truth about actual mechanisms and goals of the intelligent operation of our universe, and about moral laws that prevail in it**. **Then it faithfully and unbiasedly reports the truth that it managed to establish**. Therefore, while reading this monograph, actually one reviews a kind of scientific report, which objectively and strictly reveals everything, that so-far totalizm managed to establish about our universe, or more strictly about the structure and operation of this universe, about moral laws that prevail in it, about intelligence and purpose of the existence of it, etc. Of course, whatever totalizm worked out so far, it is only a small fraction of a logically wonderful structure, which maintains the purpose and the morality of our universe. Further unlimited knowledge still awaits to be discovered and described. However, while reading this monograph, reader already is obtaining an opportunity to realize, how wise, how intentional, and how full of justice our universe is build and working. Seeing this infinitive wisdom and purpose in every moral law, and in every mechanism that rules our life, one is not able to resist admiration towards the infinitive wisdom and justice of the universal intellect (God), who planned and created all this so precisely. This overwhelming wisdom and purpose in every tiny detail of the reality around us, which is emanating continually from mechanisms that this monograph describes, already provides a sufficient proof, that the universal intellect (God) in fact does exist, and that in fact it does rule everything. In turn formal proofs for the existence of this intellect, published in this monograph (such as proofs for the existence of God presented in subsection I3.3), are only formalities that officially confirm the truth, which anyway, after reading this monograph, becomes shockingly obvious and unquestionable.

In previous paragraph a very important idea of totalizm was used for the first time, namely the term "**universal intellect**". For the exact explanation of this term as many as two volumes of this monograph are going to be designated, namely volumes 5 and 6. However, because this terminology is to be used frequently starting from now, better if I explain it briefly already here. Namely, in totalizm the term „universal intellect" roughly coincides with a popular understanding of God – means an invisible for us superior being of the universe, which has self-awareness, which thinks, and which is secretly ruling over fate of people. But, as we probably remember, in Christianity God is in fact a combination of three components, namely so-called "God Father", "Holy Spirit", and "God Son". Although these three names perfectly reflect the composition of God, they were introduced over 2000 years ago and presently not very well harmonise with the present scientific terminology. For example, the so-called Concept of Dipolar Gravity described in volume 5 of this monograph, established that these three components of God are natural equivalents for perfectly known to everyone components of every present computer, namely "hardware", "software", and "peripherals". Therefore, in order to describe God more illustratively, in the place of "God Father", "Holy Ghost", and "God Son", totalizm introduced parallel terminology, namely "universal computer" (UC), "universal intellect" (UI), and "universal body" (UB) - for their descriptions see subsection I3.2. The term "universal intellect" is precisely the totaliztic equivalent to the Christian idea of the "Holy Ghost". But in the rough manner it corresponds to what people usually understand under the idea of

"God". This is why in places where I use the terminology „universal intellect" for a better understanding I also add in brackets the word (God).

Before we immerse ourselves into descriptions how to live our lives according to recommendations of totalizm, probably it would pay off, to learn definitions for a few basic ideas and words, which are repetitively used in the descriptions that follow. It is a bit like learning to drive a car: before we take a driver's sit, it helps to know what engine and brakes are, what people understand by traffic sings and what types of these are there, etc. But in order to NOT extend this introductory part, these basic definitions are shifted to subsection A13 - means to the summary subsection of this volume. So in case we encounter onto terminology which we do NOT understand, it is worth to have a look in subsection A13 whether this terminology is explained in there.

A2. The only rule of totalizm ("pedantically obey moral laws"), and how to apply it in everyday life

As this is going to be explained in subsection B8, totalizm strives to maximal simplicity. This means that, whatever it incorporates into itself, it tries to do this in such a manner, that the final product is as easy as possible for learning, remembering, and for applying in the real life. Therefore, totalizm purposely undertakes various steps, which are to increase this clarity, mental retaining, and applicability. For example, it limits the number of rules, that the practitioners of this philosophy are recommended to follow in their lives, to one rule only. This only rule, which totalizm has, states: "in everything that you do, **pedantically obey moral laws**". If we try to explain in other words, what this single rule of totalizm means, then the essence of it could be expressed in the following words:

"**Whatever you do in your life, even if it is a most banal activity, always do it in a manner, which obeys moral laws, because you are continually judged for the obedience of these laws, and proportionally either rewarded or punished, depending whether your actions are obeying or disobeying these laws.**"

Subsections A13, B2, B4, and I3.6 of this monograph explain, that obeying moral laws have a very central meaning for totalizm. The reason is that totalizm recognizes the authority and identity of the universal intellect (God). Therefore, according to totalizm, the pedantic obedience of all moral laws, which this universal intellect established, is the most important way of displaying our obedience to the universal intellect itself. This is also a reason why **totalizm forbids to even consider any attempt of going around moral laws** (going around moral laws, is the main behaviour of the refined version of the rival philosophy - which simultaneously is a moral disease, that in chapter KA is called "parasitism"). Even if we know exactly how a given moral law could be easily walked around, so that we would not need to obey it, but also would not be punished for breaking it, still totalizm forbids us from such walking around this law. (For totalizm, such a walking around of any moral law, represents a downhill path in the moral field, and the manner of expressing of someone's rebellion against intensions of the universal intellect.)

Every brief definition, which is not supported with sufficient explanations, can be a source of misunderstanding. Therefore, to avoid a possible confusion, I am now going to explain in more details the above single rule of totalizm. If one analyses outcomes of our life, one must come to a conclusion, that these outcomes always depend on the **decisions** that we take in our lives. In fact our lives are long sequences of decisions, which we must take at every step we make. In turn the effects of our lives are the results of correctness and consistency, with which we took these countless decisions. But in order to take correct decisions in our lives, we need to have some kind of a general principle, which leads us in the correct direction and points us straight at our goal. For example, if we compare the intentions of our life to a struggle of coming out of a jungle or a desert, when we roughly know that human settlements are to east from the area we are in, then all decisions, which we would

take in our march, would need to say: always go eastward. This is because in such a situation, if one time someone goes eastward, then another time goes westward, he/she never would be able to leave this jungle or desert, and would wander until the death. Exactly the same is with totalizm. It states that whatever decision you take in your life, always make sure that this decision is agreeable with the content of moral laws. Only through the consistent undertaking decisions, which are all agreeable with moral laws, you will reach in your life goals that you search for (that can also be indicated by totalizm).

Of course, by indicating that all decisions must be taken in such a manner, that the outcomes obey moral laws, totalizm defines only the general direction for us to go. It states that the morally correct solutions for whatever we are deciding about, are located in this direction. But it does not impose on us any restrictions, regarding the solutions themselves. We still have the free will to choose such solutions that suit us the most. For example, if our relative who lives in a different city falls sick, totalizm may recommend to travel to this city to visit him/her. But totalizm does not impose on us, that we must travel by a car, by a train, or by an aeroplane - this decision fully depends on us, on our priorities, our finances, our likes and dislikes, and on the situation which we are in. The only thing that totalizm recommends, is that we should take our decisions in such a manner, that the outcomes always should obey moral laws. Let us say, that we plan to deliver this relative to a hospital. Then the trip by a horse wagon, in order to save some money, present days would run against moral laws, because due to a long duration of such a trip, and due to inconveniences, our sick person could die in the journey. In order to summarise what I am saying here, the totaliztic life does NOT depend on undertaking some additional activities, which we normally would not complete, or on acting in a manner, that normally we would not act, or on refusal to use technical devices and facilities, which we have in our disposal and normally would use, or on making sacrifices, which we normally would not make. Totalizm allows us to live exactly the same as we lived before, i.e. doing everything accordingly to our knowledge, priorities, habits, level of knowledge, conveniences, and also doing it fastest and most effectively we can, and with all technical means that are in our disposal. Only that, in every case, when in our life we take a decision, or plan a next activity, totalizm recommends that we should bear in our mind the principle, that the outcome of this decision or activity must obey moral laws.

As this is explained in subsection A13, the existence of two opposite moral poles allows us to define more clear terminology for describing these our activities, which are obeying moral laws, or which are running against moral laws. In this more clear terminology, everything that boils down to the obedience of moral laws, is described with the totaliztic term "**moral**". In turn everything that boils down to breaking moral laws, is described with the use of the totaliztic term "**immoral**". After such a clear terminology is introduced, the only rule of totalizm stating "pedantically obey moral laws", can also be expressed for everyday use in a more understandable form: "**in your life do only these actions, which by totalizm are defined as moral**, and **avoid doing actions, which by totalizm are defined as immoral**". However, during the completion of the above brief form of the only rule of totalizm, one needs to bear in mind, that a given activity must be defined as "moral" or as "immoral" according to principles of totalizm. After all, in some other philosophical systems - especially these which originate from parasitic religions, the same statements (i.e. moral or immoral) may be defined otherwise than in totalizm (sometimes even completely opposite). For example, according to totalizm, natural and mutually consented sexual intercourse, in most of life situations is "moral". In turn breaking a peace, invading a country, or attacking someone is "immoral", even if it is done in the name of God, in the name of a religion, or in the name of democracy. (But notice, that there are philosophies and religions in which activities from the above example would be classified in an exactly opposite way.)

If one subdivides all activities into moral or immoral, one also needs to bear in mind, that sometimes in life we encounter situations, in which there is a choice between two activities, both of which on the surface appear as if they are immoral. As an example of such a choice, consider the problem of killing in self defence in a situation "you or me" described in

subsections D8 and D11.1. But if one analyses such situations thoroughly with the tools provided by totalizm, as this is done in subsections D8 and D11.1, then it turns out that moral laws define "killing an aggressor" in self-defence as a "moral activity". Thus "obeying moral laws" can also be accomplished during such drastic behaviours as defending ourselves and killing our aggressor. (Notice that in the necessity to kill in self defence, in a situation "you or me", the obeying of moral laws, and thus "moral", is to kill an attacker, while "immoral" is to allow the attacker to kill a defender.)

Many human laws are issued without any regard to moral laws created by the universal intellect (God). Some of such cases are discussed in further parts of this monograph, especially in subsection D5 (e.g. consider a "privacy act", which is allows to hide truths from people and thus makes easier to spread lies). Therefore sometimes in life, there can be situations when human laws are contradictive to moral laws, and we need to make the choice: which ones we are going to obey. In such extreme cases the only rule of totalizm is still valid, and totalizm still recommends: "pedantically obey moral laws" - see subsection D5. Fortunately for human laws, moral laws are very flexible when comes to the ways they should be obeyed, and frequently, when such a collision of laws takes place, it is possible to work out a solution within this flexibility, which allows to obey moral laws, but simultaneously enables us to not break human laws. Totalizm strongly recommends, that in such situations of collisions between moral laws and human laws, we always try to choose such non-confrontational solutions. After all, in the other case, i.e. when we disobey human laws in order to obey moral laws, whatever we do, it may turn to also be "immoral", as then there is a danger that we ourselves are going to fall victims of human laws - if we openly break them in order to obey moral laws.

As this should be clear from the single rule of totalizm, according to this philosophy all moral laws must be obeyed pedantically. This includes also the moral laws, about the existence of which we have not learned yet (although our conscience perceives the existence of them, and always tries to warn us, whenever we intend to do something that runs against them). However, there is a difficulty with the obedience of all moral laws. It is resulting from their huge number. As this is indicated in subsection I4.1.1, the total number of moral laws, exceeds the number of known laws of physics. To make it even more difficult, practically almost every moral law significantly differs from other moral laws, and concerns a different matter. So totalizm has a big task on hand: it needs to simplify the descriptions how to obey all these hundreds of different laws, so that totalizts do not need to remember all of them and remember specific methods as to how obey each single one of them. There are various ways how totalizm may accomplish the simplification of a difficult task of obeying all these numerous moral laws. In this subsection is explained the way that was crystallized by the time of writing this monograph.

However, while reading the present descriptions of totalizm, one needs to bear in mind that totalizm is a very young philosophy. It is still undergoing a very rapid development of the theoretical foundations. Furthermore, one of the fundamental principles of totalizm makes it the "open" philosophy, means it declares that totalizm always is going to have some imperfections, therefore it must stay opened and allow continuous improving itself (this is one of mayor differences between totalizm and other philosophies, which are "close" - means which consider themselves to be perfect, and are not prepared to accept any further improvements). Therefore it is almost sure that next editions of totalizm will include further ways of simplifying, extending, and improving this philosophy. It is recommended that the reader tries also to look at these next editions of totalizm.

A way of simplifying the difficult task of obeying all these numerous moral laws, which is accomplished in this edition of totalizm, depends on developing two standard procedures of obeying moral laws. Each one of these two procedures is designed for a different purpose. The first procedure, let us call it "**obey to do everything morally**", is designed to allow totalizts to carry out their everyday activities in a most moral manner (i.e. through pedantic obeying moral laws). The second procedure, let us call it "**obey to be inspired**", is designed

to allow totalizts to start completely new activities, which do not result from their everyday chores, and therefore by doing of which totalizts are inspired, just because they try to obey moral laws. This whole chapter is mainly elaborating the first procedure "obey to do everything morally". After all, this procedure is the most essential for our everyday life. The second procedure is only briefly mentioned in subsection A2.2.

Of course, in order to obey moral laws with any of these two procedures, one firstly needs to learn this procedure, and to learn moral laws which this procedure is designed to obey. Therefore the first moral law, which every totalizt must start to obey, and thus must learn through it how to obey other moral laws, is the moral law stating "continually increase your knowledge". This is why this first moral law is discussed here before any other law, namely in subsection A2.6.

A2.1. Obey moral laws to do everything morally

The procedure "obey to do everything morally" is designed to teach us how to go about obeying all these numerous moral laws, in every single daily situation. The point is that whenever we intend to do something, according to totalizm we need to firstly establish whether this particular our intention is moral, or immoral. Then, if it is moral – we do it. But if it is immoral we replace it with something else that is going to be moral. In typical situations we usually know what we need, or wish, to do, or at least we know choices that we could make. Thus the only matter which is still stopping us from doing it, is gaining an assurance, that this particular thing we intend to do, is moral, and therefore by doing it we obey moral laws. Such situations are the most common in our lives, as they result from carrying out our everyday living, and from the need to do all these thousands of everyday chores that our lives are filled up with.

The major problem with obeying all moral laws in every single of these thousands of situations that we need to live through every day, is the lack of time. This lack of time causes that it is impossible to spend too long on a thorough examining what all these numerous moral laws say about our intentions. Fortunately for us, a single rule of "**moral unanimity**" applies to all moral laws. This rule stems from the so-called "canon of consistency", which is described in subsection B7.4 (in this monograph the name "canon" is reserved to the most important, and hierarchically most superior, laws of the universe). It states that "**if there is a specific situation or intention in a real life, then this particular situation or intention is unanimously judged to be either moral or immoral by all moral laws, and by all indicators of the moral correctness, which are applicable to it**". What this rule practically means, is that if a totalizt intends to do something in his/her life, then in a given set of circumstances this something is either moral, or is immoral. Therefore with whichever moral law one would look at this something, or whichever tool of totalizm he/she would apply to qualify it, it still must be declared by this law or by this tool, to be either moral, or immoral - if this law or a tool is applicable to that particular intention and circumstances. This rule of moral unanimity simplifies lives of totalizts. Because of it, totalizts do not need to use in all situations all the procedures or tools that the philosophy of totalizm teaches them. It is enough if they apply only one tool of totalizm, which for a given their intention they consider to be the most appropriate, and then they do whatever this tool says. If no significant error of judgement is committed during applying this chosen tool, and no vital circumstances are overlooked, then whatever is stated about a given real life intention by this one tool of totalizm, then exactly the same is going to be stated by all other tools of totalizm. Therefore, if one tool of totalizm states clearly what we should do, we do not need to apply any other tools. But if one tool gives an unclear or ambiguous answer, then totalizm provides a whole range of other totaliztic tools, which we are able to apply to the same action, in order to clearly determine whether totalizm considers it to be moral or immoral. (Note that when a given tool provides an ambiguous or unclear answer, this usually means that a given tool is not applicable to a given situation. After

all, each single tool of totalizm, has its own range of applicability in which it guarantees correct outcomes. Means, it is applicable to a range of circumstances, which differ from those, to which other tools are applicable. But outside of the range of applicability, the outcomes of this tool may become incorrect.)

Below the totaliztic procedure of "obey to do everything morally" is explained step-by-step. In order to illustrate this procedure, a simple example is also provided. Although this example may appear to be quite banal, it well illustrates how totalizm teaches us to do everything in a proper and a moral manner, and also how intelligent and flexible moral laws are, and how they differ from dull human laws. Here are subsequent steps that we should complete in order to follow the procedure "obey to do everything morally":

Step 1: Make clear for ourselves, what is our current intention (e.g. what we would like to do, or what we would feel to do in a given moment of time, or in a given situation). After all, we need to know exactly what we would like to do, otherwise we are not able to determine whether this our intention is moral, or immoral.

Example: We intend to cross a street, in the area selected randomly to which we just arrived, and which is distant by around 50 meters from the nearest pedestrian crossing (this pedestrian crossing is marked and supplied with traffic signals). We are alone at the empty street.

Step 2: Choose an "indicator of the moral correctness", which we are going to use, in order to establish whether our intention is moral or immoral. It can be any indicator, which totalizm defined and explained for our use, and which is described either in subsection A2.3, or in subsections A3 to A10 of this chapter. (So for this indicator can be used e.g. the "moral field", "moral energy", "karma", "concepts of totaliztic sin and totaliztic good dead", etc.) However, for the majority of everyday situations, we should tend to use our favourite indicator of the moral correctness (i.e. the one that we know the best, or that we have chosen because we would like to accomplish the moral rewards that it brigs about - more about these rewards in subsection A2.4). After all, according to the "rule of moral unanimity", if a given our intention is moral, then all indicators that apply to it, are going to unanimously indicate that it is moral.

Example: We need to quickly judge if this crossing of the street in the existing set of circumstances is moral or immoral. In order to judge this, we are selecting our favourite indicator of the moral correctness. In this example we assume that this is the concept of totaliztic good deed and totaliztic sin described in subsection A5. (Of course, in a real life it can be any out of numerous such indicators worked out and provided by totalizm.) The use of this indicator is very simple. It boils down to establishing, whether our intention is to cause the increase of moral energy in every party involved. Only then this intention is a "totaliztic good deed" means a "moral" action. If this intention turns to cause a decrease of moral energy in any party involved, then it is going to be a "totaliztic sin" means an "immoral" action.

Step 3: Check, using the chosen "indicator of the moral correctness", whether our intention is moral or immoral. In the result of this checking, we should receive a clear assurance, whether the implementing of this intention would be "moral" and would represent the obedience of moral laws (because the chosen indicator of the moral correctness qualifies this intention to be "moral"), or would be "immoral" and would represent a disobedience of moral laws (because the chosen indicator qualifies this intention to be "immoral").

Example: We look around and we do not see any car incoming (we are alone at the whole street), so we estimate that according to the indicator of the moral correctness that we selected, our crossing of the street at that particular point is "moral", as in the light of moral laws it represents a totaliztic good deed because it does not deprive anyone (e.g. a driver of an incoming car) of his/her moral energy, while it saves us time and energy, thus it generates moral energy for us.

Step 4: If a considered intention is clearly qualified as a "moral" one, then we implement it immediately.

Example: Since our intended crossing of the street turns to be "moral", we carefully cross the street, as intended. Thus we conclude this particular brief event in our life in a totaliztic manner (means we complete it because it turned out to be moral).

Step 5: If the indicator of the moral correctness that we used, is unable to clearly qualify a considered intention to be moral, or immoral, then we change the indicator onto any other one that totalizm provides and we know of, and that immediately comes to our mind in a given situation, then we repeat this procedure, starting from step 3 above.

Example: For a better understanding of the procedure described here, let us return to the step 3 when we were looking around to determine whether any car is incoming. Let us now assume a different set of circumstances from the previous one, namely that we actually noticed a group of children approaching us and looking at us (in the previous example there were no children - we were alone at the whole street). Therefore, when we estimate whether, according to the concept of totaliztic good deed and sin, in such a different set of circumstances (children watching) this crossing would be "moral" or "immoral", we have a problem. Namely we are not sure whether by crossing the street outside of the pedestrian crossing, we would decrease moral energy of these children, because we would teach them to do a thing, which is not a perfect role model. In this case our indicator of the moral correctness is not giving a clear guidance. Thus according to the procedure described here, we need to change our "indicator of the moral correctness" into another one, e.g. into the principle of "always climb upward in the moral field" described in subsection A4. In the light of this new indicator of the moral correctness, crossing the street in the sight of children would be "immoral", because it goes "along the line of least intellectual resistance". (Notice that according to subsection A4.1, such street crossing, but without children watching, still would be "moral" because then we would not decrease anyone's moral energy.)

Step 6: If a considered intention turns out to be immoral, then we transform it into other intention, which we hope is going to turn a moral one and simultaneously allows us to accomplish exactly the same our life goal. After such a transformation into a new intention, we clearly define what this new intention is. If we transformed the immoral intention into a moral one, with the use of one of tools provided by totalizm, then we know that the new intention is moral for sure, so we can instantly implement it via step 4. But if we are not sure about the morality of the product of our transformation, then we should repeat the whole procedure starting from step 2 above. Note that some indicators of the moral correctness not only tell us whether a given intention is moral or immoral, but they also tell us how to transform an "immoral" intention into a definitely "moral" one. Effective rules of this transformation are described in subsections A3.2, A4.4, A5.5, and A7.3 of this chapter.

Example: Let us assume that from the very beginning we were dealing with this second example of trying to cross a street in the sight of children (not with the original one, when we are alone on this street). After we determined, that such crossing in sight of children would be "immoral", we need to transform it into another action which is moral and which also would allow us to accomplish the same goal, means to cross this street. According to the description from subsection A4, the transformation of an immoral intention into a moral one, depends on taking the path that runs uphill in the moral field, and thus "goes against the line of the least intellectual resistance". In our case this means walking 50 meters to the pedestrian crossing, and crossing the street over there. So we transform our initial intention into this new, moral one, and cross the street at the pedestrian crossing. In this way we conclude this particular action of our life in the totaliztic manner.

The procedure described above, in this explanatory presentation may appear to be long and complicated. But in a real-life implementation by someone who knows it well, it turns out to be almost instant. Actually, with the use of it is like with the use of a car. When we sit in a car for the first time, everything also appears for us difficult and complicated. But as time elapses this initially complicated driving a car becomes for us almost mechanical and we are able to do it simultaneously with various other actions. Therefore people who practice totalizm

and who learned already the above procedure, implement it later automatically, effortlessly, and almost without thinking, in practically every their daily chore.

The above procedure illustrates quite well the major difference between a totaliztic way of living, and a spontaneous living that is followed by the majority of people on Earth. In the totaliztic way of living, whatever we are about to do, we always firstly check whether this intention is moral or immoral. Only then we either do it – when it turns out to be moral, or we transform it into another "moral" intention which still allows us to accomplish the same initial goal – when the original intention turned out to be immoral. In this way by doing only "moral" things we do NOT bring undesirable consequences on ourselves. In turn in a spontaneous living that currently is followed by the majority of people, we firstly do whatever comes out to our mind or to our emotions, and only later we discover that it brings various undesirable consequences for us, which we are not so happy to endure.

In the first example used above, we have the situation, which frequently appears in the real life. The way of crossing a street in a random area, described there, was "moral" according to moral laws, but still in some countries could be "illegal" in the light of human laws. If the events illustrated above took place in such a "strict" country, then we would have another dilemma: which laws we should obey, moral or human. Fortunately for human laws, moral laws are very flexible and they can be obeyed in a number of different ways (subsequent ways differ only by steepness of the moral field, which we are climbing). Thus, in most of situations, they allow to easily accommodate human laws. For example, in the above situation, if we also need to obey human laws, we would choose to cross the street at the pedestrian crossing - as in many circumstances this would obey both sets of laws at the same time.

As this subsection realizes, the crucial part of "obey to do everything morally" procedure, is to learn various "indicators of the moral correctness" that totalizm already identified and described. After we learn all of them, and we are able to apply all of them, we can choose our favourite indicator, and then perfect our practical skills how to apply this indicator to our everyday intentions, so that we are able to quickly find out whether these intentions are moral or immoral. The remaining part of this chapter is to teach us about them.

A2.2. Obey moral laws to be inspired

There are also moral laws, which we cannot obey just while doing everyday chores. For obeying these laws we actually need to take initiative, and to do various things in addition and above of our everyday chores. An example of such a moral low is stating "continually increase your knowledge", which we can only obey, if we purposely devote our time to learn new knowledge and new skills. Another example is the moral low of Compulsory Defence, discussed amongst others in subsection D11.1, which says "you have a moral duty to defend yourself and to defend your living space". It obliges us to study methods of defence and martial arts. In order to also obey these other types of moral laws, totalizm developed another procedure called here "obey to be inspired". This procedure basically is saying:

A. Continually increase your knowledge, especially the one concerning new moral laws which were unknown to you before.

B. While learning new moral laws continually seek what else you could do within the time, circumstances, resources, knowledge, and skills that are in your disposal, to increase the number of moral laws that you obey, and to increase the precision with which you obey them.

C. Continually exercise your knowledge of moral laws that you accomplished so far, by observing life around you, and continually categorising in the light of these laws, if whatever you see falls into a moral category, or into an immoral category. (Note that a real totalizt never overlooks and agrees with anything that runs against moral laws and happens around him/herself, independently whether it happens on films, in books, in journals, or in the real life,

even if in a given situation is unable to do anything to change or to stop the immoral that he/she notices.)

One should notice that in order to learn new moral laws, one does not needs to use only books on totalizm (although totalizm describes these laws in the most clear and comprehensive manner). For example, in subsection I4.1.1 is stated that each moral law is an equivalent of an appropriate physical law. Therefore, one can also learn new moral laws, by translating into moral terminology known laws of physics (how to do this, it is explained in subsections I4.1.1 and G3). Also our counter-organ of conscience is knowing all moral laws and continually tells us what is moral and what is immoral. Proverbs and popular sayings are excellent sources of moral laws too. Fables and folk stories usually include a part which tries to express some moral law. Finally, the thorough and long-term observation of fate of other real people, is one of the most excellent sources of an empirical knowledge on effects of moral laws' action.

A2.3. Indicators of the moral correctness

In order to obey moral laws, one needs to know indicators that show to him/her clearly, whether through doing given things, he/she is obeying, or disobeying, these laws. Totalizm teaches us that every single moral law works with moral quantity of some sort, when it is in action. Therefore the moral quantity which this law works with, we can use to determine whether we obey, or disobey, this law. Quantities that are utilised in operation of subsequent moral laws, totalizm calls "indicators of the moral correctness". Actually, as it turns out, all indicators of the moral correctness, are simply various forms of moral energy. By observing behaviours of moral energies which are represented by these indicators, totalizts know if they obey, or disobey, moral laws.

Totalizm is a very young philosophy. But in spite of this, it already managed to identify and to describe a number of indicators of the moral correctness. This is a huge achievement - because for example the majority of religions that currently exist on Earth, have only one such an indicator (i.e. a concept of "sin", and its reversal – means a "good deed"). Thus these totaliztic indicators can be used efficiently to categorize a whole range of life situations. Because totalizm identified so many of them, practically everything that we do, or that we intend to do, can be clearly categorised as "moral", or as "immoral", by at least one of them. In turn, when we clearly categorise something as "moral", we know that when we implement this in a real-life situation, such implementation will represent our obedience of moral laws. But when we clearly categorise something as "immoral", then implementing this in a real-life situation, would represent our disobedience of moral laws (therefore, before implementing any intention that is immoral, we firstly need to transform it appropriately, so that it can clearly be qualified as moral). Here is the list of indicators of the moral correctness that are already identified by totalizm:

- **Karma**. The name "karma" is assigned to a special transferable algorithm that is temporally attached to registers, which reside inside of a counter-body of a given intellect. It describes what kind of feelings this intellect must experience on the nearest occasion. This algorithm is automatically received from other intellects, each time a given intellect induces some kind of feelings in other intellects. It is also given further to other intellects, each time when these other intellects are inducing in a given intellect the same kind of feelings. Karma is composed of algorithms of specific feelings that are caused by specific events. As an indicator of the moral correctness, karma can only be used in such situations, when our actions are generating in other people well defined feelings that we can predict easily and qualify unambiguously. When karma is used as an indicator of the moral correctness, it says that something is "moral", when we are happy to accept back the feelings that it induces in other people (i.e. we are happy that just such feelings affect also us at some point of time in the future). In turn a given action, and the feelings that it induces, are "immoral", when we

ourselves do not want to live through feelings that it induces in other people (i.e. we are to hate the time, when a similar action and feelings someone else is to induce in us). Therefore, according to totalizm, one of the method of obeying moral laws is to complete in our lives only these actions, which generate a karma that we are willing to accept back - when the time of the return of this karma arrives. But if a given action is to generate a karma, which we are not happy to accept back - means, when a given action is "immoral", then we firstly should transform this action into a "moral" one (i.e. the karma of which we are happy to accept back), and only then we should complete it. (The appropriate method of transformation of "immoral" activities, into "moral" ones, is described in subsection A3.2).

Totalizm differentiates two types of karma: "returnable karma" and "creditory karma". Returnable karma is everything that firstly we did to others, and then, according to moral laws - especially to the Boomerang Principle, it is going to happen to us. Thus, this kind of karma is a real algorithm (i.e. karmatic energy pressure), which temporally resides in our registers from the counter-body. In turn creditory karma is a kind of an empty room for karma (i.e. karmatic energy suction), or a karmatic "credit" from the universal intellect, that we receive when we accept something unpleasant that we have not deserved ourselves, but we voluntarily agree to get it for moral reasons. (An example of creditory karma is the pain that Jesus suffered on the cross.) Creditory karma is created, when we are affected by events that are not resulting from our previous actions, but we voluntarily agree to accept them, when they are served to us. (Whenever a creditory karma is to be served to us, the universal intellect always gives us a choice to accept it, and live/suffer it through, or to reject it.) More about karma is explained in subsections A3, I4.4, and I4.5.

- **Moral field**. Moral field is an equivalent of gravity field, only that it affects intellects instead of masses. We can easily estimate how this field runs in a given moral situation, because the steepest direction of the slope of it, is indicated by the so-called "line of the least intellectual resistance" - see subsection A4 for details. As an indicator of the moral correctness, moral field can best be used in situations, when our actions are directly affecting other people that we personally know of. Everything that we do in our lives, somehow moves us in this moral field. When this field is used as an indicator of the moral correctness, the moral field says that something is "moral", if it runs uphill in the moral field and against the line of the least intellectual resistance. In turn it is "immoral", if it runs downhill in the moral field and along the line of the least intellectual resistance. Thus one of the ways of obeying moral laws is to complete in our lives only such activities that run uphill in the moral field. If any our action is to run downhill in the moral field - meaning along the line of the least intellectual resistance (i.e. if it is "immoral"), then we should firstly transform it into an action which is "moral" (i.e. which runs against the line of the least intellectual resistance) and which allows us to accomplish the same original goal, and only then complete it. (The appropriate method of transforming "immoral" activities into "moral" ones, is described in subsection A4.4.) More about moral field is written in subsections A4, B3.1, and I4.2.

- **Totaliztic good deeds and totaliztic sins**. These are two handy concepts, which are developed to be used for categorising countless chores and intentions, which we need to complete everyday. The chores and intentions, which we categorise with these two concepts, are usually done in a very short time, they carry only a small amount of the moral energy, we must solve them everyday in great numbers, and decisions about them we usually need to take within seconds. Totaliztic good deeds are these countless chores which, if are completed, increase moral energy in all people involved. In turn totaliztic sins are all these numerous chores which, if are completed, would reduce moral energy in at least one party involved. It is worth to notice that absolutely every our activity completed in real moral circumstances, is either a totaliztic good deed or a totaliztic sin. If concepts of good deeds and sins are used as indicators of the moral correctness, then we consider a chore to be "moral", if it fulfils the definition of a totaliztic good deed, or to be "immoral" if it fulfils the definition of a totaliztic sin. Therefore obeying moral laws depends on doing only good deeds and refraining from committing totaliztic sins. If a given chore or intension, is qualified as a totaliztic good deed, we

simply do it. But if it qualifies as a totaliztic sin, we firstly need to transform it into a totaliztic good deed which allows us to accomplish the same original goal, and only then we implement it. (The method of such transformation of totaliztic sins into totaliztic good deeds, is described in subsection A5.5.) Both these concepts are described in section A5 of this chapter. Note that the idea of totaliztic good deeds assume that we live in a perfect world, where immoral people are not present, so that they are not able to spoil the outcomes of our efforts by their negative feelings. Therefore this idea should not be applied to laborious activities, which generate a lot of moral energy. These laborious activities are described in section A6 under the name of "moral work".

- **Moral work and immoral work**. A moral work is every laborious totaliztic good deed, which generates a lot of moral energy in the doer, and therefore which needs to be completed especially pedantic, so that it is not turned accidentally into an immoral work. For example, in the current philosophical climate of prevailing parasitism, where the world around us is overcrowded with immoral people, moral work always should be done out of sight of such immoral onlookers, because the negative motivations of immoral people telepathically spoil the outcome (so instead of generating moral energy in the doer, such a work would reduce his/her moral energy). Totalizm recommends that all laborious and time consuming activities which we are completing, should be converted into moral work to generate for us moral energy.

An immoral work, is every laborious and time consuming activity, which reduces a lot of moral energy in the doer. Therefore immoral work can be either a very laborious totaliztic sin (e.g. slavery), or a very laborious good deed, which goes wrong, and instead of generating a lot of moral energy in the doer, it actually reduces a lot of his/her moral energy. Immoral work runs against moral laws, and therefore totalizm forbids doing it willingly. If we are forced to do immoral work for some reasons (e.g. in order to survive), then totalizm recommends to work out ways to stop somehow doing this work, or to compensate the damage that it inflicts, by doing equivalent amount of moral work. A totalizt never should <u>voluntarily</u> and willingly complete an immoral work (i.e. a work, which causes the significant reduction of his/her moral energy). However, because not all circumstances of jobs, that we must do to survive, are always under our control, for the sake of surviving, in the present philosophical climate of rampaging parasitism, <u>sometimes we are forced</u> to also do immoral work, which reduces our moral energy. For example, as this is explained in subsection E8, teaching is an immoral work, because in the present philosophical climate it reduces a lot of moral energy (especially when teaching morally decadent students). But even myself, I am forced to do such teaching, because it is the only source of my income, and without it I would not be able to survive. But I am constantly undertaking steps, for compensating the destructive effects of teaching, firstly by disclosing in my monographs the fact that teaching morally decadent students is a highly immoral work, and secondly by undertaking other moral works, to replenish moral energy that teaching is reducing in me.

Moral energy (also called "zwow" - from Polish "zasób wolnej woli") is an energy that is always generated or reduced in us, when we carry out any activities. When used as an indicator of the moral correctness, moral energy reveals that something is "moral", if it causes the generation of this energy in everyone, while it is "immoral" if it causes the reduction of this energy in at least one party involved. Therefore, one of the ways of obeying moral laws, is to complete only moral works and to refry from the completion of immoral works. If a work, which we currently are completing, has attributes, which cause that it turns out to be an immoral work, then we should undertake steps, which either transform it into a moral work, or at least decrease the destructiveness of it. (Methods of such transformation of an immoral work into a moral work, or ways of decreasing the destructiveness of immoral work, are described in subsection E8.)

Totalizm recognizes many types of moral energy (zwow), in a similar way as physics recognizes many types of physical energy. For example, one type of moral energy is generated, when intellects move uphill in the moral field (thus this type of zwow is an

equivalent to so-called "potential energy" in physics). The type of moral energy (E), which is generated during "moral work", is a moral equivalent to the concept of "work" in physics. This moral energy (E) is accumulated in our counter-bodies, when a given intellect moves positive motivations (S) against feelings (F). Thus this type of moral energy is described by the equation (1E8): E=FS. Moral work should be completed out of the sight of immoral people, as such immoral people add another segment to this equation (1E8), thus transforming it into a more complex equation (2E8). The accumulation of moral energy (zwow) in our counter-bodies through the completion of moral work is discussed in subsection A6.

- **Feelings**. For totalizm feelings (F) are moral equivalents to "forces" in classical mechanics. Similarly as in mechanics forces could be described as "displacements which are obstructed", also in totalizm feelings could be interpreted as "movements that somehow are resisted". Feelings are very complex topic, and a comprehensive elaboration of them exceeds the frame of this monograph. However, because of the key meaning that feelings have for moral energy (zwow), their moral side is quite well explained in subsections A6.8, A7.2, I5.5, G3.6, and G5.

People usually divide feelings into positive and negative, for a criterion of this division assuming the pleasantness they go through, while they experience these feelings. If the experiencing of a given feeling is pleasant to a person, then the feeling usually is called "positive" one. But if the feeling is unpleasant, then it usually is called "negative". Unfortunately, for totalizm this division of feelings into "positive" and "negative" is too imprecise, as it does not contain the information about moral consequences that given feelings have. For example totalizm discovered, that numerous so-called "negative" feelings may cause desirable moral consequences, while many so-called "positive" feelings may cause undesirable moral consequences. Therefore totalizm prefers to divide feelings more unambiguously into "moral" and "immoral" - this subdivision is going to be explained here.

As this is explained in descriptions of the mechanism of feelings, which are presented in subsection I5.5, some feelings cause the accumulation of moral energy (zwow) in the counter-body of the person who experiences them (and/or in counter-bodies of people who are affected by these feelings). Other feelings cause the dispersion of moral energy from the counter-body of the person who experiences them (and/or from counter-bodies of other people who are affected by them). Therefore, in the sense of the influence that feelings have on the level of moral energy, the action of feelings is identical to the action of "totaliztic good deeds" and "totaliztic sins" (described more extensively in subsection A5). Therefore totalizm claims that the outcome of feelings can be either described as "emotional good deeds" or as "emotional sins". "Moral" are only these feelings, which produce "emotional good deeds", while "immoral" are all these feelings, which produce "emotional sins". Therefore, according to definitions provided in subsection A5, as the "**moral**" feelings totalizm recognizes only these ones, the outcome of which is to increase the amount of moral energy in all people involved (meaning both, in a person who experiences a given feeling, as well as in all people affected by this feeling). In turn as "**immoral**" feelings totalizm recognizes all feelings, which decrease the amount of moral energy in at least one person affected by them. After feelings are so divided into moral and immoral, one of the ways of obeying moral laws, is such management of our own feelings, that they only cause the increase of moral energy in all people that they affect. (Effective methods of managing our feelings, which are aimed at neutralizing destructive outcomes of immoral feelings, are described in subsections A7.2 and G5).

Unfortunately, because of the very complex mechanism of feelings, at the present level of our knowledge we are unable to qualify precisely to categories "moral" or "immoral" every single one, out of a large multitude of different feelings. This is especially valid for complex feelings, which are composed of several elementary ones. On the present level of knowledge we can only qualify a sparse number of basic physical feelings (i.e. feelings experienced by our bodies). According to this present state of knowledge, as **examples of moral feelings** totalizm recognizes: (1) hunger, which the fasting person inflicted on himself/herself because of higher moral motivations, e.g. through fasting during religious periods of abstinence, or for

accomplishing some high moral goal (however please note that the feeling of hunger experienced by a slave starved by its masters, or by a child which does not understand religion - but is forced to fast by its fanatical parents, is "immoral"), (2) <u>pain</u>, which is experienced for moral reasons, or which is experienced by a guilty criminal (or a child) which feels remorse and believes that deserved a punishment, (3) <u>suffering</u>, which a given person accepts voluntarily for a higher cause (note, however, that suffering experienced by a tortured slave, or by an innocent suspect which is tortured, is "immoral"), (4) <u>tiredness</u>, which paralyses the whole body, when we are completing some morally justified work (note, however, that a tiredness of a slave who is forced to work, or a person who believes in senselessness or immorality of a given work, is "immoral"), (5) physical <u>inconvenience</u>, which is experienced voluntarily by someone who wishes to accomplish a higher task, etc. Into the group of "moral" feelings belong also a whole range of further unpleasant physical feelings, which fulfil the following conditions: (a) experiencing of them is assumed voluntarily - usually from our own initiative, while about experiencing them by us do not know any person of a low morality, (b) the experiencing of these unpleasant feelings is accompanied with high motivations, which cause that we deeply believe in purpose of their experiencing. Because totalizm already managed to identify such feelings unpleasant to our body as "moral", some of recommendations of this philosophy suggest that we should induce them in us on purpose for increasing the level of our moral energy - see subsections D1 and D2.

- **Motivations**. In totalizm motivations (S) are moral equivalents of displacements from classical mechanics. Similarly as this is case with feelings, precise rules of managing motivations still await to be worked out by totalizm. However, totalizm already knows that motivations can also be "moral" or "immoral", and that "moral" motivations are only these ones, which require our effort to be put in them, while "immoral" motivations are all these, which do not require any effort - see subsection A7.4. Totalizm also established that if there is a rapid change (acceleration) of motivations, this change creates a kinetic form of moral energy, which is also either "moral" or "immoral" - see subsection A7.4. Therefore one of the method of obeying moral laws, is to induce in ourselves only motivations, which require some effort to be put in them. Other method is to accelerate our effort-consuming motivations, so that we change them very rapidly in order to additionally generate with them a "kinetic" form of moral energy. Slightly more about motivations is written in subsections E8, A7.4, I5.5 and G3.3.

- **Responsibility**. For totalizm, responsibility (A) is an equivalent of "acceleration" from physics and classical mechanics. Totaliztic method of moral control over our responsibility is very simple: we always should take responsibility on ourselves practically for everything. Responsibility in itself is a clear indicator of moral correctness. If it is used as such an indicator, to the category of "moral" we should qualify everything, for which we willingly and happily take the responsibility on ourselves. In turn to the category of "immoral" we should qualify everything, that we would like to push the responsibility for it on someone, or on something else. "Immoral" is also a very action, or a thought, with the use of which we push responsibility on someone, or on something else. More on the topic of responsibility is explained in subsections A8, I4.1.1, and G3.5.

- **Conscience**. Totalizm teaches us that in our counter-material bodies we have a special moral counter-organ called "conscience". This counter-organ knows all moral laws in existence. Therefore it always tells us what it thinks about a given our action or intension. Therefore, in order to use our conscience as an indicator of the moral correctness, we only need to listen what it is telling us. The conscience always tells us, whether whatever we do or intend, is "moral" or "immoral". Therefore, one of the most effective manners of obeying moral laws, is to listen continually to our conscience, and to abandon the completion of all actions, about which the conscience clearly advices us, that these are the immoral ones. More about the conscience is written in subsections A10 and I5.3.

Of course, the above list is not finished yet, as it is almost sure that totalizm is going to find in the future many further indicators of the moral correctness. When applying any of the indicators, either these which we already have, as well as also these, which we will have in the

future, one needs to bear in mind, that each one of them applies to a different type of situation and to a different type of actions or intentions. Therefore, in order to recognize whether our action or intention is "moral" or "immoral", we either should use an appropriate indicator of the moral correctness, or - when we do not know which one is appropriate to a given situation, we should use several of them, and then check which of them provide the most clear, sure, and unambiguous answer.

At this point we should clearly realize that armed with the above indicators of the moral correctness, totalizts have already sufficient number of tools, to be able clearly distinguish between "moral" and "immoral". Therefore, there is technically possible for totalizts to undertake "moral" actions in every situation they encounter in their lives. Thus, if they wish so, people are already able to live their lives in such a manner, that they "pedantically obey moral laws in everything that they do". The only further skill, that is still required to fully accomplish such a totaliztic living, is to learn how to transform our immoral intentions, into moral ones – which still allow us to accomplish the same goals as these offered by immoral intentions. But this is explained thoroughly in subsections A3 to A10 of this chapter.

A2.4. <u>Moral rewards and punishments</u>

Totalizm does not declare its own laws, or rules of behaviour, but only tries to scientifically discover and understandably describe the truth about laws and rules already existing and operating in the universe. As it turns out, this laws and rules were so designed by the universal intellect (God), that **moral behaviours in the long-term effect always are lavishly rewarded, while immoral behaviours in the long-term effect are always punish**ed. The precise presentation of most important rewards and punishments for our moral behaviour is provided in volume 3 of this monograph. But for the consistency of presentations in this subsection listed are most significant long-term rewards that practicing of totalizm is able to bring to a given practitioner.

From the information provided in subsection JF6 from volume 6 of this monograph the reader is to learn that the humanity just is in the final stage of many thousands years long era in which the universal intellect (God) carried out "experiments on people concerning so-called evilness and its consequences". Of course, in this special era of the human history God so designed the action of rewards and punishments for moral and immoral behaviour, that this action is appropriate to the goals of the experimentation on evilness. Therefore, in the era to-date, for practically every action God assigns both a reward and a punishment. One of these is served immediately, i.e. as soon as a given behaviour is manifested by us, while another one is served in long term - revealing itself only a significant time later after the completion of our behaviour. For example, in this era to-date for experimentation on evilness all morally correct behaviours of people God instantly punishes, but in long-term rewards. In turn all immoral behaviours in this lasting until today era of experimentations with evilness, God immediately rewards, but in long-term punishes. For this reasons rewards and punishments which are listed in this subsection as well as in volume 3 of this monograph, are rewards and punishments of a long-term effect. After all, rewards and punishments which are granted immediately after a given our behaviour are perfectly visible for everyone, thus do NOT require presentation. We also should remind ourselves, that there is a significant disproportion between what is served to us instantly after a given behaviour, and what is served to us in long-term. This disproportion in the best way is expressed by the English saying which describes both outcomes of every our morally correct behaviour, quote: "a thimbleful of present pain for a bucketful of future gain". It is worth to notice, that starting from 2000, God gradually started to introduce on the Earth the next era in which slightly different principles of rewarding and punishing are going to be in power. The first signs of this new era already begin to be visible around - e.g. consider consequences of so-called "economic crisis" which started in 2008. After a full introduction of that next era, the time gap between instant and long-term

consequences of our behaviour will diminish. For example, the morally correct behaviour will then be immediately punished, like at present, but simultaneously immediately will also start to appear this reward which previously appeared only as a long-term consequence of our moral behaviour. Similarly immoral behaviour in this new era is going to be rewarded immediately, as before, but simultaneously also immediately will begin to appear this punishment that is granted for this our immoral behaviour.

In the effort of discovering the truth about principles we must obey in our lives, totalizm discovered very effective mechanisms of moral rewarding and punishing, with the use of which the universe with an iron hand executes the obedience of moral laws that prevail in it. The operation of these mechanisms is based on the enormously effective manner of motivating, which people commonly know under the name of "a stick and a carrot method" – described, amongst others, in subsection JG5.2 from volume 6 of this monograph. (In this method of motivating, if someone, or something, behaves correctly, then it receives a "carrot", but if it behaves wrongly, then it is walloped with a "stick".) The operation of these mechanisms of moral rewarding and punishing can be defined in the following manner: **every case of obeying a moral law, is always rewarded simultaneously in several different ways, which mutually complement each other; while every individual case of disobeying a moral law, is always punished in several different ways simultaneously**. The secure and reliable operation of these mechanisms is additionally guaranteed by the "configuration of a fan", into which the subsequent components of these mechanisms are arranged. This configuration is accomplished, because the universe runs not one, but several such mechanisms of moral rewarding and punishing, and make them work in parallel, simultaneously, and completely independently from each other. Furthermore, subsequent mechanisms were so designed, that they tightly cover with their areas of validity the entire scope of human physical life, and eternal existence of human soul. Thus, even if some people manage to cheat on one of them, still they are confronted and sentenced by other ones. Simultaneously, if someone overlooks the operation of these mechanisms in one area of life, then still they hit him/her in the eyes in other areas of the life (similarly, if someone discovers how these mechanisms work in one area, then he/she is able to interpolate their existence and operation to other areas of life). The numerous rewards and punishments for obeying or disobeying moral laws that these mechanisms serve to people, are embedded into the very operation of moral laws. This subsection explains **one** of several different mechanisms, that implement this automatic rewarding or punishing, and that work independently from each other.

Note that apart of the mechanism that I am describing here, there are also other independent mechanisms of the effective rewarding and punishing, hard-wired into moral laws. An example of such other mechanism of rewarding and punishing, is algorithm of returnable karma described in subsection A3.2. Still another such mechanism working in this life, is briefly explained in subsection D11.1. One more such a mechanism, which this time works in the afterlife, is mentioned in subsection F2.2. (Totalizm already determined, that independently from several different rewards and punishments received simultaneously in this life, our obedience or disobedience of the moral laws also brings about several different rewards or punishments in the afterlife as well.)

Every indicator of the moral correctness, described in previous subsection, in physical sense represents a kind of energy. In turn energy has this property, that when it is accumulated in a significant amount, it starts to manifest itself. For example, if a wire accumulates a lot of electrostatic energy - it starts to emit sparks, if a tire accumulates a lot of pressure - it explodes, if a hot-air balloon accumulates a lot of heat - it starts to ascent. Moral energy also displays this property. If a person accumulates a lot of moral energy, this energy starts to manifest itself physically. A physical manifestation of this energy we call a **moral reward**. As it turns out, every single moral law in existence, has a specific moral reward embedded into it. Therefore people, who obey moral laws willingly, are gradually earning these moral rewards. The mechanism of earning all moral rewards is based on the process of

gradual accumulation of appropriate type of moral energy in our counter-material bodies. As such, each such reward is identical to the process of accumulation of moral energy to accomplish the totaliztic nirvana described in subsection E1. In order to explain this mechanism briefly, every single indicator of moral correctness, described in subsection A2.3, actually is, or represents, one of many different forms of moral energy. Therefore, these people who obey moral laws, by the process of obeying these laws they gradually accumulate in themselves the type of energy, which represents the moral indicator of correctness that is embedded into moral laws that they obey. In the result, this particular moral energy at some stage starts to be so dense in them, that it starts to produce physical manifestations. In turn these physical manifestations are giving a kind of "supernatural" abilities to the person who accumulated such a huge density of this energy. These "supernatural" abilities are the rewards for obeying a given class of moral laws.

Unfortunately, so far almost no research was done on these "moral rewards". Therefore almost everything that currently is known about them, is obtained either in the result of casual observations, or in the result of analyses of mysterious phenomena that were manifested around some historically known people, who lived highly moral lives. So far I fully experienced myself only one of these rewards, namely the totaliztic nirvana, and I am describing it thoroughly in subsection E2. But I already accumulated various indications and observations, which reveal that there are also other extraordinary moral rewards in existence, which awaits for totalizts to earn them. I try to explain these below. Although some may believe that rewards that I am listing here represent only speculations, it should be noted that there is a significant body of evidence, which indicates that these rewards actually do exist and are achievable, as some especially moral people accomplished them. Because they manifest themselves, if a given person accumulates the appropriate density of moral energy, which represents one of the indicators of the moral correctness described in subsection A2.3, I will explain them in the order of these indicators. Here is a list, and descriptions, of moral rewards that I managed to identify so far:

- **A high creditory karma**. The existing evidence seems to indicate that people, who by obeying moral laws managed to accumulate a very high density of the creditory karma, are earning a rather extraordinary moral reward. This is a supernatural ability to "**fulfil their wishes**". When someone's creditory karma is very high, then whatever such a person wishes, and this wish is satisfying a set of conditions imposed by moral laws, then the wish comes true. Of course, there are strict conditions which such a wish must satisfy in order to materialize. For example, the wish must lie within options allowed by the action of moral laws (e.g. if the wish would be to see someone to become a king, then this someone should have a karma, which allows him/her to become a king), it must be physically possible, and the fulfilment of it must require less moral energy then the wisher already accumulated in the counter-body. If someone earns this moral reward, then after making a wish, which satisfies these conditions, a kind of impossible starts to happen. Unexpectedly, in the sight of the wisher, a sequence of coincidences starts to take shape, each one of which looks completely natural, but all of which systematically lead to the eventuation of such circumstances, that the wish soon comes true. This moral reward, when it unexpectedly manifests itself, initially is rather a scary phenomenon, and it makes one to practically stop wishing anything, or at least to be extremely careful what is wishing for. But with the elapse of time the wisher gets used to it, and starts to enjoy the mind-boggling options that it creates.

- **A high position in the moral field**. If someone constantly moves upward in the moral field, then with the elapse of time he or she reaches a position in this field, at which the accumulation of potential energy exceeds the value required for creating physical manifestations. This in turn provides a different moral reward, which is the supernatural ability to obtain "**control over laws of physics**" (which include, for example, the capability to accomplish psychokinesis). Therefore such a person gains the ability to do things that are contradictory to the laws of physics, as the laws of physics are starting to obey commands of this person. For example he/she may be able to materialize things, or to make other objects or

himself/herself to levitate or to fly, or he/she can walk on water, or make others to walk on water, or he/she can split to two different people, or shift to other times and return back either by himself/herself or with other people, to change weather, to make the rain stop or start, etc.

- **The high condensation of moral energy originating from totaliztic good deeds**. It appears that the completion of countless totaliztic good deeds also brings about its own moral reward, which could be described as the **ability to control bodies of other people**. This ability combines a whole array of extraordinary phenomena, for example it may manifest itself by capability to heal other people, by ability to carry out bloodless operations, by capability to instantly hypnotise other people, etc.

- **The high condensation of moral energy originating from moral work**. The moral reward awaiting for those who accumulated the appropriate amount of moral energy via moral work is the totaliztic **nirvana**. This particular reward I experienced myself, therefore I am able to describe it comprehensibly in chapter E. Actually nirvana is not a single moral reward, but a whole continuum of rewards, which are intensified and include more and more pleasant phenomena, as the moral energy of the recipient increases. At higher stages it seems to be accompanied by various other extraordinary phenomena, for example by the emission of "saintly fragrances", by the ability to read thoughts of others, etc.

- **The accumulation of energy of "moral" feelings**. The moral reward, which awaits for those who accumulated a very high density of the moral energy (E=FS) resulting from combining "moral" feelings (F) with "moral" motivations (S), seems to be the supernatural ability to obtain positive "**control over fate of other people**". Unfortunately, this ability can be also displayed by everyone, as well as by every object, which accomplished also a very low density of energy of feelings, including also these ones who dispersed almost all their moral energy either through some "immoral" feelings or "immoral" motivations. The only difference between these two groups of people is, that people, or objects, which accumulated excessive "moral" energy of feelings and motivations, are able to impact the fate of other people in a moral manner. In turn people, who reached the below threshold value of this energy because of "immoral" feelings and motivations, are only able to influence lives of other people in an immoral manner (i.e. are only able to hurt people, cast evil eye, bring bad luck, etc.). There are various stories and empirical observations which describe this ability. For example, in medieval times an execution axe was allowed to take only 1000 human lives, because it was observed that beyond 1000 lives it becomes so loaded with the energy of negative feelings (E=FS) that it could go against the executioner and kill him. In Malaysia I heard numerous stories about trees (so-called "datuk"), which are objects of local cult, and therefore which are over-saturated with the energy of feelings (E=FS). Problem starts when authorities decide to cut down any of them. Whoever simply approaches any of these tees e.g. with a chain-saw, is falling down covered in blood, as if whatever he is intending to do to the tree, is somehow done to him.

- **The accumulation of kinetic energy of accelerated motivations**. As this is explained in subsection A7.4, rapid changes of motivations generate a kinetic form of moral energy. People who accumulate a high density of this energy seem to gain the reward of the supernatural ability to "**clairvoyance**". They can see events and things that are to happen in the future, or are to happen in distant places out of their sight.

- **Obeying the conscience**. People who accumulate a high density of moral energy in the result of a pedantic obeying whatever their conscience tells them, are gaining a reward of supernatural "**knowledge of what to do in order to positively solve specific human problems**". They actually start to know the correct solutions to human problems that they never learned. They can also answer correctly all questions, and provide correct solutions, to all problems regarding human situations that other people may confront them with. And in order to do this, they do not need to go through any process of learning or gathering the knowledge from books.

The interesting thing about these moral rewards, is that people gain access to them proportionally to the density of an appropriate moral energy accumulated in them. Therefore

some people who live morally, may gain a partial access to some of these rewards long time before they can harvest these rewards to a full extend. In this way some people may experience moments in their life, when a clairvoyance, or a happiness, or a fulfilment of wishes, or a psychokinesis, or something else, manifests itself in them, although normally they are not able to manifest any of these rewards at will. However, if they work on the further increase of the density of their moral energy, one particular reward that corresponds to the moral energy they increased, could become available to them all the time, and at every their wish.

Because there is so many forms of moral energy, and so many corresponding moral rewards, everyone who practices totalizm may choose which reward he or she would like to accomplish. This choice boils down to choosing the moral quantity which he or she would like to use as his or her favourite indicator of the moral correctness. And so, those totalizts who would like to accomplish the totaliztic nirvana, in everything that they do should take notice whether it increases or decreases their moral energy (i.e. they should do only totaliztic moral work and avoid committing totaliztic sins or totaliztic immoral work - as this is described in subsection E8). In turn these totalizts who would like to accomplish the control over laws of physics, in everything that they do need to make sure that it goes uphill in the moral field (as described in subsection A4). Etc., etc.

Of course, it does not even require special explanations, that similarly as the obedience of moral laws brings to us corresponding moral rewards, also breaking moral laws escalates for us appropriate **punishments for this breaking**, which are affecting us proportionally to our bad behaviour. One of numerous mechanism of operation of these punishments, is very similar to that described above for the physical manifestation of large amounts of moral energy. Only that instead of being released by the surplus (high density) of moral energy, it is released by a shortage (low density) of this energy. Some, out of numerous final effects of such punishing mechanisms, are described in subsections KA8.6.3 and KA4.2.

A2.5. Subdivision of moral laws

As it turns out, the form of moral energy that the obedience of subsequent moral laws accumulates in us, can be a basis for creating a classification of these laws. Such a classification allows us to subdivide all these countless moral laws in existence, into several basic subclasses. These subclasses are so arranged, that each one of them causes the accumulation of a form of moral energy, which is unique to this particular subclass. Thus each one of them enables to apply a given "indicator of the moral correctness", which is also unique to this subclass. In turn, when we obtain such unified subclasses, each one of them allows to develop a simple method, or a simple concept (such as the method of "going against the line of least intellectual resistance", or a concept of "totaliztic good deeds" and "totaliztic sins"), which explain in simple terms, how to obey all different moral laws, which constitute a given subclass. This in turn enables totalizm, to come up with several simple tools, which for each subclass of moral laws, show how to obey this subclass, what "indicator of the moral correctness" is the most effective for qualifying it, and how to reinforce in ourselves the kind of moral behaviour that this subclass of moral laws tries to develop in people. Therefore, before we dive into the deliberations from this chapter, which explain how to obey individual subclasses of moral laws, let us firstly list here the major subclasses of moral laws. These are subdivided depending on their "indicator of the moral correctness". For each one of them is explained briefly, what method, concept, rule, or recommendation we need to apply in order to obey these laws in our everyday life. Here are major subclasses of moral laws, and summary of rules how to obey them:

1. **Karma-related moral laws**. For these the indicator of moral correctness is "karma". We obey them by choosing in life only these actions which generate karma that we are prepared to take back. Their example is discussed in subsection A3.

2. **Moral laws relating to moral field**. For these the indicator of the moral correctness is "climbing uphill in the moral field". Their range of applications concerns mainly these our actions, that directly affect other people. They make "moral" everything that runs uphill in the moral field, while "immoral" - everything that runs downhill in the moral field. They represent the most frequent type of laws we encounter in our everyday life, as the majority of things that we do, directly affect other people, and thus it can either move us upwards, or downwards, in the moral field. Fortunately for totalizts, the laws from this subclass are the most easy to obey, as for all of them applies the general recommendation of totalizm, which in more details is described in subsection A4. It states that "always try to do the exact opposite to what the line of least intellectual resistance asks you to do".

3. **Moral laws relating to moral energy from countless everyday chores**. For these, the indicator of the moral correctness is the concept of "totaliztic good deeds" and "totaliztic sins". According to this indicator, "moral" is everything that in the perfect world generates moral energy in all those involved. In turn "immoral" is everything that would reduce the moral energy in at least one party involved. These laws can be obeyed relatively easy, through mastery of the concept of "totaliztic good deed", and "totaliztic sin", as these are described in subsections A5.1 and A5.2, and through learning how to convert totaliztic sins into totaliztic good deeds - as described in subsection A5.5.

4. **Moral laws relating to moral energy from laborious moral work**. For these, the indicator of the moral correctness is "the certainty of an increase in the accumulation of moral energy in the doer". For these laws, "moral" is everything that in the imperfect, real world, is certain to accumulate moral energy in the counter-body of the doer. In turn "immoral" is everything that disperses moral energy from the doer. These laws can be obeyed through the mastery and further perfecting the concept of "totaliztic moral work", and "totaliztic immoral work", as these are described in section A6.

5. **Moral laws, which govern the energy of feelings**. For these, the indicator of the moral correctness is the concept of "emotional good deeds" and "emotional sins". According to this indicator, "moral" are all feelings, which in the perfect world would accumulate the moral energy in all people affected by these feelings. In turn "immoral" are all feelings, which would disperse this energy from some people affected by them. These laws can be obeyed through the mastery of the concept of "emotional good deed" and "emotional sin", as described in subsections A7.2, A5.1, and A5.2.

6. **Moral laws, which govern our motivations**. For these, the indicator of the moral correctness is the contribution of our effort into the formation of our motivations. According to this indicator, "moral" are all our motivations, into the formation of which we need to intentionally contribute our effort. In turn "immoral" are all these motivations, into the formation of which we do not need put any effort. These laws can be obeyed through overcoming in ourselves the tendency to laziness and undertaking moral activities which increase someone's moral energy. Their example is described in subsection A7.4.

7. **Moral laws, which relate to responsibility**. For these, the indicator of the moral correctness, is the willingness to accept the responsibility for outcomes of whatever we do. According to this indicator, "moral" are all outcomes, for which we are willing to accept our responsibility. In turn "immoral" are all outcomes, for which the responsibility we do not want to accept. These laws can be obeyed through (1) undertaking only such actions, the responsibility for which we are willing to accept, and also (2) overcoming in ourselves the tendency to push the responsibility onto other people, or onto other institutions. Their examples are described in subsections A8 and I4.1.1.

8. **Unique moral laws** (i.e. which regulate such issues as: our self-defence, our learning, universal justice, direction in which our intelligent universe develops, etc.). For these, simple indicators of the moral correctness are still in the process of being developed or searched for. As examples see Principle of Counterpolarity, and Energy Conversion Principle, both described in subsection I4.1.1. These laws are very individual, and as for now, we do not have developed, as yet, general methods or effective concepts, which would teach us how to

cognitively obey more of them in one go (perhaps future generations of totalizts develop such methods, or discover such concepts). Therefore, as for now, each single one of these laws must be obeyed in an individual manner, which for all laws from this class are outlined in their descriptions provided in subsection I4.1.1. The only universal concept which applies to all of them is conscience described in next item.

9. **Moral laws, which are not known to us yet** (e.g. they are not identified yet and not described by totalizm, or they are already identified and described, but we have not learned them yet and thus we do not know that they do exist and also we do not know how to obey them). In spite that they are unknown to us, still we already have an excellent indicator of the moral correctness. It is a kind of "build-in internal encyclopaedia of moral laws" that we have inside of ourselves. This is our "counter-organ of conscience" - as described in subsections A2.3, A10, I4.1.2 and I5.3. This organ of conscience always tells us precisely whether a given action which we are intending or taking, is running along, or against, moral laws. Therefore we should learn to obey what this organ tells us, and learn to obey what our conscience is indicating about each action that we are taking.

A2.6. Continually increase your knowledge

There is a saying that "genius learns from the mistakes of others, intelligent person - from his/her own mistakes, while an idiot learns from neither of these". Well, in the light of this saying totalizm assumes an almost impossible task: it tries to make people to learn just from the descriptions of moral laws, so that by knowing these laws, they would not commit mistakes any more!

In totalizm everything begins with our learning, and everything is oriented towards learning. The reason is that there is a moral law, which orders: "continually increase your knowledge". Totalizm starts everything from obeying this law. After all, <u>one is not able to obey moral laws, for as long until he/she learns what these laws actually say and how to obey them</u>. Therefore totalizt needs to learn at least everything that is connected with totalizm. At this stage of the development of totalizm, this practically boils down to learning everything what is contained in the core of this monograph. Fortunately for totalizm, this philosophy develops rapidly, and in the not-too-distant future probably there will be further materials available to those wishing to learn more about this progressive philosophy. I was very pleased to notice that at the time of writing this monograph, there was a very active Internet discussion group in Poland (in the Polish language though) which was discussing various issues of totalizm - see subsection L4.

There is one important matter connected with the moral law (and a recommendation of totalizm) "continually increase your knowledge". This is that there is a moral law which states "**everyone carries the personal responsibility for learning moral laws and for obeying them in his/her everyday life**". What this law means is that, independently if a given person bothered to learn these laws, or simply ignored them, still in the final effect is judged for their obedience, and is rewarded or punished proportionally to the extend in which either fulfils them in everything that is doing, or breaks them. Therefore it is rather beneficial to put the required effort into learning moral laws and into obey them in our lives. After all, if we do not do this learning and obeying, our life becomes quite tough and unpleasant.

An important regularity that hits the eyes about our universe, is that practically everything in it is so intelligently designed, that it serves the increase of our knowledge, facilitates our logical thinking and researching, helps those people who utilise their minds and knowledge, etc. For example, the way moral laws were designed and work, amongst others, facilitates the increase of our knowledge. The course of moral field actually coincides with the line of the most intellectual effort and the least intellectual resistance (for details see subsections A4.1 and G3). The principles and canons on which morality is based, are also oriented towards accumulation of knowledge. The universal justice is not just a "blind justice",

but an intelligent "motivating justice", which inspires our learning. The structure and operation of the universe in itself, is promoting learning and thinking. Etc., etc. Therefore the moral law and recommendation of totalizm "continually increase your knowledge" is actually expressing the essence of the most important mechanism of our universe, and the leading intention of the universal intellect.

* * *

After we learned all this, now we can start discussing (one by one) all these indicators of the moral correctness, which are already worked out by totalizm, and learn how to use these indicators in order to live our lives in a totaliztic manner.

A3. Control your karma

The first, and probably the most important, tool, provided by totalizm, in order to easily obey moral laws, and to lead a totaliztic life, is the concept of karma. This tool can be used as an effective "indicator of the moral correctness" for fast qualifying our actions and intensions into a category "moral", or "immoral". It also allows a relatively easy transformation of our initial actions or intensions, which - according to the operation of karma turned out to be "immoral", into actions or intensions, which are going to be "moral" (a method of such a transformation is described in subsection A3.2). In this way, the concept of karma allows us to "pedantically obey moral laws" and to avoid breaking these laws. After all, it enables us to undertake efforts to do in our lives always only these things that fulfil the totaliztic definition of being "moral" activities, that means only things which generate a "moral" karma. The effective use of this tool in thousands of everyday situations, allows us to lead a highly moral and fulfilled life, named here with the qualifier "totaliztic". Such a "totaliztic life" implements the only rule of totalizm stating "pedantically obey moral laws", as it avoids breaking moral laws in anything that we are doing.

As this is explained more exactly in subsections I4.4 and B3.3, totalizm adopted the Sanskrit word "karma" (in Sanskrit "karma" means "work") for naming a unique moral algorithm. This algorithm is accepted from other people and temporally recorded in our own "registers" (for remembering and for further execution). It is recorded in us each time, when we do something that induces in these other people any definite feelings, which are directed specifically at us. The totaliztic definition of karma states, that this algorithm works in such a manner that **all feelings that we induced in other people, are memorised in our "registers" in the form of karmatic algorithms, so that some time later the same feelings can be exactly repeated in us, while we can rewrite the same karmatic algorithms into "registers" of other people, whose behaviour re-induced these feelings in us**. In order to explain this in other words, if we induce in someone from our surrounding some kind of a feeling, either by the way we act, or by our behaviour, or by feeling, motivation, pose, or in any other way, then some time later - when someone from our environment also behaves in a similar manner, his/her behaviour is going to induce in us exactly the same feeling. The definition of the feeling, that was induced firstly by us, and then induced inside of us, is recorded in the karma algorithm. The exchange of this karma algorithm occurs at the moment, when this feeling is induced in someone, while the algorithm itself always is transferred telepathically and without anyone's knowledge, from the person who is experiencing a given feeling, to the person who is inducing this feeling in the receiver. Because feelings are moral forces, which define the course and outcomes of various events that are responsible for inducing specific emotions in us, in the final result, the exchange of karma causes also that the outcomes of such events, which induced these feelings, seem for us to be exactly the same as they were for the person from whom we accepted a given karma.

There is a whole class of moral laws in operation, which influence karma, and for which karma is a kind of a motor, or algorithm, that controls their course and outcomes. The most representative of all of them is the very hard-hitting Boomerang Principle, which is described in

subsection I4.1.1. Others include so-called Law of Karma (which is simply the Boomerang Principle, but extended onto more then one lifetime), and the Law of Cause and Effect. Totalizm recommends that we should obey especially carefully all moral laws involving karma - especially the Boomerang Principle. After all, in our everyday life, we are the most frequently punished or rewarded just by these laws. In order to remind us here, what the Boomerang Principle states, it could roughly be expressed in words: "whatever feelings you induce in others, one day exactly the same feelings will be induced in you". In order to explain how we should obey the Boomerang Principle in everything that we do, totalizm recommends as follows:

"Whatever situation you encounter in your life, when you generate a karma by giving or serving something to other people that induces feelings in them, remember to handle this situation in a "moral" manner, so that when the time of repaying your karma comes, and you become the receiver of a similar situation and the same feelings, you are not going to suffer too much because of the karma you pre-programmed to be returned to yourself with these particular feelings."

This recommendation can also be put forward in a very simple wording of the Christian "Golden Rule": "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" (i.e. "Do to others only what you wish to be done to you").

A3.1. Totaliztic versus Hinduistic interpretation of karma

Originally totalizm adopted the word "karma" from Hinduism. Unfortunately, after completing lengthy research on it, totalizm discovered that the Hinduistic understanding of karma begins to differ drastically from the findings of totalizm regarding the real operation of this natural algorithm. For example, Hinduism believes that karma causes our actions to be returned in the future. In turn totalizm discovered, that karma causes the return of feelings that we induce in other people, (not our actions that induced these feelings). Most important differences between these two understandings of karma are listed below. Totalizts should be clearly aware of these differences, as their mistaking leads to the deviated understanding of moral laws. For example, if karma stores the memory of events - as Hinduism claims, then convincing someone to commit a murder would bring death also to the instigator in the karmatic return. After all, in the karmatic memory, both of them, i.e. the murderer and this instigator, would be stored as targets for being murdered (as both of them were accomplices in the "activity" of murdering). In turn, if karma stores the memory of feelings - as totalizm defines it, then convincing someone to commit a murder brings back death by being murdered to a murderer only. The instigator is exposed just to feelings of someone trying to convince him/her in the future to commit a murder.

Discrepancies between the Hinduistic understanding of karma, in comparison to totaliztic definition of this concept, originate possibly from several different sources. The majority of these discrepancies, most probably were introduced to the Hinduistic concept of karma, because this concept was used throughout several thousands of years without developing any means for verifying the correctness of it (such means are introduced only now by tools of totalizm). So in the meantime this concept managed to overgrow in Hinduism with an ocean of untrue interpretations and deviating speculations. Furthermore, in Hinduism this concept was never defined as clearly and as thoroughly, as it is done in the Concept of Dipolar Gravity - from which totalizm originates. In turn, by not having a strict definition, this concept easily was subjected to wild speculations and to various deviations.

The Concept of Dipolar Gravity, and thus also totalizm, redefined the concept of "karma", giving to it a clear and unambiguous definition, which logically results from the operation of the universe under dipolar gravity. It also verified the operation of totaliztic definition of karma on various empirical observations and data that are available at present. Therefore, although totalizm retains the name of the original concept of Hinduistic karma, and

retains the traditional significance of this concept, in fact the precise interpretation of the karma algorithm is in totalizm drastically different than in Hinduism. For example, in totalizm and in the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, "karma" algorithm is a moral equivalent to the physical algorithm of "time" - see descriptions in subsections I4.4 and I4.1.1.

Of course, by claiming that the "totaliztic definition of karma" is different from the "Hinduistic understanding of karma", it is beneficial to explain briefly here, where these differences come from, and what they depend upon. We should start these explanations from reminding ourselves, that one of the laws that govern the lives of long-living group intellects, is that these intellects with the elapse of time show the tendency to replace empirically verifiable truths, by theoretically speculated and convenient myths (see descriptions from subsection KA4.4). The concept of karma was obviously introduced to Hinduism by someone, who either discovered or learned it, and thus who exactly understood what it means, and described it in such a manner that it corresponded to truth. But in spite of that, the multitude of generations of home-made "gurus", in the course of centuries continually added their own interpretations to this concept. They gradually introduced to it various deviations, which currently place it far from the truth. Let us present here several examples of the most important of such **speculative deviations, which with the elapse of time overgrown the Hinduistic concept of karma**.

1. **Return of events, not feelings**. Probably the most significant deviation, or misunderstanding, that was introduced to the concept of karma, is the claim of Hinduism that events are subjected to karmatic returns. In this way Hinduism ignores the importance of feelings and overlooks the fact that in reality karma returns only feelings that are induced through the means of subsequent events. In order to explain this more precisely, according to the to-date findings of the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, **karma algorithm does not govern the external events, which affect us, but governs our internal feelings, that are to be induced in us in the result of random events that take place in our environment, and affect us with their outcomes; only then these our feelings can (although do not need to) modify these events in such a manner, that the events take the course which is most appropriate to the feelings that they are inducing**. Explaining this more precisely, karma algorithms are limiting their action to the interior of our counter-body, controlling in there the operation of our counter-organs. Through this controlling of our counter-organs, karma algorithms define the type and the intensity of feelings, that our counter-organs are serving to us, in the result of random events that happen in our vicinity (note that according to descriptions in subsection I5.5, our counter-organs are these parts of our counter-body, which exert a control over feelings that we experience in the result of every event). For example, according to the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, if sometime in past we caused an accident, which induced in the victim a specific kind of pain of a given intensity, then on the occasion of entirely different accident, in the result of which we were hurt, our counter-organs are going to be controlled by karma in such a manner, that we also will experience exactly the same kind of pain of the same intensity, that earlier we caused in someone else with our own accident. The accident that places us as victims, and that costs us this specific pain, does not need to have the same course, or the same form, as the accident that we made, and that caused the other person to feel this pain. A most drastic case, which documents such an operation of karma algorithm, is the so-called "death from a shock", means a death that takes place in a situation that a given person actually should not die, but he/she still dies because his/her karma makes the death to take place. (This kind of death frequently takes place when someone is shot, although not fatally.) Quite an interesting aspect of such karmatic "death from a shock" is that a deceased person freezes in the meaningful pose, which is a symbolic reflection of his/her karma.

This finding of the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, which explains to us the mechanism of karma operation, displays a drastic discrepancies with claims of Hinduism. This is because Hinduism claims that to the karma returns external events are subjected, which we cause (i.e. not our internal feelings). Therefore, according to Hinduism, if we cause for example a car

accident, in which someone is hurt, sometimes in the future we are going to fall victims of exactly the same car accident, in which we are going to get hurt in exactly the same manner. Of course, this speculative claim of Hinduism is easy to be verified in real events, and shown that it is not true. For example it leads to such paradoxes, as that if someone today dies in India in a car accident, then - according to claims of Hinduism, many years earlier this someone must kill someone in a similar car accident. But in India many years ago there were no cars! The same case, however, does not disagree with the definition of karma in the Concept of Dipolar Gravity. This is because, if someone experiences any kind of feelings - as the result of a car accident, and these feelings lead to his/her death, then from the karmatic research of this person usually turns out, that previously this person was responsible for a similar kind of an accident (which could, for example, have the form of crushing someone with a horse wagon), and in this previous accident a victim went exactly through the same feelings that currently a given person experiences in the result of a car accident.

There is, however, an aspect of karma mechanism, which results from the operation of this algorithm described by the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, which requires here a thorough explanation. This is an ability of internal feelings to change the course of external events. On this ability is based the whole range of phenomena and activities, for example black magic, evil eye, moral vampirism, etc. - see subsection I5.7. And so, according to this mechanism, when karma induces in someone appropriate kind of feelings, these feelings are in turn able to steer external events into appropriate course (if they are sufficiently strong – means if the exceed the above threshold value). So these feelings can complete a kind of unaware black magic and cause that events, which induced them, start to take the course which is aligned with their type and intensity. We actually observe in our lives this particular phenomena quite frequently, when in the presence of a specific person, something forces us, to behave accordingly to the karma of this other person. However, such modification of external events with our internal feelings can take place only sometimes - but does not need to happen all the time. For example, when something forces us to act in a specific manner, we still do not need to subdue to this forcing. This means that in a specific part of real life situations, especially in very important events, which are served to us by other people who are susceptible to telepathic suggestions, karma can (although does not need to) control the course of external events, in order to make these events exactly corresponding to our internal feelings. But in such situations this control is indirect, means karma only controls our internal feelings, only then our feelings control the external events (through a mechanism similar to that from a black magic). Therefore, the Hinduistic claim that "karma control events, which affect us", is not true. In order to amend this claim, totalizm defines that "karma controls the content and intensity of our internal feelings that are caused by external events that affect us, and only in some cases these internal feelings can modify the course of external events that affect us". We need to be aware of the above relationships, because they explain various empirical manifestations of the mechanism of karma execution, which without the knowledge of these relationships may appear to represent paradoxes, or gaps in our knowledge.

2. **Binding together the same people**. Another significant deviation introduced to the concept of karma by theoreticians of Hinduism, is the speculative claim of present Hinduism, that the return of karma must occur from hands of the same person, who originally created it (e.g. if someone kills someone, then the killer receives the return of karma, only when the victim is able to kill him/her). Of course, this deviation leads to such paradoxes, as the claim, that the return of the whole karma must occur only after the death (after all, the victim is able to kill its killer only during one of the next lifetimes), or the claim, that if someone has the karma to pay back, he/she must be born together and near the person to whom this karma is to be paid. This speculative claim is easy to abolish through simple empirical observations and karmatic research. They illustrate quite clearly that the majority of karma is returned still in the duration of our present lifetime. Usually it is returned at the nearest opportunity, when the circumstances are right for causing a return (in my case the karma is usually returned within 5 years from the time it is created). Furthermore, the return of karma takes place from hands of

any person, which differs from the original giver of the karma, but which operates in similar circumstances as this person with whom we generated a given karma.

3. **Reincarnation to forms lower than humans**. One more deviation appears to be the Hinduistic claim that immoral life may lead to incarnating people in organisms lower than people (e.g. into horses, birds, vegetables, or even minerals). This speculative claim, so-far seem to be contradictory to results of research into hypnotic regression. So far this research seem to indicate, that after someone is incarnated into a human, further incarnations are exclusively into human bodies. (Of course, further research may also prove otherwise.)

The essence of the above information about the deviations introduced into the original concept of Karma, is to realize that although the name and the general concept of the word "karma" is taken from Hinduism, totalizm and the Concept of Dipolar Gravity redefined this word quite differently and more strictly than Hinduism. Therefore, it is not permissible to assume, that one knows what this word means in totalizm, if he/she knows the meaning of this word for Hinduism. It is rather recommended, that one learns how exactly totalizm interprets karma. (A similar situation is with many other words, which totalizm adopted from religions, such as "totaliztic good deed and sin", "moral and immoral", "sacrifice", "nirvana", "conscience" etc. Although they are adopted from religions, in totalizm their interpretation was redefined and made more strict, and therefore they do not correspond entirely to their meaning in religions.) In turn, by knowing exactly how totalizm defines karma, the operation of many moral laws, which results from this karma, become for us very clear and easy to understand and to predict their outcome (e.g. consider an example of trying to convince someone to commit a murder, which was discussed earlier).

A3.2. How to manage and transform karma (from immoral into moral)

Totalizm indicates that karma is one of the most important "indicators of the moral correctness". This practically means that, if because of the operation of karma, we qualify as "immoral" any of our intensions, feelings, etc., then this qualifying should be for us a sufficient indication that we should abandon the completion of this intension, or the release of this feeling, because it runs against moral laws. In turn everything that according to the operation of karma is qualified as "moral", we should complete without any hesitation, because it obeys moral laws. The reason for such a huge usefulness of karma as an "indicator of the moral correctness", is that karma is one of the most important mechanisms hard-wired into the operation of the universe, with the use of which we are receiving either direct rewards for obedience of moral laws, or receive direct punishments for disobedience of these laws. According to the operation of karma, as "**moral**" we should consider every intention, or every activity that one carries out, which generates a karma that one is to be very happy to take back when the moment of the return of this karma arrives. In turn as "**immoral**" one should consider everything that generates a karma which one is reluctant to take back when the time of return arrives. In the matter of karma, totalizm basically tries to convince people that "in our lives we should control our karma, instead of allowing that karma controls our lives".

The control of our karma basically boils down to a **systematic transformation of these activities in our life, which generate "immoral" karma, into activities which generate "moral" karma but simultaneously allow us to accomplish the same goals**. Here is a brief explanation, as how such a transformation should be carried out. Note that this explanation makes a use of our knowledge of mechanisms of karma operation. In case of every life situation, when we are a "giving person", i.e. when we know that whatever we do, or whatever we intend, it is going to induce some feelings in other specific people, we should consider what kind of feelings we would experience, if we were in the place and position of these other "receiving people". Then we should consider, if - while being in the position of these other "receiving people", we would wish to be subjected into this kind of treatment (means to the treatment into which we are going to subject these other people, and which

induces these particular feelings). If - according to our judgement, we clearly would not wish to experience these feelings, then in the unambiguous way this lets us know, that the karma which we just are to generate through our original actions or intensions, is "immoral". Therefore, according to the recommendation of totalizm, before we complete these actions or intensions, we should transform them into other actions or intensions, that would generate a "moral" karma but still allow us to accomplish the same goal. For this purpose, we should promptly choose another, more pleasant feeling, that would be more appropriate to the situation in which the receiving people are, and which we would welcome - if we are in the situation of these other "receiving people". Then, whatever we initially intended, we should quickly change into something else, that in the receiving people would induce a new kind of feelings, which we ourselves would not mind to receive and to feel while being in their position and circumstances, and which still would allow us to accomplish our original goal. Such a change of our initial intended "immoral" action, into a new "moral" action, represents the method of transformation of an "immoral" karma into a "moral" karma.

Theoretically speaking, the transformation of "immoral" activities or intensions, into "moral" ones, can be completed with one of two different methods, namely through (i) reversal of our behaviour (action), or (ii) reversal of feelings that our behaviour induces. If we reverse (i) our behaviour, then we always need to check again, whether the new behaviour is going to induce in the receiving person the type of feeling, which this time is going to be "moral". If we decide to reverse (ii) the "immoral" feeling, which in our estimates would be generated at the receiving end, because of this our "immoral" behaviour", than we need also to find a "moral" action, which would induce such a reversed feeling.

The reversal (i) of our "immoral" behaviour, onto a behaviour which is more "moral", usually is quite a complicated procedure. Various methods used for accomplishing it, are described for several other tools of totalizm, for example see subsection A4.4 or A5.5. In implementation for karma, it can turn to be simple only in cases of rather infrequent elementary actions. Their example can be a situation, when e.g. initially we intended to hit someone, but after realizing the "immorality" of this behaviour, we decided to reverse this hitting into for example clapping his/her shoulder and turning the whole matter into a joke.

However, the matter of reversal (i) of our behaviour (action) starts to become very difficult when we deal with rather complex life situations. As examples of such complex life situations, we can consider (a) when we need to tell our child that she took seventh place in something, while we know that she was trying very hard and that she very much wanted to "win", or (b) when we received an order from our headquarters, that because of economic reasons, we must dismiss someone from our institution, and it is us who handles the human resources thus we have no other option but to complete this order (i.e. it does not lie in our capabilities to change the dismissal into, lets say, an increase of salaries). In such complex moral situations, it is much easier to solve these situations morally through undertaking rather the reversal (ii) of feelings (instead of undertaking the reversal of actions).

The reversal (ii) of feelings depends on finding such a "moral" replacement feeling, which is able to replace the original "immoral" feeling, so that in a given situation and circumstances we would be more happy to receive back this new feeling, if we were in the situation of the party that receives our actions. The process of finding this new "moral" replacement feeling - which is to replace the original "immoral" feeling but still allows accomplish our original goal, can be carried out on several different principles. Let us review here some examples.

A. **The method of finding a "moral" anti-feeling**. In general, it depends on finding a "moral" anti-feeling, that on the receiving end is going to replace a given "immoral" feeling, and then on such re-designing of our whole behaviour, that instead of the initial "immoral" feeling, we induce on the receiving end this "moral" anti-feeling and still accomplish the same final goal. ("Anti-feeling" is a feeling, which works exactly opposite to a given feeling, e.g. an anti-feeling for hatred is love, and vice versa.) This method is very useful in all situations, when there are no any quality standards build into the situations themselves. A good example of

such situation without a build in quality criterion, is a previously described case (a), when our child takes seventh place (while it tried hard to "win"). In this situation, there is no quality standard embedded into it, as it is us who are going to decide with our behaviour, whether the seventh place is "winning" or "loosing".

Note that the formal procedure, which is to be used for finding a moral "anti-feeling" to a given immoral "feeling" (i.e. for finding a reversal of a given feeling), is described in subsection A7.2. In order to interpret this procedure for the situation of transforming an "immoral" karma into a "moral" karma, below stages are listed which one needs to complete for such a transformation.

(A1) At the beginning we need to clearly realize, what exactly is the action, that we initially intended to take in a given situation, and also what is our goal that we intend to accomplish through this action. For example, returning to our previous case (a) of a child, let us assume, that our original intension was to scold our child, through telling her something along the lines "you little moron, you took seventh place - the next time please do not disappoint me", while our initial goal that we intended to accomplish through this action would be to make this child to try harder a next time.

(A2) Then we put ourselves at the receiving end, and check what we would feel, if we would be in the situation of a receiving person, while the giver would put us through the treatment, that we originally intended to use in this particular situation. Returning to our example of a child, we analyse what we would feel, when our parent would say something along the lines "you little moron, you took seventh place - the next time please do not disappoint me". Almost for sure, our feeling would be close to a mixture of hurt and disappointment.

(A3) After we check, what feeling would induce our original action, now we qualify this feeling, and thus qualify also our original action, into a category of "moral" or "immoral" - using qualifying criteria, which were described before. If the original feeling turns to be "moral", then we directly proceed to the completion of step "implementation" (A6) below. Otherwise we need to complete also steps (A4) and (A5). Returning to the example (a) of our child, the mental state or feeling that we induced in it with our scolding, means a mixture of hurt and disappointment, without a doubt would be a highly "immoral" feeling. Therefore it would demand to be reversed, before it could be implemented.

(A4) We find a "moral" anti-feeling, for a given "immoral" feeling. As this can be worked out from the content of subsection A7.2, for example the anti-feeling for mental feeling of hurt and disappointment, would be a mental pleasure and reassurance. Returning now to case (a) of our child, instead of causing this child to feel hurt and disappointment, according to totalizm we should try to cause, that in the result of our action it would feel a mental pleasure and reassurance.

(A5) We re-design our original (intended) activity in such a manner, that it induced at the receiving end this "moral" anti-feeling, instead of the initial "immoral" feeling, but we still accomplish our intended goal. In the case (a) of a child that we are considering here, we would need to do something, that instead of feeling of a hurt and disappointment, a child would feel a mental pleasure and reassurance, although still would be inspired to try better a next time. For example, instead of scolding it and saying "you little moron, you took seventh place - the next time please do not disappoint me", we could tell it something along the lines "wow, my congratulations, in this very tough competition you managed to get within the group of best ten winners, and you took seventh place - I can see that each attempt at competition makes you increasingly better in what you are doing! Probably the next time you will be close to being the first." (Of course, saying what exactly would be the most moral, it depends on circumstances of the situation that we discuss. After all, the morally best handling of this situation would depend on the actual contribution of effort and motivations of our child into a given competition.)

(A6) Implementing redesigned action. At very end of this procedure, after we redesigned our action into a "moral" one, we implement a new action, which resulted from the completion of this procedure.

B. **The method of choosing the most "moral" feeling** from the whole range of feelings that are possible to be experienced in a given situation. Another solution to a problem of finding a more "moral" replacement for some decisively "immoral" feeling, can be to firstly consider, what range of feelings can experience someone, who is at the receiving end, and then choosing from this range a feeling which in our opinion is the most "moral" out of all of them. This method of reversal of feelings, is good for moral solving of all situations, when the circumstances impose on these situations their own quality criteria. In such situations we have no possibility to interpret the situation with our own behaviour - we only can influence the way, in which the situation is handled. A perfect example of such situation is the case (b) discussed before. This is because no matter whom we choose to dismiss from work, always the dismissed person will take it very painfully. Therefore, the only thing we can do, is to find a most "moral" way of serving this pain to someone.

In order to **implement** practically in a real-life situation, this particular method of choosing the most "moral" feeling (from the entire range of feelings, that can be experienced by someone at the receiving end), we use a procedure almost identical to that one described in items A1 to A6 in previous method A. Only that, when we reach item A4, than instead of finding an anti-feeling to our original "immoral" feeling, we rather consider the whole range of possible feelings, that can be experienced at the receiving end. Then we choose from this range only one feeling, which in our opinion is the most "moral". Let us go practically through this process, using case (b) - when someone must be dismissed from a job. We start from considering a range of feelings, that can be experienced by people who are dismissed from their jobs in various ways. In this range, probably the most "immoral" feeling would be to be informed that "we do not like you, so we do not wish to see you in our team". In turn the most "moral" feeling, out of the whole range that could experience someone loosing a job, would be to realize him or her that "because of the economic decision of our headquarters, we have no other option but to dismiss someone, while according to the criterion of selecting who is going to be dismissed - at which (criterion) you also had opportunity to vote, it turns out that the dismissed person must be you".

After we find out, what would be the most "moral" feeling at the receiving end, we can now proceed with the designing, according to previous item A5, such our action, which in the person who is to loose a job, would induce just such a feeling. For example, in the situation (b) discussed here - of the necessity to dismiss someone from a job, the action which is the most "immoral", would be probably, if we personally choose someone to be dismissed, whom we do not like the most, and then send the dismissal letter at his or her home address. After all, such our action would induce in him or her the feeling "it is you, that we do not like the most, so we do not want you in our team". Therefore, in order to induce in the dismissed person, a more "moral" feeling, which we selected before, we would need to appropriately redesign both, the process of selecting a person, who is to be dismissed, and also the process of handling the very dismissal. For example, after redesigning of this process into a more "moral" one, it could take a following course:

(B1) Firstly we could organise an official meeting, in which the entire staff and management would participate. On this meeting we would explain the situation, revealing that there is no other choice but to dismiss someone, and also we would arrange for the decision to be made and democratically voted, about a criterion, with the use of which a person would be selected, who is going to be dismissed.

(B2) Democratic deciding and voting both by staff and by management, what should be a criterion, by which a person to be dismissed is to be selected. Let us assume, that amongst many alternatives which were put forward under discussion, and then voted (e.g. an alternative proposed by the management, stating that "dismissed first should be that person, who was employed as the last", and the one proposed by only bread winners in a family,

stating that "dismissed should be the youngest out of the group of those people, who do not have any family to feed"), the decisive vote of all gathered on the meeting, choose the most "moral" in their opinion criterion, stating that: "dismissed should be a person, who in a given moment of time receives the highest earnings in the whole institution".

(B3) We carry out the fair selection of the person to be dismissed, using for this selection the criterion that was voted and accepted during the meeting of all people involved.

(B4) We arrange another public meeting, during which the outcomes of the selection would be officially announced, and when the letter of dismissal would be officially handed in to the person being selected for this dismissal. For this meeting, various other activities should also be arranged, which would decrease the shock of receiving a dismissal. For example, there could be speeches, which would acknowledge the contribution of the dismissed to the institution, which would express sorrow of everyone about such turn of situation, and which would wish to the dismissed success in his or her next activities. There could also be goodbye gifts, etc.

(B5) A formal chance should also be given to the dismissed person, to be able to appeal about that dismissal, and he or she should be allowed to have a look at the list of people, who were considered for that dismissal - according to the criterion that was voted during the first meeting of the staff and management (i.e. in this case, to a list and to earning of people, who in this institution take the highest salaries).

A4. Constantly lift yourself upwards in the moral field

Motto of this subsection: "No actions or events by themselves are ever moral or immoral. Only when we know their motion along the moral field that surrounds them, the current configuration of this field is giving to them either moral, or immoral interpretation."

An extremely important discovery of totalizm, which provided us with numerous effective tools that make for us much easier to lead totaliztic lives, is the discovery of so-called "moral field". This field can be defined as follows. **Moral field is a primary field, similar to gravity, which permeates the entire universe, and which causes that every action of intelligent beings, and every outcome of intelligent processes, receives a decisive moral polarity, in which "moral" is everything that runs uphill in this field - and thus does require intellectual effort, while "immoral" is everything that runs downhill in this field - and thus does not require contribution of any intellectual effort to it**". This subsection is to describe how to use our knowledge of this important field in everyday lives, and also how to use tools of totalizm that are derived from it.

Amongst numerous moral laws in existence, laws which rule our motion in the moral field, probably occupy the second position (after karma) when their impact on lives of individual humans and whole societies is concerned. The reason is that the moral field is one of two primary fields of the universe (this second primary field is gravity). Therefore the action of this field is extended across a wide range of moral phenomena. After all, this field decides whether our actions or intensions qualify into categories "moral" or "immoral" – means whether they climb upwards in this moral field, or they slide down of this moral field.

The recommendation of totalizm concerning our motion in this moral field, is very simple. It states "always move uphill in the moral field". According to this recommendation, "**moral**" are all these our actions and intensions, which move everyone uphill in the moral field. In turn "**immoral**" are these actions or intensions, which move someone downhill in the moral field. To make it even more attractive, this single recommendation extends its applicability to a whole array different moral laws and moral situations. (For example, moving always upwards in the moral field, means to do only these things in our everyday life, which are to increase the level of potential moral energy in all people affected by the outcome of our actions. This means that when we use our motion in the moral field, as an easy indicator of the moral

correctness for whatever we are doing, and it provides a clear answer "moral" or "immoral", then we do not need to use other, more complicated indicators for the same purpose.)

A use of the moral field can be well illustrated with means of comparisons. If we would like to compare the moral field to something that we easily could imagine in our minds, the best comparison would be that "**the moral field is like a very slippery, invisible mountain made of smooth crystal and shaped into a perfect hemisphere, which is emerging from a deadly swamps**". We live on a slope of this slippery, crystal mountain. Therefore, whatever we do, this either moves us upwards or moves us downwards of this mountain of the moral field. Moving upwards on this mountain of the moral field, always requires from us putting an effort into our actions. In turn moving downwards is effortless, and pleasurable: actually we do not need to do anything, and we simply slide smoothly down slopes of this mountain of moral field. Unfortunately for us, usually we do not know that at the bottom of the mountain there is a deadly swamp waiting for the victims. Thus, when we allow ourselves to slide too much, we are to fall into this swamp and to suffocate ourselves. To make it even worse, once we fall into this swamp, there is almost no way out, as no-one can help us. Also we are too preoccupied with our suffocation in order to remember about climbing the slippery slopes of this moral mountain.

Further information about the moral field is provided in subsections A1, B3.1 and I4.2.

The above simple example illustrated to us, what the moral field is, and how it works. The next matter, which we still need to learn now, is how to accomplish this constant movement uphill in the moral field, and how to recognize that we really are moving uphill, not downhill, in this field. Fortunately for us, until now, totalizm managed to develop, and to describe, first effective methods, which explain how this movement uphill in the moral field could be accomplished. Below several different methods of doing this are described, each one of them presented in a separate subsection that follows. Here they are.

A4.1. <u>In all actions always choose the solution that is opposite to the line of the least intellectual resistance</u>

As this is explained in subsection A13, a major problem with the moral field is that similarly to the gravity field it remains completely invisible to our eyes. The course of it is disclosed only by the set of temporary circumstances, which surround a given our activity. Therefore, not in all situations it is exactly clear, in which exactly direction this field is rising, and in which direction it is descending down. After all, not all circumstances that surround the situation that we are in, are always known to us. To make it even worse, the configuration of the moral field is dynamically changing, following the momentary outcomes of human activities and intensions. Therefore, before we learn how to climb upwards in the moral field, we first need to learn how to recognize, in which exactly direction is this "upwards". Fortunately, our natural reactions reveal the direction in which it raises, thus by utilizing these reactions totalizm managed to work out first indicators as to where this "upward" direction lies.

Totalizm discovered that "upward" in the moral field always lies in the direction, which is opposite to the so-called "line of the least **intellectual** resistance". This means that "<u>upward</u>" in the moral field always lies in the direction, which coincides with the so-called "<u>line of the greatest intellectual effort</u>". Because the line of the greatest intellectual effort is simply an extension in the opposite direction of that line of the least intellectual resistance, it is quite easy to find. In order to establish where it goes, it is sufficient to find out, what our natural impulse asks us to do along the line of the least intellectual resistance, and then simply we need to logically deduce, what would be our action, if we do the exact reversal of whatever this line of the least intellectual resistance asked us to do. In a similar way we could determine the direction downward in the moral field. This "<u>downward</u>" always lies in the direction, which coincides with this "line of the least intellectual resistance", and is opposite to the direction

which represents an extension of that line of the least intellectual resistance, means opposite to the "line of the highest intellectual effort".

Totalizm find out also that human nature includes build-in mechanisms, which in every situation indicate to us firstly the line of action, which always coincides with the line of the least resistance that dominates a given situation. These build-in mechanisms are similar to that one, which in mountains tempts us to effortlessly go downhill according to the action of gravity field, instead of laboriously climb upwards. Therefore, after we involuntarily realize what this line of the least resistance is, we can deduct logically from it, which direction lies "uphill in the moral field". However, we must be very cautious with the use of this finding. We must remember that according to totalizm almost every human activity includes three different components, namely (1) intellectual, (2) physical, and (3) feelings. These three components actually represent three basic dimensions of totaliztic mechanics - see subsection G3. In turn each one of these three components has its own line of the least resistance. But the direction uphill in the moral field is coinciding only with the single line of the highest "**intellectual effort**" (and opposite to the "line of the least intellectual resistance"), not with a line of "physical effort", or "emotional effort". (This is similarly as the direction "uphill" in the gravity field is always coinciding only with the coordinate "height" of the physical three-dimensional space, and is NOT coinciding with the remaining two coordinates of this space, means "width" or "thickness".) Fortunately, in the moral field <u>the line of the highest **intellectual** effort is always perpendicular to the line of the highest physical effort, while the third line of the highest emotional effort is always perpendicular to the previous two</u>. Similarly is with the extensions of these lines in opposite directions. The line of the least intellectual resistance is always perpendicular to the line of the least physical resistance, and to these two still is perpendicular the third line of the least emotional resistance. All three lines (i.e. intellectual, physical, and emotional), for moral phenomena are forming three basic coordinates of the moral space, which are equivalents of three basic axes of the three-dimensional physical space, i.e. height, width, and thickness. A part of information on this topic is presented in subsection A13. The line of the least **intellectual resistance** could be defined as "**the path of solving a specific situation, which in given circumstances requires from us the least mental effort to work out how to implement it**". This intellectual line significantly differs from the line of the least physical resistance, which is utilised by untamed nature. The line of the least <u>physical resistance</u> can be defined as "<u>the path which to be followed requires the least physical effort</u>". Finally these two must be distinguished from the third line of the least <u>emotional resistance</u>, which can be defined as "<u>the behaviour in which a doer invests in feelings the smallest possible emotional contribution</u>".

It should also be remembered, that natural human impulses always are indicating only the lines of the least resistance, not the lines of the highest effort. But on the basis of the lines of the least resistance, our logic is able to determine the extensions of these lines in opposite directions. These extensions are called lines of the highest effort. We always find them practically through the logical deduction of actions, which are exactly opposite to actions indicated by the lines of the least resistance.

In order to provide here an example, which explains differences between these three lines, let us say that we are in a room with someone, and this someone offends us. The line of the least intellectual resistance would be to leave the room slamming the door. The line of the least emotional resistance would be to hit this person or to shoot him or her. In turn the line of the least physical resistance would be to faint, or to drop down to the floor, so that we would not need to do any physical effort - neither the effort of hitting, or walking out. The real-life situations, in which the "upward" direction of the moral field can be discovered the most easily, are all situations, in which the outcomes of our activities directly affect other people, without steering strong emotions in them. This is because in all such situations involving other people (but no feelings), the lines of the least physical and emotional resistance seem to somehow disappear, and the only visible becomes the line of the least intellectual resistance.

People most frequently confuse two out of three of these lines, i.e. confuse the intellectual line with a physical line. Sometimes they additionally confuse with them this third emotional line. Therefore, life situations to be solved most safely with use of the line of the least intellectual resistance, are these, when people are direct receivers of our actions, and when situations do NOT induce strong feelings. Then we usually do not notice that three lines of the least resistance do exist (i.e. intellectual, physical, and emotional), and we see only the intellectual line. When our actions interact e.g. exclusively with inanimate objects, then the line of the least physical resistance becomes more obvious from the intellectual one, even if these actions do not induce strong feelings in us. Practically this means that in situations, when the effects of our actions are going to affect only ourselves, or affect only inanimate objects, or going to concern something that induces strong feelings, the direction "uphill" in the moral field is not so clear or so easy to determine. The reason is that we then start to confuse the physical line, or the emotional line, for the intellectual one. In turn the ascending slope of the moral field does NOT lie opposite to the line of the least PHYSICAL or EMOTIONAL resistance, and actually is exactly perpendicular to these two lines. For example, when we dig a trench, then for circumstances not involving other people nor feelings, it clearly turns out that the use of a bulldozer is lying more upwards in the moral field, then the use of a shovel. In such circumstances the use of shovel is clearly more opposite to a line of the least physical resistance, then the use of a bulldozer. In turn a bulldozer is the most opposite to the line of the least intellectual resistance, because in order to use it, we need to overcome the largest number of thoughts and formalities. (Note that this is the line of the highest intellectual effort that corresponds to the highest rise of the moral field.) Similarly is for example, when we look up a word in an encyclopaedia. Then looking directly onto a page, where this word is described, is more "uphill" in the moral field, then e.g. a laborious reading this encyclopaedia from a cover to a cover in order to find this word out. This is so because looking up straight at the correct page, requires from us the highest intellectual effort, means requires to use our knowledge, memory of the alphabet, ability to resist a temptation to look at pictures on our way, etc. What I try to explain here is that the use of "the line of the least intellectual resistance" or "the line of the highest intellectual effort" as the indicator of the direction, in which the moral field climbs up the most steeply, gives the fast, sure, unambiguous, and correct results. This is especially true in all cases, when our actions do concern people, but do NOT induce strong feelings. This is because in such cases our judgement is not obstructed by lines of the least physical or emotional resistance which in these situations can be clearly identified and cannot be confused with the line of the least intellectual resistance.

An extremely effective **recommendation of totalizm** is based on the method of detecting the slope of the moral field through the searching for a course of this "line of the least intellectual resistance". If is used in a correct manner, this recommendation is indicating, how to behave "morally" in all real-life situations. This recommendation generally states that:

"In all actions always do the opposite to whatever the line of the least intellectual resistance prompts you to do".

As it was explained during previous analyses, the most easy to apply the above recommendation in all life situations, which relate to human relationships, but do not induce strong feelings. In these situations, the line of the least resistance that immediately reveals itself to us, is the line of the least intellectual resistance. Thus, in order to find for them a "moral" course of action, it suffices to complete the reversal of whatever our natural impulses tell us to do.

The situation becomes more complicated, when a given situation induces strong feelings, or concerns our physical activities. In such situations we need to search for the line of the least intellectual resistance, because it does not appear just by itself. In order to show how to practically do this, let us consider an example when someone (other person) offended us in the office, and we have to work out logically what our "moral" response should be. In order to solve this problem, we firstly need to ask ourselves, what these three existing lines of the least resistance prompt us to do in this situation. Let us assume that they prompt us to: (1) leave the

office, loudly slamming the doors, and never again speak to the offender, (2) sit by our desk and do nothing, (3) slap the offender. Then we need to establish, which one of these three impulsive actions represents the line of the least intellectual resistance. After a brief thinking we probably notice that these three impulses are the outcomes of the following three lines of the least resistance (1) intellectual, (2) physical, (3) feelings. Because only the intellectual line is parallel to the steepest gradient of the moral field, we ignore impulses (2) and (3) and concentrate on finding the reversal of the impulse (1). As it turns out there can be several such reversals, depending on actual circumstances. But each one of them requires we reply somehow the offender and either (1a) change the matter into a joke, (1b) propose we discuss the problem together in depth during a nearest lunch, (1c) find a weak spot of the offender and publicly prove that his or her logic is wrong, etc. Note that in spite the working out of this moral behaviour may appear to be laborious and too long, practically we need to go through this process only once. Later, each time this situation repeats itself in the office, we only re-implement the moral solution that we once worked out. In order to do a practical exercise on the use of the method described here, let us now consider ourselves, what should be our moral reaction, if we found a loaded wallet (i.e. a wallet full of money which belongs to someone else).

As it is with everything that we meet for the first time in our life, the recommendation of totalizm "in all actions always do the opposite to what the line of least <u>intellectual</u> resistance prompts you to do", can be misunderstood by some people, or can be used beyond the scope of its applicability. For example, I was asked rather funny questions, whether this recommendation means, that instead of e.g. going to another city by a train, we should go there on foot, or instead of sending an e-mail to someone, we should go to him or her and deliver a message in person. Of course, if we are able to distinguish the line of the least <u>intellectual</u> resistance (or intellectual effort), from the line of the least physical or emotional resistance (or effort), then the reply to this questions is simple and easy. After all, much higher intellectual effort is required when we use a train instead of walking, and when we write an email instead of telling a message verbally. But even without the ability to distinguish between these three lines, these type of doubts may have only those people, who concentrate the whole attention on this one tool of totalizm, and loose from the sight other tools, forgetting the fact that this one tool cannot be considered in separation from what other tools of totalizm have to say. For example, according to what was explained in subsection A2.3 and A2, the recommendation discussed here we should implement only in cases, when we have no slightest internal doubt, that it indicated to us the line of action, which is the most "moral" and correct in a given situation. But if we have any such a doubt, then we should the same decision subject also to other indicators of the moral correctness, and check what these other indicators have to say about a given situation. For example, if we consider this funny decision, whether we should walk to another city on foot, or to go by a train, then it would turn out, that the walking would cause a loss of non-proportionally more moral energy, then we would accumulate because of this walking on foot. (I.e. in normal circumstances, going to another city on foot, according to subsection A6, would represent the so-called "immoral work".) It would so happen, because our walking on foot along the line of the highest physical effort, would on one hand generate for us a lot of moral energy because of our physical effort, but because it lies perpendicularly to the highest gradient of the moral field, thus according to the content of subsection D11.8 it would introduce the highest level of so-called "side effects". These side effects would be a cause of the simultaneous loss of a significant amount of moral energy, because of a loss of time, a damage to our shoes, and the exposure to inconveniences of such a trip. Furthermore, it would also cost the loss of our moral energy because of the drop of our motivations resulting from the doubts, and from nagging thoughts (these doubts surely we would experience, because we would not use the effective technical means of transport, which is offered to us by present civilization). Thus, if we in fact took a decision to walk on foot, then even if because of the misunderstanding of the recommendation described here, this decision could be incorrectly seen by some, as a "moral" one, from the

perspective of other indicators of the moral correctness described in subsection A2.3 and A2.1, this would turn out to be decisively an "immoral" decision. The above example realizes, that during a practical implementation of every recommendation of totalizm and every indicator of the moral correctness, one needs to bear in mind, that every recommendation, and every indicator, have their recommended "**range of applicability**". A use of anything outside of its range of applicability, leads to the absurd outcomes, which could be recognized fast. The appearance of such absurd outcomes is a signal for us, that for a given situation we rather should use another recommendation, or another indicator of the moral correctness.

There are numerous real-life situations, when we do not deal directly with other people, so that whatever we are doing affects directly only us, or inanimate nature. In such situations, during the search for the course of the moral field, the most noticeable is the line of the least physical resistance. So during the searches what we should do, this physical line starts to dominate over the intellectual one, usually completely hiding it from us. Of course, for these situations, we still are able to determine, what is "moral" according to totalizm. However, in such situations we must use such a procedure, that it is going to highlight for us the intellectual effort, above the thoughtless physical work. Here is what in such situations the recommendation of totalizm asks us to do:

"**In all real-life situations, the solution which in these situations climbs the most steeply upwards in the moral field, and thus which is the most "moral" amongst all solutions feasible in a given set of circumstances, is this one which requires the highest intellectual effort to be worked out, and which simultaneously is well balanced physically and emotionally**".

Let us explain the above on an example. We assume that we are a manager in a park, and that our current activity - which we would like to complete in the most moral manner, is to install a newly purchased bench in the park. The placement of such a bench is a typical situation, when the outcome is not directly affecting people. (It affects people only indirectly. This means that only afterwards, i.e. some time after we install this bench, people are going to sit on it.) Therefore, in this case, the line of the least resistance that is going to reveal itself first, is the physical one, not the intellectual. So if we think, what is coming to our mind first, as such a line of the least resistance for this instalment of the bench, then it probably will be to install it in the point nearest to the area, where our track can arrive (e.g. nearest to the entrance gate of the park), so that we do not need to drag this bench on our backs too far. The action, which is opposite to this line of the least resistance, would be to install the bench in the middle of dense bush at the top of the most distant hill of the park. Of course, in practice this place (i.e. in the bush, at the top of the hill), does not turn to be the most moral, because it is a place indicated by a thoughtless physical effort, not by intellectual one. Thus, in order to establish which point of the park totalizm in fact indicates for us as the most moral one, we must use the above recommendation. For this, we firstly need to prepare for ourselves a list of all feasible points, in which our bench could be installed. Then, from this list, we need to choose that one, the exact determining of which is going to cost us the highest intellectual effort (not just a thoughtless physical effort). For example, it can be a place, which requires from us intellectual verification that it has a sun in mornings and shade in middays, that it has the most beautiful view, that is close to nice smelling flowers, that is close to a frequently walked path - just after passers by finish climbing a local hill, etc.

People who are used to thoughtless completion of formulas, probably are going to have a difficulty with understanding, that the morality of the universe was so programmed, that it requires constant thinking and use of intelligence. <u>Evidently, the universal intellect (God) is so much interested in the development of intelligence and capability to think in all creations, that it hardwired the promotion of these qualities into the morality of the universe</u>. Therefore also all the recommendations of totalizm, including also these described here, are forced to require from people the continuous use of intelligence and capability to think. Therefore totalizm must not be interpreted in a thoughtless and automatic manner. This philosophy should be understood, not just followed. The recommendations of totalizm do not order anyone to

dismiss the efficiency of his/her actions, to ignore the development of science and technology, or to climb trees again. It is just the opposite. Totalizm recommends that everything should be done in the manner, which is the most intelligent, the most effective, the most modern, and possibly the most utilizing of new tools, technologies, and achievements of science, that are currently at our disposal. Our actions should also be fully agreeable with our personal habits and priorities. Of course, totalizm does not mean by this to follow "immoral" impulses of emotions and temporally temptations. It asks to complete only those things that are "moral". In a significant number of cases this means actions that are exactly opposite to these temporally impulses and temptations.

At this point of our considerations, we should remind ourselves that our civilization is decisively oriented towards parasitism, described in subsections A1, B2, B4, and in chapter KA of this monograph. Therefore, almost everything that our civilization worked out, implemented in everyday life, and now promotes in present educational system, publications, and mass media, is oriented towards "going along the line of the least intellectual resistance". As such, frequently it runs exactly opposite to what totalizm recommends. For this reason, implementing totalizm in our lives requires a drastic change in our manner of thinking and in the way we look at the world around us. Thus, the totaliztic way of living, in spite that it is so agreeable with the laws of the universe, so logical, so simple, and so moral, in fact is rather hard to implement in everyday life. After all, it requires from a totalizt to almost continually run "against the flow" of whatever the present parasitic society considers to be "normal".

A4.2. Attributes of moral field

Previous subsections explained illustratively, what moral field is, how it runs, and how to practically determine in which direction it rises the most steeply. This subsection formally summarises the explanations provided before, providing a list of attributes of moral field, that were identified so far.

Each intelligent activity, including each thought, feeling, stand, or physical activity completed by an intelligent creature, always changes positions in the moral field for all these intellects in which this activity induces any kind of feelings. Therefore, every such an activity, due to changes of someone's position in the moral field, clearly belongs either to a totaliztic category "moral" or to a category "immoral". Basic attributes of the moral field allow us to determine, to which one of these two categories a given activity belongs. They also help us to transform "immoral" activities into "moral" ones which still allow us to accomplish the same original goal. For this reason, in spite that these attributes were already discussed, now they are combined into a structured list.

Attributes of the moral field can be subdivided into two groups: (a) categorizing attributes and (b) descriptive attributes. **Categorising attributes** are these ones, which help to distinguish easily between moral human activities, from immoral activities. Therefore, each attribute belonging to this group is clearly fulfilled by one category of human activities (e.g. by moral activities), but is not fulfilled by the opposite category of activities (e.g. by immoral activities). In turn **descriptive attributes** are these, which explain various regularities detectable in the way moral field is configured and works.

Listed below are the most important attributes of the moral field. Here they are:

A. Categorising attributes. (These allow for an easy categorising. Means they allow for an easy distinguishing between such human actions which are "moral" – and thus which obey attributes marked "yes" on the list below but disobey attributes marked "no", and such human actions which are "immoral" – thus which disobey attributes marked "yes" but obey attributes marked "no.) Here they are:

1Yes. "Moral" are all these feelings-inducing activities, which either move uphill in the moral field all intellects that are affected by them, or which prevent the pushing these intellects downwards in the moral field. Completion of moral activities always brings immediate benefits

of a moral nature. In turn an active prevention of moral activities immediately brings some kind of immoral consequences.

2Yes. All opposites or reversals of the activity, which represents a movement uphill in the moral field, and thus is "moral", are going to represent movement downhill in the moral field, and thus are going to be "immoral".

3Yes. The direction of the steepest slope of the moral field, and thus the direction of the most "moral" activities, is indicated by these feasible activities, which require putting into them the highest intellectual effort, or which are opposite to the line of the least intellectual resistance.

1No. "Immoral" are all these feelings-inducing activities, which either push downhill in the moral field all intellects that are affected by them, or which prevent the rising of these intellects upwards in the moral field. A completion of immoral activities always brings immediate consequences of an immoral nature. In turn an active prevention of immoral activities immediately brings some kind of moral benefits.

2No. All opposites or reversals of the activity, which represents a movement downhill in the moral field, and thus is "immoral", are going to represent movement uphill in the moral field, and thus are going to be "moral".

3No. The direction of the steepest downhill slope of the moral field, and thus the direction of the most "immoral" activities, is indicated by these feasible activities, which do not require putting into them any intellectual effort, or which are aligned with the line of the least intellectual resistance.

B. <u>Descriptive attributes</u> (these describe various regularities detected so-far in the way moral field is configured and works):

B1. In the real-life situation, **everything is either "moral" or is "immoral"**. Therefore, this something either is "moral", and thus it fulfils all the attributes (1Yes), (2Yes), and (3Yes) above, but simultaneously it does NOT fulfil all the attributes (1No), (2No) and (3No) above. Or this something is "immoral", and thus it fulfils all the attributes (1No), (2No), and (3No), but simultaneously it does NOT fulfil attributes (1Yes), (2Yes), and (3Yes). For this reason, when we discover that a given our activity/intension fulfils, or not fulfils, even a single one out of all the above attributes (1Yes), (2Yes), (3Yes), and (1No), (2No), (3No), this practically means that after a careful consideration we are going to discover that particular activity/intension is accordingly also fulfilling, or not fulfilling, all the remaining attributes marked with the same symbol "Yes" or "No". For this reason, in order to effectively categorize our actions with the use of the moral field, it is enough to find a single attribute which sticks out in a given situation amongst the whole list (1Yes), (2Yes), (3Yes), and (1No), (2No), (3No), and then clearly establish whether it is fulfilled, or not fulfilled. (An example of categorising with the use of attributes of moral field, is provided in subsection A4.3.)

B2. Every real-life situation in which anyone can find him/herself, always provides the people who take part in it, with at least **the choice of two solutions** morally opposite to each other, out of which one always represents the motion uphill in the moral field (means is moral), while the other always represents the motion downhill in the moral field (means is immoral). If in a given situation more than two solutions do exist, then they always can be arranged into opposite pairs, so that for each pair one solution is moral, while the other one is immoral. For example, consider a situation described in subsections D11.1 and D8, when there is a self-defence categorised as "your life or mine". In this situation always at least two solutions exist, namely one going uphill in the moral field - when the attacked kills the attacker, and other one going downhill - when the attacker kills the attacked. Trough the mutual comparison with each other both the opposite solutions from a given situation, every person has a possibility of easier distinguishing the course of action which is moral, from a course of action which is immoral.

B3. Actions, which are perfectly moral, means which climb precisely upwards in the moral field - while their vector forms the angle of 0 degrees with this moral field, do NOT have the so-called "**side effects**". (The topic of "side effects" is addressed in subsection D11.8.)

Furthermore actions, which are fully immoral, means which run precisely downwards in the moral field, while their vectors form the angle of 180 degrees with the moral field, also do not create "side effects", although they duplicate later their immoral consequences in the form of unpleasant karmatic return. Thus, only the actions, the vectors of which are slanted towards the moral field under angles between 0 and 180 degrees, form side effects. The most powerful side effects have these actions, which are positioned under the angle of 90 degrees in relation to the moral field, i.e. which are difficult to qualify whether they belong to category "moral" or to category "immoral". This means that the appearance and the extend of side effects that result from a given action, can be used as one of indicators, how moral, or how immoral given actions are (e.g. how moral or immoral are given methods of healing).

A4.3. How to categorise our actions into totaliztic categories "moral" or "immoral"

The moral field, and also distinct attributes that this field displays and that were described in previous subsection, has numerous practical applications. One of these is to simply categorise each our action to one of two basic totaliztic categories, namely as "moral" or as "immoral".

As this was already explained before, according to theory of totalizm the whole universe is permeated with this unique type of primary field, which is called the "moral field". In turn feelings that are formed during every human activity, cause that every such activity constitutes a vector of movement in this moral field. Depending on the direction in which this movement propels someone in the moral field, the vector of action which it represents, is qualified either as a "moral", or as an "immoral". According to totalizm, "**moral**" is everything that represents a movement in the direction uphill in the moral field. But because, according to previous explanations, uphill in the moral field is simultaneously in the direction of the highest intellectual effort and in the direction opposite to the line of the least intellectual resistance, totalizm additionally explains that "moral" is either everything which runs against the line of the least intellectual resistance, or also everything which coincides with the line of the highest intellectual effort. In turn "**immoral**" is everything which represents a movement downhill in the moral field. Thus, according to the previous explanations, totalizm defines as immoral everything that runs along the line of the least intellectual resistance.

In order to explain the above in different words, according to totalizm "moral" are all these human activities which fulfil attributes (1Yes), (2Yes) and (3Yes) listed in subsection A4.2, but simultaneously which do NOT fulfil attributes (1No), (2No) and (3No). In turn "immoral" are all these activities which fulfil attributes (1No), (2No) and (3No), but which simultaneously do NOT fulfil attributes (1Yes), (2Yes) and (3Yes) from subsection A4.2. (See also an example of attribute based categorising, explained in subsection A5.4.)

For an example of totaliztic categorizing of our action/intension to a category "moral" or "immoral", using attributes of the moral field, let us consider a case of "priority at doors". Two people of a similar age, health, status, load carried, etc., during a nice day try to pass simultaneously through the same doors. One of them is entering a given room, while other one is leaving this room. Considering the most typical circumstances, try to establish for which one of them the priority of passing through these doors as the first person would be "moral", and for which would be "immoral"? If through these doors first would be allowed to pass the leaving person, while the way would be given to him/her by the person who is just entering the room, then the attribute (1Yes) from subsection A4.2 would be fulfilled, because the priority given to the exiting person would immediately bring about various moral benefits. For example, it would increase the amount of free space in a given room. So the person which is entering could use this room more freely. It would decrease the confusion, noise, and crowd. It would free the attention of people already present in the room, so that these people could later devote the whole their attention to the newcomer. Etc., etc. Simultaneously, if one actively prevents the exiting person from leaving the room, then immediately would appear various

immoral problems, such as blocking the passage through doors, unnecessary large number of people in the room, confusion, division of attention, etc. Attribute (2Yes) would also be fulfilled, because every reversal of leaving a given person from the room, would turn to be immoral in the light of totalizm. For example, it would bring about the consequences listed already during discussion of the attribute (1Yes). Attribute (3Yes) would be fulfilled as well, because people who are just entering a given room (e.g. coming from outside), acting along the line of the least physical resistance, by a habit would try to do it hastily and without giving priorities to those who are leaving. Therefore giving the way to people who are exiting, requires from them thinking the matter over, and requires the gathering of knowledge on attributes of the moral field. Therefore, in fact such thinking and gathering of knowledge represents the acting along the line of the highest intellectual effort. Also for people who just leave a room, executing their rights to the priority at doors, usually requires a higher intellectual effort than acting along the line of the least physical resistance and to give way to those who hurry to enter. Simultaneously attributes (1No), (2No), and (3No) would not be fulfilled in the case of priority of the exiting person, because they represent the exact reversals of attributes (1Yes), (2Yes), and (3Yes). In turn, if as the first through these doors passes a person, who is just entering a given room, while the way gives the person who is just exiting this room, then all attributes (1Yes), (2Yes), and (3Yes) would NOT be fulfilled, while all attributes (1No), (2No), and (3No) would be fulfilled, because all these attributes would relate to an exact reversal of the situation already discussed above for the case of priority given to the exiting person. In order to summarise the above, if there are no special circumstances in action, than totalizm declares as "moral" the priority of passing through doors given to the person who is just leaving a given room, while as "immoral" the priority of passing given to a person who is just entering a given room. Therefore totalizm realizes, that in typical circumstances those who are to enter should give their way to those who are exiting.

However, apart from showing who has the priority at doors, the above example realised also even a more important matter. This is that **in totalizm moral matters can be judged equally precisely, as in physics are judged physical matters**. And this is the greatest strength of totalizm. It gives to moral and philosophical matters the precision and unambiguity of strict sciences, which previously only physical and mathematical sciences have enjoyed.

The above example was categorised very pedantically. This means that all the attributes of the moral field listed in subsection A4.2 were checked how they fit a problem under consideration. However, in real life situations such a pedantic categorisation is not necessary. As this was indicated in item B1 from subsection A4.2, attributes (1Yes), (2Yes), (3Yes), and (1No), (2No), (3No) of the moral field display such a property, that all of them for YES are either fulfilled, while simultaneously all of them for No are NOT fulfilled, or otherwise (i.e. or all of them for YES are NOT fulfilled, while simultaneously all of them for No are fulfilled). Therefore if only a single one of these attributes is fulfilled, or not fulfilled, usually this already suffices for a correct categorising of a given action. Thus, in the real life situation we do not need to do our categorisations as thoroughly as in the above example, and it is enough for us to categorise on a basis of a single one of these attributes - means this one which we can see the most clearly in a given situation and which we can check the most promptly.

Here is a practical exercise to practice the reader's totaliztic thinking. Cooks from various cultures accustomed their clients to different methods of making portions from meet dishes that contain bones (e.g. making portions out of chicken dishes). For example cooks from Poland divide portions at natural joints of bones. Cooks from New Zealand cut bones into equal portions with a kitchen saw. In turn cooks from China chop bones into small pieces with the use of hand choppers. By utilising attributes of the moral field, justify why in a typical set of circumstances, only the Polish method of making portions out of meet with bones is "moral", while other two methods are "immoral" (more immoral is to chop bones than to saw bones).

The above should be complemented with a reminder that according to totalizm, when we discover that we are doing any immoral activity, then we should immediately suspend this activity, and firstly convert it into another activity, which would be a moral one while

simultaneously it would allow us to accomplish the same final goal, and only then complete this another, moral activity. Next subsection explains how to do this practically.

A4.4. How to utilize moral field for transforming "immoral" actions into "moral" ones

Moral field, and the unique attributes that it displays, provide us also with a relatively simple, but simultaneously quite effective method of transformation of our intentions, which turn out to be "immoral" (and thus, the completion of which, would represent a disobedience of moral laws), into intentions, which are going to be "moral" and allow to accomplish the same goal (and thus, the completion of which, will represent the obedience of moral laws). The most easy procedure of this transformation is based on the practical implementation of the recommendation of totalizm that "in all actions always do the exact opposite to whatever the line of least intellectual resistance prompts you to do".

Probably the most typical situations in our lives, when this recommendation should be applied in order to transform "immoral" intensions into "moral" actions, are all sorts of personal **conflicts**. Someone brutally trumps on our toes, our feelings start to boil, and as a consequence we usually commit some "immoral" action, which disperses a lot of our moral energy, i.e. which we later painfully regret, and which spoils our reputation for a long time. Therefore let us now consider a case of a typical conflict, and let us try to explain to ourselves, how with the use of this recommendation we should go about a transformation of our "immoral" intension, into a "moral" intension which accomplishes the same goal. Totalizm recommends that in such conflict situations we should apply the recommendation "in all actions always do the exact opposite to whatever the line of least intellectual resistance prompts you to do". In order to apply it, a person who practices totalizm should go approximately through the following steps of a mental application procedure (details of this procedure may differ, to suit personality individual people and circumstances of given situation):

1. **Determine our impulsive reactions**, which run along lines of the least resistance. For this we must ask ourselves silently in our mind, what we feel the most strongly as to do in that particular situation, if acting according to our natural internal impulses. As it turns out, in every situation there is always something that we feel more strongly to do, than doing anything else. This something would give us a biggest pleasure and the strongest satisfaction, when we do it just in that particular moment of time and in that particular situation. Because such conflict situations are usually quite complex and involve a combination of at least two out of three components of our activities (i.e. intellectual, physical, and feelings), most probably the situation is NOT going to be dominated by the "line of the least intellectual resistance", but by one of two remaining lines, e.g. in situations of strong feelings by the "line of the least emotional resistance", while in situations of decisive actions by the "line of the least physical effort". Therefore, the strongest natural impulse that we are going to feel first in such a conflict situation, probably is going to be some feeling dominated action. For example we may feel as to hit our adversary in the face, or to yell and swear at him/her, or to say "shovel your ...", etc. However, because it is not an intellectual reaction, we must clearly state ourselves that this action is impossible, and again ask ourselves what we would like to do as our next impulse, when this first one is impossible to implement. In the reply we receive another impulse suggestion, which - depending on circumstances of our conflict, can be intellectual or physical. For example we can strongly feel that we should continue the physical activity that we currently are doing (this would be a physical impulse), or that we should punish this person through ceasing the further talking to him/her and breaking all our communication channels (this would be an intellectual impulse).

2. **Identify our intellectual impulse**, which corresponds to the line of the least intellectual resistance. Amongst all natural impulses, which are prompted by the lines of the least resistance that dominate a given situation, we need to eliminate these impulses, that are

prompted by the lines of the least physical and emotional resistance. In this way we identify and choose for further transformations only this one out of all our impulsive reactions, which is prompted by the line of the least intellectual resistance.

3. **Reverse our intellectual impulse**. After we establish, what would be our "immoral" action going along the line of the least intellectual resistance, now we need to reverse mentally whatever we feel as to do, into an action which represents an exact opposite. For example, if we feel as to stop talking to someone, there would be a whole array of actions, which are opposite to pretending to be a mute. To name some of them: we could offer first our hand of peace, we could suggest to go together for a lunch in order to discuss the matter in more details, we could smile and politely start to support our offender in whatever he/she is doing, and offer to solve together this difficult situation, we could agree with whatever has happened and reassure the offender that his/her standing on our toes perhaps could be one possible solution for this current problem - although a more winner-winner way of solving this problem would be by ..., etc. Interesting that depending on circumstances of the current situation that we are in, always for a given immoral intellectual impulse, we can relatively easy deduce what would be the most moral reversal of this impulse. However, according to totalizm, every opposite or reversal of an immoral activity becomes a moral activity - see attributes (2No) in subsections A4.2 and A5.3. Only that each one of these opposites goes in a slightly different direction, and therefore implementing each one of them may bring slightly different outcomes. Therefore, in situations when we have more time to spare, we should analyse the moral consequences of each one of them, and choose for implementing this one, which provides the most steep lifting in the moral field. Of course, all of them have this in common, that they all are going uphill in the moral field. Thus in all hot conflict situations, when there is no time for long deliberations and selections, we should grab any of such "moral" opposites (e.g. the one which at a given time gets to our head as the first, or looks the most appropriate), and simply implement it. Even if this first opposite turns out to be not the most desirable one, still it goes uphill in the moral field, thus it turns us into moral winners in a given conflict.

4. **Implement the opposite action**, which we just mentally selected. This means that in a given conflict situation, we actually do whatever is exactly opposite to the line of the least intellectual resistance, NOT what the line of the least intellectual resistance tells us to do. In this manner we transform our impulsive immoral action, into a moral action that we just intentionally worked out.

A4.5. Whenever in moral dilemmas - atomise or converge issues

A next effective tool provided by totalizm, which also results from properties of moral field and moral energy, is the so-called "**principle of superposition**". This principle extends its range of applications to almost all phenomena, which are obeying laws of summation and division of energies. Thus it also includes all phenomena, which take place within the range of moral field. The general formulation of this principle states that "every complex motion in a given field, can be replaced by a sequence of simple movements of a smaller range, while every simple movement of a small range, can be combined with a similar simple movements, thus together giving some more complex total motion". When related to moral phenomena, this principle provides totalizm with a very effective tool that has a whole range of applications. For example, it allows solving so-called "moral dilemmas" described in this subsection. It constitutes a nucleus of almost every totaliztic method of transformation of "immoral" intensions into "moral" actions with the same goal (as an example see descriptions from subsection A5.5). Etc., etc.

"Moral dilemmas" are one of the biggest problems in situations from our real life. We deal with such situations every time, when it may appear that more then one rule simultaneously applies to them, so that given situations we need to solve with the use of several different tools of totalizm, while each single one of these tools states about these

situation something opposite/different then other tools. Moral dilemmas obstruct, or make completely impossible, our choice of the correct (totaliztic) course of action, as they do not allow us to apply the rules, methods, or solutions, that we already know. They are outcomes of the fact, that the substantial majority of circumstances, which we encounter in the real life, are very complex. Therefore tools of totalizm in our disposal do not apply to them, as these tools were developed for solving elementary situations (i.e. for solving situations, which are already atomised into elementary moral issues). In order to explain this on a more illustrative example, moral situations from a real life, are like an actual movement of a ball during a football match. After a single kick, this ball not only flies through the air, but it also spins around its axis, bounces from the ground (oscillates), etc. But a classical science of mechanics has not developed equations-tools that would describe every complex movement of such a ball: it only described tools/equations, which describe elementary behaviours of the ball, means the linear flight, the rotation around the axis, or the bouncing (oscillations). Thus, if someone wishes to predict theoretically, how such a ball is going to behave during a specific kick, such someone must firstly atomise the flight of this ball, into several elementary behaviours, namely into a linear flight, into a rotation around the axis, and into a bouncing (oscillations). Only then, for each one of such elementary behaviours, he/she must use a different tool of the classical mechanics, in order to predict where this behaviour leads to. Tools of totalizm are exactly the same: they describe only how to solve elementary moral issues. Therefore, during solving of complex situations from a real life (means, during solving such "moral dilemmas"), frequently they require that these situations firstly need to be skilfully atomised into elementary moral issues, and only then solved - each one of them separately from others.

It is very fortunate, that otherwise than it is with all other philosophies and religions on Earth, totalizm is based on the properties and behaviours of moral energy. In turn, for absolutely all phenomena concerning energy, this "principle of superposition" can be applied. This principle causes that, for the totaliztic definition of morality, all moral phenomena can be either "atomised" - means split into series of smaller moral issues, or "converged" - means joined together into bigger moral entities, which are later considered as single problems (note, however, that for every definition of morality other then totaliztic, such treatment is impossible, as it does not base morality on the idea of moral energy). Because of the applicability of this principle, totalizm recommends as follows:

"If we are not able to solve a given moral dilemma as we see it, we should try to split/atomise this dilemma into several elementary moral issues, and solve each one of them separately, or try to converge this dilemma with other current issues, and solve them all as one single whole".

This recommendation can also be expressed in a more brief manner: "<u>when facing a dilemma, atomise or converge it</u>".

In order to explain this recommendation better, let us use two examples. This first example is for atomising/splitting large dilemmas into smaller simple moral issues, each one of which later can be easily solved with tools of totalizm. Let us assume that we are already an aged person, we are in a crowded public (city) bus, and we would like to make a sit for someone, who according to totalizm needs it more than us (e.g. someone much younger than us, but who carries a lot of delicate parcels, which do not leave him/her free hands to keep a balance during the ride, while we have free hands and feel well, so without difficulty we can keep our balance). But before we stand up and give our own sit to this parcel man, we realize that next to us sits a very young and very energetic stud, who also do not carry anything, and therefore who has higher than us predispositions to give out his sit. So we are in a moral dilemma. If we stand up and give our sit to a parcel owner, we obey what totalizm and moral laws say regarding the parcel man. But we give a very bad example to the young stud. Then we would teach him that he can cultivate his parasitic behaviours without any obstacles, as always someone else will fulfil his moral obligations. In turn, if we wait until the young stud notices the meaning of situation, and gives up his sit, the situation concludes and the parcel man leaves the bus. So there is a dilemma situation, which asks to use the recommendation

on atomising for solving it. In order to approach this situation, we need to start from splitting this whole dilemma into individual moral issues, and solve each one of them separately. In our case, there are two such issues. The first issue is the parcel man, who is the original source of the whole dilemma. According to totalizm and moral laws, in a situation as this described here, we should instantly stand up from our sit, and offer this sit to this man, with the encouraging and polite explanation that it is much easier to manage so many parcels while sitting. The second moral issue is the young stud, who should give up his sit instead of us. If, according to our estimates, he is not currently sick, tired by some work, or does not go home from a visit to dentist, then according to totalizm we could somehow let him know, that it would be appreciated if the next time it is he who gives his sit in such a situation. But we would need to do this very politely and discrete, if possible - humorously and jocose, as we do not know all the circumstances of this person, thus we do not know whether there is a really important reason, for which he was forced to remain in a sitting position (our motivation is not to offend him, or to put him down, but to let him learn, in case he previously had no opportunity to learn principles of a totaliztic behaviour).

For an example of the case, when it is beneficial to converge several moral issues together into a larger entity, let us consider a different situation of a "baby/teenager sitter". Someone asked us for a favour of taking care of his "little angels". So we went by a bus to a fun fair, which is distant a few kilometres from our home. We have two teenagers, one of which has the tendency to be obese, the other - tendency for a bad behaviour. The obese teenager constantly asks to buy him snacks, and gorges them against our remainders that he should maintain moderation in eating. The snapping teenager is rude to us, and requests all our money to be spend on buying for her costume jewellery. Our dilemma as to what to do is increased even more, when we spotted something that we wanted to buy for a long time, but it costs all the money we have with us. So what to do in such a situation? Well, we could converge all issues into one solution of purposeful running out of money. So we could buy the thing we wanted to buy, and we let to know teenagers that we just run out of money completely. So the obese teenager cannot eat any more, as there is no money to buy further snacks, the rude teenager cannot be rude, because there is no money to buy her anything. In addition we all need to go home on foot, because there is no money for the bus ticket home. (By such walking home, all of us gain something moral, e.g. the fat teenager spends the excess of energy, the rude teenager has a time to reflect on the day, while we ourselves have the time and occasion to talk with them about things that really matter to us. It does not need to be explained here, that during a next occasion of taking care of the same teenagers, both of them would surely behave themselves, just in case that by accident they may deserve again a next portion of blisters on their foot, and need to repeat this memorable walk on foot for many kilometres.)

It is worth noticing, that in totalizm all moral dilemmas can be atomised or converged. Therefore they can be solved with simple tools of totalizm described in this monograph. So if, after reading this subsection, someone meets in the real life, a moral situation which cannot be solved, as it is with tools described in this chapter A, because it is too complex and therefore it creates a moral dilemma, then totalizm recommends: firstly try to atomise this situation into elementary moral issues (and if this does not help - try to converge it with some other matter), and only then attempt to solve each issue separately.

A4.6. Apply the method "from a principle, to implementation"

Totalizm developed a further tool for designing a "moral" solution for a given situation. This one is also based on the principle of mowing upwards in the moral field. It is going to be discussed in this subsection. It can be called the method "from a principle, to implementation". It is applicable in all situations, when we have a lot of time, while an important decision must be made, which affects numerous people. For example, this method could be used by local

authorities, governments, and other bodies, which do something important for the whole society, as well as by the heads of families, when they make a very important decision affecting everyone in the family. Furthermore, it can even be used for solving problems of relationship between two people.

During the practical implementation of the method "from a principle, to implementation", the intellect, which makes a given decision (means a person who decides, or a governing body), should go through the following steps:

1. **Defining the problem**. This is to determine what our final goal is, and what type of a "moral" solution is being sought for. For this we need to clearly realize, what our problem is about, what type of solution we are seeking, and what actually is our goal that we try to accomplish. The outcome of these searches, is to describe for us "a principle", which we should use in solving this problem.

2. **Relating the problem to the moral field** (together with the solution being sought). This is to determine the criteria that should be fulfilled by our most "moral" solution of the problem. For this, we need to bring to our sight the recommendation of totalizm, which states that "in all our actions we should choose only these solutions, which lift all people involved most steeply upwards in the moral field". Then we need to translate this recommendation into circumstances of a given our problem, in order to establish, what actually this "most steep upwards in the moral field" means in our specific situation. We must to remember, that the more steep something runs upward in the moral field (or the more opposite is this to the line of the least intellectual resistance), the less unwanted consequences and unpleasant side effects it brings immediately (see subsection D11.8), the more pleasant karmatic returns it is to bring, the more areas it shows - in which it brings benefits to all involved, and also the more intense is each one of the benefits that it brings to people affected by the outcomes.

3. **Preparing several implementable solutions for a given problem**. In order to prepare a list of possible solutions, we may use any conventional technique of problem solving, that we can apply in a given situation - e.g. the technique of a "brain storm". But from our list, we must remove all these solutions, which for some reasons are not feasible, and cannot be implemented in our circumstances.

4. **Choosing the solution, which causes the highest uplifting in the moral field** of all people affected by this solution. For this purpose, one by one, for all our feasible solutions, we need to check how they run through the moral field. This checking is easiest, if for each solution we determine and list, the most important moral outcomes that it is going to bring. The solution which is running the most steep upwards in the moral field, is going to show the lack of instant consequences of the "immoral" nature, and the largest number of instant consequences of the "moral" nature. These "moral" consequences are also showing for it the highest benefits affecting everyone involved. During checking for these outcomes, we should place each our solution in the order, which depends on how steep a given solution runs upward in the moral field. In this way, the mutual order of our solutions is going to indicate for us, which one of the solutions, that we listed, is causing the highest uplifting of people that it concerns, upwards in the moral field (means, which one takes the first place on the list that we are preparing). This most steep uplift means, that a given solution is the most deserving to be chosen for a practical implementation.

5. **Designing the implementation procedure**, which is going to cause this solution to be implemented in the real life. In this step we try to accomplish exactly the same, as it was described in subsection A3.2. This means that knowing the moral outcome, which we would like to achieve, we design a detailed implementation procedure, which is intended to cause the appearance of these outcomes in the real life. In order to complete this design, we firstly need to identify several (or at least one) general principles, about which we are sure, that after they are implemented, they allow to accomplish the outcomes that we desire. Then, out of the group of several general principles, we choose one for implementation. Our choice should fall on that one, which according to a totaliztic indicator of the moral correctness (e.g. to an indicator described in subsection A2.3), causes the most "moral" consequences. (If we

identified only one such a principle, then we do not have situation, when we need to carry out such a choice.) Finally we need to transform the principle that we have chosen, into some kind of an implementation procedure, which leads to the implementation of our solution in the real life. The development of such a detailed implementation procedure, furnishes us with the "implementation" part of our method "from a principle, to implementation".

6. **Implementing** the detailed procedure that we designed for our solution. Because our solution meets the requirement of "the most steep running upwards in the moral field", thus this solution displays all the signs, that later it is going to prove itself to be the most "moral" and the most correct in given circumstances.

We are going now to review together a simple example, which relatively well illustrates a practical application of this method. Let us assume, that we are just involved in a relationship, and we found ourselves together with a partner, whom we discovered to be completely incompatible with us in many different ways. If we continue our relationship with this partner, our life is going to turn out into one continuous nightmare. (In case of a full incompatibility, our relationship probably indicated to be a source of continuous problems from the very beginning, but initially we could ignore the signs believing that we may be able to "teach new tricks to an old dog".) In order to solve "morally" the problem of relationship with this partner, we can use, amongst many others, the tool of totalizm discussed here (of course, in a way similar to that described below, this tool can also be used for solving a whole range of other problems). Here are subsequent steps of our procedure "from a principle, to implementation" that we would need to go through to solve this problem:

(1) After a thorough, objective, and logical analysis of our problem, we reinforce ourselves in a belief that we are in a relationship with a wrong person. After all, we both are mutually incompatible with each other so much, that together with the partner we are not able to solve even a single one of our problems that continually trouble our relationship. Because we know that personalities of people are almost impossible to change, this our incompatibility means, that the only "moral" solution for our problems, is to finish our relationship, and open through this finishing a possibility for each one of us to find for himself/herself a more compatible partner. This means that our problem boils down to accomplishing the goal of a most "moral" possible finishing of our relationship. However, what makes the matter difficult, is that our partner "is not a graceful looser" and is not going to let us go easily.

(2) After we relate to the moral field, our matter of finishing the relationship, we start to understand that the whole problem boils down to such finishing our relationship, that it would cause possibly the least pain, and the least moral damage, to both parties involved. Thus our search for a solution must concentrate on finding a least painful and a least damaging manner of finishing our relationship.

(3) During the preparation of a list of possible solutions for our problem, we determine that in our current situation, feasible are only three such solutions, namely (a) we break up the relationship, through the open telling to our partner that, because of our incompatibility, we must finish our relationship and both of us must start looking for another partners, (b) we ourselves one-sidedly avoid further meeting with our partner and we try to never meet this partner again - thus with the elapse of time the problem would hopefully "solve" itself (although we risk then that the partner is going to resort to various tricks to force us back into this relationship), (c) we intentionally cause in a most "moral" way possible, that our partner finishes the relationship with us (in this way, after finishing, none of us is going to undertake efforts to revive this unfortunate relationship).

(4) After analyses of all three feasible solutions, we realize that the most steep in the moral field lifts up the solution (c), because it does not bring any "immoral" consequences or unpleasant side effects (see subsection D11.8), and also because the numerous "moral" outcomes from it, are going to provide the most benefits to all parties involved.

(5) We design of a detailed implementation procedure, with the use of which we intend to implement the solution that we just worked out. We start this design from identifying some general principles, which would cause the voluntarily departure of our partner. By analysing

thoroughly all that we know about the personality and habits of our partner, we identified only one such a principle. This is a well known to us tendency of the partner to feel "disgust" for even the smallest reasons, combined with another tendency, that the partner is not able to keep any contact with people, who in any way induced such a feeling of "disgust". This principle was demonstrated to us many times, and we know for sure that it always works. Because we were able to identify only one such a principle, we are forced to use it, independently how the moral status of this principle compares to other principles, which could also cause the same outcome (i.e. without comparing this principle to other principles, and also without selecting a principle, which is the most "moral"). In order to build this principle into a detailed implementation procedure, we deduce, that in order to cause a voluntary departure of our partner, we should fling our briefs in a toilet with thick blobs of chocolate paste one morning, in a manner that it is going to cause untasteful connotations. Then, in the sight of our partner, we need to lick pleasurably this chocolate, immediately after we get out from the toilet (preferably, when the flush and rush of water still can be heard).

(6) During the implementation of this detailed procedure "from a principle, to implementation" we noted, that our collecting with a finger a thick blob of chocolate, and then licking the finger with a pleasurable words - "yummy, chocolate", in fact did induce on the face of our partner a grimace of powerful disgust. After we implemented the solution, we also noted, that after departing that morning, our partner avoids the further meetings with us. When, after encountering us on a street, this former partner has no way to escape from us, then - with a weird smile and a hasty greeting, the former partner continues a speedy walk, without making any scenes or throwing tempers - which sometimes resulted from meetings of other former partners, with which we parted in different manners. This in turn shows, that the method, which was theoretically designed to climb most steeply upwards in the moral field, after it is properly implemented, proves itself also to be the most "moral" (or, perhaps, the least "immoral") practical solution for this complex situations from our everyday life.

The above we should also supplement with an explanation, that totalizm is a highly realistic philosophy. It acknowledges, that with morality is the same as with health - if we initially neglect the prevention measures and allow a moral problem to develop, then for healing the situation we must accept some moral costs (similarly is with a tooth - if we allow it to rot, then in order to heal it, we must put up with some amount of pain). Totalizm acknowledges also, that there are situations in life when we do not obtain solutions, which we would subjectively judge as truly "moral" (although they are "moral" in an objective sense), and we need to compromise and to choose between many choices, which in our subjective view are less or more "immoral". However, we still need to pick up our choice, and totalizm teaches us that in making this choice, the universal intellect requires from us to obey moral laws (means, that it is required from us to choose what is the most "moral" according to objective indicators of the moral correctness, not according to our subjective personal judgement"). Therefore frequently in the real-life circumstances, "moral", or "more moral", in the eyes of totalizm, may actually mean "the most moral amongst all choices that are still left for us in this particular situation". For example, in the real-life situation of a self-defence described in subsection D8, when an attacker is determined to kill us, there are only two choices: either we die, or the attacker dies. Thus, in the eyes of totalizm, only "moral" solution in such a situation, is to quickly kill an attacker in the self-defence, before he/she has a time to kill us. All other solutions, that one may deduce, may look nice on paper, but in reality they introduce a risk that they do not prove themselves working, because they are not realistic and feasible.

It is worth noticing that exactly the same tool of totalizm, as described above, can also be applied in all other cases, when for an indicator of the moral correctness is used something else. For example, instead of the uplifting in the moral field, this other indicator can be to work out for ourselves the most moral karma - as this is described in subsection A3.2, or to increase moral energy in all people involved - as this is going to be described in subsection A5.5.

A5. Totaliztic (behavioural) good deeds and totaliztic sins

A next group of several effective tools of totalizm, is based on the concept of intelligent moral energy "zwow". To this group several different tools belong, for example (1) already mentioned in this chapter totaliztic ideas of "behavioural good deeds, and behavioural sins", together with their numerous applications, (2) similar concepts of "emotional good deeds and emotional sins" explained in subsection A7.2, together with their numerous applications, and also (3) the concept of "moral work and immoral work" discussed in subsection A6. Each one of these tools of totalizm is applicable to different circumstances. Therefore each tool requires separate descriptions. These descriptions we start here from the idea of "totaliztic good deeds and totaliztic sins", which are to be explained in two subsections that are to come now. It is worth noticing that the qualifier "**behavioural**" which proceeds these two names, is introduced to distinguish them from another group of totaliztic good deeds and sins, which in subsection A7.2 are proceeded with the qualifier "emotional" - because they are outcomes of feelings and therefore in order to affect people they do not need any actions.

In subsection B3.2, I4.3, G3.7, and G7 the concept of intelligent "moral energy" is explained. Amongst many definitions, which could describe what this energy actually is, one of the simplest definitions states that "moral energy is simply an intelligent form of energy, which is accumulated in our counter-bodies each time when we obey moral laws". Moral energy differs from physical energy because it is intelligent. (As we know physical energy is "stupid".) Moral energy always completes our mental commands, it obeys moral laws, and it proves the intelligence on tens of different ways. When we consider moral activities, which move us within the moral field, then intelligent moral energy is a potential energy that is assigned to a given position, that we have in this moral field. Thus, if we move upwards in the moral field, this movement must increase the amount of intelligent moral energy that we accumulated. In turn when we move downwards in the moral field, this movement must reduce the amount of the moral energy that we accumulated. This subsection is to give us a simple tool for qualifying human activities. The outcome of this qualifying depends on the influence these activities have on the state of moral energy that we accumulated, and also that is accumulated in other people who are affected by our actions.

From the point of view of influence which a given activity has on the accumulation of moral energy, only two major categories of human activities can be distinguished, namely: (1) activities which increase the amount of moral energy in every person involved; and (2) activities which disperse moral energy from someone (i.e. which reduce this energy in at last one person involved). For the reason of convenience, totalizm needs to give some names to these two major categories of human activities, so that later they can be refereed to by their name. Of course, they could be named with any possible name from the wide range of words and specialized terms currently available in various languages. For example, the activities which generate moral energy could be called "contributions", "generators", "legalities", "gifts", "releases", etc. In turn activities which reduce someone's moral energy could be called "crimes", "withdrawals", "reducers", "deviators", "hold-ups", etc. However, after thinking this matter over, I decided that for an everyday use, it would be much easier to remember these names, and to apply them in totalizm, if they utilize the old names, which were given to them by religions, namely names "good deed", and its opposite meaning "sin". The reason is that they are already etched in languages and everyone knows exactly what these two names mean. Therefore their meaning does not need to be explained by totalizm again, while their use do not need to be etched again. Furthermore, the activities which are representing these two names, in totalizm are performing exactly the same functions as their religious equivalents, i.e. we need to concentrate on doing in our lives so many "totaliztic good deeds" as we can, simultaneously we should avoid committing "totaliztic sins" in our all actions.

After we defined the concept of totaliztic "good deeds", and the opposite concept of totaliztic "sins", they allow us to carry out a very simple qualifying of all our actions, into two basic categories "moral" or "immoral". This is because according to definitions of these two

concepts, "moral" is everything that qualifies as a totaliztic good deed, while "immoral" is everything that qualifies as a totaliztic sin. Because totalizm teaches, that obeying moral laws depends on doing in life only these things, which are "moral" (see subsection A2), this means that according to totalizm obeying moral laws boils down to carrying out only these activities, which can be qualified as totaliztic good deeds, and avoiding committing any activities, which represent totaliztic sins. Subsection A5.5 explains that in order to avoid committing totaliztic sins, each time we realize that we are about to commit such a sin, we should transform it into a totaliztic good deed, and complete this good deed instead completing this initially intended sin. How to transform totaliztic sins into totaliztic good deeds, is explained in subsection A5.5.

While totalizm reintroduces to use the ancient concepts of a good deed and a sin, it simultaneously stresses that **in totalizm many aspects of good deeds and sins are defined differently than in their religious counterparts** (this is because of these significant differences, totalizm adds a clear identifier "totaliztic" to their names, thus calling them "totaliztic good deeds" and "totaliztic sins", instead of just good deeds and sins). There is several reasons for these differences. Let us list here the most important of these reasons:

1. Moral energy, which represents a major outcome of activities, which in totalizm are called with these two names, is affecting people instantly, and influences them definitely during this current life (as we remember, consequences of our religious sins and good deeds are affecting us only after we die).

2. According to totalizm, everything that we do in our lives represents either a totaliztic good deed, or a totaliztic sin. This means that according to totalizm there is not even a single human activity, that occurs in a specific circumstances, and that could not be qualified to one of these two main categories. A totaliztic good deed, or a totaliztic sin, represents even a most banal activity, such as breathing, eating, going to a toilet, crossing a street. But in religions only some of our activities are called with names of good deeds, or sins (not all of them).

3. Depending on specific circumstances in which a given activity takes place, theoretically speaking in totalizm every possible activity can belong to any of these two basic categories. This means that for totalizm, depending on the current configuration of the moral field, in one set of circumstances a given activity is a totaliztic good deed, but in a different set of circumstances the same activity is a totaliztic sin. (For example, a well behaved going to toilet is a totaliztic good deed, but defecating in a public park, or at a footpath, is a totaliztic sin). Therefore in totalizm the process of categorizing a given activity to the group of totaliztic good deeds, or totaliztic sins, must be carried out only when we know the complete set of circumstances, in which a given activity takes place, means when we know the current configuration of the moral field, in which this activity moves us. In turn religions usually do not look at a set of circumstances, in which an activity takes place, and judge an activity just on the basis of its name.

4. Totalizm defines good deeds and sins very precisely. So there is no any unambiguity, to which one of these two basic categories, a given human activity belongs in a given set of circumstances. Also in totalizm there is a very clear indicator (i.e. the increase, or the decrease, in moral energy zwow) which unambiguously shows, with what outcome of a specific activity we are dealing in a given set of circumstances. In turn religions are rather imprecise, as they use a lists of activities which are declared to be either good deeds, or sins, without concern to circumstances in which these activities are carried out. Then religions tend to alter these lists of activities, and redefine some of them. For example killing is a sin in almost every religion, but killing in the name of that religion is declared an exception, and in many religions it represents a good deed for which faithful are promised to be rewarded by "going directly to heaven" (meaning, that for such a religious killing, the believer is going to also be killed according to the Boomerang Principle, but after the death, he/she is going to get a "special treatment").

5. Totalizm is fully aware the imperfection and approximation of these two concepts of good deeds and sins, therefore it describes exactly reasons for these imperfections and explains how to avoid their consequences (see descriptions in subsection A5.6). In turn

religions pretend that their concepts of good deeds and sins do not contain any imperfections and do not take any simplifying assumptions.

Of course, if the use of these "ancient" words inhibits to someone the understanding and accepting of the concepts presented in this chapter, then I would propose that for a private use such a person introduces his/her own more "modern" or "scientific" names, instead of using names "totaliztic good deeds and sins". After all, independently of what names are assigned to these two concepts, their meaning and influence on our lives still remains the same important.

There is one more matter, which needs to be mentioned here, in spite that it is explained in more details in subsection A5.6. This is the **problem of simplifying assumptions**. Totalizm is fully aware that in spite of large usefulness of these concepts of totaliztic good deeds and totaliztic sins, and also in spite of their handiness in the fast qualifying of thousands of small chores and intentions, which we need to do everyday, in fact these two concepts are very crude. They are based on very significant assumptions, which are discussed in next subsections. Thus everything that is qualified with them as a good deed or as a sin, is carrying a significant error. Therefore totalizm recommends that these two concepts should be used only for non-significant activities, means for activities, which religions do not qualify at all (e.g. washing hands and teeth, eating, breathing, cooking, work, crossing a street, greeting a neighbour, etc.). The use of these two concepts should be limited to cases, when we are more interested in the speed and simplicity of qualifications, than in the precision of the outcome. Examples of situations, when in spite of a significant margin of error, these two concepts are still useful, are all these thousands of small chores, which we need to do every day, which do not take much time and effort - thus do not involve a lot of moral energy, but which according to totalizm still need to be done in a "moral" manner. Because these chores and intentions require a handy tool to be precisely qualified, as to whether they are moral - and thus they should be completed, or immoral - and thus they should be changed into other ones, these two concepts prove to be extremely useful. But during their use we must remember that they represent a quite naďve view of reality, because they are based on the simplified assumption, that the outcome of our chores and intentions does not depend on the morality of other people involved. However, as it is to be explained in sections A5.6 and A6.8, actually the moral outcome of our actions can be altered, if these actions are completed in the sight of people that have different from us views, about what we are doing (after all, views of these people shape the course of moral field). Therefore, apart from the crude concepts of "totaliztic good deeds and sins" described in this section, and applicable to small everyday chores, totalizm introduces also another and more precise concept of the "moral and immoral work", which is explained in section A6. This more precise concepts of "moral and immoral work" we should use instead of the "totaliztic good deeds and sins" in all cases, when we are especially interested in the precision and in the low margin of error of the qualifying of a given action, and when we wish to eliminate the spoiling potentials of immoral receivers of very laborious endeavours.

A5.1. Totaliztic (behavioural) good deeds

From the point of view of totalizm, it is extremely important that we are able to quickly recognize, which ones of our everyday behaviours, chores, activities, or intensions, are "moral", and which ones of them are "immoral". Then we can complete only the "moral" chores, while these ones, which are "immoral", we can firstly convert into "moral" ones - according to the method described in subsection A5.5, and only then we complete their "moral" equivalents. For a fast recognizing them, very useful is the concept of totaliztic (behavioural) "good deeds", described in this subsection. These "**behavioural good deeds**" need to be clearly distinguished from "emotional good deeds" described in subsection A7.2. For reasons described previously, instead of introducing for these behaviours, chores, activities, and

intensions, a completely new, and previously unused term, they are to be called here with the ancient name of "good deeds", supplemented with the qualifier "totaliztic". Such a name is quite clear and understandable for everyone.

A totaliztic (behavioural) **good deed** can be defined as "every vigorous human activity, which in a perfect world without people who intend to prevent it, would instantly and significantly either increase the amount of moral energy in every person involved, or would actively prevent the decrease of this energy in the doer, and simultaneously it would not serve the purpose of causing a flow of moral energy from one person to the other". The expression "in a perfect world without people who intend to prevent it" is used here on purpose, as according to analyses presented in sections A5.6 and A6, every good deed, which is done e.g. in the sight of immoral people, may be easily spoiled by immoral motivations, feelings, or actions of such people. Therefore, a moral totaliztic good deed, which is opposed by immoral people, instead of an increase of moral energy in people affected by the outcomes, could cause a decrease in this energy. However, because we only use the concept of totaliztic good deeds to qualify quickly thousands of everyday chores or intensions, which take a very short time to complete, and therefore which do not carry a lot of moral energy, it is not justified to loose a lot of time to qualify them precisely by considering all aspects and complications of reality. Therefore, in qualifying such small totaliztic good deeds, we are simplifying our task, by taking this assumption, that we live in a perfect world, in which everyone is moral. Because in such a perfect world every person would lead a totaliztic life, then the outcome of any our good deed would not be spoiled in it by immoral trouble-makers.

Depending on who is benefiting from the completion of given totaliztic good deeds, each single one of them can be qualified into one of the four major categories, as listed below. Differences between these categories, boil down to who is gaining moral benefits from a given good deed, namely whether the benefactor is a doer (means a person who completed a given good deed), or receivers of these good deeds (means people who are affected with outcomes of given good deeds). These categories are as follows:

(1) **Defence** - this is every vigorous counter-action against attempts of sinning, which shows the presence of all fundamental properties of totaliztic good deeds, although in the case of successful completion, it leaves approximately the same total amount of moral energy in all affected people - like the amount that would appear if this counter-action is not undertaken, or if it is completed but it finished with a defeat. Fundamental attributes of a totaliztic good deed, which must be manifested by every activity which is to be qualified as a defence, include: (a) not undertaking the defence activity would cause that the opposite side would commit a totaliztic sin, (b) undertaking the defence is to stop the opposite side from committing a totaliztic sin, (c) the defence must be provoked by an aggressive action of the other side (i.e. the responsibility for creating a situation in which the defence is necessary, must lie in the other party than the party which is defended), (d) in the success of this defence are interested also people other than the one which is defended, while this success for these other people is corresponding to a totaliztic good deed. Depending on who carries out the defence and who is defended, the good deed of defence can be further subdivided into self-defence, and defending of others. In turn both these sub-categories of the totaliztic good deed of defence have their exact opposites in the form of totaliztic sins of slavery and oppression.

(2) **Stimulation** or inspiration/assistance - this is a vigorous activity, which instantly increases moral energy only in all other people who are affected by the results, but it does not cause any noticeable change in the zwow energy of the doer. Depending on the purpose for which a given stimulation takes place, the good deed of stimulation can additionally be subdivided into a good deed of inspiration to take action, and a good deed of pulling someone out of problems. In turn both these versions of the totaliztic good deed of stimulation have their exact opposites in form of totaliztic sins of being caught, and suppression.

(3) **Self-improvement** - this is a vigorous activity, which instantly increases the amount of moral energy only in the doer, while energy zwow of all other people remains unchanged. Depending on the purpose for which a given self-improvement takes place, the good deed of

self-improvement can additionally be subdivided into a good deed of inspiring oneself to take action, and a good deed of pulling oneself out of problems. In turn both these versions of the totaliztic good deed of stimulation have their exact opposites in form of totaliztic sins of self-victimising, and self-destruction.

(4) **Progress** - this is a vigorous activity, which instantly increases moral energy in all parties affected, means both, in the person/people doing a given good deed, as well as in all people who are going to benefit from fruits of this good deed. Depending on who supports the progress, and who actually makes it, the good deed of progress can additionally be subdivided into a good deed of helping, and a good deed of setting directions. In turn both these versions of the totaliztic good deed of progress have their exact opposites in form of totaliztic sins of exploitation and sacrifice.

Out of all categories of totaliztic good deeds, the most important is the good deed of defence. After all, it is the basis of survival, and in order for anyone to be able to generate moral energy, means to be able to do other totaliztic good deeds, such a person firstly must be able to survive. The good deed of defence is so important, that in fact totalizts have not only the right, to defend whenever they are attacked, but also they have the duty to show a continuous readiness for a defence, and also a duty to defend in all cases of detecting an attack. Because of the exceptional importance of the good deed of defence for totalizm, it is discussed in more details in separate subsection D11.1. In this subsection D11.1 is explained that, for example, killing in self-defence a robber, who arrived to our home with a gun and shows the intention to rob and kill us, is a totaliztic good deed. Furthermore, a similar totaliztic good deed is to force someone, who broke traffic rules and destroyed our car and then insisted that we pay him a compensation, to pay a compensation to us.

As this is explained in subsection A2.4, all totaliztic good deeds have appropriate moral rewards written into them. These rewards are granted to people, who complete such good deeds. They (the rewards) are also written into a good deed of defence. These out of them, which was possible to identify by now, are described in subsection D11.1. Practically this means, that even if the completion of a moral defence requires to kill someone, still otherwise to whatever religions say about this, such a defence killing receives a moral reward, not a moral punishment.

It is also worth noticing, that amongst the existing categories of totaliztic good deeds, only self-improvement can be accomplished in a separation from other people, e.g. through learning, increasing our skills, or by some self-improving exercises (e.g. "kung-fu" ("wushu"), "taj chi", "qi-gong", "aikido", "reiki", "arkatutos", "yoga", etc.; of course, a self-improvement is not accomplished, when we mindlessly stare in TV sets). Further two categories of totaliztic good deeds, namely inspiration and progress, require our continual and positive interaction with other people, by assisting them, facilitating what they are doing, giving them our moral support, removing painful obstacles which are hindering them, etc. This in turn means, that in order to generate in ourselves some kind of moral energy, which we later can spend on accomplishing goals, which depend on other people, we also must devote our time to some positive activity amongst, and for, other people. It is not important if this activity is bringing us a profit, or it is just an altruistic help. The understanding of the need to interact with other people is very important in present days, when adults show tendency to isolate themselves from others, to work in closed offices, to spend time with computers - instead of people, and to rest facing a TV set instead of another human being. For this reason, the totaliztic recommendation regarding doing totaliztic good deeds, could be formulated in following words:

"**In our everyday life we should seize every opportunity, to do as many totaliztic good deeds as many we can. While doing them, we should motivate ourselves as much as we can that we are doing all these good deeds fully wholeheartedly - for the pure good of other people. Especially vital are good deeds, which we are doing anonymously for people which we do not know, and which we never meet again.**"

It should be noted that a habit of doing good deeds should be passed to our children as well. Especially, that present days children are encouraged to play "safer" games with

computers, electronic devices, or to mindlessly steer in TV sets. Such isolated from the interaction with other people lifestyles, make impossible to generate moral energy, and they also make impossible to get idea about the importance of interacting with other people. The result is that without generating new amounts of moral energy, the existing amounts of this energy can diminish fast, thus leading to the moral suffocation of individual people and the whole societies.

Examples of good deeds from the category of "progress" include: writing a positive, constructive, polite, and morally supportive letter, inventing or building a highly productive machine, which is going to work for the good of many people, professional and effective completion of an activity, which is much needed by other people (if it is paid - then it is "progress", if it is unpaid - then it is "stimulation"), giving to a thirsty a glass of water, giving a formal agreement to do something that is very important for someone else, fast and satisfactory serving a client, and many more. A good deed of the highest rank (progress) could also be the entire effort of giving birth and then bringing up a child - but this is the case only when circumstances are adequate for having a child (i.e. when there are suitable conditions to provide for a proper growth and education of this child). For example, almost every mother by giving birth and then upbringing a child, is finally increasing her amount of zwow to such an extend, that later she is able to accomplish things which are almost impossible (i.e. which no childless women can accomplish, even if they are well situated financially). A totaliztic good deed of the progress type is also every activity, which leads to building a new factory that is going to produce useful products, but simultaneously is not polluting the environment, or which leads to keeping operational an old factory that is equally valuable, or which leads to opening a new business, etc. The requirements are here, however, that such a factory or business are well serving other people, are increasing moral energy in all people involved, are not polluting the environment, and are paying adequately their employees (i.e. are not oriented towards exploitation of their labour), etc. Capitalists and owners, who have such "fair" factories or businesses, in the light of totalizm - and contrary to the popular belief, are not "blood suckers", but goodies who with their initiative are furthering the progress for other people.

Examples of good deeds in the category of "stimulation" include: a large proportion of giving favours to someone (after all, during giving favours to someone, we increase moral energy in receivers, but not decrease this energy in ourselves), making a sitting place in a bus for someone with numerous packs and bags, polite and unoffending causing that someone extinguishes cigarette in a compartment for non-smokers, or teaching a new skill to someone who is willing to learn (if for free, then it would be a stimulation, if for payment, then it would be a progress).

In turn examples of good deeds from the category of self-improvement include: buying for ourselves some much needed equipment - e.g. a radio-telephone (if for a common use this would be a progress, if exclusively for our own use - this would be a self-improvement), reading a book, which contains a useful information (e.g. reading this monograph), learning a new skill (e.g. how to drive a car), taking an umbrella for a walk when it is going to rain, learning a skill of self-defence (e.g. kung-fu (wushu), or aikido).

Of course the list of good deeds does not finishes on the above, and practically to this category belongs every activity, even the most banal one, which removes from someone any obstacles limitations, sources of inconveniences or problems, which provides someone with something that opens for this someone new horizons, which allows someone to accomplish something that previously was impossible, etc. These activities do not need to be carried out with some extra effort or suffering. They simply can represent a satisfactory way of carrying out our everyday duties, chores, homeworks, etc. All what is required from them, is that they make someone pleased with them, increase someone's amount of moral energy, and that they do not carry out this increase of moral energy against the will of people affected.

On the list provided before, a total effort of **giving birth** and bringing up a child, was indicated as an example of a totaliztic good deed of the progress type. After all, it generates a huge amount of moral energy for all parties involved, i.e. within the person being born, in

parents, in grandparents and other relatives, in the future spouse of this newly born person, in the country whose citizen it is, etc. However, somehow so happened that the whole issue of giving birth, and being born, was made by religions very complicated. For this reason it requires a clear explanation, what the stand of totalizm is on this issue. (Probably the main reason for such stand of religions in the matter of birth, is because birth usually involves sex, while almost all religions tend to qualify sex as one of sins - perhaps in order to prepare our civilisation to the not-too-distant arrival on Earth the female only civilisation, in which there are no sexual intercourses, and which multiplies through cloning (see subsection A3 in [1/4]). Only in special circumstances, such as religious marriages, this label of a sin is being lifted from sex, and the sexual intercourse is converted into a "godly duty".) Well, according to totalizm, the very act of being born, definitely generates a large amount of moral energy in the person who is just being born. After all, such an act places this person somewhere on a crystal mountain of moral field (as explained at the beginning of subsection A4) and allows this person to make further decisions regarding his/her life and living. Therefore, from the point of view of the person being born, the very act of birth, is definitely a totaliztic good deed (i.e. not a totaliztic sin). Therefore, contrary to religions, which for some reason call this act, an "original sin", totalizm could call it the "original totaliztic good deed". Actually, according to totalizm, every person which is being born, in the effect of this "original totaliztic good deed" receives a specific amount of moral energy, which in future we should be able to measure and to calculate very exactly, and which totalizm could call "the original dowry" that a new-born baby receives from his/her parents.

However, in totalizm, the birth is looking slightly different from the point of view of parents, especially mother. The reason is that according to the moral law, which is explained in subsection I4.1.1, and which is called the "Principle of Energy Conversion", every "original dowry" of moral energy, which the person just being born is receiving from parents, must originate from something. In order to put this in different words, **"in order something new could be born, it is necessary that parents, who bring it to this world, supply to the process of birth an amount of energy, which represents the exact equivalent of the 'original dowry' that the new-born receives"**. This "original dowry" of energy, must practically be provided to everything that is newly born, not just to new-born people. For example, in order to bring to this world the philosophy of totalizm, I need to put up with a lot of additional effort, discrimination, and suffering, only a small portion of which is described in subsection L4. In order an inventor is bringing to this world a new machine, he/she must give to this invention enormous amount of energy by spending all his/her time and effort on research, by gaining a space and conditions for experimenting, by building and researching a prototype, by disseminating knowledge about this prototype, etc. In turn in order a mother is giving a birth to a new child, she, her husband, and all people involved, must also put a lot of energy. For example, she must be very careful, not to lift too heavy loads, must watch what is eating, must overcome frequent indispositions, etc. In turn the father must eat cold dinners, walk in unwashed shirts, and frequently live without sex, all this for the good of the new-born.

The problem with the "original dowry" is that this energy must originate from somewhere. Therefore, depending on the source that this "original dowry" comes from, the act of giving birth can be qualified either as a totaliztic good deed, or as a totaliztic sin (i.e. otherwise to the act of being born, which in totalizm is always a totaliztic good deed - if a new-born survives the birth and carries on through the life). If the "original dowry" energy, is supplied by parents, in the form of energy other then zwow, and only the process of birth converts it into moral energy, then such an act of giving a birth totalizm qualifies into the category of totaliztic good deeds (of the "progress" type). But if parents must supply this "original dowry" energy in the form of moral energy, which is being withdrawn from them, then totalizm qualifies such a birth into one of categories of "totaliztic sins". For our first example, let us consider the birth of totalizm itself. As this is explained in subsection L4, the birth of totalizm was oppressed by almost all people of authority, who had a direct influence on the bringing this philosophy to this world. As such, totalizm needed to be born at the expense of my

personal moral energy. For this reason, the philosophy of totalizm was born in the effect of a totaliztic sin (of a "sacrifice" category), where I was the person who sacrificed myself for the good of this philosophy. (It is worth to note at this point, that according to what is written in subsection A5.6 and A7.2, this totaliztic behavioural sin of a "sacrifice", was compensated by my simultaneous emotional good deed of a "progress" type.) For the second example, let us consider the birth of the current knowledge on genetic engineering and cloning. (As this is explained in subsection L4, this knowledge is forced into people by "evil parasites", who pretend to transform our civilization from a two-sexes one, into a female only civilization, which is going to multiply through cloning. Therefore these evil parasites are manipulating various decision makers, to push cloning of people fast forward.) This knowledge is being brought to our world because of corporations, militaries, and governments, pour countless resources into it. Therefore, in order to be born, this knowledge does not need to be born at the immediate expense of anyone's personal energy zwow. (Although, according to the "Principle of Counter-polarity" explained in subsection I4.1.1, it will eventually cause the loss of moral energy in many people.) Therefore, according to totalizm, the genetic engineering and cloning were born in the effect of a totaliztic good deed (although their births were simultaneously accompanied with committing numerous emotional sins).

This possibility to qualify births to both, good deeds and sins, causes that we must be very careful not to suppress births which depend on us, so that they would not turn into totaliztic sins because of this suppression. The major way of avoiding this suppression, is to not impose any restrictions on births. This means, that if anyone wishes to give birth to something, he/she should be allowed to do so. Especially this concerns young mothers, who - if somehow restricted, loose a lot of moral energy to bring to this world a new person. The result is that such restricted mothers suffer a "postnatal depression", which according to what is written in subsection B6.3 and in subsection A5.2, is just one of the numerous signs of the rapid reduction of moral energy in these particular mothers.

Another matter which frequently makes people wonder, and thus which should be elaborated here, is the problem of so-called "**mercy killing**". According to totalizm, in appropriate set of circumstances every activity can represent a totaliztic good deed, including ones which in the majority of circumstances are plain totaliztic sins (such as killing someone). After all, in totalizm, whether a given activity represents a good deed, or a sin, it is determined by the current course of the moral field, which in turn is defined by a set of circumstances which surround the performing of this activity. Therefore, there are circumstances, in which also killing another person could be a good deed. For example, a killed person could just be in the process of blasting a nuclear bomb in the centre of a huge city, thus potentially was about to take millions of lives loaded with their zwow energy. Thus, killing such a person would be a defence, which from the moral point of view, would represent a good deed. However, in all serious cases, including "mercy killings", totalizm strongly recommends to be very cautious what we do, and to not rely only on moral energy as an indicator what to do, but also to take other moral indicators under account, such as karma, our conscience, etc. This is because, when relying solely on a single moral indicator (in this case on moral energy), we could commit a human error in the judgement of situation, as in our considerations we could miss some vital circumstances which were hidden from our sight, but which significantly weighted on the situation. The result would be, that what we judged to be a totaliztic good deed, later could turn to be a totaliztic sin, with a very unpleasant karma to come back to us. Personally speaking, myself I would never volunteer to take a karma of killing someone on myself, and the only situation in which I would consider killing someone, is the situation of self-defence, where there is only a single choice "your life or mine" (although even then probably I would firstly consider wounding and incapacitating, and only if this would prove risky, I would consider a direct killing). Thus, instead of the "mercy killing", totalizm would rather recommend to help in committing a "mercy suicide" (i.e. euthanasia), in which the final act of the release of actions that would cause the death, would be left to a suffering person.

Totaliztic good deeds are not just activities which we can do or not, depending on our caprice. After all, through carrying out these good deeds we generate moral energy, which is absolutely necessary for our survival, and which is a kind of "oxygen for our spirit" (means the oxygen which keeps alive our counter-material body, which in subsection I5.1 is also called a "spirit"). Therefore, anyone's decision to not do totaliztic good deeds, is equivalent with a death sentence through "moral suffocation" that this person is issuing on himself/herself. In turn, anyone's decision to do good deeds in as large numbers as possible, introduces all these positive consequences that are described in subsections A2.4, A6, and F2.1.

Otherwise than this is the case with totaliztic sins, the acceptance of effects of someone's totaliztic good deeds is a good deed in itself. This is because a person who accepts outcomes of someone's totaliztic good deed, instantly does not decrease anyone's moral energy, but rather increases this energy in all people involved. Simultaneously, a refusal to accept fruits of someone's totaliztic good deed, represents a totaliztic sin, as it decreases moral energy, or fails to increase it in at least some people involved, when existed an opportunity to do so. To provide here some example, taking a payment for a work, which was done properly and in a good faith, so that this work bears fruits that it increases someone's moral energy, is a totaliztic good deed. (A totaliztic sin would be to take payment for a work, which one has not completed, or completed but in a manner that decreases, not increases, someone's moral energy.). In turn, a refusal to accept a payment, knowledge, book, or anything that would increase his/her moral energy, and which he/she deserves to obtain, represents a totaliztic sin, because it prevents someone to increase his/her moral energy, when there was an opportunity to make such an increase.

Before we proceed to other parts of this section, to discuss totaliztic sins, we should again remind ourselves, that the concept of totaliztic good deeds is created with the simplifying assumption, that we live in a "perfect world", which is deprived immoral outsiders. Therefore this concept is only applicable to brief everyday chores, which do not take much time to complete, and which require instant decisions. However, if we need to deal with very laborious activities, which totalizm calls "moral work", then we need to drop this assumption and deal with the whole complexity of the real life. How to do this, is explained in section A6.

A5.2. Totaliztic (behavioural) sins

"Totaliztic sins" are defined as "all actions and their circumstances, which either decrease amount of someone's moral energy directly and actively, or decrease this energy passively by holding back someone from increasing this amount". These **"behavioural sins"** must be clearly distinguished from "emotional sins" discussed in subsection A7.2. Note that depending on circumstances in which a given activity takes place, the same activity in one set of circumstances can belong to a category of totaliztic good deeds, while in a different set of circumstances it can belong to a category of totaliztic sins. Therefore, when deciding on the category, to which a given activity belongs, one needs to consider activity together with the complete set of circumstances, in which this activity takes place (these circumstances define the current configuration of moral field).

Totaliztic sins are subdivided into several different sub-categories. Each of these sub-categories differs from others by ways in which the amount of moral energy changes in the person who carries out a given sin, and also changes in other people who are affected by this sin (i.e. how moral energy changes in a sinner and in the victims of this sinner). Each one of them has its mirror reflection regarding who is the sinner and who is the victim. Also each one of them represents an exact reversal of appropriate sub-category of totaliztic good deeds. These sub-categories of sins are listed below in the order from the sin which is the most venial, to a sin which is the most heavy. To emphasize the logical connection of sins discussed here, and good deeds discussed previously, the first sub-category of totaliztic sins explained here, is numbered 5. The numbering of subsequent sins is supplied with symbols 'prim' and "bis" to

highlight that they are remaining in a mutual partnership. During defining these sins, for a higher simplicity of descriptions, the precise (and therefore unnecessary lengthy) terminology is cut short. Therefore, in definitions provided below, the phrase is missing which emphasizes that "a totaliztic sin also includes a passive reduction of someone's moral energy, through wasting opportunities for an increase of the amount of this energy, when there were circumstances which facilitated such an increase". Therefore in all definitions listed below by the word "decrease" we should understand "decrease, or fail to increase when there are favourable circumstances which facilitate such an increase,". Definitions do not include also a phrase which explains the action of "Principle of Counterpolarity" explained in subsection I4.1.1, and also they do not include the explanations which illustrate the consequences resulting from this principle. Therefore under the word "instantly" we should understand the phrase "instantly and in the manner resulting directly from a given action". Furthermore, from the definitions below for simplicity the explanation is also eliminated, that in totalizm many activities, depending on the circumstances in which they took place, may represent either a totaliztic sin or a totaliztic good deed. For example, an extra-marital sexual intercourse, in totalizm is a sin only in some circumstances (e.g. if it has a character of a rape, or an imposed intercourse of a boss with a subordinate), while it is a good deed in numerous other circumstances (e.g. if it has a character of reaping fruits of love by a couple which intends to get married). Therefore, in the definitions provided below, under the word "activity", we should understand the phrase "activity, and the complete set of circumstances in which this activity takes place,". So here are, the basic categories of totaliztic sins:

(5') **Sacrifice** - this is an activity which instantly decreases the amount of moral energy in the sinner, while it instantly increases the amount of moral energy in other person (or people) who is (are) the subject of this sacrifice. Note that the totaliztic sin of sacrifice maintains a victim-sinner relationship with the next totaliztic sin of exploitation (i.e. whenever one intellect commits the sin of sacrifice, the other intellect, which willingly creates circumstances that leave no option but to carry out this sin, or which intentionally forces this sin to take place in order to benefit from the outcome, commits the sin of exploitation). An exact opposite of the sin of sacrifice is a good deed of progress (setting directions).

(5") **Exploitation** - this is an activity which instantly increases the amount of moral energy in a sinner, at the cost of instant decrease of this energy in other person/people (victim/s of exploitation). The name for one type of sins of exploitation, which takes place at the emotional level, and thus which belongs to so-called "emotional sins", is a "moral vampirism". It is described in subsections A7.2 and I5.5. Note that the totaliztic sin of exploitation remains in a sinner-victim relationship with a totaliztic sin of sacrifice (i.e. whenever one person commits the sin of exploitation, the victim of this sin, who willingly accepts this exploitation, commits the sin of sacrifice). An exact opposite of the sin of sacrifice is a good deed of progress (helping).

(6') **Self-destruction** or self-aggression - this is an aggressive activity directed at oneself, which instantly decreases the amount of moral energy only in the sinner/victim, while this energy remains unchanged in all other people. (Self-destruction is a sin that is routinely committed in the result of a deadly moral illness called "parasitism", described in subsection KA4.2.) Example of this sin include suicidal mania, or ignoring the actual danger. Note that the totaliztic sin of self-destruction, as every other sin, has also a corresponding sin, which represents the sinner-victim partnership to a self-destruction. We could call this corresponding sin a "self-victimising". An exact opposite of the sin of self-destruction is a good deed of self-improvement (inspiring oneself to take action).

(6") **Self-victimising** - it is falling a victim of oneself. It is a partner to self-destruction, in which instead of aggressiveness towards oneself, someone is a victim, or a slave, of oneself. Examples include anorexia or any complex. In the majority of cases of self-aggression and self-victimising, two separate location of sources of moral energy loss can be distinguished, which correspond to one of these sins and to their partners. For example in the first of these, self-destruction, the source of zwow loss is the gaining pleasure from causing a self-damage

(usually characterised by a feeling of power over oneself, or anger towards oneself). In other one, the source of zwow loss is the result of the self-inflicted destruction (frequently characterised by the feeling of complex of the own inferiority). An exact opposite of the sin of self-victimising is a good deed of self-improvement (pulling oneself out of problems).

(7') **Being caught** - this is a state, or an activity, which instantly decreases the moral energy in sinners (i.e. in these intellects who do wrong and allow others to catch them on this), without any immediate change in the level of moral energy in these intellects who caught them. Note that the totaliztic sin of being caught keeps a sinner-victim relationship with another totaliztic sin of suppression (i.e. whenever one person tries to commits a sin of suppression, but the victim of this suppression made an avoiding move, and would not accepts this sin, than the committing person is caught on this sin). Note also that the sin of being caught differs in intensions from the sin of self-destruction or self-victimising. A person that got caught had bad intensions towards other people, and only by an accident was damaging itself, while a person who committed a self-destruction or a self-victimising, had bad intensions towards itself. An exact opposite of the sin of being caught is a good deed of stimulation for taking action.

(7") **Suppression** - this is an activity, which instantly decreases the moral energy in victims, without any immediate change in the level of moral energy in sinners. Note that the totaliztic sin of suppression stays in a sinner-victim relationship with a totaliztic sin of being caught (i.e. whenever one intellect wishes to push down, or to force into something, or to deprive of something, or to imprison, someone else, then the outcomes of such activities are going to represent sins of suppression - when they are successful, or sins of being caught - when they are unsuccessful or exposed). An exact opposite of the sin of suppression is a good deed of inspiration (pulling someone out of problems).

(8') **Slavery** - this is a state, or an activity, which instantly and directly decreases the level of moral energy in sinners who allow themselves to be enslaved, as well as decreases the amount of energy in these oppressive intellects, who imposed the slavery and who benefit from the fruits of it. Note that slavery keeps a relationship with another totaliztic sin of oppression. Oppression is a sin committed by intellects who oppress others, while slavery is the sin committed by these intellects, which willingly accept the position of being oppressed. An exact opposite of the sin of oppression is a good deed of self-defence.

(8") **Oppression** - this is an activity, which instantly decreases moral energy in all people who are affected by them, i.e. it decreases this energy both in the sinners, and in the victims. Note that oppression also has a related sin, which is slavery. Oppression is an activity carried out by the sinners who oppress others, while slavery is another activity carried out in response to oppression by these victims, who willingly accept to be oppressed and do not oppose it. An exact opposite of the sin of oppression is a good deed of defending others.

The above list reveals several interesting rules, which apply to totaliztic sins. For example, it shows that every totaliztic sin has a sinner-victim partner, and that this partner is also a sin - if it is willingly accepted by the other side. Furthermore, every totaliztic sin has an exact reversal, and this reversal is a totaliztic good deed. It also realizes that **intellects which willingly allow a totaliztic sin to be committed on them, actually are also committing a totaliztic sin** (thus totalizm promotes an active opposition against any attempts to commit on us totaliztic sins). For example: quietly standing in a queue, when these who should serve are gossiping, waiting on someone being late without protesting, or accepting money which one unearned, all these represent totaliztic sins, because all of them decrease someone's moral energy. In turn intellects, which disallowed totaliztic sins to be committed on them, for example by disobeying restraints imposed on them, in fact are doing totaliztic good deeds, because they increase someone's moral energy. For these reasons totalizm strongly recommends: **always discreetly withdraw your cooperation, whenever you are sure that a totaliztic sin is being committed on you, so that on your side of the situation you subtly transform this sin into a totaliztic good deed**.

On the list of totaliztic sins above, the most controversy induces "sacrifice". It is so controversial, that for a logical dispersion of the controversy that it induces, a whole subsection D11.2 is devoted. This is where the reader finds further explanations on it.

To reinforce a better understanding of the definitions of totaliztic sins, let us now analyse, how in the light of totalizm actions would be qualified, which in the light of many religions are qualified as sins. In this understanding, for example a sexual intercourse of a couple who took only a civil wedding, or an engaged couple, who plans to get married soon, is not a totaliztic sin at all, as it does not decrease moral energy in any of the partners. In turn a rape, a sexual intercourse of a boss with a subordinate, or a forced intercourse of a church wedded husband with a wife who does not want to have a sex and protests against it, is definitely a totaliztic sin, as it decreases the amount of moral energy in both parties involved (thus it would belong to a category of oppression). Similarly, in the light of the above definitions, in most of normal circumstances, killing anyone, even during Crusades, or aggressive wars in the name of religion, or from the verdict of religious institution (e.g. inquisition), would also represent a totaliztic sin, because it would eliminate in a single action the whole amount of moral energy that a dying person had. (Note however, that killing an aggressor to defend others, or in self-defence, is a totaliztic good deed.) In turn helping someone who is terminally ill, in bringing to the end his/her suffering, through organizing the possibility of committing a suicide, is not a totaliztic sin for the person who helps to commit it (i.e. such helping does not deprive anyone moral energy, and even gives to someone an additional choice to live, or to die), although the act of committing a suicide is a totaliztic sin, as it eliminates the remaining moral energy that the dying person still had.

For a scientific exactitude let us consider also some activities, which in the light of many religions would not be considered to be sins, but they are in the light of totalizm. For example, lighting a cigarette in a compartment, in which there is a non-smoking person, in totalizm belongs to a most heavy sin of oppression, as it reduces moral energy both in the smoker (e.g. it accumulates in the non-smoker, who is tortured with the cigarette smoke, the feeling of revenge, which will be realised one day at a completely unrelated occasion), as well as in the non-smoker (e.g. exposing him/her to the danger of getting a lung cancer). Similarly, burning any book, which is in a good technical state, as well as forbidding, or making it difficult in any manner to read such a book, or even just not informing that such a book does exist, when we have an opportunity to do so, is also a totaliztic sin from the category of suppression. Someone coming late to a meeting, when all others are waiting for him/her, is committing the totaliztic sin of suppression, because such a person decreases moral energy in all those that wait. Similarly a bureaucrat, who is having a private conversation on telephone, while a long queue is waiting for him/her, is also committing a totaliztic sin of suppression for the same reasons. A parent, or a teacher, who neglected the need to punish a naughty child for an action, which is turning into a bad habit, or a bad addiction, is also committing a totaliztic sin of exploitation. In a similar manner a person, who is aware that someone else (e.g. a boss) is reducing moral energy in some other person (e.g. by smoking in presence of a non-smoker who reacts with allergy on cigarette smoke), but has no courage to notify the trouble-maker about the non-acceptability of such a behaviour, is also committing a sin of exploitation. A boss who forbids a subordinate to carry out some action that would increase moral energy in numerous people, is committing a totaliztic sin of suppression. A person or institution which would publicly reprimand, or in any other way limit a freedom of action of someone, who is working on a project that is to increase someone's moral energy, is also committing a totaliztic sin of suppression.

Independently from the above general examples, let us now illustrate examples of totaliztic sins that belong to specific categories listed before. And so, examples of the most heavy totaliztic sin, i.e. oppression, would include: having an argument with someone, throwing swear words at someone, or physically attacking someone in the public place. These totaliztic sins are reducing enormous amounts of moral energy in all people affected, therefore totalizm recommends to refrain from committing them. In turn allowing to be oppressed in any

possible manner, is a sin of slavery. Examples of slavery include: to accept bullying, to continue to work while the employer refuses to pay us, to allow a robber whom we recognize to take our belongings, etc. A next serious totaliztic sin is suppression, means an activity which does not instantly change moral energy in the sinner, but it decreases this energy in victims. Examples of totaliztic sins of suppressions are: pollution of the natural environment, vandalism of a public property which the vandal is not going to use, a test explosion of a nuclear bomb by a neighbour country (such an explosion, but carried out in the own country, would be a totaliztic sin of oppression), construction of a new nuclear reactor on someone's border, closing down a non-polluting factory in spite that it does not make losses, as well as almost all answers "no" to requests, which are easy to fulfil (therefore, according to totalizm, the unconditional and final "no" answer, should be completely eliminated from the everyday use: if someone is forced to say "no", he/she should simultaneously define the conditions, the fulfilling of which would turn this "no" answer into a "yes" answer). Examples of sins of suppression include: accepting the situation when in the neighbourhood there is a source of a powerful and continuous smell, accepting when someone forbids us to read a book that we are interested in, accepting when a boss is forbidding us to do something that is not affecting the company but would be beneficial to many people. In turn examples of activities which represents the totaliztic sin of a self-destruction are: leaving behind an umbrella when it obviously is going to rain, not asking about something that we are not sure, while there is an opportunity to ask, not buying something that we really need and can afford (e.g. new shoes, which are to replace the old ones that just show a hole in them), not doing our homework, spending time on doing nothing (idleness very rapidly decreases our moral energy; but it should not be confused with an effective resting, which increases our moral energy), emigration to a different country (this is especially valid for people with unique languages and cultures, like citizens of Poland, for which does not exist any other country in which their language, education, culture, and other values which carry moral energy, would be fully utilised). Examples of a totaliztic sin of exploitation include: making people to work for us, but not paying them adequately, taking favours without repaying them, etc. In turn a totaliztic sin of sacrifice (from the sinner point of view, because from the receiver's point of view it represents an exploitation), would be for example: giving to someone our money, not putting a lock in our flat - thus allowing robbers for an easy robbery, or allowing our employer to employ us for the salary, which is much lower from our real contribution to a given institution, to accept, without any pay increment, working hours, which are inconvenient for us, but are convenient for the employer.

Of course, as this was clearly explained before, in definitions of subsequent totaliztic sins we always should consider the sum of all short-term effects of a given action, not just one of these effects. For example, in one of the letters I received, a reader is claiming that in his opinion every scientific discovery is a totaliztic sin, because it disables other scientists to made this discovery. In such a thinking, this particular person misses out a few vital points. The first of them is that other scientists had their opportunity to made this particular discovery, but they have not utilised this opportunity - so it is them, not a discoverer, who commit totaliztic sins (according to totalizm, a sin is also not to do something, when we have opportunity to do it). Then the reader that we are discussing, missed out also the point that a given discovery only moves forward the border of unknown to another area, so that it opens to other scientists the additional opportunity to discover something that lies beyond a given discovery (so a scientific discovery does not deprive anyone moral energy, but actually generates it). Furthermore, the claim in question fails to address the matter of applications: after a scientist makes a new discovery, this discovery can be applied and therefore it directly generates (not reduces) moral energy. Therefore, from the instant moral effects point of view, every scientific discovery does not decrease anyone's moral energy, but to contrary - it increases it for everyone. Therefore to make a scientific discovery is to do a totaliztic good deed (of the progress type).

To all the above it should be added that totalizm, and also the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, are recognizing a different type of activities, which are not carried out at the physical

level, but which involve above-threshold feelings. Examples of physical effects caused in this way, include "black magic", "psychokinesis", etc. Similarly to physical actions, also these non-physical activities can belong to the category of totaliztic sins, or to the category of totaliztic good deeds. After all, from the point of view of totalizm, it is not important how given effects were accomplished, but important is how these effects influence moral energy in a doer and in other people affected by them (e.g. in victims). For this reason totalizm also recognizes a group of emotional sins, which are caused by our feelings (e.g. jealousy), our attitudes (e.g. proud), our motivations (e.g. being "not interested"), etc. More on this subject is going to be presented in subsection A7.2.

Otherwise then this is with the religious sins - the punishment for which arrives only after someone is dead, totaliztic sins are punishing the doer instantly - when he/she still lives this life. This is because their committing causes the removal of invisible life-giving fluid (energy), which is named here "moral energy" or "zwow". This fluid could be compared to life-giving oxygen, because if we are deprived it, we need to die from the moral suffocation. Each totaliztic sin that someone commits, removes a portion of this life-giving fluid. In turn as the amount of this fluid is reduced in us, we gradually begin to suffocate. I am of the opinion, and hope to prove it somehow in future, that a large proportion of idle retired people dies presently just because of such suffocation from the lack of moral energy. This moral suffocation is also a reason for the death of at least two intellects about which we learn in our history textbooks, namely communism and feudalism. (Very interesting results is giving the comparison of the circumstances, course, and results of deaths through the moral suffocation, with allegorical pictures about torturous events taking place in hell, that are painted by various religions.) According to my knowledge, many present countries, including very close to my heart Poland and New Zealand, also currently display all signs of the state which proceeds the death through the moral suffocation. For example, some of symptoms of such moral suffocation include the repetitive thinking by an increasingly large number of people that "whatever I do, I am still not able to accomplish the goal that I am striving to, although it seem to be almost in the range of my hand", the increasing discrepancy between what people say officially, and what the are doing, the domination of form above the content, the reign through pilling up restrictions instead of assistance, galloping bureaucracy, increasing frustration affecting practically everyone, the disappearance of people from footpaths in big cities, increasing moral vampirism (described in the third paragraph below), and many more - see subsections B6.3 and G6.

There is a possibility that, because of the life-giving properties of moral energy, some "magical" ways of tribal execution in so-called "primitive societies", such as "pointing the bone" or "singing out", which were used instead of the death penalties by Australian Aborigines, technically represent a kind of total reduction of moral energy in the executed person. I also believe that the majority of human behaviours are determined by the average level of moral energy existing in a given society. For example, I believe that there is a linear dependency between average level of moral energy and the birth rate (i.e. societies, which reached low levels of moral energy, are stopping to multiply), and also between moral energy and suicidal tendencies (i.e. people who are deprived of moral energy, are falling in depression, which frequently finishes with a suicide). Also there is a correlation between moral energy and the crime rate (i.e. people who have the reduced amount of moral energy, are loosing the sense of morality, and therefore they easily commit crimes).

So far we were used that a philosophy is something that can be used for conducting disputes, while in the matter of death and life we should go to a doctor. But totalizm tries to show that this is just an another myth. For this reason totalizm carries out the knowledge which for many people may turn to be a saver of their lives. For example according to totalizm (see subsection KA8.6.3) "committing a suicide is a reaction of someone's intellect to the situation that his/her amount of moral energy is reaching the level very close to zero". This means that a **suicide is one of manifestations of death by the moral suffocation**. This claim of the totalizm is fully supported by empirical evidence, which indicates that the majority

of suicides are committed by people who do not generate their own moral energy, for example by teenagers whose moral energy originating from the original good deed (i.e. from the fact that someone was born) was fully dispersed, while they have not learned yet how to generate their own zwow energy, by retired people, by unemployed, etc.

When the life-giving function of moral energy is concerned, it is necessary to also mention the so-called "**moral vampirism**". Similarly as this was the case with legendary vampires, which used to suck blood from their victims in order to boost their own power and vitality, also moral vampires are sucking moral energy directly from other people, and use this energy to compensate for the results of their own idleness and moral decay. The moral vampirism is a deadly sin conducted at the level of **feelings**. It depends on connecting directly the counter-organ of compassion in a victim, to the same counter-organ in a vampire. This direct connection allows moral energy to be transferred directly from the counter-body of the victim to the counter-body of the vampire. The requirement of this energy flow is, that the vampire must steer in the victim a deep feeling of sympathy. Therefore, to steer such a feeling, moral vampires always use the trick of acting as casualties of the cruel fate, and tell their victims all about the tragic situation into which they currently were put. To make the victim even more sorry for them, usually they hint that actually they suffer only because the victim contributed somehow significantly to their tragic situation. The mechanism which explains how exactly this transfer of the moral energy happens, is elaborated in subsection I5.5. The moral vampirism can also be a side effect of every situation when totaliztic sins of exploitation and sacrifice are committed (i.e. the moral vampire is committing the sin of exploitation, while its victims are committing sins of sacrifice, and the victim commits this sacrifice with a very strong feeling of compassion for the vampire). Even the more sinister form of this moral vampirism takes place when such a sucking of someone's moral energy is carried out without any visible physical exploitation, but solely by creating a kind of emotional trap, which steers feelings of the victim, and forces him/her to open the counter-organ of compassion to send own moral energy directly to the vampire. (Sometimes, we can notice this very sinister form of vampirism, when even a short period of time spend with a given person makes us very unhappy, exhausted, and emotionally destroyed.) Moral vampirism can also be carried out via psychokinesis, or via black magic (see subsection I5.7). The most frequently, a moral vampirism, which is accompanied by an obvious physical exploitation, is committed by idle teenagers on their parents (especially on mums). Sometimes it is also committed by ruthless employers on their employees, or (rarely) vice versa. In turn older people are frequently committing the purely emotional type of vampirism, which reduces moral energy from their victims without any signs of a physical exploitation (e.g. some retired parents commit it on their offspring, some wives - on their husbands, in some cases also husbands - on their wives). I noted that in recent years this extremely destructive phenomenon is intensifying, as in the situation when our moral energy is fast diminishing globe-wide, the vampirism increasingly is starting to become a source of this life-giving fluid. Unfortunately, it does not disperse the danger of moral suffocation of the whole our civilisation, because it only transfers moral energy from one intellects to others, but it does not causes the generation of new amounts of this life-giving fluid.

It is worth to mention that moral energy, is just only another form of energy. Therefore, most probably, at the more advanced level of our development some devices will be constructed, which will allow to transfer this energy from one person to the other, in a manner similar as presently we can transfer electrical energy from one cell or battery, to the other. If at that time our civilization is still going to follow the path of parasitism described in chapter KB, then such devices will allow in future that instead of forcing slaves to do something to their master, this master can simply rob them from their moral energy. This most advanced form of moral vampirism is carried out by the advanced civilizations, which in subsection KB2 are called "evil parasites". They vampire on less advanced civilizations, and literally "milk them out" from their moral energy with the use of special energy extracting machines. (Such a

machine is described in treatise [3B] as a "freezing chamber", as it firstly freezes a victim before it extracts his/her moral energy.)

The above should be supplemented with the information that moral energy is unique for people (i.e. in the form required for humans it appears only in people, and possibly also in some space beings which would be almost identical to people), and it is not available in the same form in animals. Although animals are generating their equivalent of moral energy, their energy is much more primitive, and cannot be used by people. Therefore, moral energy extracted from an animal, is not going to be suitable for sustaining people. This bears a special meaning for the moral vampirism, as such a vampirism cannot be carried out on animals, and must be committed on people. Therefore, if an advanced civilisation chooses the path of parasitism, as this is described in subsections B2 and in chapter KB, it must carry out this vampirism on another civilisation, as it is unable to carry it out on animals.

Similarly to the concept of totaliztic good deeds, also the concept of totaliztic sins is based on a simplifying assumption. But the assumption for totaliztic sins states that we live in a "world without a will", in which the other party always willingly accepts what sinners serve to it. Of course, in reality it does not need to be so, as the other side has a free will, and it does not need to passively accept someone else's sins. And totalizm actually teaches us to not accept sins, but to transform them into totaliztic good deeds (e.g. as this is explained in subsection A5.5, totalizm itself was born only because a totaliztic sin was not passively accepted, but it was transformed into a totaliztic good deed). However, it should be noted, that otherwise than this is the case with the assumption for totaliztic good deeds, **the simplifying assumption for sins does not decrease the usefulness of the concept of totaliztic sins, and does not decrease the accuracy of moral categorizations accomplished via this concept**. (After all, totalizm uses the concept of sins only to <u>avoid</u> committing totaliztic sins in life. Thus, if someone's activity on the other side, helps us in this avoiding, this is even better for our morality.) It only has this effect, that the concept itself is much simpler, and much easier to implement, then it would be if we assume that everything happens in a real and very complex world.

A5.3. <u>Basic attributes of totaliztic good deeds and totaliztic sins</u>

As this was indicated in previous subsections several times, totaliztic good deeds and totaliztic sins are obeying all laws which refer to energy. These laws cause that both these concepts also fulfil several strict rules and equations. In turn such rules and equations give to totaliztic good deeds and sins several very clear properties. One of numerous consequences of the existence of these properties is, that both concepts can be used for formal proving and for logical analysis (a good example of such theoretical proving and analyses, for which these two concepts can be used, is contained in subsection D11.1). This means, that the existence of these attributes, and also their knowledge, have a large scientific and formal significance. For these reasons, the attributes of totaliztic good deeds and sins are discussed in this subsection.

Attributes of totaliztic good deeds and sins can be subdivided into two groups: (a) categorizing attributes and (b) descriptive attributes. **Categorising attributes** are these ones, which allow to distinguish between good deeds and sins. Therefore, each attribute of this group is clearly fulfilled by a given category (e.g. by sins), but is not fulfilled by the opposite category (e.g. by good deeds). In turn **descriptive attributes** are these, which explain consequences of good deeds and sins.

Below the most important attributes of totaliztic good deeds and sins are listed. Here they are:

A. <u>Categorising attributes</u> (these allow to categorise easily, means to distinguish between totaliztic good deeds and totaliztic sins):

1Yes. A constructive prevention of a totaliztic sin to take place, represents a totaliztic good deed. (E.g. a good deed is a prevention accomplished by reversing this sin into a totaliztic good deed, or convincing a sinner to reverse his/her sin into a totaliztic good deed, and to abandon the original idea of carrying out this sin.)

2Yes. Every opposite, or reversal, of a totaliztic sin, which instead of running downhill in the moral field, runs uphill in the moral field, becomes a totaliztic good deed. (E.g. if not taking an umbrella when we go for a walk while is going to rain, is a totaliztic sin of a "self-destruction" type, then taking an umbrella when it is going to rain, is a totaliztic good deed of a "self-improvement" type. Also such a good deed is to wait with going for a walk, until rain stops.) Therefore, when we are faced with the intention of committing a totaliztic sin, we should reverse it quickly into any totaliztic good deed, and only then implement it.

3Yes. The acceptance of outcomes of someone's totaliztic good deeds, in itself is also a totaliztic good deed.

1No. Active prevention of someone from doing a totaliztic good deed, represents a totaliztic sin. (Actually, there is an empirical method called a "**blind Samurai method**" described in subsection W6.1 of monograph [1/4], which concerns the activities of "evil parasites" described in subsection KB2. This method states that "if you are sure that you are doing a totaliztic good deed, and someone intensely tries to stop you from doing it, this means that your totaliztic good deed is extremely important for our civilisation; therefore the more pressure is exerted on you to stop this good deed, the more you should intensify your efforts to actually complete it".)

2No. All opposites or exact reversals of an activity, which represents a totaliztic good deed, are constituting totaliztic sins. (For example, if undertaking a defence from an aggression, is a totaliztic good deed, then either our unprovoked attack on someone would be a totaliztic sin, as well as to refuse to defend ourselves, when someone is attacking us, would be such a sin.) Therefore, when we are faced with the someone's negative pressure, or with some negative situation, which force us to commit a reversal of what we know for sure that it represents a totaliztic good deed, in no case we should subdue to this pressure or situation - and we should complete our original good deed intended, or not to complete any action at all.

3No. A passive acceptance of someone's committing a totaliztic sin, as well as every acceptance of outcomes of such a sin, also represents a totaliztic sin.

B. Descriptive attributes (they describe various consequences of good deeds and sins):

B1. Every human activity, even the most banal one, in given circumstances causes the change of someone's amount of moral energy. For example, this activity may run uphill, or run downhill, in moral field, and thus change the level of potential energy. Similarly every feeling, altitude, motivation, verbal communication, telepathic message, which managed to influence any activity, also causes the change in someone's moral energy. Therefore every human activity (as well as all these feelings, mental states, and communications) occurring in unambiguously specified circumstances, can be qualified to either a category of totaliztic good deeds, or to a category of totaliztic sins.

B2. Depending on circumstances in which it is carried out, the same human activity can be qualified either as a totaliztic good deed or as a totaliztic sin. Therefore for each activity, the process of qualifying to a category of totaliztic good deeds, or totaliztic sins, must be conducted only on basis of the complete understanding of all circumstances that it takes place. Even though, for some especially important activities, because of the possibility of making a human error in judgement (e.g. there are hidden circumstances attached to a given activity, about which we do not know), totalizm recommends to additionally check their moral merit on the basis of other moral laws, especially on the basis of the Boomerang Principle.

B3. Moral laws have hardwired into them systems of automatic rewarding for doing totaliztic good deeds, and punishing for committing totaliztic sins. Therefore each completing of a totaliztic good deed is always automatically rewarded in several different ways. In turn every committing a totaliztic sin is always automatically punished in several different ways.

B4. Every totaliztic good deed, and also every totaliztic sin, has two parties involved, e.g. givers and receivers, or sinners and victims, etc. Furthermore, in the real world the other party always has a free will not to accept a good deed, or a sin, which is served to it, and has a free will to convert it into an opposite (i.e. to convert a good deed into a sin, or to convert a sin into a good deed). Therefore, this other party always introduces to our considerations an unknown quantity, the behaviour of which we are not able to predict. So in order to still be able to carry out our qualifying, in spite of this unknown quantity, the concept of totaliztic good deeds introduces a simplifying assumption "that we live in a perfect world", while the concept of totaliztic sins introduces a simplifying assumption "that we live in a world without a will". These assumptions, and errors of judgement which they potentially introduce, cause that we should limit the application of both concepts only for categorizations of small everyday chores, which do not carry too much of moral energy.

B5. Our access to the aspects of life that are highly sought-for (e.g. happiness, quality, freedom, self-fulfilment, longevity, etc.) must be paid with moral energy that we accumulated in our counter-bodies. Therefore, the more totaliztic good deeds we manage to do in our life, and the more totaliztic sins we avoid to commit, the better our access to these sought-for qualities of life is.

B6. All activities, which in a "perfect world" would either increase moral energy in all people involved, or would prevent the decrease of this energy, are called "totaliztic good deeds". The generation of moral energy still takes place (and is most recommended by totalizm, because it does not create any negative feedbacks) when we do the anonymous totaliztic good deeds, means we do them for people whom we do not know, and even never met.

B7. In doing totaliztic good deeds no hierarchy should be respected (e.g. type: you are my boss, so you should do them first), also no code, or order, should be obeyed (e.g. type: you are less needy, so you should help first). The choice of doing or ignoring these good deeds should be left to the free will and moral judgement of every individual person, and therefore whoever first sees an opportunity to do a totaliztic good deed, and feels as to do it, he/she should seize this opportunity without looking what anyone else is doing.

B8. If a given situation creates a moral dilemma, because it contains components which qualify it to both, a category of totaliztic good deeds, and a category of totaliztic sins, then the person who tries to solve this situation should either atomise it into smaller issues, and then solve each one of these issues separately, or converge it with other entities, and create a bigger entity, which is then solved as a single whole (for details see subsection A4.5).

B9. All activities, which in a "world without a will", would reduce moral energy in any intellect involved, are called "totaliztic sins". Committing totaliztic sins, in long run always reduces moral energy in the sinner (if not directly, then it reduces it in the result of the Boomerang Principle). The reduction of moral energy still takes place even if we do not know the people which our totaliztic sins are going to affect. Therefore, totalizm forbids to commit totaliztic sins, even if they are committed completely anonymously.

B10. Every intellect, which is allowing that moral energy it generates in the result of doing totaliztic good deeds, is much smaller then the amount of moral energy it looses in the result of totaliztic sins, is going to die in very dramatic circumstances, because it is to fall a victim of a "moral suffocation" at the moment when the level of his/her moral energy reaches zero.

If one is able to effectively apply the above attributes and rules in his/her everyday life, then the majority of brief moral situations that he/she faces, should be possible to solve just by using only them. However, it is again remained that in very important situations we should not rely just on the categorization of a given intention to the group of totaliztic good deeds or totaliztic sins, but we should also verify the merit of this intention by additional analysing it from the point of view of other moral laws, totaliztic mechanics, etc.

A5.4. Categorize or qualify each everyday chore

When the procedure "obey to do everything morally" was discussed in subsection A2.1, various methods and tools of totalizm were mentioned there. These methods and tools, allow a totalizt to obey moral laws by always choosing the "moral" manner of doing all things that he/she intends. One of such method, or tools, is the "categorising" procedure explained in this subsection (sometimes called also "qualifying").

In this monograph, the name "categorizing" or "qualifying" is given to a simple method of **putting a label**. This label always must be a synonym for the meaning "moral" or for the meaning "immoral". For example it can read "good deed" or "sin", or indicate "uphill in the moral field" or "downhill in the moral field". This label is attached to a specific chore or intention, which is completed in a given set of real circumstances. It allows later to decide, what we should do with this chore or intention according to totalizm (meaning whether we should complete it straight away, or to transform it into something else, and only then complete this something else). This method is very similar to a method of qualifying used by religions. But in totalizm it is much more exact and much more rigid then in the religious application. Because of the simplicity of this qualifying, and because it is proven in action that it works extremely reliably, it can be used even by people, who do not have much intellectual training, or who do not have much time to deliberate. Therefore it is very handy to be used in all situations, when we do not want, do not have opportunity, or do not have a time, to carry out any mental procedures of checking whether a given activity obeys all moral laws.

Categorising can be done with the use of any indicator of the moral correctness. Therefore, actions that are described in subsections A3.2, A4.3, A7.3, A8 and A9 are simply various methods of categorising, only that in these cases they use different indicators of the moral correctness. In case of the use of totaliztic good deed or totaliztic sin, categorising explains, whether a given action is one or the other of these two. Therefore, the categorising which uses these two ideas, assigns the label "moral" to all these activities, which turn to be "totaliztic good deeds". In turn it assigns the label "immoral" to all these activities, which turn to be "totaliztic sins".

The procedure of categorising described here, which is based on the concept of totaliztic good deed or totaliztic sin, has slightly different range of applications then similar procedures described in other subsections. It is usually used for fast qualifying all brief everyday chores. For example, it is quite useful in all these situations, for which the direction of our motion in the moral field is not giving a clear answer, requires too much time, or simply seems to be too difficult to determine. We are going to use it, when we need to make an instant decision, but we do not have the required time or mental energy, for going through the procedure of finding a correct solution, which is to go opposite to the line of the least intellectual resistance. Or the problem is so formulated, that we are not able to establish what actually would be the action along the line of the least intellectual resistance. Or the chore is so ambiguous that we just do not know whether our intentions are running uphill or downhill in the moral field. For all such doubtful, ambiguous, or unsolvable by moral field chores, totalizm provides this next tool of choosing a moral course of action, which can be called "categorizing" or "qualifying".

If the label assigned to a given activity or intension in the outcome of this categorising, is going to read "totaliztic good deed", then according to totalizm we should go ahead and implement it straight away. But if our categorizing proves that a given chore belongs to a category of "totaliztic sins", then we should refry from implementing it, and we should try to implement a totaliztic reversal of this chore (i.e. we should so transform this chore, that instead of being a "sin" it becomes a "good dead", and then implement this good deed).

Categorising always can be completed in two different manners, which we can call "definition-based" or "attribute-based". In the definition-based categorising, generally speaking we check whether a given activity **fulfils the definition** of good deeds or definition of sins. In turn attribute-based categorising depends on checking whether a given activity **carries**

attributes of good deeds, or attributes of sins. As a first example consider categorising of the "intension of accepting requisition of a neighbour to service his garden" (other examples are going to be provided in the next part of this subsection). If we categorise this intension by definition, then we would check, whether the outcome is going to increase moral energy in all involved, or going to decrease this energy. But if we categorise this intension by attributes, we would check whether (a) preventing it would be a good deed or a sin, (b) reversal of it would be a good deed or a sin, and (c) accepting the outcome of it would be a good deed or a sin - see "categorising attributes" listed in subsection A5.3.

In order to implement practically the **definition-based** categorizing for a given chore or intention, one needs to ask a following simple question (no. 1):

"Does this chore or intention represent a totaliztic good deed?"

If the answer to this question is a definite YES, then we can go ahead with the implementation of this chore or intention. But if the answer is a definite NO, or if we are not sure what the answer actually is, then we should not implement this chore or intention in the existing form.

There is, however, one problem with the application of this method. This is that the strict definitions of "totaliztic sins" and "totaliztic good deeds", which are provided by totalizm, unfortunately not always coincide with religious "sins" or "good deeds" - see subsection A5. The most probable reason for the existing discrepancies is a human error, or more strictly in the fact that during the past ages original religious interpretations were re-interpreted by various people, who slightly altered the rules according to their own believes, culture, and knowledge. For example, according to totalizm "making love" between an unmarried couple who loves each other and intends to get married is a good deed, while religions would call it a sin. Similarly according to totalizm hitting someone, who is in the state of hysteria, and would regain the control in the result of this hitting, is also a good deed. Therefore, in order to apply the method discussed here, it is necessary to be sure about the categories of good deeds and sins to which a given intention may belong. For this reason, the "categorizing" method described here requires also a good knowledge of details which are described in subsections A5.1 and A5.2.

If we are not sure whether a given situation or intention belongs to a category of "totaliztic good deeds" or to category of "totaliztic sins", or we do not remember the exact definitions of these two concepts, then it is better to ask a different question, from that one stated above (i.e. no. 1: "does this chore or intention represent a totaliztic good deed?"). This different question actually establishes the exact category to which this chore or intention belongs. The reason is that in totalizm we have very strict definitions of totaliztic good deeds. For example, they are defined as "every activity that increases the amount of moral energy in all intellects involved". Therefore the different question (no. 2) that we should ask states:

"Is the realization of this chore or intention going to either directly increase the amount of moral energy in both, in myself - and also in every other person who is going to be affected by the results of this chore or intention, or is going to prevent this energy from falling down?"

If the answer to this question is a definite YES, then it means that a given chore or intention is a totaliztic good deed and therefore we should go ahead with implementing it. But if the answer to this question is a definite NO, or is not clear, then this means that a given situation or intention represents a totaliztic sin, and therefore we should not implement it without transforming it into a totaliztic good deed.

Let us provide here **an example** of application of the definition-based categorizing method described here. In order to choose for this example a case, which is very difficult to be morally qualified without the use of concepts of totaliztic good deeds and sins, let us categorize the saying "who knows keeps silent, who does not know - is talking". If it is analysed without the use of these two tools of totalizm, the moral category of the saying concerned, is almost impossible to establish. But if we use the method of categorizing described here, it turns out that from the totalizm point of view the above saying represents a

clear totaliztic sin, and therefore it should NOT be implemented directly in our lives. (But, according to the general recommendation of totalizm described in subsection A4.1, we would be allowed to implement in our lives a totaliztic reversal of this saying. This reversal would state, for example, that "who knows does the talking, who does not know - keeps silent".) Now let us see how the method of categorizing works. For this let us ask the question (no. 2) stated before. As it turns out both segments of the analysed saying are practically decreasing the amount of moral energy of someone involved. The first part of this saying "who knows keeps silent", is reducing moral energy in all people affected: for example the subject's knowledge is not allowed to be used and is not disseminating, while the listeners are not gaining his knowledge and the knowledge the subject has does not serve to any good. Also the second part of the saying "who does not know - is talking" is also reducing moral energy in all people affected, because for the subject/talker it diminishes his/her reputation and devaluates the idea about which he is talking, while for the listeners, it misleads them, waists their time and attention, etc. Therefore, from the totalizm point of view, the saying which was analysed here proves to belong to the heaviest category of totaliztic sings, namely to the category of "oppression". Thus no totalizt should ever attempt to implement it in his/her life, as it would slide him/her downwards in moral field.

In order to implement practically the **attribute-based categorising**, we need to check, whether given our intension carries attributes of totaliztic good deeds, and simultaneously do not carry attributes of totaliztic sins. This kind of categorising is extremely useful for moral proving, as it allows to consider very strictly even the most abstract situations and to judge them definitively - see example in subsection D11.1. In order to complete this categorising, we need to reassure ourselves, that our intension displays the following attributes of totaliztic good deeds (see categorising attributes from subsection A5.3), e.g.:

(1GD) An active prevention of someone from doing a totaliztic good deed represents a totaliztic sin.

(2GD) All reversals of an activity, which represents a totaliztic good deed, are constituting totaliztic sins.

(3GD) The acceptance of outcomes of someone's totaliztic good deeds, in itself is also a totaliztic good deed.

Simultaneously we need also to check, that our intension does not display the following attributes of totaliztic sins (see subsection A5.3), e.g.:

(1S) A constructive prevention of a totaliztic sin that is going to take place, represents a totaliztic good deed.

(2S) Every positive reversal of a totaliztic sin, becomes a totaliztic good deed.

(3S) Every passive acceptance of someone's committing a totaliztic sin, as well as every acceptance of outcomes of such a sin, also represents a totaliztic sin.

For example, if we consider a saying that we previously categorised "who knows keeps silent, who does not know - is talking", then in the majority of typical life situations, in fact it displays only the attributes (1S), (2S), and (3S). This displaying can be noticed, if one checks in the previously discussed analyses of this saying, how the saying fulfils attributes (1S), (2S), and (3S). (E.g. the attribute (1S) is displayed by this saying, because if one prevents from the silence those wise who know, and stops from talking all those fools who do not know, then all involved are going to only benefit from it - this means that such a preventing what the saying states, is a totaliztic good deed.) Simultaneously this saying does not fulfil attributes (1GD), (2GD), and (3GD). So in fact, the content of this saying, in the majority of everyday life situations, represents a totaliztic sin, which needs to be transformed into a good deed before it is completed.

Even a more illustrative and comprehensive example of attribute-based categorising is presented in subsection D11.1.

A5.5. A way of converting totaliztic sins into totaliztic good deeds

The concept of totaliztic good deeds and totaliztic sins explained in previous subsections, is very useful and practical, because it allows totalizts to qualify and to solve a lot of chores and situations from everyday life. All what it takes to solve any given chore or situation with the use of this concept, is to apply the simplified procedure of "obey to do everything morally" described in subsection A2.1. As the very concept of totaliztic good deeds and sins, automatically qualifies a given situation into categories "moral" or "immoral", procedure from subsection A2.1 can be largely simplified by stripping it out of all unnecessary steps. In so simplified procedure, we complete only the following three steps (see subsection A2.1):

Step 3: Determine whether a given our intention is a totaliztic good deed. We use for this determining the categorizing or qualifying method described in subsection A5.4. (If such determining is initially impossible, then before we determine what it is, we should firstly atomise, or converge, a given intention, and then consider separately each one of the resultant moral issues or entities.)

Step 4: If a given our intention is in fact a totaliztic good deed (i.e. if it is "moral") then we implement it immediately. Otherwise,

Step 6: If a given our intention represents a totaliztic sin (i.e. it is "immoral"), we need to firstly reverse it according to the rules of reversal described in the next part of this subsection, so that from a totaliztic sin it transforms into a totaliztic good deed, and then implement this totaliztic reversal of the initial sinful intention.

As the above procedure explains it, whenever we face in our life a situation that we are about to commit a totaliztic sin, then **totalizm recommends to temporally suspend our action, convert this sin into a good deed, and then implement the resultant good deed (instead of the initially intended sin)**.

The method of conversion of totaliztic sins into totaliztic good deeds is simple. We actually utilise for such a conversion the finding of totalizm described in subsection A4.1, that "everything that moral goes uphill in the moral field and therefore it requires putting intellectual effort into the completion". If we would like to clearly outline, step by step, how practically complete this method of conversion, it includes following steps:

A. (Optional step - completed only for more complex sins) Analyse a given totaliztic sin, in order to identify the individual moral issues, which cause that an intellect which enforced this sin, decided to choose this particular course of action. In other words, we **atomise** this sin, so that we know what are componential moral issues from which this particular sin is composed (in some cases we can also converge a given sin with other similar sins to create a larger entity, which we later could subject to a moral reversal). This atomising we carry out according to rules described in subsection A4.5. As a separate moral issue we should consider each separate reason why a given totaliztic sin is intended to be carried out (e.g. each separate expectancy of benefit by someone, or each single fear of something by someone, etc.). A separate moral issue is also each separate way this sin is going to be carried out (e.g. by not paying, as it should be paid, or by restricting something). In more simple cases, we can consider the whole sin just as a single moral issue.

B. Find a reversal for each one of the individual moral issues from which a given sin is composed (in more simple cases - find a reversal of the entire sin). Note that in the initial sin each of these moral issues is going downhill in the moral field, thus promising benefits without putting effort into our action. Therefore, during working our reversals to these issues, we need to find solutions which are going upwards in the moral field, thus which are requiring our intellectual effort to be put into them. In this manner, each separate moral issue, which initially was combined into the totaliztic sin, now is converted into a totaliztic good deed.

C. Implement in our life the reversal of each of these moral issues, thus implementing a resultant totaliztic good deed, instead of the initial totaliztic sin.

It should be noted, that by using the above conversion rules, practically every totaliztic sin can be converted into a totaliztic good deed. Thus instead of damaging, it may start to work into the good of all people involved.

In order to explain on an example how the above method of conversion works, let us now consider how it was applied in one of my own cases. For this, let us consider how a totaliztic sin of slavery - that I was endangered to commit practically in every place that I worked, I kept converting into a good deed of progress. As this is explained in subsection L4 of this monograph, practically in the majority of places where I worked, I was subjected by my superiors to a very subtle oppression, regarding a topic of my research. This oppression manifested itself through disallowing me by my superiors, to officially carry out the research that I am devoted to. In this way, their subtle oppression depleted significantly both, my own moral energy (i.e. I could not complete freely the research that I wanted), as well as their moral energy (i.e. they were depriving themselves, institutions they represented, and countries they were citizens, all the benefits that potentially were to stem from the results of my research). From the point of view of totalizm, such a behaviour of my superiors, represents a very definite sin of oppression. In turn, if I would accept this totaliztic sin of oppression, then according to totalizm I would commit myself a sin of slavery. Fortunately, I have not accepted it, and have converted it into a good deed of progress (e.g. in the result of this good deed the totalizm was born, and also this monograph eventuated). So how I did it. Well, I applied the above method of conversion, although at that time I was not aware that I use it, simply because it was not articulated yet. So firstly I analysed the oppression that I was subjected to, and analysed what are the issues that limit my freedom of action (i.e. that try to force me to move downwards in moral field). As it turned out, there is several issues, which caused that this sin of oppression (and the danger of my slavery) was committed. To name some of them: (a) my superiors always were afraid that the publicity that the research that I was doing could bring, may not be favourable to their institution, (b) my superiors wanted me to complete research, which would directly support their personal life goals, and would release them from some obligations, which otherwise they would need to fulfil themselves (e.g. which would allow them to publish, to claim, or to get rewards actually without putting an effort into their actions), (c) my employers were afraid that I may openly utilise a percent of my office time for doing my research. After identifying these issues, I found an uphill reversal for each one of them. In the final result, instead of doing an open research, I adopted a policy which in subsection L4 is called "total conspiracy", thus according to this policy: (a) I stopped to disseminate my results in the place and country of my employment, so that there was no any publicity about what I was doing, but still I could do it; (b) I started the completion in my office time, what I called a "mock research", i.e. additional stream of research which I was not interest in, but which always concerned topics that my superiors wanted me to carry out, because this research supported their personal goals; (c) I was doing my own research exclusively in my private time and only with my private resources, so that my employers did not have any argument at hand to use it for starting hostilities. (Amongst my superiors there were several ones who practised parasitism. Thus, in spite of all these my prevention measures, still such parasitic superiors continually tried to induce various hostilities against me - as this is explained in chapter A of treatise [7/2], and in subsection L4 of this monograph. But they were not able to find anything against me. So in majority of cases, I was able to defend myself successfully.) Finally, after finding totaliztic reversals for all these main issues, I carried them out, thus refusing to commit the totaliztic sin of slavery, and converting it into a totaliztic good deed of progress. Due to this, totalizm could be crystallized as a mature philosophy, and also this monograph was allowed to be born. However, it should be noted, that by forcing me to work in conditions of the "total conspiracy", the society in which I am living, still continues to commit on me the totaliztic sin of oppression, thus I reversed only my side of this totaliztic sin.

A5.6. Factors, which distort concepts of totaliztic sins and totaliztic good deeds

The method of changing a totaliztic sin into a totaliztic good deed that was described in previous subsection, has illustrated to us also one of the weak spots of the concept of totaliztic good deeds (and also concept of totaliztic sins). It shown to us that both these concepts are only approximate ideas, which are based on a crude simplifying assumption, and therefore which are unable to reflect well the reality which surrounds us. In case of totaliztic sins, their approximation of reality has no significance, because totalizm recommends anyway that we use the concept of sins only to detect, which ones of our activities are sinful, and therefore which ones should NOT be carried out by us before they are converted into totaliztic good deeds. Therefore, if we make a mistake, and qualify any activity to a sin, while in reality it is a good deed, then there is no much problem, because acting according to totalizm we then transform it into an even more beneficial good deed. However, when we make a mistake in regards to a totaliztic good deed, and we qualify as a good deed and then carry out something that in reality is a sin, then the consequences can be much more severe for us. Therefore, this approximation of the concept of totaliztic good deeds is a main reason, why totalizm recommends that people use this idea only for fast and approximate qualifying not too important life situations, which do not carry in themselves too much moral energy. When we deal with the very serious situations, which carry in themselves a lot of moral energy, then totalizm recommends that we use an idea of "moral work" which is described in subsection A6.

Of course, the fact that the ideas of totaliztic good deeds and totaliztic sins are imperfect, and mainly refer to an "ideal world" (not to a real world in which we live), actually does not decrease their huge usefulness. Imperfections of these ideas, are compensated by numerous their advantages, and also with our knowledge about the existence of these approximations. For example, these concepts are very simple to understand and to use. Their use in real-life situations, does not require a lot of time for analyses. With them it is possible to qualify correctly a large proportion of everyday chores, which we need to complete fast and without too much deliberations. Also, these concepts, and their clear attributes, allow to subject moral problems to theoretical analyses and to formal proving procedures, which are similar to these presented in subsection D11.1. In this way, concepts of good deed and sin, give to totalizm the character of very strict science, similar to physics and mathematics. Therefore, the sources of imperfections of these two ideas, which are described in this subsection, are aimed at enhancing our effectiveness in their use, not at discouraging to use them. After all, a totalizt who is going to know imperfections and limitations of the tools that he/she is using, in fact is going to use these tools in a more correct and effective manner.

This brief subsection contains the list and description of factors, which totalizm managed to identify so far, and which are actually distorting the precision of judgement of everyday situations with the use of concepts of totaliztic good deeds (and also totaliztic sins). Here they are:

1. **Simplifying assumption**. The first of such distorting factors is a simplifying assumption, which we must take in the judgement of a given situation through a concept of totaliztic good deeds (and also sins). This assumption states that "the party which receives good deeds, does not undertake activities, which would be contradictive to the intentions of the party which gives these good deeds". In order to explain this assumption, it is because of this one, according to subsection A5.1 we must always assume that "totaliztic good deeds are carried out in an ideal world, in which there are no situations that the party which receives a given good deed is going to try to distort it and to convert it into a totaliztic sin".

2. **Overlaying of feelings on actions**. Independently from these simplifying assumptions, there is also a next factor, which also distorts the precision of our judgement of the situation accomplished with the use of the concept of totaliztic behavioural good deeds (and also sins). This is the fact of the existence of feelings, which by themselves constitute emotional good deeds and sins. As this is going to be explained in subsection A7.2, whenever we carry out any physical activity, we also simultaneously steer in ourselves, and in other people, some kinds of feelings. The moral intention of these feelings is usually independent

from the moral intention of our physical activity. This means that, for example, there is a situation possible, when with our physical activities we carry out a totaliztic behavioural good deed, while simultaneously with our feelings we carry out an emotional sin. Therefore, when the output of moral energy from our feelings exceeds the output of moral energy from our physical activities, then in total the activity, which we carry out, can be a sin. Of course, the above can also work in an opposite direction - when our physical sin can be overturned by a good deed that we accomplish at the level of feelings, so that in total we commit a good deed (such a situation can provide a justification, that in some exceptional situations we should carry out various high level sacrifices, in spite that from the activity point of view, sacrifices are always totaliztic sins). Thus a fact that effects of our activities have imposed on them effects of our feelings, cause that the concept of totaliztic good deeds (and also totaliztic sins) is unreliable even more for a correct judgement of a given moral situation. Thus, the consequence is such, that totalizm recommends a high caution, when we use these two concepts in our judging any highly important life situation, which involve strong feelings.

3. **Religious practices of qualifying actions, without consideration to circumstances, in which these actions take place**. In totalizm, actions by themselves cannot be qualified into categories of good deeds or sins, simply because we do not know anything how these actions are positioned towards the moral field, which surrounds them. After all, in order to know, whether a given action is "moral" or "immoral", one needs to know also, whether it rises uphill in moral field, or falls downhill of this field. But the configuration of moral field around a given action, is determined by the circumstances in which this action takes place. The same action in one set of circumstances can be a good deed (e.g. consider slapping a fainted person), while in other set of circumstances can be a sin (e.g. consider slapping an innocent passer by on a street). Therefore, during qualifying a given activity into a category of good deeds or sins, always we need to analyse also the circumstances in which it happens. Unfortunately, religions deeply enforced into us the practice, that one should qualify only actions, and should ignore circumstances that surround these actions. Therefore, after totalizm is adopted, people continue this practice, still qualifying only actions and ignoring circumstances which surround them. Although every action in the majority of cases belongs to a single category, there are always special circumstances, which cause, that in some number of cases the same action belongs to a completely opposite category. Therefore this religious practice, to ignore circumstances in our considerations, introduces a significant error in our moral judgements.

4. **The existence of hidden circumstances**. There is one more factor, which also significantly influences the distortion of our correctness in qualifying activities with the use of concept of totaliztic good deeds (and sins). This is a lack of knowledge of all circumstances in which these activities are carried out. Especially, we know very little about circumstances that surround the receivers of given our activity, even if these circumstances are brought to open. Also, in every situation circumstances can exist, which are hidden from us on purpose. Thus, otherwise then it is with our own circumstances - which we are able to judge quite precisely, the circumstances of recipients of our activities usually are completely unknown to us. In turn these recipients, with their counter-actions, feeling, motivations, or altitudes, may very easily change the moral outcome of our actions, turning them from totaliztic good deeds into totaliztic sins.

At the end of this brief subsection we should also address the matter of reliability of concepts of **religious good deeds and religious sins**. As this is explained at the beginning of subsection A5, totaliztic concepts of good deeds and sins are derived from similar concepts that are used in religions for centuries. Only that totalizm defines these concepts in much more strict manner, and provides them with very concrete physical foundations based on concepts of moral energy. If concepts of totaliztic good deeds and totaliztic sins defined so strictly, are displaying such high level of approximation and have so many factors which may distort them, then how approximate and misleading must be their religious counterparts. And - to make it worse, in religions the counterparts of good deeds and sins are the major indicator of

"morality" and "immorality". After all, contrary to totalizm, the majority of religions do not have any other indicators of the moral correctness, which could be used in order to additionally verify the correctness of the concept of good deeds and sins. Therefore, for the majority of religions, concepts of good deeds and sins are the only indicators of the moral correctness, while for adherers of these religions - the only indicators of "moral" behaviours. So when these two religious concepts are unable to indicate correctly, what is "moral" and what is "immoral", then in what way these poor adherers of religions could distinguish between good and bad, between moral or immoral, between virtuous and evil. Our awareness of this fact, actually explains how it happened that in spite of many thousands of years of existence and activities of numerous religions, still our planet remains so barbaric, so immoral, and so thoroughly submerged in parasitism.

A6. Moral work, immoral work, and totaliztic nirvana

In subsection A5 the concept of totaliztic good deed, and totaliztic sin, were described. They are excellent "indicators of the moral correctness" for the multitude of everyday chores and situations, which take just a short time to complete. Such chores and situations do not carry much moral energy in them. Therefore, although totalizm recommends to complete them "morally", in order to obey moral laws, simultaneously it advices not to be too concerned, that other people, who are also involved in them, may not obey moral laws as pedantically as we do. So, these other people, through their immoral responses to our moral behaviour, may spoil results of these chores and situations. But still all is OK, because these chores do not carry much moral energy. For this reason, the concept of totaliztic good deeds is developed for the idealistic assumption that "we live in a perfect world", and therefore in doing totaliztic good deeds we do not need to be concerned too much about the immorality of other people.

The situation drastically changes, when we are to complete works, which require hours and hours of heavy labour. Such heavy works carry a lot of moral energy, and therefore we would not wish other immoral people spoil our results, and thus waste our efforts. Therefore we would like to complete such laborious works in a pedantically "moral" manner, without taking any idealistic assumptions, so that moral energy, which represents an outcome of these works, is not wasted by immoral altitudes of other people. Therefore in this subsection we introduce a new concept of the totaliztic "moral work".

A totaliztic **moral work** is to be defined as a "every laborious and time consuming totaliztic good deed, which carries a significant amount of moral energy, and which is carried out in the pedantically moral manner, so that the immoral outsiders are not able to spoil the outcomes, and therefore the entire moral energy, which this work generates, serves to the benefit of the person which completes this work". The above definition reveals that a moral work is a special category of a very laborious totaliztic good deed. It includes only activities which involve a lot of moral energy, and therefore which need to be done in a very careful and pedantic manner. (Typical totaliztic good deeds always concern chores or situations which involve a little of time and a little of moral energy, and therefore which are completed without too much concern about immoral contributions of other people, which could spoil their effects.) Therefore in the completion of moral work we drop the previous idealistic assumption about living in a perfect world. We accept for it, the realities of being surrounded with immoral people. Of course, dropping the idealistic assumption makes everything more complicated. This subsection is to systematically explain all issues and complications involved in completing a moral work. In turn the detailed conditions that we need to fulfil, in order for our work becomes a "moral work", are explained in subsection E9, means near the end of separate chapter E devoted to the totaliztic nirvana. (The totaliztic nirvana is the final reward that awaits people who undertake such intended and systematic completion of a moral work.)

An exact opposite of a moral work, is an immoral work. A totaliztic **immoral work** is defined as "every laborious and time consuming work, which reduces a lot of moral energy in

the doer". For example, an immoral work is every work, which originally was intended to be a moral work, but which went wrong for some reasons. Also an immoral work is every laborious and time consuming totaliztic sin (e.g. slavery, sacrifice, or self-destruction), especially if it is done for our job, as the source of our income. According to totalizm, doing immoral work represents a disobedience of moral laws, and therefore it should not be done willingly. However, totalizm recognizes also, that in the present philosophical climate of the prevailing parasitism, it is almost impossible to completely avoid doing immoral work. For example, the majority of present immoral employers force their employees to do immoral work, so currently many people is forced to do immoral work simply to survive. For this reason, totalizm states that it is OK to temporally do immoral work for important reasons - see subsection A12. However, while doing it a totalizt should: (1) be aware that what he/she is doing, actually represents an immoral work, (2) he/she takes steps which in future prevents this particular work to be forced upon him/her, or upon other people, (3) he/she should compensate the destructive effects of doing such an immoral work, by voluntarily doing some other moral work of his/her own choice, which neutralizes the damage. In subsection E9 an information is provided, which helps to recognize an immoral work, and helps to distinguish it from a moral work.

Otherwise to totaliztic good deeds, which concentrate mainly on our own activities, and do not take deeply into consideration the morality of other people involved, moral work is very pedantic about influences of immoral outsiders involved. The main rule of moral work say, that since the doer puts a lot of effort and motivation to complete a moral work, he/she should pay a special attention to immoral outsiders, who may spoil the outcome of his/her work. Therefore, the last two subsections of this section are explaining in great details how we should deal with the issue of such immoral outsiders and their spoiling influences. Examples of steps, which totalizm recommends to be taken in order to prevent influence of immoral outsiders on the outcome of our laborious efforts, include:

(1) To complete all our moral works fully anonymously, without the knowledge of other people, and if possible also out of the sight of other people. If outsiders know, what our activities are for, then with their jealous minds they may spoil the results. When such immoral outsiders are able to see us in action, they are also able to spoil the outcomes by their telepathic influences.

(2) To increase our anonymity at the workplace as much as we can. For example, we could wear identical uniforms, avoid features which make us distinct, put barriers and screens around us, etc. If outside observers are unable to see individual people in us, they are also unable to spoil outcomes of our actions.

(3) The supplementing of our physical efforts with powerful idealistic motivations. For example, we should not just perform a work, but strongly believe that we do it for the good of other people, for humanity, further generations, that we do it in the most effective, fast and modern way we can, that in the work we utilize all our knowledge and all the technology which is in our disposal, etc.

If we manage to complete moral work in a proper manner, it is capable to significantly increase our moral energy. In turn via the increase of this moral energy, we gradually are earning the most spectacular reward of totalizm, namely the "totaliztic nirvana". The phenomenon of this nirvana is explained in details in chapter E.

In order to earn a totaliztic nirvana, one must obey exactly the same rules as when one completes a moral work. These rules are described in details in subsection E9. To save on the volume of this monograph, they are not repeated here.

A7. Managing our feelings and motivations

Feelings (F) and motivations (S) perform an extremely vital role in totalizm. After all, they are two major quantities, which converge together (E=FS) to generate, or to reduce in a

given person, moral energy (E). In turn totalizm is actually a science, which is very interested in fate of our moral energy, because numerous goals of totalizm is accomplishable through the correct management of this energy. For this reason, totalizm puts a lot of attention to the development of our knowledge of feelings and motivations. Unfortunately, they are extremely complex phenomena - as we know the entire official science, which have thousands of well-paid experts in its disposal, so far failed to explain properly, what actually feelings and motivations are (not mentioning, that so-far the official science has also failed to develop any effective tools for managing feelings and motivations). Thus, in respect to feelings and motivations, totalizm has a difficult task at hand, and must acknowledge the level of difficulty of this subject. Although totalizm was able to accomplish, what the official orthodox science already broke its teeth on, and it already explained what really feelings and motivations are, still many further details await to be worked out, before the tools, that totalizm offers us to manage our feelings and motivations, become the same moral, effective, and clear, as tools that it worked out to manage our actions. However, a Polish proverb says that "Krakow city was not build all at once" ("Nie od razu Krakow zbudowano"), so after some time elapses, totalizm surely is going to have something similarly innovative to offer.

Totalizm is a philosophy which tries to help, not to restrict people. It acknowledges that diverse and well balanced human feelings and motivations are the most important ingredients of everyday joy of life (see subsection I5.5). They are also a major requirement of our health and well being (see subsection I5.6). In addition to this, they are also a basic ingredient of our intelligence (see the totaliztic definition of intelligence provided in subsection G3.2). Therefore, our feelings should not be restricted in any way. In order to intensify all these important functions of feelings, and also in order to assume our moral control over them, totalizm proposes a three level management of feelings. It is based on the following principles:

1. **A free release of feelings, without suppressing or limiting them**. Totalizm states that feelings should be released freely, without any holding them back or suppression. If we somehow influence their surfacing, then totalizm allows only to intensify or to modify them, but under no circumstances allow to suppress them. This means that we release them in such a manner, as our everyday behaviours, joy of life, and playing our human roles, requires this from us. In this manner, our intensive emotional life stimulates the beneficial flow of energies through our body and counter-body, boosts our intelligence, and adds a taste to our life.

But it needs to be noted, that such a free release of feelings does not mean, that after they spontaneously release themselves, we allow them to equally wildly convert into some immoral outcomes. Totalizm recommends the strict control over the outcome of feelings, means over whatever we do with these feelings next - i.e. after they release themselves. This means that, although we do not suppress or control feelings themselves, we still have the duty to manage whatever these feelings turn into. In order to explain this on an example, if we are in circumstances which induce in us a feeling of anger, according to totalizm we should allow this anger to be freely released from our counter-body to our body. But when it finishes to materialise itself, we have a duty to subject the - whatever this anger would later try to turn into, to a totaliztic categorization and then to transformation into moral outcomes, or simply subject it to a neutralizing.

2. **Checking the moral category of the feelings that we currently experience**. After our feelings are released without any suppression, and we "feel" them, we need to start planning how we are going to channel morally the outcomes, into which these feelings are going to turn. For this, we firstly need to categorise them into one of two possible categories of "moral" or "immoral" feelings. The "moral" feelings do not need to be managed, so we can allow them to spontaneously convert themselves into any outcomes that may spring out of them. But "immoral" feelings we need to decisively manage, so that we convert them into only "moral" consequences, or that we neutralize them.

3. **Managing outcomes of feelings**. This last stage of totaliztic management of feelings, concentrates on such control of immoral feelings, that the outcomes of their action

were either moral, or at least neutralized or directed wherever they do not cause too much damage.

A we see, the present totaliztic approach to management of feelings is slightly different than the management of actions. Actions we manage <u>before</u> they are materialised, while feelings we manage <u>after</u> they appear.

More information about totaliztic management of feelings is contained in further subsections of this section A7. Subsection A7.3 describes several tools which show how to manage the outcomes of feelings. Two other subsections, namely A7.2 and A7.4 provide simple methods and tools, which allow to qualify feelings and motivations into categories of "moral" or "immoral". But because of the complexity of the topic of feelings, they will be addressed also in other volumes of this monograph. For example principles involved in management of feelings and motivations, are discussed also in subsections G5, G3.6, D1, and in several other parts of this monograph. In turn mechanism of releasing of feelings and motivations is discussed in subsection I5.5 from a different chapter I (and different volume 5).

A7.1. <u>How our feelings and motivations work</u>

Totalizm and the Concept of Dipolar Gravity developed a handy model, which explains how feelings and motivations work. This model is described in subsection I5.5. For our understanding of explanations, how morally control our feelings and motivations, we actually need to know - at least briefly, how feelings and motivations work. Therefore, this subsection is to summarise the description of that mechanism.

Before we explain briefly what are our feelings and how they work, we firstly must remind ourselves a few facts about the structure of humans. According to what the Concept of Dipolar Gravity has established, and what is exactly explained in subsections I5, I5.1, I5.2, and I5.5, every living human is composed of three separate components, namely: (1) biological body, (2) counter-body, and (3) registers. The <u>biological body</u> is that one which we know fully, because we can see it, and it is well described by present medicine. The <u>counter-body</u> is less known, because in order to understand it, one needs to know the Concept of Dipolar Gravity. A good description of this body is contained in subsection I5.1. But in order to briefly summarize it, the Concept of Dipolar Gravity states that the counter-body is an exact copy of the biological body, only that it is made of counter-matter, instead of a biological matter. In the sense of its function, the counter-body is an equivalent to a religious description of "spirit". Counter-matter which is forming our counter-body, has this property, that it is capable of thinking in the natural state. This capability to think causes, that our counter-body is a kind of a small computer for our personal use, which have the ability to memorise, and to execute our personal algorithms/programs and karma that are gradually accumulated and run in it. This our personal computer is connected with the huge universal computer (UC), forming with it a kind of a network or Internet, and continually exchanging with it various data. Finally <u>registers</u> are algorithms/programs, which are kept in this personal computer called counter-body. The counter-body is a computer for these registers, and it executes whatever the programs from registers order. Registers are equivalents of the religious idea of "soul", which lives in the "spirit". Registers have this property, that they work and can be executed on any natural "computer", not only on our counter-body. Therefore they are this one of three components of us, which actually "survives" our physical death.

In order to fully understand how the mechanism of feelings and motivations works, we firstly need to learn one function performed by our counter-body. By being an exact copy of our biological body, this counter-body also performs various functions. For example, it contains counter-organs. Similarly as our biological body has organs, such as heart, stomach, nose, eyes, or the brain, also this counter-body houses various "counter-organs", such as counter-heart, counter-stomach, counter-nose, counter-eyes, mind, conscience, compassion, counter-organ of karma management, and many more. Each one of these counter-organs

also performs functions, which are defined for it. For example our counter-organ of smell senses smells, which propagate throughout the counter-world, while our counter-eyes recognize shapes that are visible in the counter-world. But in addition to all these basic functions, for which these counter-organs were created, all counter-organs always perform also one additional function of "pumps" and "valves" for moral energy. These pumps/valves are controlled with the energy that is supplied by our biological body in the form of our motivations. Depending on energy of our motivations, these counter-organs can cause one of two possible effects, namely they can compress, or release, moral energy stored in our counter-body. During the compression, the energy is pumped out of our biological body, and compressed into our counter-body to be stored in there (for carrying out such a compression, the required "propulsion power" for these "pumps" supply our motivations). In turn, during the release of energy, these counter-organs are opening and allowing that the moral energy, which is compressed in our counter-body, freely escapes into our biological body (to cause such a release of moral energy, no energy of motivations is needed to be supplied to our counter-organs). When moral energy is being compressed in our counter-body, a given counter-organ - through which this energy flows, produces a specific sensation, which we know under the name of "feeling". For example, in the case of our counter-organ of stomach - the flow of energy caused by its compression, is producing an unpleasant feeling of a "hunger". In turn, when moral energy is released from our counter-body, then a flow of energy through a given counter-organ produces a reverse feeling, which is an appropriate "anti-feeling", means an exact reversal of the previous feeling. For example, in case of our counter-organ of stomach, this anti-feeling formed during the release of moral energy from our counter-body, is a pleasurable feeling of a "satisfied hunger".

The above descriptions allow us to define precisely, what our feelings are. In order to summarise briefly this definition, and also summarise explanations that in subsection I5.5 accompany this definition, **feelings are simply sensations, which we experience when moral energy flows through various counter-organs contained in our counter-body**.

In turn motivations are "propelling powers", which control our counter-organs, and thus which cause, that these counter-organs either pump our energy from the biological body to the counter-body, or release this moral energy from the counter-body to the biological body. In a very simplified manner, motivations could be imagined as propelling powers, which are supplied to kinds of "motors" located inside of our counter-organs, which (the motors) depending on the power we supply to them with the effort of our mind, either cause that these counter-organs compress moral energy in the counter-body, or release this energy from the counter-body to the biological body. When these "motors" propelled with the effort of our mind, cause the compression of moral energy in our counter-body, then they complete significant work. According to the "Principle of Energy Conversion" (described in subsection I4.1.1) this work requires putting into it appropriate amount of energy, which must be withdrawn from the effort that we invest in our motivations. Therefore producing "moral" motivations, which cause the compression of moral energy in our counter-body, always is combined with the necessity of putting a significant effort to generate these "moral" motivations. This practically means, that "**moral**" are always these our motivations (and feelings that result from them), which, in order to be generated, we must put effort in them, which cause our tiredness and force us to break our internal laziness. In turn "**immoral**" are all these our motivations (and feelings which result from them), which happen in a spontaneous manner, which do not require our effort to be put into them, and which do not cause in us the feeling of tiredness.

The biggest problem that totalizm currently has with feelings, is that on the present level of development, we do not have yet a "catalogue of human feelings". Such a catalogue would describe, which elementary feelings originate from which counter-organs, and would inform whether they are generated during the compression, or during the release, of moral energy (i.e. whether they are "moral" or "immoral"). So far, the Concept of Dipolar Gravity managed only to determine the general principles, which are obeyed by feelings. And so, according to the to-date findings of this concept, all feelings which originate from the biological

body and have the nature of "unpleasant sensations", in fact cause the compression of our moral energy (this means that these are "moral" feelings). For example, moral energy is compressed in our counter-body each time when we feel: hunger, thirst, hotness, suffocation, any physical pain, tiredness of our muscles, discomfort, etc. In turn moral energy is released from our counter-body each time when we feel a "physical pleasure", for example we feel: satisfied hunger, satisfied thirst, pleasurable warmth, rest, comfort, orgasm, etc. This means that "physical pleasures" are "immoral" feelings. Completely different is with feelings of the mental origin. Mental feelings of the "pleasure" type (e.g. happiness, love, optimism, enthusiasm) cause the compression of moral energy, while mental feelings type "hurt" (e.g. concern, hate, fear, stress, jealousy, contradiction) cause the release our moral energy. In order to make even more difficult our understanding the operation of feelings, there are special counter-organs, e.g. conscience or compassion, which are ruled by their own laws, whether they compress or release moral energy (in more details the operation of these special counter-organs is described in subsection I5.5).

Knowing all this, for a full understanding of operation of feelings we need to know one more fact, namely that in reality, feelings that we usually experience are actually a composition of several different elementary sensations, produced simultaneously by several different counter-organs from our counter-body (for details see subsection I5.5). For example, when we dig a garden, then we can simultaneously experience, let us say, physical tiredness of our muscles - which compresses our moral energy, and e.g. mental feeling of injustice - which simultaneously causes the release of our moral energy (caused, e.g. because our parents ordered us to dig this garden, when we actually wanted to visit our friend). Therefore the total moral outcome of each our action, means the total increase or decrease of our moral energy, always is the difference (or sum) of all elementary feelings that we induce during a given action.

An unique property of the mechanism of feelings is, that feelings also obey the Principle of Counterpolarity. The consequence of this is that experiencing a given feeling always simultaneously generates so-called **reactive potential**, which later causes the release of appropriate anti-feeling for this feeling - for more details see subsection I5.5. (E.g. if we experience a feeling of love, we simultaneously generate a reactive potential, which later is going to turn into an anti-feeling of hate.) Thus, our feelings act very similar to forces of action and reaction (i.e. each action produces a reaction, and vice versa). Feelings are also very similar to electrical charges (i.e. the generation of each electrical charge, causes the simultaneous appearance of similar but opposite anti-charge).

The above explanations should be supplemented with a reminder that totalizm not only does not require from people to put any breaks or suppression on feelings that they generate, but even recommends that we should carry our emotional life to the full. After all, according to the mechanism of feelings (which - the mechanism, was discovered only because of totalizm), feelings are vital components of the joy of life and people should not suppress them in any way. Furthermore, the fullness of the experiencing of feelings decides about our health and intelligence. Therefore totalizm recommends something opposite - it asks to continually intensify, enrich, and diversify our emotional life. However, totalizm teaches also, that we must learn to categorise and to qualify feelings and motivations that we release, into categories "moral" and "immoral". Then we should also learn how to manage them, how we turn them into actions, and what consequences we allow them to bring to people. Although it is not permitted to limit the generation of our feelings, we still have a full control over where we direct these feelings - once they are generated, and also into what we convert them. So let us now look at tools that totalizm offers to us for categorising and qualifying feelings and motivations.

A7.2. Emotional good deeds and sins

Previous subsection revealed, that each time, when we feel something, moral energy is pumped to, or is released from, our counter-body. Thus, from the point of view of effects that they exert on moral energy, feelings work exactly the same as actions. After all, actions also cause either compression, or release of moral energy. Because feelings can, and are, experienced at exactly the same time as we do specific actions, their moral effects are combined with moral effects of actions that are accompanied by them.

The fact, that similarly to our actions, also feelings can have "moral" or "immoral" consequences, introduces interesting outcomes. In ourselves, means in the givers of our feelings, "moral" feelings are going to compress moral energy in our counter-body, while "immoral" feelings are going to release moral energy from our counter-body. In turn in other people, means in receivers of our feelings, many of the feelings that we generate, are going to induce some secondary feelings. These induced secondary feelings are also going to compress or disperse moral energy, but this time from other people. Thus all this together causes, that our feelings are working exactly the same, as totaliztic "behavioural good deeds" or totaliztic "behavioural sins" do. Therefore totalizm introduces a concept of "emotional good deeds or sins". Such **emotional good deeds or sins**, are appropriate kinds of feelings, which cause the same consequences, as their counterparts amongst totaliztic good deeds or sins. Also, similarly as their totaliztic counterparts described in subsections A5.1 and A5.2, feelings can also be qualified to the same categories. For example love and enthusiasm are feelings, which in normal circumstances would be qualified as emotional good deeds of the "progress" type. After all, if we allow them to cause some consequences in other people, typically these consequences are going to be moral and similar to those caused by totaliztic good deeds of progress. In turn hatred and jealousy are feelings, which would be qualified as emotional sins of the "oppression" type. After all, in typical cases they work immorally, similarly to an oppression.

The above is worth supplement with a reminder, that the majority of our real activities, always contains at least two components, namely actions and feelings. Moral effects of both these components always are going to combine together. For example, an emotional good deed of "deep believe in necessity" (i.e. "inspiration"), together with an action sin type "sacrifice", in the final effect may give an outcome, which in total is "moral", because together they compress more moral energy than they disperse (in spite that sole "sacrifice" is a sin, which in person who sacrifices something, causes a significant loss of moral energy). Therefore, one of useful skills, which we should learn, is to distinguish in all our activities their action component and feeling component. Then we are able analyse each of these two components separately, so that we can determine what influence it has on changes in moral energy, and thus we can undertake corrective actions towards these changes of moral energy, which are undesirable.

When we discuss the matter of qualifying of subsequent feelings into categories "moral" or "immoral", we must remember that totaliztic understanding of feelings is different from their popular understanding. In to-date tradition, people classified feelings into "positive" or "negative", not into "moral" or "immoral". Furthermore, "positive" usually were these feelings, which were giving pleasant sensations - independently what their moral consequences were. Similarly "negative" were all unpleasant feelings - independently of their moral outcomes. Therefore, for example "love" and "physical comfort", traditionally both are qualified as positive feelings, although according to totalizm only love is "moral" - because it increases our moral energy, while comfort is an immoral feeling - because it depletes moral energy from our counter-body. Similarly "jealousy" and "hunger", both are considered to be negative feelings, although only jealousy is "immoral". But after we learned general principles according to which subsequent feelings are working, and thus we know approximately, which ones are compressing, and which one are dispersing, moral energy, now we can more precisely qualify subsequent feelings. And so, according to totalizm, "**moral are all these feelings, which compress moral energy in people involved, or which prevent the dispersion of moral energy from people involved**". In turn "**immoral are all these feelings, which noticeably

disperse moral energy either from a person who generated them, or from any other person involved". It is worth noticing that the above qualifying of feelings into moral or immoral categories corresponds to similar qualifying of actions in definitions of totaliztic good deeds and sins.

Amongst many immoral feelings, especially destructive are these additional feelings, which are generated as a byproduct of parasitic philosophy. From the point of view of totaliztic mechanics, they are emotional equivalents of accelerations and centrifugal forces in spinning objects - as described in subsections KA8.5 and G4. They appear only in people, who practice parasitism, and are almost unknown to adherers of totalizm. Their examples include a feeling of power over other people and a feeling of depression. One of many of their destructive consequences is that, amongst others, they practically blow apart every relationship or marriage in which they appear. This is to eliminate them, a "new" model of marriage is currently propagated in the USA. The author of this model, Laura Doyle, in her book **[1A7.2]** "Surrendered Wife", describes it as the resignation from the feeling of power. Of course, this model is only new for today feminists with parasitic philosophy, as in fact it was known and practised throughout centuries as a traditional model of relationship and marriage - notice an old Polish proverb "it is a doomed home, where the female bullies the male" (i.e. "biada temu domowi, gdzie krowa przybodzie bykowi").

Although people utilize feelings in various moral and immoral purposes for a very long time, until the time of totalizm, no-one was aware that feeling are actually moral equivalents to idea of forces from classical physics. As such equivalents, feelings are extremely important for totalizm, as a whole array of moral and physical effects can be accomplished through their use.

The importance of feelings for totalizm, and the fact that feelings can be used on a thousand and one different ways, causes that their utilization by totalizm is very complex. It also requires a lot of time to be converted into simple rules and tools, and explained in a similar clear way, as totalizm already accomplished for controlling our actions. Until the time, when such simple rules and tools are worked out by totalizm, it recommends to its adherers to develop in themselves a habit of controlling this, into what our feelings are finally converted.

As this was explained in subsection A7.1, the mechanism which generates feelings is very complex. But the good knowledge of this mechanism allows to convert immoral feelings into moral outcomes. A method which describes how to accomplish this, is described in subsection A7.3. In order to make our management of feelings more effective, very useful turns out to be a "**catalogue of human feelings**". This "catalogue" is simply a detailed list of all elementary feelings that human beings can experience. Each feeling on this list would be supplemented with an information whether, and why, this feeling is causing a compression, or a dispersion, of moral energy (means whether, and why, it is "moral", or whether, and why, it is "immoral"). Furthermore, it would be useful, if such a catalogue could contain also some other information about a given feeling, for example which counter-organ generates it, what is its anti-feeling, if this is a compound feeling - then from which elementary feelings it is composed (or, if it is an elementary feeling - then in which compound feelings it participates), which our motivations are capable to modify the "reactive potential" that it creates to generate moral secondary feelings (about the modifying of the reactive potential - see subsection I5.5). As this is explained in subsection A7.1, so far the Concept of Dipolar Gravity (and totalizm) managed only to determine some general principles, which apply to the moral qualifying of feelings. It also was able to qualify only a few simple elementary feelings (e.g. hunger, pain, etc.). But is not able to produce a complete catalogue of human feelings. For example, out of these general principles that rule feelings, we know already that in the majority of circumstances:

- All unpleasant bodily sensations (pain, ache, hunger, thirst, etc.) cause the compression of moral energy,

- All pleasant bodily sensations (pleasure, resting, etc.) cause the dispersion of moral energy,

- All mental pleasures (cheerfulness, happiness, trust, etc.) cause the compression of moral energy,

- All mental sufferings (worry, stress, fear, etc.) cause the dispersion of moral energy,

- All moral approvals from our conscience (assurance, rightness, etc.) cause the compression of moral energy,

- All moral disapprovals from our conscience (guilt, remorse, etc.) cause the dispersion of moral energy,

- All cases of receiving compassion from someone (being pathetic in the sight of others, being comforted, etc.) cause the increase of our moral energy,

- All cases of giving our compassion (being sorrow for someone, expressing comfort to someone, etc.) cause the reduction of our moral energy,

- All "pro" telepathic signals perceived by our counter-ears (support, approval, etc.) cause the compression of moral energy,

- All "against" telepathic signals perceived by our counter-ears (hate, jealousy, disapproval, etc.) cause the dispersion of moral energy.

Our knowledge of even some of the above general rules applicable to "catalogue of human feelings", usually is sufficient to qualify the most important feelings (F), which we just experience, into a category of "moral" or "immoral". In turn when we know, which feelings are "immoral", we can concentrate on such management of their outcomes, that they do not cause too much destruction, or on such managing these feelings themselves, that with the use of other feelings we can neutralize the loss of moral energy that they cause.

A7.3. Conversion of immoral feelings into moral actions

Motto of this subsection: "I have no influence on how I feel, but I can change what I do".

Previous subsection A7.2 taught us how to distinguish moral feelings from immoral feelings. It also revealed that every feeling that we experience, in circumstances of real life always represent either an emotional good deed, or an emotional sin. Thus, according to formulas that were discussed in subsection A7.2, we now should be able to qualify every feeling that we experience, either to a category of a "moral" feeling, or to a category of "immoral" feeling. The previous analyses revealed also, that our feelings have a direct cause-effect relationship with our actions. They either represent a source of our actions, or they are an outcome of our actions. All this considered together indicates, that for totalizm, feelings that we experience are one more, handy "indicator of the moral correctness". It allows to qualify quickly to categories moral or immoral, these ones from our actions, that have a cause-effect relationship with our feelings. This indicator states, that **moral** are all these our actions, which generate in us feelings that belong to a category "moral". Moral are also all these our actions, which are spontaneously undertaken in the response to impulses from our moral feelings. Therefore the completion of actions which produce moral feelings is to obey moral laws. In turn **immoral** are all our actions, which generate in us "immoral" feelings. Immoral are also all these our actions, which are spontaneously undertaken in the response to impulses of our immoral feelings. Therefore the completion of such actions represents a disobedience of moral laws. For this reason, before we complete any immoral action, which has a cause-effect relationship with our immoral feelings, we firstly should convert this immoral action into an appropriate moral action. This subsection explains how to do such a conversion.

According to totalizm, there are two basic methods of converting "immoral" feelings into "moral" outcomes. The first of these we could call "action driven", because it ignores feelings, and concentrates on controlling actions that result from these feelings. The second one we could call "feelings driven" because they depend on such management of feelings that their final outcome is always "moral".

Let us start our analyses from the "**action driven**" method of converting immoral feelings into moral actions. According to totalizm, it has two implementations. The first implementation concerns cases, when we intend to complete an immoral action, which is a

spontaneous outcome of immoral feeling that we just are experiencing. According to totalizm, before we complete such an immoral action, we firstly should convert it into a different moral one. This different "moral" action must be the one that we would complete, if it would result from a moral anti-feeling to a given immoral feeling (i.e. it should be an outcome of an anti-feeling to the feeling that we just have). Only after we complete this conversion, we can proceed with doing this new moral action, instead of this previous immoral one. The second implementation of the "action driven" method of converting immoral feelings into moral actions, concerns cases, when we are just completing some immoral activity, and rapidly realize that this immoral activity generates in us an immoral feeling. According to totalizm, we should then interrupt this immoral activity, quickly convert it into a moral one, and only then pick up the continuation of doing of this secondary, moral action. This secondary moral action should be such, that in normal circumstances it would generate in us a moral anti-feeling for a given immoral feeling.

In order to illustrate on examples, both implementations of the "action driven" method of converting immoral feelings into moral actions, let us analyse now two cases. The first of these concerns a situation, when we already are experiencing some immoral feeling, and this immoral feeling pushes us to complete an immoral action. Let us assume that we do not like someone - means that we experience an immoral feeling of dislike. When such a disliked person asks us for something, we have a temptation to refuse spontaneously, means immediately, without thinking, and without a justified reason - after all we do not like this person (means, we feel to do, what usually parasitic American films teach us to do in such situations). However, this refusal would result from our immoral feelings. Thus it would represent a disobedience of moral laws. Therefore, before we complete it, we firstly should determine, what we would do for another person, which would ask for exactly the same as this disliked person asks, but towards whom we would feel an anti-feeling to the feeling that we feel right now, means whom we would like a lot. The outcome of this determining indicates to us the moral action, into which we should convert the previously intended immoral action. Then we should complete towards this disliked person a new moral action, instead of that old immoral one. Of course, this conversion of actions does not mean that our feelings would change (after all, we still would dislike that particular person), but only means, that without any suppression of our own feelings that we experience, we still managed to disallow our immoral feelings to convert into immoral action. (As we remember, totalizm forbids any suppression of our feelings, but recommends the management of our actions!) In this particular methods of converting "immoral" feelings into "moral" actions, very good is classical English culture (currently on the brink of extinction), according to which people always did what a politeness and good upbringing asked them to do, independently what feelings they have to the receivers of their actions.

The second implementation of "action-driven" method of converting immoral feelings into moral actions, concerns situations, when we already are doing something, that generates in us an immoral feeling. According to totalizm, as soon as we become aware that we do such an immoral thing, we should convert it into doing something that is going to generate in us a moral feeling. Let us assume, that we just are lying on a couch and enjoying idle laziness (hopefully, we are able to distinguish between such an idle laziness, and a constructive resting after we finished heavy work). The pleasurable feeling of laziness, which we then experience, is an immoral feeling, because it disperses our moral energy. Therefore immediately after we realize, that we are doing an immoral thing, according to totalizm we should quickly convert it into something that is moral. In order to work out what we should do instead of this laziness, we need to convert a feeling that we are experiencing, into a anti-feeling. As it turns out, an anti-feeling to laziness, is physical tiredness of our muscles. Therefore, in our mind, we should revise the list of physical works which are awaiting our completion, and choose this one, which most quickly make our muscles tired (let us say that this work is washing floors in the whole our flat). Thus, instead of continuing our laziness, we stand up and start to do the washing.

Note that we again do not suppress feelings we have, and we allow our body to feel whatever it wishes. We just only change what we are doing.

Let us change now the topic into discussion of the "**feeling-driven**" method of converting immoral feelings into moral outcomes. This method depends on such management of our feelings, that the total outcome of all feelings that we experience in a given moment of time, is moral. This means that the sum of all feelings that we experience in a given moment of time, should always be managed in such a manner, that it causes the compression of moral energy in our counter-body (instead of dispersion of it). Such a final outcome can be accomplished with the use of several different principles, which are based on the mechanism of feelings described in subsection I5.5. The simplest way of accomplishing it is to "add" further feelings to feelings that we already are experiencing (from the mechanism of feelings we know that we are not able to suppress feelings, but we can induce them in ourselves, or redirect them). For example, if we are lying on a couch for a long time, the feeling of an idle laziness that we are experiencing is immoral, as it causes the escape of moral energy from our counter-body. But if we are able to add to it one more feeling of an intensive metal pleasure caused, let us say, by learning further knowledge about something that we are interested in, then the total outcome of both these feelings can be moral. In turn, if one Sunday we decide to visit our friend, about whom we know that he is a moral vampire and is going to suck a lot of our moral energy, we perhaps could turn this visit into a moral outcome, if the whole that Sunday we devote to a highly motivated fast, the feeling of which is going to increase our moral energy. Example of another, much more difficult way of eliminating the immoral outcome of immoral feeling, is to combine our immoral feelings with moral motivations, so that these combined feelings and motivations are going to generate a "reactive potential" for moral anti-feelings. This method is based on the principle of modifying the reactive potential with our motivations, as this is described in subsection I5.5. In general, it depends on inducing in us a special kind of motivation, each time we experience any moral feelings (e.g. we induce the motivation of helping others, each time when we experience a feeling of pain). These special motivations must be strong (at above threshold value), moral, and skilfully selected. Their outcome is that they modify the reactive potential, which is generated by a given moral feeling. In turn this modification causes that such a new reactive potential in future induces another moral feeling, instead of an anti-feeling for a feeling that we are just experiencing (e.g. in case of our pain, in future generated is for example a moral anti-feeling of mental pleasure, instead of an immoral anti-feeling of physical pleasure, which typically is arriving after a physical pain). Unfortunately, the development of any of the "feelings-driven" method of converting immoral feelings into moral outcomes, is requiring a deep knowledge about the mechanism of feelings. This practically means that a lot of further research needs to be done, and at least a beginning of "catalogue of human feelings" needs to be developed, before handy tools, which tell us how to do it practically, are provided by totalizm to our everyday use.

A7.4. How to categorise our motivations and transform them into a kinetic moral energy

Motivations are next ones amongst all these moral quantities, which so-far were least understood and appreciated by people. It took totalizm to assign to them the importance that they deserve, and to explain the mechanism of their operation (see subsection A7.1 and I5.5). Totalizm discovered that human motivations in fact represent moral equivalents to displacements (S) in classical physics and mechanics. Therefore totalizm treats motivations in the same way, as physics treats displacements. For example, it uses them to generate moral energy with the use of equation (1E8): E=FS.

Totalizm discovered also, that even more useful than motivations themselves, is a quantity (v), which represents changes in motivations (dS) that are taking place in small time increments (dt). Such a quantity by mathematicians would be described by the equations:

$$v = dS/dt, \text{ or } v = \Delta S/\Delta t \tag{1A7.4}$$

Quantity (v) expressed with equation (1A7.4), by classical mechanics is called "velocity". Therefore totaliztic mechanics calls it "moral velocity" or "enthusiasm" - see subsection G3.4.

Moral velocity (v), or enthusiasm, is rather important for totalizm. After all, the changes of motivations that it represents, are able to compel a given intellect with intelligence (I), to gain a momentum (Iv), which as the outcome generates a moral equivalent to kinetic energy ($E = \frac{1}{2}mv^2$) from classical mechanics. This equivalent is expressed by the following equation:

$$E = \frac{1}{2}Iv^2 \tag{2A7.4}$$

Let us interpret above equation (2A7.4) in a descriptive manner. According to it, whoever manages to quickly change his/her motivations ($\frac{1}{2}v$), so that his/her own inert intellect (I) this person transforms into an active intellect (Iv), then the faster someone accomplishes such a change, the greater kinetic energy (E) these altered motivations start to generate. A reversed process is going to occur during the collapse of motivations. If someone, who is just active in a given moment, rapidly deflates his/her motivations so that he/she becomes inactive, then the faster someone's motivations deflate, the greater reduction of the kinetic form of his/her moral energy is going to occur: $E = \frac{1}{2}Iv^2$.

Because of this capability of motivations to transform themselves into a kinetic form of moral energy, the velocity of changes of someone's motivations (v) can be used as a separate "indicator of the moral correctness" described in subsection A2.3. Furthermore, moral energy (E) resulting from such a change of motivations, can gradually be accumulated in an intellect that managed to accomplish it, and in the final result it can provide this intellect with one of moral benefits described in subsection A2.4.

As this was explained in subsection A7.1, in totalizm motivations are either "moral" or "immoral". Therefore the velocity of changes of motivations (v), by itself is an effective "indicator of the moral correctness". This indicator can be used for moral qualifying of our motivations. In case of using (v) as such independent indicator, it is necessary to determine whether a given change of motivations requires from us to put some effort in it. This is because, according to the Principle of Energy Conservation described in subsection I4.1.1, "**moral**" are all changes of our motivations, which consume our effort and energy, means which require from us to put in accomplishing them an intended contribution of our labour. In turn "**immoral**" are all changes in our motivations, which do not require our contribution of effort, which sometimes even generate a pleasure for us, and thus which show the tendency to complete themselves in a spontaneous manner, almost without our conscious participation.

In order to obey moral laws, in every case, when a prospect of completing a given action puts us in the situation of changing our motivations, we should ask ourselves whether this change is "moral" or "immoral". For this we need to ask ourselves, whether a given change of motivations requires from us putting any effort into it, and thus whether it is connected with the necessity to break through our laziness. If the answer is "yes", means if the change of our motivations in fact does require our effort to be put into it, this means that this change is "moral". Therefore an action to which it leads is coinciding with moral laws and we should complete it. In turn in all cases, when the change of our motivations does not require our effort to be put into it - and thus does not generate any sensation of effort in us, or even generates a kind of pleasure, this is a sign that the change is "immoral". Therefore the lack of action, or the action, that is to result from it, represents disobedience of moral laws. We should either refrain from completing it, or complete it only after we change it into its own moral reversal.

A8. Let us take the personal responsibility

In totalizm and in the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, "responsibility" (in this monograph labelled with the symbol "A") is immensely important moral quantity. This is because it represents a moral equivalent to the idea of "acceleration" from the classical mechanics - for

more details see explanations in subsection G3.5. The reason is that it causes our motivations (S) to accelerate. In turn, by being an equivalent of "acceleration", according to a well known equation of classical mechanics (i.e. Newton's Second Law of Motion: F = ma), a product of that responsibility (A) and of a mass of an intellect (I) must form together a feeling (F):

$$F = IA \tag{1A8}$$

Note that moral mass (I), in totaliztic mechanics represents intelligence of a given intellect. This intelligence, or moral mass, in fact is the carrier of that responsibility (A).

If anyone looks deeply inside himself/herself, the sole fact that responsibility appears in us, always is connected with simultaneous appearance of an unique feeling, which usually is named the "sense of responsibility". This unique feeling, which appears in us always when we assume some kind of responsibility, is in fact the outcome of the action of equation (1A8), in which (I) is the moral mass, or our intelligence, while (A) is responsibility.

Responsibility we can assume on ourselves. Then it represents an equivalent of acceleration (A) for our motivations. As this is clearly indicated by equations of totaliztic mechanics (E=FS=IAS), in case of such acceleration of our motivations (means in case of such assuming our responsibility), our moral energy (E) is generated. Responsibility can also be pushed on someone or something else. Then it begins to constitute an equivalent of deceleration (-A) for our motivations. As this is clearly indicated by equations of totaliztic mechanics (-E=-FS=I(-A)S), in case of such deceleration of our motivations (means in case of such pushing away of our responsibility), our moral energy (-E) is being depleted. The situation in these two cases is an exact reflection of situation from classical mechanics, when we either accelerate (a), or decelerate (-a) some mass (m). In such cases, this mass (m) is also going to either increase its energy (E), according to equation (E=Fs=mas), or disperse this energy (-E), according to equation (-E=-Fs=m(-a)s).

Whenever in our life we encounter a problem of responsibility, we must remember, that pushing responsibility on someone else, or something else, is an equivalent of introducing a deceleration (-a) to a situation from classical mechanics. Thus such pushing our responsibility out, directly leads to the dispersion (-E) of our moral energy. For totalizm, this practically means that a given our action decisively runs against moral laws. As this is explained in subsection I4.1.1, moral laws clearly attach the responsibility for everything to doers, putting this responsibility directly onto these people who are completing a given action, or in the presence of which a given event took place. Therefore, all attempts to push responsibility onto someone or something else, is the conduct decisively "immoral". As such, those who push responsibility onto others, are affected with appropriate punishing consequences served by moral laws. Therefore the findings of totalizm are very clear: in everything that we do, or in which we take part - but we fail to do anything, we take on ourselves the personal responsibility for all consequences that may raise from it. For example, if we take a part in a bank robbery, and during this robbery someone is killed, according to the findings of totalizm moral laws will charge us with responsibility for this death, even of in fact the person who killed was someone else.

In itself, responsibility alone is a separate "indicator of moral correctness" - see subsection A2.3. If it is used as such indicator of moral correctness, then as "**moral**" is qualified everything, for which we willingly take responsibility onto ourselves. In turn as "**immoral**" is qualified everything, for which the responsibility we try to push onto someone, or something, else. According to such definition of responsibility, in every life situations, in which we try to undertake an action, for which the responsibility we later try to push on someone, or something, else, this action runs sharply against moral laws. Also we should be aware that an action, which in itself is the pushing of responsibility on someone else, or on something else, runs sharply against moral laws as well. In such an immoral case, we should refry from the completion of this action, replace it with another action, for which we willingly are to take the entire responsibility onto ourselves, and then complete this replaced action.

Responsibility is immensely important moral quantity, which carries numerous meanings for totalizm. For example, there is a whole group of moral laws, which are based on

responsibility. (After all, in Physics there is also a whole class of physical laws, which utilise acceleration in their operations.) Some of these moral laws, which describe the action of responsibility, are already identified and explained in subsection I4.1.1.

One of the most significant consequences of the moral function of responsibility is, that it defines very unambiguously various models of totaliztic organising of public and social life. Because of the function of responsibility for moral motivating of people, as this is explained in subsections KA4.1 and KA4.2, totalizm strongly recommends that everything that we do in public and social life, must be done in the manner which inspires and maintains the sense of responsibility in individual people. Therefore totalizm must promote, amongst others, the following models of public and social life, which directly result from the morally motivative function of responsibility (these models are additionally described in subsections KA8.2 and KA7.1):

- Totaliztic model of governing. It is based on leadership of moral and wise individuals (selected in a democratic manner), and decisively it rejects the group governments conducted by all sorts of committees, councils, juntas, cooperations, etc. After all, governments of individuals stimulate and maintain the sense of individual responsibility, as this is explained in subsections KA8.2 and JD4.1. In turn all group governments are gradually dispersing, diminishing, and killing out, the sense of individual responsibility. Therefore the model of government, which is already in existence, and which is currently the closest one to totaliztic model of governing, is the so-called "presidential democracy". However, in the totaliztic model of governing, the ruling person is continually accountable for the precision, with which in all decisions and actions he/she is fulfilling moral laws, instead (as this is the case in current presidential democracies) being accountable for the extend in which he/she pleases the governed masses. After all, only the pedantic fulfilment of moral laws in everything that one does, leads to the development of totalizm and to the increase of quality of life, while the present pleasing of governed masses, always must finish with the development of parasitism and with a fall down - see subsection KA8.2.

- Totaliztic model of ownership. It is based on the ownership of individuals, and decisively rejects the group ownership, which presently takes the form of various companies, shares, communes, committees, boards, etc. After all, totalizm states that only individual ownership stimulates and develops the feelings of responsibility over owed properties. In turn group ownerships always gradually erode and eliminate responsibility. More on this subject is explained in subsection KA8.2.

- Totaliztic model of family. It is based on the traditional model of family. The family bounds are permanent and final (as previously people used to say: "blessed by God", and therefore in the initial assumption - for a whole lifespan), while every member of a given family shares the full responsibility over the fragment of family's fate that is assigned to him/her. This model reinforces the traditional moral values that were assigned to families. Also it promotes the clear division of roles and responsibilities in each family - so eagerly dismounted in recent years. For example it reinstates roles of "head of family" and "bread winner", although it leaves to individual families to decide, who is to fulfil which role. Moreover, it emphasizes the importance of "work over the quality of coexistence" and the value of marriages for a life, while disregards the temporary relationships and frequent changes of partners.

- Totaliztic model of justice. In this model everyone is personally responsible for good deeds, or destruction, that caused. There is no such things as bad influence of parents or environment, acting under the influence of drugs, acting while mentally unfit, group prizes, etc. It is based on the moral laws "you did, so you are responsible", "you did not prevent, so you are responsible", "you accomplished, so you rip rewards", "you managed to prevent a disaster, so you are awarded", etc.

By informing here about these models, which are resulting from the morally motivative function of responsibility that totalizm discovered, I am fully aware that they are exposed to attacks of all sorts of armchair critics. These critics most probably are going to argue that totaliztic models, by returning to traditional values, are actually ignoring the accomplishments

of modern sciences and latest social movements (about which, unfortunately, we do not know how much in them is human influence, and how much is manipulation of evil parasites described in subsection KB2). But all these critics should be aware that totaliztic models are based on moral laws, while all the modern sciences and social movements, quite decisively ignore the existence and action of moral laws. In turn we exactly know what happens, when someone starts to systematically ignore the action of laws of the universe, as this was well illustrated by the history of communism, feudalism, or slavery. For example, communism fell down in spite that it was ignoring only a small fraction of the laws of universe - namely it ignored only economical laws. In turn when one analyses the modern sciences and social trends, they ignore a whole large area of very important moral laws. Thus the outcome for them is rather predictable.

A9. Totaliztic handling of spiritual matters

Motto: "In an unknown territory we can be misled most easily".

As this is described in more details in subsection I5, according to the new Concept of Dipolar Gravity, human beings are composed out of three basic components, namely out of: (A) biological body, (B) counter-material body (by religions and folk wisdom called "spirit"), and (C) intelligent registers stored by the counter-matter from our counter-body (by religions and folklore named "soul"). Each single one out of these three basic components, has this property, that it displays its own needs, it obeys its own system of laws and rules, and it exerts its own influence on our lives. Therefore, according to totalizm, there are as many as three major dimensions, or components, to human lives. These are: (a) our physical activities, (b) our emotional life or feelings, and (c) our intellectual life. In addition to these three basic dimensions identified and recognised by totalizm, our culture and religious tradition distinguished one more dimension, or component of life, which traditionally was called "**spirituality**". This dimension was devoted exclusively to satisfy needs of human souls. Unfortunately, although religions recognised the existence of two non-physical components of human beings, called "spirit" and "soul", they were confused in differentiating one of them from the other, and in describing their functions. Therefore, even the name itself for this additional dimension (or component) of human lives that is devoted to needs of the soul, is expressing this religious confusion, because instead of being named "soululality" is named "spirituality". Thus, this traditional name by a mistake seems to suggest, that it serves to needs of spirit, not to needs of the soul. However, in spite that totalizm revealed the inadequacy of this name, for the respect to our tradition it is going to maintain it. It only limits itself to defining exactly, what by the name "spirituality" totalizm understands. But while keeping the traditional name, totalizm simultaneously clarifies the confusion, that actually "spirituality" concerns the needs of human soul, not the needs of human spirit (after all, soul and spirit are not the same).

In subsections A4 to A6 we discussed how according to totalizm we should shape our physical activities. Subsections A7 and A8 explained to us how in the light of totalizm we should conduct our feelings. Now there is a turn, to explain in this subsection, how according to totalizm we should conduct our spirituality.

In the old, non-totaliztic understanding of spirituality for everyday use, it is usually defined as: "spirituality is everything that serves the satisfying of needs of someone's soul". Unfortunately, in such a definition, spirituality is an "unpolarised" entity. This means, the definition of this term, does not impose any quality requirements on it. Also the use of this term does not subject it to any criteria of assessment. Therefore in this traditional, unpolarised definition of spirituality, there is no distinction between "moral spirituality" (means morally beneficial for us), and "immoral spirituality" (means morally destructive for us). In turn without a capability to distinguish between these two opposite poles of spirituality, such a traditional, unpolarised understanding of this concept allows to "push people into darkness". Such

pushing can be accomplished through persuading people into the completion of various practices or ceremonies, which could be claimed to be "spiritual" - because they have an indirect connection with "soul", but are enormously destructive to people. After all, as this is the case with all human activities, also activities qualified as "spiritual" can be either constructive or destructive, meaning in the understanding of totalizm either "moral" or "immoral".

Because of the wide spread of this "unpolarised" understanding of spirituality, so far under the terms "spirituality" and "spiritual activities" almost everyone understands something different. For some people, spirituality is to go to church every week, to put our own contribution to church's collection of money, and to participate in all important religious celebrations. For others, it is to eat vegetarian food and to be disgusted with people who eat meat. Further people are expressing their spirituality through regular meditations, or through refrying from sex. There are also people, who in the name of spirituality must belong to a specific religious sect, or to oppress believers of other religions. Etc., etc. Currently we have a real labyrinth of various understandings of spirituality, and different ways of fulfilling needs of the soul, in which an ordinary human being can easily get lost. Actually this confusing situation was introduced on purpose by the so-called "evil parasites" described in subsection A3, as in the spiritual confusion that we presently experience, it is easy for them to spread "parasitic spirituality" on Earth, means spirituality which is highly immoral and destructive for people. In this situation it is important that totalizm is introducing some sort of guiding recommendations or traffic signs, similar to tools which it is giving to us in respect to physical activities and feelings.

Because the Concept of Dipolar Gravity clearly defines, what human "soul" is (i.e. "registers in the counter-world" - see subsection I5.2), and what functions are fulfilled by it, totalizm is able now to define spirituality more precisely then the previous "unpolarised" traditional definition. Here is this totaliztic definition, which explains what actually totalizm understands by this idea: "**spirituality are all activities belonging to the <u>intellectual</u> dimension, that an intelligent being is carrying out in order to intentionally <u>shape</u> in the software registers from the counter-world, such <u>moral</u> algorithms and records that turn to be the most beneficial for the future fate of this being**". In order to express this with a different wording, totaliztic definition of spirituality explains in a decisively different (i.e. strict and qualifying) manner, what this idea actually means. The basic difference between the above, totaliztic definition of spirituality, and the previous, traditional definition, boils down to three matters, namely to the (1) belonging to intellectual dimension, (2) moral polarity of spirituality, and (3) shaping. Let us explain more exactly each one of these differences.

(1) <u>Intellectual dimension</u>. As this is explained in subsections G3, D11.8, A1, and A4.1, all activities of intelligent beings take place in so-called "moral space", which has three different dimensions, namely: (1) physical, (2) emotional, and (3) intellectual dimension. These three dimensions of moral space correspond to three dimensions of physical space, namely to (1) width, (2) depth, and (3) height. But in moral space every of these dimensions belong to a different component of us. And so, the physical dimension (1) belongs to biological body and to physical activities that this body carries out. The emotional or feelings dimension (2) belongs to our counter-body (i.e. to religious spirit) and to feelings that this counter-body generates. In turn the intellectual dimension (3) belongs to our registers (i.e. to religious soul) and to intellectual activities that it controls. For this reason, according to totalizm, all activities which are concerning our soul, and thus that are called "spiritual", must include a sizable intellectual component. Therefore totalizm is not qualifying to spiritual activities anything that only contains a physical effort (e.g. just carrying a heavy cross or figurine during religious celebrations), nor anything that contains exclusively emotional component or feelings (for example mutilating our body or self-whipping in the name of faith). In order to be qualified as spiritual, these activities must include also an intellectual component, means needs to be combined with thinking, reflecting, adding an intellectual purpose for it, etc. Simultaneously, the totaliztic definition of spirituality, includes into spiritual activities also these ones out of

intellectual nature, which previously were not considered to be spiritual, e.g. reading or learning about totalizm, or carrying out our live according to the requirements of totalizm. Notice, that the discovery of this important requirement by totalizm, that matters to be qualified to spiritual category must include a significant intellectual component, changes a lot in spirituality. Many areas, which previously were considered to be "spiritual", according to this discovery, are not spiritual at all, and have nothing to do with spirituality.

(2) Moral polarity. In this area totalizm decisively acknowledges that - as everything in our universe, also spirituality can be either "moral" or "immoral". Therefore, according to totalizm, not everything that is somehow connected with needs of souls, actually serves for the benefit of those who practice it. Thus totalizm advocates the need for a strict qualifying of all spiritual activities into categories "moral" or "immoral", similarly as it does with physical and with emotional activities. Then only "moral" spiritual activities should be carried out, while "immoral" should be converted into "moral" ones, or abandoned. This need for qualifying also spiritual activities is a very novel idea, which was introduced only by totalizm. Previously people used to believe, that "if something is spiritual, it must be good for you, so go for it". The outcome was this multitude of deviations that we now observe in spiritual matters.

(3) Shaping. In turn, in the area of "shaping of our software registers", totalizm states that every possible object (including in this not only all living creatures, but also all inanimate objects), contains in the counter-world a kind of software registers, which are continually updated with every event that this object takes part in. These registers are described more exactly in subsection I5.2. These registers have such meaning for the object that carries them, that in fact they decide about future fate of this object. Therefore, in the vital interest of everything that exists in our universe, is to take care that the updates that are recorded in these registers, are always beneficial. Only then the future fate of this being or object, is going to take a beneficial course. Such a drive to shape our own registers from the counter-world in possibly most beneficial manner, is an essence of shaping of our spirituality. Of course, in order to accomplish such a most beneficial shaping, given beings must mainly complete spiritual activities, which in totalizm are defined as "moral". For example, according to findings of totalizm to-date, these beings must live so that in every area of their spirituality they pedantically obey moral laws. In such understanding, examples of activities from the area of totaliztic spirituality include, amongst others, lifting our knowledge in disciplines which do not serve directly our income, or satisfy directly our bodily needs (for example, increasing our knowledge on totalizm), protection of our karmatic registers from generating karma that we would not like to take back - means leading a moral life, keeping open channels of communication between our mind and the universal intellect - means amongst others praying and listening to whispers of our conscience, searching for new directions in knowledge, creative activity, and many others. Totaliztic spirituality includes also, amongst others, all activities, which are giving measurable effects and benefits, which are not directly oriented towards physical needs of our body, nor emotional needs of our counter-bodies - see subsections I5.1 and I5.2.

The previous (non-totaliztic) understanding of spirituality conceals several destructive problems. The most dangerous out of them boils down to qualifying into spirituality the activities, which previously were unjustly called spiritual, although in fact which had nothing to do with needs of souls, because they were missing their intellectual component (means because they were pure physical activities, or pure emotional experience). For example, previously meditation was qualified as a spiritual activity, although in spite of its name ("meditate" means "think"), the most popular form of meditation actually depends on the complete elimination of thoughts, thus on the removal of intellectual component from it. Similarly is with vegetarianism, which in the previous form was usually a purely emotional activity, while as such it has not contained any intellectual component and thus it would not qualify for the totaliztic definition of "spiritual".

Another dangerous problem with the to-date understanding of traditional spirituality depends on the fact that practically no-one, nor nothing, so far clearly told people how to

distinguish spiritual activities which are fulfilling the totaliztic definition of "moral" activities, from the spiritual activities which fulfil the totaliztic definition of "immoral" activities. For example, if we find a way of adding an intellectual component to meditations and to vegetarianism, still so far no one was able to explain to us, how to distinguish such meditations, which are constructive - and thus "moral", from meditations, which are destructive - and thus "immoral". We also do not know which versions of, for example, vegetarianism extended by a intellectual component are constructive and moral, and which are destructive for health, and thus immoral. Seeing people, who whip themselves in the name of religion, pierce their tangs and cheeks for their God, or who mutilate their sexual organs, even if into their activities is added an intellectual component, still so-far we were not able to state unambiguously, whether they act morally, or immorally. Therefore, practically everything that somehow was connected with other world, so far was considered to be "good" spirituality - unless it visibly goes towards some crime or catastrophe.

With spirituality is a bit like with people who use computers. For the outside observer all of them look knowledgeable and busy with some constructive activities. But when one investigates more deeply, what actually these people are doing, then it turns out that only a part of them use computers wisely and constructively, as a tool of "moral" intellectual activities. This wise and constructive part of computer users, is writing useful programs, is using computers as tools of work or services that are needed by others, or is gaining necessary knowledge and information with the use of these computers. The remaining part of people, use computers foolishly, and even worse, for a destructive purpose, or for play. They write computer viruses, they sent nasty emails to other people, they crack codes in Pentagon and try to initiate a next world war, etc. Of course, in case of computers, experts already learned how to distinguish what type of these two activities a given person leads (although our legal system is not so clear about it). However, in relation to spirituality, we still need to find criteria of qualifying subsequent activities.

From the observations, which so-far totalizm managed to accumulate, for a criterion of qualifying someone's activities to a category "spirituality", or even worse to a category of "moral" or "immoral" spirituality, one **should NOT use** such indicators as:

A. Amount of time that one spends on prayers or in a temple/church/mosque. Although for totalizm prayers remain a main channel of communication with the universal intellect, during the prayers important is the intellectual component, and also the quality, effectiveness, and content, not a length, manifestation, or place in which it is carried out.

B. Loudness with which someone highlights his/her religiousness.

C. Manifestation with which someone completes his/her religious practices.

D. Positions in religious institutions that someone managed to accomplish.

E. Number of non-typical capabilities that someone managed to master - e.g. meditations, hypnosis, lying cards, ghost calling, crystal ball glazing, clairvoyance, forecasting, divining pendulum, making buzzing sounds, quoting holly books, etc.

F. Type of food that someone eats. For example, according to totalizm, thoughtless vegetarianism is not at all, an expression of someone's spirituality, but only an expression of obeying the manipulations of evil parasites - for details see descriptions from subsection D9. As it turns out, evil parasites from UFOs exploit spirituality as an excuse to force vegetarianism onto those people, whom these evil parasites chosen to rob from their life energy. The reason is that the life energy is (amongst others) a carrier for someone's taste habits and memory of emotional history. In the result, those UFOnauts who later use life energy robbed from someone who eats meat, are craving to also eat meat. But UFO civilisation eats only synthetic food. Thus a UFOnaut, who absorbs life energy robbed from such a meat-eater, goes through real tortures, because it feels to eat meat, while meat is not available in civilisations of evil parasites. For this reasons UFOs make all people, whose life energy is extracted and exploited by evil parasites, to NOT eat meat. In order to make this not eating of meat more justified, they push people into belief that not eating meat increases someone's spiritualism. However, in my to-date research completed on UFOs, I met numerous people, who do not

practice vegetarianism because they wish to be spiritual, but for a simple reason that after a UFO abduction they were hypnotically programmed to be disgusted with even a thought of eating meat. These people, although have nothing against eating meat, still are turned off with a great disgust each time they try to swallow even a smallest piece of meat. What I am trying to say here, is the conclusion of subsection D9 that vegetarianism is imposed on people by evil parasites described in subsection A3, only because meat eaters are useless for evil parasites as donors of life energy. But in order to logically justify the need for the exploited people to become vegetarians, evil parasites explain for them this need with the excuse of spirituality (although, when this excuse does not work, such people still are hypnotically forced to become vegetarians).

In my to-date search for criteria of distinguishing between really "spiritual", and "physical" or "emotional" that pretends to be "spiritual", and also between "moral" activities in the area of spirituality, from "immoral" such activities, so-far totalizm managed to develop the following criteria:

1. **The presence of intellectual component** (i.e. intellectual dimension) in a given activity, combined with the simultaneous motivating this activity to the good of our soul, or from the need of our soul. According to the totaliztic discovery of the basic condition of qualifying something to the category of spirituality, this something must completely fulfil the totaliztic definition of spirituality, especially it must include the intellectual component. This in turn means, that if we do something and we want it belongs to the category of spirituality, then this something must contain a noticeable portion of our own thoughts, understanding, mental justification, reflections, mental creativity, etc. According to this criterion, spirituality is not at all a thoughtless reciting prayer beads that were formulated by someone else, but spirituality is e.g. constructive communicating with the universal intellect in our own words and thoughts. Spirituality is not e.g. tiresome although thoughtless carrying a heavy cross or a figurine around a church, but is e.g. mental reflection on the suffering of Jesus, combined with the simultaneous carrying a cross to experience in person how painful must feel to be Jesus. Spirituality is not at all refrying from eating meat because we feel disgusted by meat, but it is spirituality to refuse for higher reason to eat a piece of meat for which we just have a temptation, but the calories of which are not needed by our obese body, combined with the simultaneous mental reflection that we devote this our refusal to extend the life of an animal that provides this type of meat. Actually, if one considers this criterion, then many activities which previously were claimed to be "spiritual", turns out to have nothing to do with spirituality. Examples include many forms of traditional prayers, religious festivals, typical thoughtless "meditations", majority of vegetarianism, and many more. Simultaneously, many activities which previously were not considered spiritual, actually belong to this category. As an example consider reading this monograph, or leading totaliztic life.

The above should be complemented with an information, that if it turns out that some activity does NOT fulfil the definition of "spiritual", because it does not contain an intellectual component, but for some reasons we wish, or are forced, to complete it, then it can be easily converted into spiritual in the totaliztic understanding, through adding to it morally oriented intellectual component.

2. **Constructive balance between spiritual activities and physical activities** or/and feelings. According to this criterion, as "moral" we should consider every type of spiritual activity, which either is extending and improving physical activities, capabilities, effectiveness, or feelings, in ourselves, or in anyone within our sphere of influence, or at least which is not causing a decrease in these activities, capabilities, effectiveness, or feelings in anyone out of all parties involved. In turn "immoral" spiritual activities are all activities which disorganise, suppress, or distort effectiveness or capabilities to act or to feel, either in ourselves or in anyone from our environment. Putting the same in other words, **"moral" is every well balanced spirituality which lifts upwards someone's physical potential or feelings, whereas "immoral" is every spirituality out of balance, which pushes physical potential or feelings down**. Examples of spiritual activities, which according to this criterion would be

decisively "moral" can be exercises type "tai chi" (or "kung-fu" ("wushu"), or "aikido", or "qi-gong"), which contain an intellectual component and simultaneously increase our physical capability and feelings, and which intensify our moral power, perseverance, resistance to pain, and self-defence capabilities. In turn examples of spiritual activities, which according to this criterion are decisively "immoral", can be, amongst others, permanent mutilation of ourselves with the intellectual justification that we do this in the name of religion, or installing in a given temple very loud speakers, which wake up everyone in the hours of the most effective sleep, and force everyone to subdue his/her own routine to the course of the prayers imposed by creators of given religion.

3. **Location of control**. According to this criterion, as "moral" should be considered every possible activity, including in this also "spiritual" activities, which are entirely under control of a person who carries them out. This means that a moral spiritual activity, is an activity which is carried out at the time and situation that this person chooses, and which is helping this person in accomplishing life goals that this person places for itself. In turn "immoral" are all these activities, to the completion of which a given person is somehow forced, and therefore which make more difficult accomplishing life goals by this person (i.e. which holds back, instead of helping, the accomplishment of these goals). Putting the same in other words, **"moral" are all these aspects of spirituality, the control over which is in the hands of people who carry them out, whereas "immoral" are all these spiritual aspects, which exert their control over people who carry them out, and thus which dictate to people what, when, and how they should do**. Therefore, for example, according to this criterion, "immoral" spirituality would be an addiction to everyday meditation (that contains intellectual component), which would force a given victim to meditate even when there would be a very important work to be done, i.e. when the outcome of this work would influence a lot in the life of this person. "Immoral" would be also an "absolution" which imposes on a sinner the duty of everyday going to church, in spite that this going would disorganise the life of a given sinner. In turn "moral" according to this criterion would be all motion exercises type of "tai chi", "chi-kung", "kung-fu", "aikido", "yoga", etc., which are a kind of motion meditation with intellectual component, that helps in accomplishing personal goals, and which would be carried out only in time that a given person would choose voluntarily, and which would not disturb anything that this person is doing.

4. **Gain or loss of moral energy**. According to this criterion, as "moral" we should consider every possible human activity, including into this number also activities which by people who complete them are considered to be "spiritual", which increase moral energy in at least one person involved, without simultaneous depletion of this energy in anyone out of people affected by this activity. In turn by "immoral" activity, one should understand every human activity, which depletes moral energy in at least one of the parties involved. In order to express the same with different words, **moral spirituality replenishes moral energy in all parties involved, or prevents the dispersion of this energy, while immoral spirituality depletes moral energy in at least one party involved**. Therefore, for example, according to this criterion, taking part in an aggressive crusade or a holly war, or attacking and killing a member of other religion, is an immoral activity - although defending ourselves from an aggressor which attacks us in the name of his god, is a moral activity, even if it requires killing our aggressors. Similarly, all forms of meditations or psychokinesis, which exhaust their participants and are dangerous for their health, are "immoral" activities. Immoral is also loud calling to conduct prayers carried out at 4 am, which wakes up and deprives the resting also all those people from neighbourhood who do not believe in such prayers. However, exercises, such as Chinese tai-chi, chi-kung, kung-fu, Japanese aikido, Hindu "yoga", etc., which replenish moral energy, carried out in proper circumstances, are "moral" type of activities.

5. **Karma**. According to this criterion, as "moral" we should consider every possible human activity, including in this also activities which by people who complete them are considered to be "spiritual", which generate karma that we are willing to accept back. In turn by "immoral" activity, we should understand every human activity, which generates karma that

we are not willing to accept back. In order to express the same with different words, **moral spirituality generates in the doer wanted karma, while immoral spirituality generates in the doer unwanted karma**. Therefore, for example, according to this criterion, aggression and killing someone in the name of God, even if this person is a heretic, is an immoral activity. In turn helping an orphan, or a sick person, are "moral" type of spiritual activities.

6. **The obedience of intentions of the universal intellect, objectively verifiable with "unanimity rule"**. In spiritual matters somehow happens so, that the more someone is wrong in them, the more is convinced that he/she is right but other people are at wrong. Therefore, the more someone's actions run against intensions of the universal intellect, the more this someone believes, that whatever he/she is doing is corresponding exactly to what the universal intellect asks us to do (i.e. such home-made gurus of spirituality usually believe that "I am right, all others are wrong"). In this matter, subsequent gurus, and sometimes whole religions and cults, behave similarly like this driver, who after the entering a highway hears a warning in the radio "attention, attention - some crazy man is driving on the highway against the traffic flow", for which he reacts with a scream of condemnation - "if only one - I see hundreds of them". But if a given spiritual activity is really morally correct, then it must obey the highly objective "unanimity rule" described in subsection A13. (This rule is an outcome of the "canon of consistency" described in subsection B7.4. The "unanimity rule" states that "if there is a specific situation or intention in a real life, then this particular situation or intention is unanimously judged to be either moral or immoral by all moral laws and by all indicators of the moral correctness, which are applicable to it".) This in turn means that with the use of this "unanimity rule", which works in the entire universe, the moral correctness of a given spiritual activity always can be objectively verified and confirmed. Furthermore, this verification and confirmation can be accomplished not with just one, but independently with several tools of totalizm. Putting this in other words, **a moral spirituality can be objectively confirmed as "moral" with the use of several different indicators/criteria of the moral correctness; also an immoral spirituality can be objectively disclosed as "immoral", simultaneously by several different indicators/criteria of the moral correctness**. In order to provide here an example, according to the content of subsection A6.4, the activity of accomplishing a resonance nirvana through meditations, represents an "immoral" spirituality. After all, it depends on repetitive gaining benefits, which someone does not earn - means it displays the disobedience of the moral law that "everything must be earned", and thus it disobeys the intension of the universal intellect (means it is "immoral" according to the criterion described in this item). Therefore, if one submits the activity of accomplishing resonance nirvana, and submits all circumstances which accompany it, to a judgement from any one of criteria described in this subsection, then after such an analysis, it must turn out, that it is judged to be an immoral activity by each of these criteria. For example, according to criterion 2 ("Constructive balance between spiritual activities and physical activities") listed before, resonance nirvana is immoral, because the skill of accomplishing it causes a drug-like kind of addiction - those who know how to accomplish it, begin to direct the whole their life to repetitively reach it. It is also immoral according to criterion 3 ("Location of control"), because at the moment when someone learned how to easily accomplish it, it takes over the life of this person and turns into a kind of drug-addiction. It is immoral even for criterion 4 ("Gain or loss of moral energy"), although the mechanism it uses is just based on the temporary boosting a level of moral energy. It is so, because the discovery of a method, by which one can boost his/her moral energy without any effort, and reap all benefits which come with it, in long term lead to a complete discouraging of a given person to increase his/her moral energy via a systematic labour and completion of multiple totaliztic good deeds. Finally, it is immoral also for criterion 5 ("Karma"), for several reasons explained in subsection I5.9. In addition to a resonance nirvana, also other examples of moral and immoral spirituality, provided in this subsection, document that if something is immoral, in fact it is immoral according to every single criterion, with the use of which it is categorised/judged (e.g. consider these loud speakers in temples, which wake up and order to pray in hours of the best sleep). In turn, if

something is moral, then the moral correctness of it is agreeably confirmed by all criteria simultaneously (e.g. consider these motion and mental exercises of type "tai chi", "chi-kung", "kung-fu", "akaido", "yoga", etc.). This in turn indicates, that also all previous examples of spirituality from this subsection, fulfil this immensely important for totalizm "unanimity rule" described before.

Although the above criteria represent only a humble beginning of totaliztic description of spiritual activities and morally correct spiritual behaviours, still they provide us with first indicators as to in which direction our spiritual activities should develop according to totalizm. This is especially important to people who practice totalizm. After all, "spirituality" is one of these areas, which are exploited most frequently by the evil parasites (as this is explained in subsection VB3 of monograph [1/4]), to push naive people into darkness. Therefore, before we ourselves start to practice some form of "spirituality", to which someone, or something, forcefully tries to convince us, claiming that it is good for us or for our soul, we firstly should check it with the use of the above definition and criteria, in order to objectively verify whether in fact it is "spiritual" and whether it is "moral".

A10. Let us listen and obey our organ of conscience

As this is explained in subsections A7.1 and I5.3, the new scientific theory called the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, which is described in chapters H and I, states that we have two different physical bodies formed from two different substances. These are: (1) the biological body - made of matter, and (2) the counter-body - made of counter-mater. (There is also a third human body - namely (3) "registers", but this one is made of programs and data, not of a substance, and resides in a "cyberspace" located inside of the counter-world.) The biological body resides in the physical world and we know it well because our awareness normally resides in it. In turn a counter-body resides in the counter-world, while our awareness sometime shift to it during hypnosis, or a dream. (Registers reside in the cyberspace from inside of the counter-world, and our awareness shifts to it only after our death.) So far our science taught us a lot about biological body. But is completely unaware of the existence of a counter-material body (not mentioning of registers). However, the Concept of Dipolar Gravity explains, that this counter-material body is equally complicated and equally important as our biological one. For example, it also contains various counter-organs, which perform strictly defined functions, and which significantly impact our lives. Several such counter-organs are described in subsection I5.3. The operation of many of them is equivalent of operation of organs from our biological body (e.g. similar to our brain, lungs, heart, limbs, etc.). But there are also counter-organs, which have very unique operation, that is not corresponding to the operation of any known biological organs. One of them is a counter-organ called "conscience". It is known to people for a long time, although our material-oriented science taught us to ignore it. But the counter-organ of conscience is extremely wise - much wiser than our biological brain. Actually its wisdom is almost equal to the omniknowledge of the universal intellect. After all, according to what is explained in subsection I4.2.1, conscience is a kind of "hot telephone line", which links us directly with the universal intellect (God). For example, it knows all the moral laws in existence, it also knows perfectly all the circumstances we are in, knows our thoughts and intensions, and also it knows future! Therefore, whenever we intend to do something, the conscience always shares with us the knowledge about this intension, and is giving us an emotional message, which tries to tell us, whether whatever we intend to do, is going to obey moral laws, or going to break moral laws, therefore whether it is "moral", or "immoral". Our conscience also always is warning us about dangers which are waiting for us, currently updates us regarding attributes, intensions and feelings of other people, whispers to us what the future is going to bring, etc.

The Concept of Dipolar Gravity informs us, that the conscience is enormously important counter-organ. According to this concept, our **conscience is a direct communication line,**

which links us with the universal intellect (God). In fact, without knowing this, via this counter-organ of conscience we receive direct answers of the universal intellect to every single question that we ask. The conscience is the only communication channel, with the use of which the universal intellect actually answers immediately and directly to everything that we ask. But as it is also the case with everything that the universal intellect does, the process of making this channel available to us is done very wisely and carefully. The channel is secured from being abused by people who do not deserve to use it. Namely the answers to our questions that are given through this channel, are always formulated in a very special language, which in subsections I4.1.2 and I5.4 of this monograph is called the ULT or the "language of God". But in order to learn this language at the conscientious level, and thus to receive the access to replies that the universal intellect is continually giving to our questions, it is necessary to constantly listen to our own counter-organ of conscience - in turn to such listening are capable only these people who are very moral (see subsection KA4.2). Through the aware learning of this ULT language, and through learning how to use it correctly, we are able to carry out two-way "conversations" with the universal intellect. Contrary to conversations in a spoken language, means to an ordinary "praying", these conversations in the ULT have two-directional character - they are not just our own monologue, but an active two-way conversations, in which we immediately receive answers to all questions that we ask. For more information on the topic of ULT and two-way communication with the universal intellect (God) see subsections I4.1.2 and I5.4 from volume 5 of this monograph.

The whole our lives we are pressured by the immoral world around us to learn to ignore, what the conscience is telling us. Therefore, only as young children we are able to determine errorless whether a given action is moral or immoral, and we reflect with whole our behaviour what our conscience is telling us. If, according to our conscience, as small children we feel guilty, then we also look guilty. But then education, interaction with immoral people, adulthood, and the need to earn for living, gradually teach us how to ignore what the conscience has to say to us, and how to not show on ourselves what it tells to us. After all, everyone around us seems to ignore this organ, so why we should not also do just that? The result is that eventually we kill this organ. In this way we start our slipping downhill in the moral field, and falling straight into claws of a dreadful moral illness called parasitism - as this is described in subsection KA4.2.

Totalizm uses only one rule of behaviour, namely: pedantically obey moral laws. Because our conscience always is whispering to us, how our action look in the light of these moral laws, totalizm is also saying: carefully listen and pedantically obey directives of your own conscience. According to totalizm, **"moral"** is everything that our conscience approves and asks us to do, while **"immoral"** is everything that our conscience forbids us to do. There is about a time we start to listen this forgotten organ, and start to do what it says. If we begin to carefully listen what it says, we are going to accomplish increasingly higher harmony with it, and the number and kinds of error free information that it starts to forward to us, is going to grow constantly.

There is one area of life, where totalizm does not develop, as yet, formal tools of selection, therefore recommends to totally depend in it, on directives of conscience. This area is the selection of a best method of accomplishing a given moral intension. For example, let us consider that someone is ill and we must decide how to take it to a doctor. After all, we can decide to use a bicycle - carrying this ill person on bicycle's frame, we can use a horse wagon, bus, ambulance, or even a helicopter. In such situations we need to ask our conscience, which one of these methods it directs us to choose. Totalizm says that whenever we choose a method of moral acting, we must be internally convinced that it was the most correct and the most appropriate to given situation we are in. Interesting that when arrives a situation when we need to do a selection amongst many morally correct actions, our conscience always errorless whispers to us, which action is the most proper. If we really take the action which it indicates, then not only everything goes right, but also we have a special feeling of internal peace and assurance, that we do what we supposed to do.

When in our lives we do exactly, what our conscience says to do, then one of the outcome is that the effort we put into this doing, gradually accumulates in our body a special type of energy. When the density of this energy exceeds a threshold value, then a moral reward described in subsection A2.4 is granted to us.

A11. Development of moral quantities: intelligence, moral power, etc.

All moral quantities which were described before, display some sort of relationship with moral energy. As such, they allow to accomplish various moral benefits, which directly depend on moral energy. For example, with their assistance one can accomplish happiness, feeling of self realisation, etc. - see subsection F2.1. However, there is also another group of moral quantities, which are indicated by the totaliztic mechanics, and which are allowing to accomplish various moral benefits that are not directly connected with moral energy. These quantities include, amongst others, intelligence, moral power, etc. This subsection is aimed at brief discussion of the manners in which one could develop or increase in himself/herself also these special quantities.

Intelligence (I), or moral mass. This can be increased in a manner described in subsection G3.2. In general, such an increase depends on developing in ourselves, or in person on which we are working, the quantities of the totaliztic mechanics, which directly influence the value of intelligence (I), and which are described by equation (1G3.2): $I=\Delta F/\Delta A$. These include sensitivity for feelings (ΔF), and also the permanency of our sense of responsibility (ΔA). Note that according to this equation $I=\Delta F/\Delta A$, especially important for our intelligence (I) is consistency in keeping the changes of our responsibility (ΔA) at possibly smallest range, and making these changes (ΔA) totally independent from changes of our feelings (ΔF) that accompany these changes of responsibility.

Moral power (W). This can be increased due to various hardening activities, for example thorough physical effort, resistance to pain, capability to voluntarily undertake and withstand fasting, etc. - see descriptions in subsection D1.

A12. No one is perfect, but it always is worth to try

In this way we reached the end of the most important volume of presentations on the present version of totalizm. These presentations explain how this moral philosophy is to be practised in our everyday life. The question is: can anyone implement straight away this philosophy in full 100%? My personal experience says that ... NO. No matter how simple, how correct, how moral, and how effective totalizm would be, the practical implementation of this new philosophy in our life will be a slow and gradual process. There is a number of reasons for this. Let us now discuss the most important of these.

The first reason for a gradual implementation of totalizm, is that no-one was born perfect, or can be perfect from the very beginning, thus everyone must earn his/her perfection in a laborious manner. In turn immediate implementation in 100% everything that totalizm recommends, would turn us into morally perfect people. Thus merging together the fact of our in-born imperfection, with the need to be perfect if one becomes 100% totalizt, practically means a slow and gradual process of embracing this philosophy. Therefore, before we learn how to lead a fully totaliztic life, there is a lot of mistakes, and lot of unsolved situations awaiting us, when even with the best intensions, we still fail to implement recommendations of this philosophy. But we should not worry about this too much, because "loosing one battle does not mean the loss of the entire war". Therefore, if on some occasions something does not go right, we should not give up, and try to learn from our losses, so that we can do better a next time.

The next reason for the slow process of the implementation of totalizm, is the fact that we all have a free will. We are the ones who are going to take the final decision what we should do. Therefore, independently what totalizm recommends us to do, our free will allows us to take any decision that we consider to be proper in a given situation, even if it runs exactly opposite to whatever moral laws and totalizm ask us to do. Although totalizm teaches us to obey moral laws pedantically, it also says that we have a free will to break these laws, if we are prepared to accept the consequences and punishments that one day are going to return to us for this breaking of moral laws. (Actually, it should be clarified here that moral laws will force these consequences upon us even if we are not prepared to accept them, as for sure we are going to be punished by these laws for every single instance of breaking them.)

Other reason for slow progress in implementation of totalizm is the fact that this is a demanding, specific, unambiguous philosophy, which imposes on the adherers a lot of clear requirements and restrictions, and thus is difficult for a full implementation in every moment of our lives. It requires to develop by adherers a habit of continuous thinking, analysis, considering, justifying, etc. (e.g. which our decision is going to increase our moral energy the most, which solution of current situation is obeying moral laws, what consequences and return brings a given our action, why we should do this - not something completely different, etc.). If one tries to characterize it, totalizm shifts limitations and requirements from thinking into actions and feelings; meaning it recommends that in our thinking we eliminate all our limits, breaks, and requirements, while we consequently impose these onto our actions and onto consequences of release of our feelings. This means that totalizm recommends to undertake continuous efforts to do only whatever increases someone's moral energy, and also to systematically eliminate own idleness and eliminate all these activities, which are to decrease someone's moral energy. In fact totalizm is much more rigorous and more quality-oriented than for example any of the religions that currently exists. It is also no comparison of totalizm to the easiness of parasitic living according to the line of the least intellectual resistance. For this reason, not everyone has enough strength and determination to practice totalizm in every moment of his/her life.

Another reason for slow process of implementing of totalizm, is a realistic awareness of this philosophy that it is still an imperfect one. Fact is that in the area of clarity, accuracy, verifiability, usefulness, and effectiveness of concepts and principles, totalizm is already far in front of everything that so-far was developed on Earth regarding moral issues (this practically means that totalizm is already much more perfect then any other known philosophy on Earth). Still, however, because totalizm is a realistic philosophy, it does not need to pretend that is absolutely perfect and without any errors. According to its mission, it can openly address the problem of its own imperfection - see subsection B8. After all, totalizm is only a further strict scientific discipline. As we know from the history of science, in all scientific disciplines only a fraction of the knowledge that it gathered at a given moment of time, is fully correct. Another fraction or part of this knowledge is partially correct and partially incorrect. In turn the last fraction, or part, of a given discipline, is later found to be totally incorrect. Unfortunately, in a given moment of time no-one knows which parts of a given discipline are belonging to which one of these three categories. By analogy to other scientific disciplines, no realistic person would negate that some proportions of correctness and incorrectness must also be embedded into totalizm. Only future research and further development of totalizm are able to detect which parts of this philosophy are correct, and which ones need to be changes and corrected. Only very laborious process of identifying and removing the existing mistakes, will allow to repair all present imperfections of this philosophy. However, most probably, during the removal of the current imperfections, further sources of errors most probably will be introduced. So, similarly as this happens with all other scientific disciplines, also totalizm never reaches the state of absolute perfection. Knowing the fact that similarly to every other scientific discipline, realistically speaking also totalizm must include some errors and specific proportion of imperfections, people who practice this philosophy must take this under account. This means that even if we would do everything in life exactly as totalizm recommends it to be done, still

only a specific proportion of what we would do would be exactly aligned with the content of moral laws and with the intensions of the universal intellect. Fortunately for totalizm, only on the basis of what it determined so-far, we know that these people who are practising any other philosophy that exists on Earth today, including philosophies of religions, create even more discrepancies with the moral laws than totalizts do. After all, other philosophies do not even know about the existence and operation of moral laws.

The next reason why implementing of totalizm is so difficult, is the lack of time that we all experience. If we try do everything in a moral manner, unfortunately it would require from us much more time, than doing it in any other manner, namely than compromising it, doing it on principles of "choosing a smaller evil", leaving it undone, or simply doing it in an immoral way. But each day has only 24 hours. Therefore, in our lives we are continually forced to prioritise our actions, and to choose only these matters for implementation, which for us are the most important. In turn, when we use the order of priorities in our activities, surely only the most important activities are completed thoroughly and with full consideration to moral laws. All these activities, which carry a smaller priority to us, we may be forced to do only "briefly", on principles of a "smaller evil", as a compromise, or even in an immoral manner. There will be also a group of matters, which we need to leave completely unattended because of the lack of time - in spite that the totalizm recommends to complete everything in a moral manner. Of course, after we shift some activities beyond the scope of what we can implement, amongst others we attain the effect that for these matters we are not able to fulfil whatever moral laws request from us. This means, that in our life we are capable to implement morally only a fraction of duties which constantly are bombarding us. The natural consequence of this inability to implement everything that we are connected to, means that in fact we never are able to conduct ourselves 100% moral.

Another reason why the implementation of totalizm may turn to be laborious and lengthy process, is the fact that we live in especially barbaric times. Around us parasitism is raging, immorality is spreading, and man to man becomes a wolf. Thus, practically in the world we live today, no matter how much we would try, still from time to time we must break moral laws for several different reasons. For example, the most frequent reason why we need to break moral laws, is our survival. After all, in our everyday life, we started to be similar to gladiators in ancient Rome - means in order to survive we must not allow others to kill us. As we know, gladiators in Roman times could not obey all moral laws, simply because they would need to allow to kill themselves during some fights. **Totalizm teaches us to live for it, not to die for it**. This means that when our survival is at the stake, not always we have a choice to act morally. Other frequent reason for breaking moral laws is the increasingly larger number of situations is everyday life, which fulfil the definition of "you or me" - as described in subsection D8. In situations of this type, if we are not on the defending side, no matter what we choose or do, the result is going to decrease someone's moral energy.

Taking all this under account, can totalizm be angry with us, when we fail to "pedantically obey moral laws" all the time? Of course that not! Leading a life that is coinciding with recommendations of totalizm is a gradual and laborious process, not a single effort. Totalizm knows that everyone is only a human and that everyone must still learn how to lead a moral life. If, from time to time, we fail in doing something right, it is not a reason to be discouraged, nor to believe that we are failing as totalizts. After all, about the final outcome of our life decides a mean value of all actions and behaviours, not just only those ones which did not come right for us.

Remembering all the time, that we are born imperfect and that totalizm is a laborious process - not a one-time effort, here is a few last advices of totalizm for these moments when in spite of trying everything, we are forced to break moral laws. According to totalizm, in such times we should bear in mind the following:

1. Be aware that we break moral laws. Furthermore, be aware why exactly we are breaking moral laws, how we break them, and what punishments and consequences are

going to be for such breaking (there are always punishments for breaking moral laws, similarly as there are always rewards for obeying them).

2. Try to remember about the karma which is going to return to us, because of this breaking of moral laws. So when we break these laws, we should do it in such a manner that the karma we generate is acceptable for us, when it returns back to us (e.g. we should rather wound than kill, compare to criteria rather than judge, give choices rather than decide for others, impose conditions rather than refuse, etc.).

3. Compensate for the effects of our breaking of moral laws. For example, if the effects include the loss of our moral energy, then we should undertake additional actions, which renew the moral energy that we loose. If the effects include the loss of something by someone else, then we should undertake efforts, which allow this someone could somehow regain whatever he/she lost, or receive a fair compensation for it.

4. Find a most important reason why we are forced to break a specific moral law. Then we should try to disclose and reveal this reason to others, so that it is learned by other people and in the effect gradually eliminated from further doing a damage to people.

5. Undertake a fight with whatever forces us to break moral laws. The fight should be aimed at removing the power from whatever forces us to break moral laws, and neutralizing it, so that in future the situation is gradually improved, and that other people are not forced to break these moral laws.

Respecting the above guidelines causes that even breaking moral laws in totalizm is occurring according to different rules than in parasitism (parasitism is described in chapter KA).

A13. So let us summarise what we have learned so-far from the content of this volume

This brief subsection is just to summarise most basic ideas, expressions, and words of totalizm, which we learned studying this volume. In order to notice easier this new terminology of totalizm in the text below, explanations for each one of them are emphasised with bold letters **(like this one)**. Of course, each one amongst these basic ideas and words is thoroughly explained in various chapters of this monograph, so that if someone chooses to adopt totalizm in his or her life, he or she needs to understand perfectly each one of them. Because of these comprehensive explanations that are provided in other areas of this monograph, this subsection provides only the bare minimum about each idea and each word - just enough for the reader to know what this is all about. But if you notice that you still get entangled in the brief descriptions from this subsection, and find these descriptions too theoretical, you should not hesitate to skip through them without reading, and proceed directly to the next volume. Only later, when you meet a word that you do not understand, try to return to this subsection, and find out what this word actually means.

The most basic fact, which can be proudly announced regarding totalizm, is that - otherwise than this is the case with almost all other philosophies, totalizm was never "invented", or "given" to us. Totalizm is simply an outcome of applying a new scientific theory, called the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, to everyday life situations. (The Concept of Dipolar Gravity is described in chapters H and I.) Totalizm was derived from this new Concept of Dipolar Gravity, in a manner similar like in physics are derived new equations, which describe the universe around us. Thus, new findings of this concept, are the major source of such a huge effectiveness and success of totalizm. For example, one of the most vital contributions, that this new Concept of Dipolar Gravity introduced to totalizm, is the discovery of the so-called "**moral field**" that previously remained unknown. This moral field, alike the gravity field, is also a primary field of our universe. It behaves similar to the gravity field, but it interacts with thoughts, motivations, attitudes, and feelings of people (instead of interacting with objects and masses - as the gravity field does). Moral field is a mirror copy of gravity field. Similarly like this is the case when masses are moved upwards, or uphill, in the gravity field, also someone's motivations can be moved upwards, or uphill, in this newly discovered moral field. When such

an uphill movement of motivations occurs, a specific moral effort, or work, needs to be done. The reason is that this newly discovered "moral field" has a structure very similar to gravity field. It allows to clearly distinguish, which our mental efforts are going upwards, and which our intentions are going downwards in this moral field. Namely, when someone's motivations are going downward in the moral field, then similarly as when someone goes downward in the gravity field, NO work of lifting needs to be completed. Thus a downhill motion in the moral field is easy, effortless, and pleasurable. In turn an upward movement in the moral field always requires an effort to be put into it.

The fact that the Concept of Dipolar Gravity disclosed existence of the moral field, bears countless practical implications for us. Let us now list a few most important of these implications. For example, the existence of moral field explains why there are **two moral poles** in everything that takes place in our universe. This means that the operation of moral field explains, why everything that takes place in our universe, is either "moral", or is "immoral". Well, when one realizes that there is such thing as this moral field, which is a kind of a steep field similar to gravity, then every motion that is done within the range of this field, must either go uphill, or go downhill, in this moral field. The moral field is somehow so designed, that everything that goes uphill in this moral field, simultaneously fulfils the definition of being "**moral**". In turn everything that runs downhill in this moral field, simultaneously fulfils the definition of being "**immoral**". For this reason, at the moment when we begin to understand the concept of moral field, we also start to understand clearly the concepts of "moral" or "immoral". Furthermore, the moral field allows also to establish precisely, what is more, or is less, moral or immoral from something else. For example, the more moral from others are all these activities, which run more steep uphill in the moral field (in turn, for immoral things: the more immoral from others are all these activities, which run more steep downward in the moral field). Because when we go uphill in any possible field, including also this moral field, we need to put a significant effort (work) into this motion, the existence of the moral field causes that "**everything that is moral, is also difficult to accomplish, and requires an effort to be put into it**", and "everything that is immoral, is also easy to accomplish, and does not require any effort to be put into it". (Notice that these rules apply to everything that is moral or immoral, e.g. to peace and war, to truth and lie, to improving and spoiling, to earning and stealing, etc.)

The moral field shines a totally different light onto the totaliztic understanding of "moral" or "immoral" human actions. The reason is that, because of the existence of the moral field, no human action in itself, is neither "moral" or "immoral". This action only becomes "moral" or "immoral" in the effect of motion that it undergoes in the moral field (i.e. the action is "moral" - when it ascends upward in the moral field, or "immoral" - when it descends downward in the moral field). In turn a **current configuration of the moral field, depends on the circumstances in which a given action takes place**. This means, that whether a given action is "moral", or is "immoral", in totalizm depends entirely on the configuration of momentary circumstances, in which a given action is carried out, and does not depend on the action itself. In the light of totalizm, exactly the same action, one time can be "moral", another time can be "immoral" (as an example consider slapping someone who lost conscience, and slapping an anonymous passer by who is peacefully walking on a street, or digging a garden and digging a public road). Therefore, in order to qualify a given action to a category "moral" or "immoral", totalizm requires from us to learn exact circumstances, in which this action occurs. Totalizm never allows to consider actions in separation from circumstances in which they occur, and always requests to carefully determine how these actions are relating to the moral field that is formed by these circumstances. All mistakes in the correct qualifying actions to categories "moral" or "immoral", according to totalizm, always result from errors in our evaluation of circumstances, and thus the moral field, in which these actions are to take place.

The existence of moral field, and the existence of clearly defined moral poles (i.e. the pole "moral" and the pole "immoral"), causes that every form of human activity can be carried out either in a moral manner, or in an immoral manner. Therefore, all manifestations of human activities which we see around us, we can, and we definitely should, qualify to one of two

basic categories, namely to "moral" or to "immoral". And so, in life we meet people who intuitively or intentionally practise a moral philosophy called here totalizm, and other people who practise a highly immoral philosophy called here parasitism. Such moral people this monograph calls "**totalizts**", while such immoral people it calls "**parasites**". All intelligent organisms, in this monograph called "**intellects**", can and should be classified into one of these two major classes of totalizts or parasites. For example, there are managers of various institutions, or politicians, whom the philosophy that they practice qualifies either into the category of totalizts, or into the category of parasites. There are even entire institutions, and even countries, which because of the philosophy that dominates in them, qualify themselves as either totaliztic institutions or countries, or parasitic institutions or countries. Of course, there are also scientific institutions, as well as individual scientists, which in every their activity intuitively climb uphill in the moral field, and thus practice the moral science that we should call the "totaliztic science". But there are also scientific institutions and individual scientists, which should be called "parasitic science". For this parasitic science and parasitic scientists, in everyday life already a popular name was coined of the "**orthodox science**". Therefore, this monograph keeps this popular name, only clarifying in subsection H10 what exactly one should understand by it. (Notice that the philosophy that is adhered by the science and by scientists commonly named "orthodox science", is definitively a philosophy of parasitism. Thus, according to subsection H10, the name "orthodox science" is actually a polite synonymous to a name "parasitic science".) People, institutions, and entire countries, may act morally telling truth, practicing peace, and doing good deeds, or may act immorally – lying, instigating wars, and spreading evil. Although this qualifying into categories "moral" or "immoral" is actually carried out by the behaviour of interested parties themselves, we, means people who are affected by this behaviour, in our own interest should start to notice it, categorise it, and name it correctly. After all, when such qualifying and naming is correctly accomplished, it becomes obvious for us, what we should expect from this people, institutions, or countries, and how we should relate to them.

The existence of moral field puts also a different light on such human behaviours as "**going along the line of the least intellectual resistance**", and "going against the line of the least intellectual resistance". As we know jolly well, many humans prefer to live their lives by "going along the line of the least intellectual resistance" - as this is an effortless and pleasurable kind of behaviour. But if one analyses this behaviour from the point of view of moral field, then it turns out, that going along the line of the least intellectual resistance, is equal to going downhill in this moral field. Therefore, this is a decisively "immoral" type of behaviour. The reason is that, the line of the least intellectual resistance represents the path downhill, along the steepest gradient/slope of moral field. In this way, by knowing a simple rule, that "moral is everything that goes against the line of the least intellectual resistance", now we start to understand, why one of the recommendations of totalizm states: "in all matters always do the exact opposite to what the line of the least intellectual resistance prompts you to do" (see subsection A4.1).

While addressing the matter of motion along the line of the least resistance, it should be mentioned that totalizm distinguishes as many as three different such lines. For moral phenomena these lines are equivalents of three basic dimensions from the three-dimensional physical space designated by a height, width, and depth. (In three-dimensional moral space equivalents of these three physical dimensions are intellectual effort, physical effort, and feelings.) A **line of the least intellectual resistance** is that one, which requires the least mental effort, meaning the least thoughts, memory, knowledge, logic, etc. It is usually selected by immoral people and other immoral intelligent beings. The extension of this line in the opposite direction is the line of the highest intellectual effort. This one is selected to be followed by people of highly moral philosophy. In turn a **line of the least physical resistance** is the one, which requires the least physical work (thoughtless type). Along the line of the least physical resistance always move the untamed nature (e.g. by rivers flowing downhill of mountains, by electricity, etc.), and especially lazy people. The extension of this line in the

opposite direction is <u>the line of the highest physical effort</u>. This one is selected in action of people usually described as "workaholics", or less politely as "strong but stupid". Finally a **line of the least emotional resistance** is the one, which requires the smallest contribution of feelings into a given action. Along the line of the least emotional resistance always act people usually called "cold" or "deprived of feelings". The extension of this line in the opposite direction is <u>the line of the highest emotional contribution</u>. This one is selected in action of people usually described as "exalted", or less politely as "hysterics". In relationship to moral field, all these three lines run in three different directions, namely all of them are mutually perpendicular to each other - see their more comprehensive descriptions in subsection A4.1. Out of all three of them, only the line of the least intellectual resistance (and also the line of the highest intellectual effort) are coinciding with the greatest gradient/slanting of the moral field slope. As examples of these three lines consider two methods of sewing tens of buttons to a new suit: (1) with hands, using an ordinary needle and thread, and (2) with a sewing machine. The hand sewing would be more aligned to the line of the least intellectual resistance then machine sewing, because it almost does not require any mental and technical skills, although it requires putting a sizeable physical effort. In turn the machine sewing would be more aligned with the line of the least physical resistance then the hand sewing, because it almost does not require any contribution of physical effort, but it requires putting an intellectual effort. But when during the completion of any of these methods someone missed the button and sewed his/her own finger, then for example, responding in an anger he/she could throw the suit to a rubbish tin, acting along the line of the least emotional effort. Of course, in real-life, various current circumstances would additionally alter the course of the moral field, making it to run closer to one of these two ways of sewing. Humans and other intelligent beings must be aware of the existence of these three different lines of the least resistance, in order to be able to determine what is good for them, means to be able to choose actions, which are "moral" because they are "running against the line of the least intellectual resistance" and "along the line of the highest intellectual effort". (But notice that whatever "runs against the line of the least physical or emotional resistance" and "along the line of the highest physical or emotional effort" is NOT "moral" at all.)

When we start to analyse such ideas, as moral field, going along the line of the least intellectual resistance, motion of our motivations within moral field, etc., then we notice that there are definite regularities in ways these ideas relate with each other. Two examples of such regularities we already brought to light before, when we discovered that "everything that is moral, always runs uphill in the moral field", or that "everything that is moral, is difficult to accomplish, and requires an intellectual effort to be put into it". These regularities are very similar to these ones, which are described by physics, when it analyses gravity field, potential energy, motion of masses in gravity field, etc. Because physics named the regularities that it describes, with the term "laws", therefore totalizm introduced a term "**moral laws**". By the term "moral laws", we should understand laws, which describe mutual relationships between basic ideas explained in this subsection, such as moral field, moral energy, motivations, feelings, intellects, motion of human motivations within moral field, etc. As everything from this subsection, also moral laws will be explained in more details in the further parts of this monograph (see subsections B3.3 and I4.1.1).

Moral laws clarify even further the position of moral poles. Because of the existence and operation of these laws, as "moral" must be defined everything that is agreeable with the moral laws. In turn as "immoral" must be defined everything that runs against moral laws. In the light of these new definitions, the only rule of totalizm to "pedantically obey moral laws" can be simplified to the rule "**do in your life only these things, which totalizm defines as moral**".

The existence and operation of moral laws, places people in the situation of necessity of making continuous choices regarding their behaviour in relation to these laws. After all, in whatever people do, they can either choose to do it in such a manner that obey these moral laws, or do it in such a manner that they disobey these laws. This means that people can

either in their lives mainly do mentally difficult and laborious things that run against the line of the least intellectual resistance, and thus is agreeable with moral laws, or mainly do mentally pleasurable and effortless things that run along the line of the least intellectual resistance, but are contradictory to moral laws. In turn these two choices of basic behaviours in life, lead to the development in people two opposite philosophies of life, or two opposite stands concerning everyday living. In this monograph these two opposite philosophies are called "totalizm" and "parasitism". **Totalizm** is the philosophy of life, or the stand taken about the way of conducting our lives, which says that we always should "pedantically <u>obey moral laws</u>" - means that we always should do only things which run upward in the moral field, or which totalizm describes with the use of word "moral". Thus totalizm chooses to complete only these actions, which are agreeable with our current priorities and preferences, but which run <u>against</u> the line of the least intellectual resistance, and therefore which constantly require from us to put significant effort and labour in everything that we do.

(It should be stressed here that the moral, peaceful, positive, constructive and progressive totali**z**m described in this monograph, in all languages should be spelled with the letter "z". This letter distinguishes it clearly from the whole array of very destructive parasitic philosophies, which usually are described under the name of "totalitarianism", but sometimes are also referred to with the word totali**s**m, but spelled with the letter "s". For the same reason all words related to "totalizm", such as "totalizt", "totaliztic", etc., also should be spelled with the use of letter "z".)

Depending on how a given person knows about the existence and operation of the moral laws, which this person obeys in his/her actions, totalizm can be further subdivided into "intuitive totalizm", and "formal totalizm". **Intuitive totalizm** is the one, in which people at the conscious level are unaware of the existence of moral laws, therefore they intuitively obey these laws only because their counter-organ of conscience is telling them to do so (for details see descriptions from subsection A10, I4.1.2 and I5.3). In turn **formal totalizm** is a philosophy, in which people learned cognitively about the existence of moral laws, know that there is such thing as totalizm, and also know already various tools that totalizm offers to them, to obey moral laws better. Therefore they obey moral laws in a fully aware, intellectual manner, through the everyday application of various tools that the philosophy of totalizm is equipping them with for a more effective living according to the requirements of these laws.

The introduction of the name "totalizm" for the positive philosophy described in this monograph, has this consequence that it forms the need to introduce also several further names which are outcomes of totalizm. For example there is a need for the term that should be spelled as "**totalizt**", and "totalizts", to denote a person, or people, who adhere to totalizm. If we would like to specify, which one out of two basic versions of totalizm a given person practices, we could use names "intuitive totalizt", or "formal totalizt". There is also a need for introducing the qualifier "**totaliztic**" for describing all attributes and subjects, which relate to totalizm, or originate from totalizm. Although these words in the first moment may seem unfamiliar to our eye, with time we get used to their spelling, while they allow to distinguish excellently subjects discussed in this monograph, from terms like "totallist", "totallists", or "totallistic", which are used by a negative philosophy that bears a similar name, and also are used by some other unrelated concepts.

Parasitism is a philosophy of life, or the stand taken about the way of conducting our lives, or a type of moral disease, which represents the exact opposite of totalizm. (This is why parasitism is a major adversary, or enemy, of totalizm, and also why parasites always instinctively attack totalizts, and try to destroy them.) Parasitism takes a stand that in life we should "<u>disobey every possible law, unless forced to do otherwise</u>". This means that the adherers of parasitism disobey moral laws, as well as disobey every other kind of laws about which they believe they can get away without obeying them. Parasitism does not need to be learned, or intentionally practised, as it always appears naturally when a given person, or group intellect, follows the line of the least intellectual resistance, and refuses to obey whatever it should, thus rolling itself effortlessly down the slope of moral field. After all, such

effortless rolling downhill in moral field requires that a given person must refuse to obey anything that it should obey (i.e. refuses to obey anything that requires putting an intellectual effort into it). But in spite that it eventuates naturally, parasitism is a distinct philosophy, which has a recognizable form, and which always displays the same set of distinct philosophical features - see chapter KA. For example, adherers of parasitism almost never follow any rule (or more strictly, they always follow the rule "to not follow any rule"), they always act at their internal impulses, they always choose the solution, which is the easiest way out, they always willingly do only these things, which bring them power over other people, wealth, or fun, and they always viciously attack adherers of totalizm over whom they feel to have some advantage of power (although they never attack anyone that they consider to be stronger than them, as this would require an effort and courage - quantities that they never spare). Parasitism is naturally acquired by all these people, who believe that in life they should do only pleasurable things, which require little effort, or no effort at all. Unfortunately for the parasites, all pleasurable things by definition must run along the line of the least intellectual resistance. Therefore, these things slide the person who does them, steeply downwards in moral field. Of course, one cannot infinitively fall downhill. Therefore practising a parasitism always finishes with a catastrophe (on a similar principle, as solar systems, which always follow the line of the least resistance, at the very end always reach the state of an astronomical "black hole"). For this reason, in the light of totalizm, practising a "refined parasitism" is even worse than living an immoral life. This is because these ones who live immoral lives have limits how bad they could be, while these ones who practice parasitism, have almost no limits for their evilness. It is rather shocking, that in spite of being so anti-moral, parasitism is so dominant presently on Earth, and that everything, starting from our mass media, and finishing on numerous religions, are promoting parasitic ways of living. To make it even more anti-moral, in order to be able to lead such a pleasurable life, people who adhere to parasitism, always need someone else who does all the work for them, while they only reap fruits of this work and do nothing. Therefore adherers of parasitism can only survive, if they turn others into slaves, and then live from these slaves by exploiting them in a thousand and one different ways. This is the reason why, the adherers of this philosophy, are called "**parasites**" in this monograph. Because of this necessity to have slaves who work for them, parasites lead lives of intelligent parasites. (This parasitic life is the reason for the name "parasitism" being used to describe their philosophy.)

Depending on the way how parasites disobey moral laws, there are two versions of parasitism. In this monograph they are named the "primitive parasitism" and the "refined parasitism". **Primitive parasitism** is the one, in which adherers do not know yet about the existence of moral laws. Therefore they disobey these laws simply by brutal breaking them. People on Earth currently practice primitive parasitism. In turn **refined parasitism** is the one, when the adherers already know about the existence of moral laws, therefore they do not break them, but carefully work their way around them. If parasitism is practised by a large institution, a country, or a whole civilization, we call it **institutional parasitism**. Institutional parasitism has this terrible property, that it forces parasitism on everyone who is within sphere of influences of a given parasitic institution. Therefore, if institutional parasitism overtakes a whole civilisation, then there is no escape from this moral disease, and everyone must become a parasite, while the whole such civilization finally must self-destruct itself.

In order to lead a highly moral life, totalizts need some kind of indicators which tell them which their intentions are moral, and which are immoral. In this way totalizm developed several different "**indicators of moral correctness**". These indicators are simply various moral quantities (e.g. forms of moral energy), which allow to judge morally human actions. A good example of them is a concept of "sins" (and its opposite - means "good deeds"), which for the majority of religions on Earth are the only indicators of the moral correctness that these religions use. Totalizm either discovered these indicators by itself, or adopted them from other areas. They tell everyone who wishes to know, what is moral, and what is immoral in the light of totalizm. Thus they indicate clearly, what is OK to do - according to totalizm, or what totalizt

should not do at all. Totalizm already uses several such indicators, and further ones are in the process of being identified and introduced (see subsection A2.3). Examples of these already in use include: (1) <u>moral field</u> (i.e. totalizm considers to be "moral" everything that is going upward in the moral field) - note that the so-called <u>line of the least intellectual resistance</u> is a line which passes downhill along the steepest slope of the moral field, and thus which indicates what is the most "immoral" in a given situation, (2) <u>moral energy</u> (i.e. totalizm considers to be "moral" every action that increases the amount of moral energy accumulated in counter-bodies of all people affected by this action, or that prevents them from the decrease of this energy), (3) <u>karma</u> (i.e. "moral" is everything that produces a karma that we are happy to accept back), and several further such indicators. The wonderful thing about our universe is that everything in it is either moral, or immoral. Therefore, if something is moral, than all these indicators confirm to us unanimously that this is moral. In turn if something is immoral than all these indicators confirm to us unanimously that this is immoral. This "**unanimity rule**" makes the life of totalizts much easier and simpler, because whenever they face a life situation, that they do not know whether the intention they wish to complete is moral or immoral, they always have a whole array of indicators to guide them, so that they do not make errors in their judgement, and thus they avoid doing immoral things.

The next idea, which is the outcome of moral field, is intelligent **moral energy**. We can understand this moral energy better, if we consider a case of moving something upwards, or downwards, in gravity field (gravity field is very similar to moral field). Such a motion within the range of gravity field causes, that we always either accumulate, or disperse, a form of energy, which in physics is called "potential energy". For example, if we would like to lift a heavy load uphill in gravity field, we either need to use an electric motor, which consumes (for this lifting) a specific amount of electrical energy (that we need to pay for), or we need to lift it on our back, thus consuming a specific amount of our own biological energy (which we need to get from our expensive food). Similarly is with moral field. If we move with our actions uphill in this moral field, we accumulate via these actions a specific amount of moral energy (in totalizm this moral energy sometimes is also called "**zwow**"; the term "zwow" is an abbreviation from the Polish words "**Z**asob **WO**lnej **W**oli" - meaning the "amount of free will"). In turn when we do something that moves downhill in this moral field, then we disperse from ourselves an appropriate amount of moral energy. Of course, the concept of intelligent moral energy is much wider, and includes all possible cases of completing a moral work, or an immoral work. The detailed description of this concept is carried out in several large subsections - e.g. see subsections B3.2, I4.3, G3.7, G7.

Moral laws have a **punishment** embedded into them, for those who disobey them. This means that everyone, who disobeys them, is automatically punished. As this emerges from the to-date research of totalizm (a part of which is presented in subsection D12.1), this punishment for the disobedience of moral laws, is completed in two portions, present and eternal. The first portion of it is served to guilty people, when they are still in their physical life, while the second portion is served later, after they die. This heavy punishment is also served to people who disobeyed moral laws only because they are not aware of the existence of these laws (means that our lack of knowledge about moral laws does not prevent us from being punished for breaking these laws). Apart of the activities of "evil parasites" described in subsection KB2, this constant punishment, which we are receiving from these laws, is the reason why the life on Earth is so miserable and so full of suffering. Therefore in our life we basically have two choices: namely to either obey moral laws and to live a happy life, or to disobey them and to receive a heavy punishment for disobeying them. For this reason **totalizm is not just a philosophy which teaches us how to live a moral life, in which we pedantically obey moral laws, but also a philosophy, which teaches us how to live a happy life, in which we enjoy a variety of rewards resulting from the obeying moral laws, and do not need to suffer because we received heavy punishments served for every disobedience of these laws**.

Moral laws have also **rewards** embedded permanently into them, for their obedience. This means that for obeying every single moral law, several joyful benefits are being automatically added to our life, and to our future fate. The most important of all benefits, that the pedantic obeying of moral laws can bring to a totalizt, is the totaliztic **nirvana** described in subsection A6. But there are also numerous other rewards as well, which are described in subsections A2.4 and F2.1 of this monograph. As this emerges from the to-date research of totalizm (a part of which is presented in subsection D12.1), also the rewarding for obedience of moral laws is served in two doses, present and eternal. The first dose of rewards we receive when we are still conducting our present physical life. In turn the second dose of these rewards we are receiving after death - in our eternal life.

Moral laws do not know **forgiveness**, or mercy, which for the political reasons is falsely claimed by various religions. These laws rigidly punish everyone, who disobeys them, and consistently reward everyone who obeys them. What by some people could be taken as a forgiveness, is actually a lack of immediate punishments from moral laws, which results from a time delay embedded into these laws. Otherwise to physical laws, moral laws do not have time limits scheduled into them to provide their responses. Therefore, they respond whenever appropriate circumstances eventuate, not when the specific time elapses. But they do punish, or reward, with an iron consequence, similarly to physical laws. Therefore no-one, who disobeys them, can escape from suffering of consequences. Also no one, who obeys them, is missed out in receiving appropriate rewards.

When discussing intellects, moral field, and moral laws, as mental equivalents of masses, gravity field, and laws of physics, it is important to briefly remind ourselves the idea of so-called "black holes" in astronomy. If one tries in simple terms understand what these "black holes" are, one only needs to realize where leads every motion, that is carried out "along the line of the least resistance". Well, we can move a stone downhill, so that following the line of the least resistance, it drops down to a foot of a mountain. Then we can again throw this stone downhill even lower, into the bottom of a sea. Then, with a bit of luck, it could still sink even lower, into the centre of Earth. Then electrons from atoms that constitute this stone could collapse inwards, and create an astronomic "**black hole**". But what would happen next. Well, there is noting else, because at the end of every motion, which systematically occurs "along the line of the least resistance" a "stagnation" awaits, where NO motion is possible. What this example is trying to explain, is that at the very end of every motion, that continually occurs in the direction of the line of the least resistance, a "black hole" is awaiting, inside of which no further motion is possible. Totalizm explains that such a black hole is also awaiting for people, who in moral matters continually follow the line of the least intellectual resistance. When, because of the constant motion downwards in the moral field, they finally arrive to the point, when the entire their moral energy is withdrawn to zero, they turn into a kind of a moral "black hole". No further intellectual motion is possible for them (i.e. their thoughts cease to function, their logic refuses to work, and their motivations turn impossible for them to accomplish anything). Therefore they simply must die, even if their body is physically fit and kicking. This kind of death, which takes place when someone's moral energy (zwow) drops to zero, totalizm calls the death by a "**moral suffocation**". The paradox of our times is, that the death by a moral suffocation is the most frequent cause of death in present days, while almost no-one knows anything about it, and almost no-one promotes totaliztic ways of living, which are able to prevent it.

Totalizm noted that moral laws affect in the same way individual people, as whole families, institutions, countries, and even civilisations. It turned out that moral laws apply to everything that leads its own "life". Because not only people are capable to lead their own lives, totalizm introduces a concept of "intellect". An **intellect** is everything that lives a separate, own life, and therefore that is subjected to the action of moral laws. Examples of separate intellects include individual people, families, institutions, factories, religions, countries, and entire civilisations. Intellects can be subdivided into "individual intellects" (e.g. single people) and "group intellects" (e.g. factories, organizations, countries). As this is explained in subsection

B7.1, subsequent "group intellects" are merged into separate entities by a dominant type of feelings, which binds together all individual people that constitute them. Thus each one of us, is not only an individual intellect, but also a member of several "group intellects". From moral field point of view, an intellect is an equivalent to an object, or to a physical body (a cluster of masses) subjected to gravitational interactions. This means, that similarly to what gravity does to an object or to a cluster of masses, also moral field does to intellects (e.g. pulls them down, makes them to move, etc.).

In the final part of this subsection I would like to return to the **Concept of Dipolar Gravity**. I skipped through this scientific theory without actually explaining it, while some readers may wish to know roughly at this stage, what this theory is all about. (Although this theory is explained in great details in other parts of this monograph. Actually chapters H and I of this monograph are entirely about it.) In order to briefly outline it here, the Concept of Dipolar Gravity is a very strict scientific theory, quite similar to mathematic, physics, or mechanics. Generally speaking, this concept proves that gravity is not a static, monopolar type of field - as our orthodox science used to describe the gravitational field. (The expression "orthodox science", is used in this monograph to describe a hermetic science saturated with philosophy of parasitism, which is practised in some of our colleges and universities, and which must be clearly distinguished from totaliztic science postulated in subsections H10 and A1.2 of this monograph.) Putting this in other words, the Concept of Dipolar Gravity proves, that properties of gravity field are different from properties of known static monopolar fields. (For example, they differ from properties of such monopolar static fields, as electrical fields, or pressure fields.) Actually this concept reveals that the gravity field belongs to a dynamic, dipolar type of fields, similar to a field created by magnets, or to a field created by vacuum cleaners. Perhaps it should be explained here that a dynamic, dipolar field, is a field which has a definite "inlet" (I) that sucks something into it, and a definite "outlet" (O) which disperses this something from it (e.g. for a magnetic field, I=N and O=S - see descriptions in subsections H5.2 and F5.2). Of course, because this concept has found out that our science so-far was completely wrong about gravity field, which is the most important field of our material world, this concept goes further and it looks how actually our universe must be structured, and how it operates, when gravity field is a dipolar one (i.e. not monopolar, as our orthodox science believed so-far). As it turned out, in such a case our universe looks completely different than it is pictured to us now, by our orthodox science. It is more similar to that universe described by religions, or by acupuncture, than to this one described by present physics and by present astronomy. For example, it is composed of two different physical worlds which prevail on both ends of gravity dipoles (i.e. our world, and the counter-world), and it also includes a third intelligent, or software, virtual world. In each one of these three worlds different sets of laws prevail. In the separate physical counter-world, an unique substance is present, called **counter-matter**. Across this counter-matter, sound-like vibrations can propagate, similarly like acoustic vibrations can propagate across matter from our physical world. These sounds that can be heard only in the counter-world, are called "**telepathy**" by the Concept of Dipolar Gravity. Human science does not have, as yet, a device which would allow people to hear telepathy, although first descriptions of such technical devices are published in treatise [7/2]. The counter-matter displays various properties, which are completely opposite to properties of matter from our world. For example, this counter-matter is intelligent in the natural state (our matter is dumb in the natural state). Therefore, this counter-matter can gather information, can remember, and can think in the natural state, thus turning the entire universe into a single, huge, natural computer. The Concept of Dipolar Gravity calls this natural computer with the name "universal computer" (UC), and precisely describes its properties and behaviour (look up in subsections I3 and I2 for these descriptions). This "universal computer" is a type of natural computer hardware, which fills up the entire universe. Inside of this "universal computer" various spiritual intellects live. One can understand these intellects, as a natural type of "software entities" that lives inside of an equally natural "hardware of the universe" (means inside of the "universal computer"). One type of natural software entities, which lives inside of

this "universal computer", are what religions call "souls", which in this monograph are described in more details in subsection I5.2. Another, superior kind of a single natural software entity, which lives inside of this "universal computer hardware" is a spiritual superior being, which totalizm calls the "**universal intellect**" (UI). Totalizm understands this superior universal intellect, as a kind of "operating system", only that it is natural, and that it controls the operation of the entire universe. As it turns out, this universal intellect (UI) is actually an equivalent of what religions call God. Because the Concept of Dipolar Gravity formally proves, that this universal intellect (God) in fact does exist (see subsection I3.3), this concept is the only strict, physics-like, scientific theory so-far, which acknowledges the existence of the universal intellect (God), and which also explains how this intellect looks like, how it behaves, what properties it displays, etc. Furthermore, the Concept of Dipolar Gravity deduces, that moral field, and moral laws, are actually established, and with an iron hand are supervised, by this universal intellect (God). Therefore, according to the Concept of Dipolar Gravity, and also according to the philosophy of totalizm which was derived from this concept, the most important obligation of all intelligent creatures, which populate our universe, is to obey moral laws, which are established and supervised by this universal intellect (God). They both (i.e. totalizm, and the Concept of Dipolar Gravity) enforce this obligation, because their knowledge to-date about the universe, which they managed to accumulate, indicates that the obedience of moral laws is the basic and the most important way of expressing the obedience to this superior universal intellect (God). Whoever (like parasites, and like evil parasites) do not obey moral laws, he/she actually takes a stand of an adversary to the universal intellect (God). Furthermore, as totalizm managed to determine, the universal intellect introduced, and supervises in the whole universe, a system of very effective enforcements of the obedience of moral laws. These laws have punishments and rewards permanently embedded into them. Thus **everyone who disobeys moral laws, is severely punished by them. In turn everyone who obeys these laws, is lavishly rewarded by them**.

* * *

This concludes the present edition of the chapter A on implementing totalizm in our everyday life. The information provided in this chapter should suffice for all those, who wished to know, what the implementing of totalizm is all about, or wished to check whether they are able to introduce this philosophy into their everyday lives. Of course, this information does not exhaust all dazzling potentials of totalizm, but only presents the methods and tools which are fully worked out by now, and thus which are ready for everyday use. Further methods and tools are currently being developed, to be presented in future editions of totalizm. Actually the present state of this philosophy could be compared to the state of human sciences during times of Copernicus, Columbus, and Newton - i.e. totalizm is developed enough to become extremely useful and to reveal the dazzling horizons that it opens for people, but it still awaits for further major discoveries, which would allow to utilize the full capacity that it offers. Actually, it does not take much to realize, that totalizm carries the potentials to revolutionize our moral life to the same extend as previously physics revolutionised our material life.

I do hope that the information provided in this chapter managed to explain simple rules and tools that one needs to use in order to obey moral laws. The tools already available enable one to solve almost every moral situation from a real life that one may encounter. Therefore, these tools allow one to consistently obey moral laws, to live a moral, satisfying, happy, fulfilled, and uplifting life, to build up (compress) his/her moral energy, and to earn gradually moral rewards that are made available by the universal intellect (God) to all those people, who obey moral laws that it established.

Note that totalizm is a philosophy which continually develops itself. Therefore, if you are determined to implement this moral, peaceful and highly progressive philosophy in your life, try additionally to return to the descriptions of this chapter also after a few months, or even a few years of time. This is because then the descriptions outlined here will be further improved.

Since we already learned how to implement totalizm, we can proceed now to next chapters in order to learn all these basic ideas which allow us to also understand totalizm and to understand scientific foundations from which it this progressive philosophy was derived.

Because this monograph is very voluminous, depending on the reasons why someone took it to his/her hands, it can be read in several different manners. For example those, who only wished to learn, what totalizm is all about, may finish reading on this most important volume 1, although personally I would recommend them to also read subsection L4 (in volume 8), which would familiarize them with very interesting history of this progressive philosophy. People, who decide to implement totalizm in their lives, in my opinion should carefully read at least four most essential volumes of this monograph, namely volumes 1, 2, 5 and 6 - which explain the essence of totalizm. People, who are interested in all implications of totalizm, perhaps should also read about various issues stemming from this philosophy, presented in volumes 3 and 7. Finally people with strict approach to life, or oriented towards research, which would like to learn everything that so-far is known about totalizm, should read this monograph from a cover to a cover - including the scientifically and technically oriented volume 4 and the volume 8 about history.

A next volume 2 combines together the most important information, which allow to understand totalizm better. In this way, the answer "what to do" in order to carry out a moral life - that was answered in this volume 1, next volume 2 extends additionally with an answer "why should be done just this, instead of something completely different".

Fig. A1. **Logo of totalizm**. It has a shape of an ellipsis in the horizontal position. Inside of this external ellipsis there was another smaller ellipsis with the logo itself. Between both ellipses, larger and smaller, word of one of the principles of totalizm were written - the content of this principle was changing depending on the individual inclinations of the person who carried a given logo (means depending which principle/mission of totalizm a given carrier of this logo considered to be the most important for his/her life - e.g. my favourite logo contained the principle/mission "knowledge is responsibility"). Inside of the smaller ellipsis there were two stylised letters "t", one placed in reverse to other, which utilise the common horizontal dash (means the line which turns the letter "l" into the letter "t"). Furthermore, above each letter "t" there was a dot, which to this letter "t" added another function of a small letter "i". The rounded ends of both "t" tangentially joined (merged) with the inner ellipsis. Both joined together and mutually reversed letters "t" subdivided the area of the smaller ellipsis into two halves, out of which one had white colour, while the other - a red colour.

The logo of totalizm not only has an extraordinary history, which is described in this monograph, but it also shows unusual properties. For example it emits unique configurational vibrations, which can be detected with methods of radiesthesia. These vibrations seem to form in the counter-world a favourable configuration, which facilitates the accomplishments of the intensions of a person who carries it. Thus, to the long list of extraordinary properties that this logo displays, belongs also the capability to work as an amulet and to bring good luck to people who carry it with them.