

Handouts for Discussion-3

Dear workshop attendees,

I have thrown together an edited (and in some places a little mangled) selection of posts from the MBT Forum (Go to the MBT web page www.MyBigTOE.com and click on "Discussion groups") that I think you may find interesting.

1 OOB, Imagination, and growing up.

Thynes: This is going to sound weird but its an easy way start accessing/awareness with visuals and communication, close your eyes and just start imagining something, yes you will be using your imagination, make it up in your own head as you go along and you may notice things starting to take off on there own, things will start to come that you know were not from your own mind. 'start talking to a deceased relative, just make up a normal conversation about stuff with them, it may take a few min but you might be surprised at what you start perceiving. or take a swim in a pool, feel the water and actually be there like you are swimming, take a look around the pool or lake if you notice anyone, strike up a conversation with them, Again it may take a few min of imagining before you start to notice.

FYI: this has not worked 100% of the time for me but more than not it has.

I would like Toms input on this one, I haven't seen it on this board but I have had some very interesting experiences this way.

Tom: Thynes suggested: "close your eyes and just start imagining something..."

How is this different than visualizing the soccer ball, or repeating a mantra? Let's say you start imagining a conversation with Uncle Fred. That act of imagining pushes out all other thoughts and pretty soon, if you really get into it, it is only you and Uncle Fred in your awareness and you have just left PMR behind. Now, while you are no longer aware in the physical (you are now officially out of your body) and while your intent is focused on Uncle Fred, guess who you are likely to start engaging? Yes, no other than Uncle Fred or some other rabbit hole that has an Uncle Fred association because that is what you are thinking about and that thinking might just happen, in an instance of good luck, to contain a single clear intent (signal) for perhaps a second or two if you are not too scatterbrained and drifting about. If you are scatterbrained and your thoughts are just drifting around, you will get nothing coherent because your consciousness is not coherent. We practice meditation to avoid that particular ending.

Now, is this really dead Uncle Fred you are talking to? Maybe, but probably not. More likely you are picking up the Uncle Fred theme in either the past actualized or unactualized data bases. If your thoughts are all general plain vanilla "Fred sure was a nice guy" sort of stuff you get nothing of interest back. If your mind (consciousness & intent) happens to latch onto a more focused thought (intent) going in some specific direction or toward some specific inquiry, then, and only then, are you likely to get some specific information input into your mind. About this time you begin to notice (because of the specificity of the data) that the data you are receiving is not organic to your own experience data base. Now you are on to something. Pursue it and experiment – collect some evidential data if you can manage to ask the right questions that lead to evidential data. Asking Uncle Fred what his favorite color was or if he was happy and loved his wife won't deliver much evidential data. You are querying a data base, so don't ask Fred to tell you a checkable secret. Would you ask the Google data base to tell you a checkable secret? Repeat

this exercise 100 times or until you get good at it – i.e, you get good at: letting completely go of PMR, focusing your intent on some specific task, narrowing that task so you can probe for some specific evidential feedback, clearly receiving and interpreting the data you get, and doing experiments and collecting and checking evidence to prove to yourself that the data was not just something you made up. Simple – except you should have noticed that there was lots of opportunity to take branches where you end up with nothing coherent or useful.

All a mantra does in meditation is push extraneous thoughts out of your mind. Imagining a soccer ball or following your breathing does the same thing. So does reading a captivating book, but reading leaves your mind occupied with the story instead of blank, open, and paying attention to what might come into it, and ready to focus on a well thought out intent that leads you to evidence. You see, getting out of body, at least for a few minutes is entirely natural, almost trivial, something almost everyone does with little effort, while making the experience stable and doing something useful with it is much more challenging.

Most of those having or wanting to have OOBIE are focused only on making the experience stable. Few ever go beyond that. Many, having gained stability, eventually let it go once they discover that OOBIE holds little value from the viewpoint of their ego or their intellect. OOBIE experiences do not automatically reduce your ego or lower your entropy. They may give you a somewhat different set of opportunities to do that because of the bigger picture they impart, but the easiest and most natural thing for a human, awash in his culture, to do with that bigger picture is to wrap it in a mantle of belief and thus nullify its value. You still have to grab that opportunity and find a way to use it to fundamentally change who you are. If your focus is on evolving the quality of your consciousness, becoming love, rather than having OOBIE on demand, then your odds of achieving that fundamental change are much greater.

Tom C

2 Logic, reason, and uncertainty

TobyH,

Your personal logic is what you use to make sense out of the data (your experience data base) you happen to have. If your personal logic is based on open-minded skepticism, then you have the best chance of what you think makes sense actually making sense in the big picture. Most people base their personal logic on cultural beliefs, fear and ego -- thus they have a very small probability that what they think makes sense actually makes sense in the big picture. Fundamental truth lives in the big picture, indeed, fundamental truth is what makes the big picture a big picture. Your personal logic is all that you have to go on.

The thing that is giving you problems, that is causing confusion is that you must learn to accept uncertainty. One who develops his personal logic with open-minded skepticism must learn to live gracefully and productively with much uncertainty. To attain such grace and productivity while honoring the probabilities and possibilities that abound within your personal experience base, often requires that you exist apart from the herd -- a 6 sigma understanding bouncing around within an ocean of normal mediocrity.

One of your biggest growth challenges is to develop enough confidence in the quality of your personal

logic to accept the inevitable uncertainty that must be a part of a process based upon open-minded skepticism. Do your best to get it as right as you can get it and then move forward fearlessly with what you know is most likely true. Do not look for certainty; there is precious little “certainty” that is not belief based.

The point is: if you are open and skeptical, there is always more to learn and new data to absorb and factor in – you deal in probabilities and possibilities rather than certainties because you must always be open to new data enabling you to discover new insights. Let those who are certain live forever with their errors. Be confident in knowing that your process of open-minded skepticism is the only process that has the possibility of converging to real knowledge.

Tom C

3 Models of reality

Cole,

In a nutshell:

It is a matter of language, metaphors, models, how we communicate, and on what level we communicate. It is also a matter of not confusing reality with the model of reality. Not confusing metaphorical description with what is being described.

Background:

We in PMR have a propensity, indeed a need, to define everything into its own separate pigeon hole. We do that because the PMR rule-set creates a reality of separate objects and separate beings so that we may learn through interaction. That is all we know so we project it onto everything. Consequently, the schemes we think up (guides, soul, oversoul, higher self, planes, chakras etc.) with everything separated, labeled, and given its proper unique function constitute our models of reality. The value and usefulness of these models is that they allow us to communicate ideas to others who cannot think in any other terms (almost everybody). To communicate, one must speak to others in terms of concepts that can be comprehended. Learning must take place in sequential stages of personal discovery. Talking truth that flies "over the head" of others without careful explanation, just confuses rather than educates -- as you have been confused by conflicting accounts of "guides" and "soul" existing and not existing. Teachers exhibiting their command of the truth without sufficient care often confuse (retard the growth of) many, many more people than they help (advance the growth of). Such groups become esoteric with only the “insiders”, the “enlightened” ones, really knowing and understanding deeply. The “secret” or lofty knowledge of such groups is held in high esteem, as are its leaders. Of course, the burden of communicating is not only upon the teachers. Casual students often take words out of context, misinterpret meaning, and are drawn toward the mystique of superior knowledge like moths to light. Some cultures encourage this largely dysfunctional educational paradigm more than others. What consciousness is and the responsibility for explaining it to others:

Consciousness is one integrated whole thing. It is awash in a flurry of integrated activity that would put all the great cities on this planet, taken as one together, to shame – A swirl of information transfer that

ebbs and flows, comes together and disappears, attends needs, provides data, and lowers its entropy by employing a few billion parts of itself in virtual reality trainers, and many more billion parts to produce, service and optimize the VRs and the opportunities of those engaged in the VR trainers. That is what it does – we are part of a bigger animal called consciousness. We are all of The One – we are it, it is us. We break it into functional pieces so we can comprehend it more easily and can talk about in a meaningful way to others. If we didn't do this, we would appear to the majority of the world's people like vaguely coherent, self-appointed cult leaders – enlightened masters living in our own opaque world constructed of our own undecipherable truth – teaching few, affecting little outside of our tiny circle of followers (tiny compared to the rest of humanity). We, who would try to make a more significant difference, must understand that everybody must interpret their own personal reality from the experience base, understanding, beliefs, and fears that they happen to have. To tell them, "here is the truth, go sink or swim with it", is not all that helpful. Discovering knowledge and truth is terrific – discovering knowledge and truth and sharing it with others is better. Enlightenment is useless to all but itself, if its truth is invisible to those who need it – if its message confuses more than it helps.

Leveling up – a growing pain:

As people's level of understanding grows, a problem begins to occur when the models they have unfortunately come to believe in (are trapped by), i.e., the models they learned in elementary school (that were communicated to them using metaphors and conceptualizations they could understand), no longer accurately or consistently describe the reality they experience (recall the basketball with bbs flying around it was science's initial model of the atom). This is a problem generated by individuals believing that their model of reality is reality -- a common error among scientists and non-scientists alike.

What your uncle never told you about reality:

You have heard me say in these forums many times that guides are merely metaphors expressing a form of help the larger consciousness system provides to encourage and aid our evolution. Also that "Higher selves" or "Over-souls" are also merely metaphors for that non-PMR functionality of our consciousness – that we and our higher selves are one fully integrated thing, not separate things with separate functions. Add souls, IUOCs, Indra's Net, RWW, TBC, AUM, VRRE, OS, and everything else that we have functionally defined as a separate component of the larger reality to that list of "merely metaphors". None of it exists -- not as separate objects/beings/stuff/units. It's all virtual. Consciousness itself is the only fundamental reality – everything consciousness creates out of that vast informational field is virtual. Consciousness and free will are logically necessary for each other's existence -- evolution requires free will, consequently, that attribute is doled out wherever the engine of evolution requires it. Our VR is one such engine and we are (as the free will enabled stars of this game, of course) what makes that particular engine work. Like the Freon in a refrigerator or the exploding gasoline and pistons in an internal combustion engine, we go round and round, decreasing entropy on each pass as we go. Chug, chug, chug. Do your part.

Cole, do you like this model better?

Pick a model, any model...but pick one that is productive for you:

A model is not judged on accuracy alone, but also on what value it can deliver. The above model, though less encumbered by habits of PMR thinking, will deliver little value to most of the world's population. If you are grown up enough to absorb and feel the beauty of this model and celebrate the joy and peace that comes with being a valuable part of The One Whole Thing, and if you are evolved enough to be thrilled with the idea that by your hard work and diligence, you have the blessed opportunity to become a contributor to the survival, success, and continued existence of existence itself, then you have come home to snuggle up contentedly in the lap of The One Consciousness-Evolution Fractal Digital Love Being/Machine. If, on the other hand, your giant ego roars in self-focused infuriation at the thought that you suffer through life after life, being shoved this way and that, whipped by fear and pain like a dog, in order to serve as the Freon in the evolution chamber of some monster consciousness information system, then you are probably sorry that you asked this question and finally got a straight answer.

In either case, don't believe that this model is the real reality either. It is just a model. Don't confuse the model of reality with reality. Some models may be more accurate than others but their productivity to your growth is much more important than accuracy. Besides, accuracy is very difficult and problematical to assess. Learn to reduce your ego and fear to the point that you can live gracefully with uncertainty.

Tom C

4 What is reality

OM: Ok, now that I think that I understand the model and the model is not the reality, What is the reality?

Tom: The reality is that your reality can never be anything more than what you experience. Because your experience will always be limited, you are thus stuck with only a tentative model that best describes the potential facts of your personal experience. To keep this inherent uncertainty from raising your entropy, creating a distraction, or becoming a barrier, you must learn to accept uncertainty and live with it gracefully. That sounds easy at the intellectual level, but at the being level this uncertainty is the root cause of the frustration that is generated by you continually running into limitations that you cannot see and do not understand. With sufficient experience and due diligence, you will be able to connect more and more of the dots at both the intellectual and being levels -- thus discovering and reducing your limitations -- but not entirely eliminating them as long as you are you -- an IUOC (in any of your forms) differentiated from the whole. When you are one with The One, your limitations disappear along with you need to know or be anything more than you already are -- you are reality -- All That Is. With enough experimentation, experience, and due diligence, one day your model (Big TOE) will perhaps evolve to be able to fit (explain) all the considerable data you have managed to collect over the decades. At that point the string you are pushing on (limitations you are and are not aware of) may feel a little stiffer and more solid (less frustrating) because your personal experience and understanding give you the confidence that is necessary to accept uncertainty gracefully. Goals become irrelevant and disappear as the journey through now becomes more than enough to grow on.

5 Those who gain psi abilities without reducing entropy or growing up very much

OM: You may or may not have the proper intentions and still gain those abilities to a degree.

Tom: That is true. It is a little like finding a side door that lets you sneak into the Library of Congress (thus giving you unearned access to almost everything ever published in English) and then only being able to “read” comic books (look at the pictures) because you are six years old and only have a first grade education. You also have a six year olds attitude and maturity level -- and thus little ability and interest in improving yourself to go beyond looking at the pictures in comic books. Your discovery of the side door is, at best, of little value beyond providing superficial amusements. At worst, it is wasting your time and distracting you from other more important things (like going to school) that you could be doing to develop your abilities.

A side note: Some of the people who sneak in the side door are given their unearned access because of complaining bitterly last experience packet about “... if I only had access... I could have learned and grown so much more ...” Most will squander that access because, like the six year old, the quality of their being is not yet developed to the level where they can profit from the experience. If it had been, and if the experience of NPMR was deemed a useful stimulant to their personal growth, they would have had the experience. At the end of this packet, their complaint will be silenced with direct proof that leading with the intellect and ego is not profitable.

Develop your being and let whatever follows define your next step.

OM: But the want to access NPMR/OBE in a more conscious experiential fashion is coming from where then? I want to know undeniably, fully aware and experience that this is the truth not fragmented intermittent experiences.

To Taste it, touch it, feel it to be so.

Tom: Primary: Continuing focusing on growing up. Secondary: continue to develop your ability to explore the larger reality. Let the two mature together. If becoming adept at exploring the larger reality is on your path (an integral part of your personal growth process), then both the quality of your consciousness and your ability to be operational within the larger reality will blossom together. Make no demands, have no expectations, but do follow the path that your intuition guides you toward. Have confidence that what you need to know will unfold in front of you when you are ready to understand and have the need to know it. There may be much value in trying to understand what you are doing, where you want to go, how you might go about getting there, and how the view looks from the big picture – and very little value (sometimes negative value) in trying to tie down all the details and understand every nuance of the entire process from your current perspective. Generally, big picture education and understanding is a "just in time" process delivered only when you are ready to make good use of it.

Get the big picture, take one step at a time in the direction you feel compelled to go in, and forget about intellectually crunching the details – they will take care of themselves.

6 Love, Relationships, and friendship

TobyH,

Love is a singular thing while relationship requires two or more -- they are two different things that may or may not be entangled in each other.

Love is something you give -- without conditions -- without expectations -- without requirements. It is dependent only on you, not on another person. You do not have to like someone to love them, but it is more pleasant when those two go together. People have varying capacities to love -- a few almost none, many somewhat, and a few very much. It depends how grown up they are, how much they are dominated by fear, belief, and ego. Most people confuse need with love. They fall in need when they find a relationship that satisfies their needs and soothes their fears.

Relationship is about interaction. An interaction (relationship) needs to have value to all parties or the interaction will dissolve. If in a specific interaction with another you find limited value, then you must decide whether or not the relationship has enough potential value for you to invest the time and energy required maintain it, increase investment to explore potential value, decrease investment to limit losses, or dissolve the interaction. Potentials are often more important than actual. Sometimes it is just business, and sometimes care a lot about the health and welfare of the person you have the relationship with. Relationship can persist under any level of commitment -- commitment within a relationship is generally proportional to the perceived actual or potential value of the relationship. Unlike love, much about relationship is conditional. Relationship is based on mutual value which encompasses conditions, expectations, and requirements.

Relationships come and go, wax and wane, but love is more permanent. Like, as opposed to love, is an attribute of relationship. Remember, when entangling love and relationship not to confuse which is which -- that confusion seems to lie at the root of your problem.

7 Be careful what you intend (wish for).

JoshM: How much uncertainty do you (Tom) face in your daily life for major events?

Tom: Probably a little less than you do. But if that is the case, it is because I glean more information from my interactions with my environment than most people do. I make no special effort to use the paranormal to optimize my PMR existence. I do use whatever data comes to me. When I get in a plane, I take the same risks you do -- I don't check it out in the probable future data base. However, in general, I do try to pay attention whenever I receive a very specific nudge to duck.

JoshM: Tom: "Fixing things to be the way you want them is not as important as learning from them."

Tom: That is the key idea. As a general rule, the more capability one has to manipulate reality, the less one uses it. The game here is to deal with what happens -- to interfere with how that game naturally

plays out is to interfere with one's opportunities to learn from the challenges and feedback that this VR offers. To make one's reality deterministic by manipulating it to be the way you want is to negate one of the major advantage of being here. Why would anyone want to do that?

JoshM: If I have an intent to grow up and become fearless, does accepting whatever negative consequences that could arise from this actually increase the chance of them happening? What if the best way for a person to grow up is to get into a car crash where they can't walk again? Will having the desire to grow up the most efficiently somehow weave that event together to satisfy the intention?

Tom: It might -- but only if it were the optimal path for you and all others who were affected by a reasonably wide margin. If that rattles your cage, try this one: what if the best way for somebody else (or several others) to grow up would be for you to become unable to walk? That might happen as well if the overall system's entropy reduction was optimized by your taking that path. Such arrangements, if not circumstantial or random events, are generally made with the consent of all IUOCs involved (but not necessarily at the PMR level of awareness). This is just one thousands of experience packets -- your job this time may be primarily to set up someone else's learning opportunity -- not at your expense -- but with all involved being part of a team, each playing their part to maximize the potential benefit of the whole.

The best thing for you to do is not to wish or intend for specific future outcomes (goals) like "maximum growth" but rather focusing on actualizing your opportunity for growth in every moment of the present and letting the future take care of itself. Manipulating future reality with your intent is a risky game because you do not have the big picture. Just be the best you can be in the present and trust that the future will unfold however it does. Be confident that you will deal with whatever comes as best as you can.

Growing up, dropping beliefs, and attaining a greater awareness requires courage -- as does living gracefully with uncertainty. Courage is a natural result of fearlessness.

8 The meaning of words: Assessing the credibility of The Source

Cole: Anyway, the main crux of this question regards the concepts and differing opinions about "becoming," "desire" and "intent."

Tom: Words are imprecise symbols and metaphors. They mean different thing to different people because both context and interpretation is personal. "becoming," "desire" and "intent." are three words that are probably fuzzier and more ill defined than most because they describe states of mind which can only be subjective. Twisting oneself into a pretzel trying to determine the precise meaning emanating from the mouth of another is an exercise in futility and much to do about nothing. The point is what significance do the words spoken by another have for you. How does your interpretation of what is said make your reality more profitable to you. Take from words whatever you can that is useful to you today and leave the rest. You can do no more. As you change, so does the meaning of whatever words you hear.

Was Seth or Castaneda's Don Juan real or imaginary? Who cares? It makes no difference! Can you learn or grow from what they write -- do you find significance in their words that you can use? If so, the source is irrelevant. The same goes for great sages. Take what you find useful today and leave the rest. You will never know exactly what they meant because you must interpret what they say in terms of your own experience and understanding which can never be their experience and understanding. Agonizing over what you think they might have meant is a waste of time. Trying to rationalize the precise differences

between two speakers only compounds the uselessness of your effort – it doesn't matter. Believing that you know exactly what they meant, or that you or anyone could determine what that might have been, is just another belief based in fantasy. You or anybody else can only determine what you think they meant and then compound that error by believing that you know exactly what they meant. Everybody thinks they know – nobody actually can know. Fortunately it does not make any difference. What they meant is academic flimflam to be argued endlessly by opposing egos believe in and searching for a certainty that does not exist. The only real significance is how what was said affects each individual -- particularly in the long term. Let the words go if they do not hold value for you. If you think they do bring added value to your existence, take that value and apply it. Let the results of that application determine what is or is not of value to you at this point in your life. Open-minded skepticism and living gracefully with uncertainty will keep you informed as you change and what is valuable or not valuable to you changes. Stop looking for the "experts" to tell you what is correct or real, or significant, or what to believe -- you must figure that out for yourself -- nobody can figure that out for you.

Read the words of others and evaluate them in light of your own personal experience. Apply what you can and assess the value of it to yourself based on the results of that application. Be open to change always. Who cares what Rajneesh, or the Buddhists, or the Christians or Tom Campbell says about the nature of reality? By all means, study everything written and said about the nature of reality (or anything else) carefully in order to better assess the possibilities, but if you ever want to be more than a hapless believer of some sort, you must come to your own conclusions based on your own experience. Picking over the bones of other people's ideas can never constitute anything more than rough inexact input into the process of personal discovery. Be your own person; learn to live gracefully with uncertainty until you have collected enough personal data to come to a tentative hypothesis that is always open to change. Then continue to live gracefully with uncertainty as you carefully rank and rate your many hypotheses as to which are more or less probable based on your own carefully interpreted experience base, understanding, and beliefs as they exist today.

The path of Big Picture knowledge must be blazed anew by each individual – one cannot ride down this path on the backs of those who have gone before – divining truth as you go from the words of others. Wisdom cannot be learned from another. Truth must be verified by your own experience or it is not your truth. To live with uncertainty as you discover your own truth requires courage.

The good news is that this is not a timed test, you have forever.

Kathy,

A very good essay. Desire in the service of an individual's fear and ego is the only desire that must be eliminated. Just as when we talk of one needing to be detached we mean being detached from fear and ego – not from life, or love, or existence. Words can mean many things – the context is key. After the expressions of fear and ego are eliminated from desire, one is left with intent. It is intent that animates consciousness (moves data).

Words are tricky little things – one must read between the lines rather than try to logically parse one's interpreted meaning of another's words because all meaning is necessarily subjective.

Tom C

9 The world and everything in it is “living information” -- netted, and connected within the three database to all it has touched and all that has touched it through its individual experience

Is not an IUOC just memory, process, rules and data -- is not a clam and a bush and a rock just memory, process, rules and data as well. The memory, process rules and data for each are all very different in type, style, flexibility, time scale, and capacity. But all are organizations of data within TBC. Clams and bushes react to their environment, so do rocks but on a much longer time scale (they affect the environment and the environment affects them). They (people clams, bushes and rocks) change state through interaction with their environment and each other according to the rule-set. The entities themselves (people clams, bushes and rocks) and their interaction is just data existing and being passed around in the big computer. Would not a record be kept of all the changing states and potentials (in all 3 data bases). Is this not a form of memory – perhaps the form of memory? Do not all things interact and thus influence and depend on each other ... rocks, dirt, plants, animals (including people) all interact with each other? Without rocks you don't get dirt, without dirt you don't get plants, without plants, you don't get animals. Plants and animals return to dirt. Dirt gets compressed into rocks. All existence is interactive. Rocks have no intellect thus no decision space but they have a recorded history of interaction with the whole that serves as the memory associated with their specific organized bits in TBC. Look up a particular rock or hand full of dirt or dad's favorite chair in the database and there is associated with it a web of all its interactions (all references to it in the database including all the things that web of interaction touches). In other words, the affects it had on “other” and all that affected it is cross-referenced within all three databases. Thus one can touch (or focus one's intent on) an ancient relic and get pictures from the database about that object and everyone and everything that was ever connected to it in some way. Not only material facts are saved, but relationships and connectedness are saved as well – how else could accurate predictions be made?

Thus, the computer cranks only what is needed to compute the probability of all critters and things and how they interact and are related whenever it needs to know this information and then renders the resulting potential probabilistic PMR into a player's intellect as the player requires it (makes a measurement). Once a measurement is made, the rules-et requires continuity and consistency thus constraining what can happen next and what is likely to happen next.

An old forest has accumulated a long, deep, and rich history with many interactions and connections of all types that give it a larger historical “perspective”. Then we could say that all units or occurrences of organizations of data, history, and interactions that exist in TBC, whether they represent an individual (rock bush, clam or people) or a type or species, or family, or nation or culture – or any other way you wish to organize that data and its interactions and history – all have their own characteristics of “personality” and “perspective” as a sum of all the connections and interactions they have experienced with all other specific organizations of data. Even a storm quickly develops interactions and connections and potentiality as it forms and organizes itself into being – represented by organized data in TBC with the “personality” and “perspective” born of its actual and potential and probable interactions and connections. When that storm dissipates, so does the organization that represented it in TBC – but the history of its brief life remains forever woven in the thread of PMR actualized and non actualized history

This handout was sourced from the My Big TOE Forum
Thomas Campbell (www.mybigtoe.com) MBT Events (www.mbtevents.com)

fully connected to everything it experienced (changes in its data set) and everything that experienced it (changes in the data sets of others). People are no different except their level of complexity and integration allows for an intellect that inputs to the processing function – they are also a sum of all their history (interactions, connections, as well as decisions and intents).

Tom C

10 OOBE – A tour of the database

Remember, you are not going to a place when you are OOBE, you are just plugging into a different data stream that then defines a different reality frame. Of course, the data that defined Ramon's experience was taken from one or more the three databases. Because his intent (though not clearly stated) was to check facts, the data probably, for the most part, came from the actualized historical database.

Every bit of data is not stored every DELTA-t -- that would be massively redundant particularly for backgrounds. Although the data that seems most important from a big picture perspective (is connected to someone's lesson or decision) is given priority, the set of all possible data is merely sampled. The sample rate is dependent on the assessed value of the data -- e.g., projected likely needs and uses. When it was noticed that the brick column wasn't correct, the system looked at other samples (perhaps from nearby DELTA-ts that did include the brick column and updated its output. Different lighting conditions could have been due to pulling samples from times when it was darker, averaging samples, and/or a device purposely used by the system to limit the amount of detail that was necessary to render.

Like the missing little red hats on the fox hunters, one should not expect photographic duplication of all detail. Some is missed in sampling, some is just ignored because it is deemed unimportant, and some is limited by the psi uncertainty principle. There is yet another important variable: The amount of detail you get depends on the amount of detail you request/demand from the database. A loosely defined request gets a loosely defined answer within a loosely defined data stream.

Details of the setting are the least important in the big picture and the most important in the little picture (in the little picture they are called "facts". Consequently, explorers must develop statistics over an accumulation of experience to generate evidence and to concentrate on what is important to their growth while those researching paranormal events must accept inconsistencies and incompleteness of the physical facts (little picture details of the setting) as the nature of the system rather than as flaws of the process.

The historical database is only one DELTA-t (One billionth of a billionth of a second in the Book 1 example) behind the present moment. The real-time present moment data stream goes to people who are aware in PMR to define their physical reality according to the PMR rule-set. Ramon was in NPMR outside of the PMR rule-set and thus more likely to be fed data from the historical database. It would be impossible for Ramon to notice that you were one DELTA-t behind.

Tom C

11 OOB – Psi uncertainty, backward causation, and simultaneity

Depending what you mean by the words, one could say the past, present, and probable future all exist at once -- they all exist in data bases (can be accessed from the present) at any time. on the other hand, I think such a statement is often more confusing than helpful because it leads, if taken literally, to a logical impossibility usually ending in a denial of free will. Free will choice (any real choice) in the present requires a unique and separate before (future) and after (past) state – or the choice is meaningless.

A "many worlds" concept that executes or actualizes the logic that everything that can happen does happen, also leads to a denial of free will -- if every possibility is actualized, there is no choice, just process.

No free will implies no possibility of growth or evolution and thus no point or purpose -- i.e., no consciousness.

"Several worlds" that proportion a beings awareness (90% in this reality frame, 4% in another and 6% in yet another realityframe) would theoretically work but this concept is not likely to produce enough additional significant growth to warrant the extra complexity.

Seven (and others) have been getting it mostly right in the posts above. Seven said:

"I do know that there are a significant quantity of experiments out there by Leibovici, Jahn, Dunne, and others, including the delayed choice Physics experiments, that appear to "prove" backward causation. The trick to the result, it seems, is that the past that is influenced must be "unobserved" by the conscious observer. They must not know the result of the past they are trying to influence. This leads me to believe that in some way the unobserved past is also a probable past, not existing until it is observed in the "present". In some ways the "past" is also the "future" in these instances."

This is very close to the truth of the matter. The present defines what we call reality. Measurements in the present (the perception of information) define what probable future and uncertain past will be actualized into the minds of those interacting within the present moment. Remember – reality is just personal data delivered to a consciousness. The Virtual Reality Rendering Engine (VRRE - a metaphor for the source of our individual and shared data) can giveth and the VRRE can taketh away – its just data. We get the data and that defines our reality.

There is, in our PMR rule-set, a requirement for consistency – otherwise PMR would not be a very good or effective trainer. The Psi uncertainty principle requires that the existence of any inconsistency (local psi violation of the PMR rule-set) must be surrounded by enough uncertainty such that the PMR consistency requirement appears to hold in the minds of the many (rule-set consistency cannot be proven to a certainty to be invalid). This arrangement allows for whatever is uncertain within the PMR past or

future to be modified by PMR intent/choice and then actualized in the present moment -- which leads to defining the present PMR reality.

Uncertainty in the past implies a probable past. Be clear that this uncertainty is the uncertainty in the PMR so called "objective" record. Uncertainty within this "objective" record is not reflective of uncertainty in the state vectors that make up the actualized past data base – everything is accurately recorded there.

PMR "objective" reality is defined by the individual and collective subjective perceptions, beliefs, interpretations, and memory of its players. Each player lives in his own personal reality and interacts with other player's personal realities and with "the set" (environment) which has evolved according to the rule-set. Together they produce (more or less haphazardly) an "objective" record of what they (the recorders) think/believe happened – these are called "facts". Because players must rely on belief based and experience based individual subjective interpretation and because they only selectively produce recorded "facts", there is much room for uncertainty in the "objective" PMR record. The uncertainty in the PMR record, and the ability to manipulate "past events" within the bounds of that uncertainty by present intent, is constrained by (must be compatible with) the probabilities associated with the choices that make up the unactualized past. [Recall that the probabilities associated with un-actualized past choices are the same probabilities that were earlier associated with those probable future choices (the probable future that was not actualized by present freewill choices) that become the unactualized past.

A free will intent generated within consciousness is the only active ingredient – it is the "motive force" that moves or changes the data of consciousness. Intent can modify the probabilities within the probable future database (making a potential event more or less likely to be manifested in the present because a "measurement" collapses the probability wave to the most probable event). Intent can also modify the probabilities of past actualization (within the uncertainty associated with the "objective" past). Because of that intent, a potential historical event (or its effect) will be more or less likely to be manifested into the awareness of the present moment because it is again a "measurement" in the present that collapses the past or future probability wave to the most probable event.

So, the prayer group using its intent to modify the healing of selected people from a list of people who had previously been hospitalized, found that those selected had statistically significant shorter hospital stays because the measurement (who on that list had shorter or longer hospital stays) had not yet been made (the result was uncertain) and the data that could be collected after the fact (interviewing those patients to see if the records were accurate) is likewise uncertain. There is no inconsistency in PMR – no "backwards causation". Psi uncertainty requires that there be no proof what so ever of any ill patients suddenly healed, or of records being magically changed as a result of the prayer group's actions – it is perfectly reasonable, within the uncertainty of the situation, to assert that PMR reality trudged on completely consistent with the "objective record". What happened was that a specific uncertainty concerning the relative duration of hospital stays these patients experienced was reduced by a measurement whose outcome was modified by the focused intent of the prayer group. It only produces a "gee Whiz – how

could this happen” along with assumptions of backward causality if one erroneously believes that PMR reality is an objective physical reality.

Intent can modify the present moment (PMR reality) within the grey areas of uncertain outcomes of specific measurements, without disturbing PMR’s consistency, as long as the measured result falls within the bounds of probable outcomes.

Ted: Now looking at the concept of 'backwards' causality, we again come down to the collapse of a probability wave. In this case, we must be dealing with a past situation that has not been observed and thus already had the probability wave collapsed and the result 'fixed' as a reality.

Tom:we are dealing with a past situation where a specific piece of information content has never been observed in the PMR “objective” record, OR a specific piece of information content that at one time had been observed in the PMR objective record, but now that information has been permanently and irretrievably lost from the PMR “objective” record. Such lost information returns to the realm of probability – there is much uncertainty surrounding its existence. This is true even though every detail defining that specific content had been originally observed as a present choice sometime in the past and is now residing as data in The NPMR actualized history database. The information in the NPMR data base remains in NPMR – no records are lost in the NPMR database and its digital memory does not fade – everything actualized in that past present-moment remains recorded there. The uncertainty is in the PMR “objective” record. As time goes by and memories fade and records are destroyed, more uncertainty blossoms in PMR.

Bottom line: The uncertainty that can be manipulated by intent is not just potential existence/information that has never been measured in PMR, but also new uncertainties that are created as information drops out of the “objective” PMR record.

Ted: So we, individually or as a team of scientist/experimenters, can attempt to mentally, through prayer or meditation of some kind, attempt to modify some aspect of the past. Since this 'aspect of the past' has not been observed and thus recorded and fixed in the past, it is in fact open to change of it's probability wave, the only way in which it really exists. Then if the observation is made, in the present, which fixes the probability wave from the past, then we can find that we have modified the result that this probability wave collapses to, at least to our perception.

Tom: I would change: “Since this 'aspect of the past' has not been observed and thus recorded and fixed in the past,···” to read: Since this 'aspect of the past' is not to be found in the PMR objective record, it is thus not a part of the existing historical record and thus not fixed in the past (instead of a fixed/recorded/known factual event, it is now an uncertain event or a probable event within the past.

Ted: This raises a question for a clarification to my mind. If this past aspect existed only as a probability wave in the past because it was not collapsed then by a conscious observation, is it not still now a probability wave in (and of) the present, although we are speaking of a probability wave that could have been collapsed then in the past if an observation had been made then? Thus we are speaking of a probability wave of the past, that simply continues as a probability wave into the future, now, and is it not then as much a probability wave of now as of, potentially, the past. A probability wave is a probability wave . . . is a probability wave, until it is collapsed by a conscious observation at some time, when and if ever.

Tom: It may have been a probability wave in the future that simply migrated to a probability wave in the PMR objective record, i.e., information that was available within PMR that could have been noticed/measured/recorded but that was never measured or the result of that measurement was never recorded. The list of patients sorted by length of hospital stay is a good example. The data existed, that is why a measurement could be made to validate the effect of the focused intent. However that result (a list of the patients with shorter than normal stays) was never measured (made a part of the PMR objective historical record), thus psi uncertainty could allow intent to modify the result of a random selection of patients without violating PMR consistency. Had that measurement been made (had a document existed that listed all the patients with shorter than normal stays) then the psi uncertainty principle would have denied an intent focused on random patients from having any effect on who left the hospital early since that information would have been a matter of factual record in PMR). The circumstances also could have been that such a measurement was made (there was a document produced that listed all the patients with shorter than normal stays) but that document was subsequently destroyed. The destruction of the document returned that information to the status of unknown (i.e., there was sufficient uncertainty to allow an application of focused intent upon random patients to determine (to some extent) who went home early since there was no PMR objective record to contradict that outcome.

Ted [Tom]: I believe that you have in fact said this in effect, that all of reality is in fact 'fuzzy' and open to change to the extent that it has not been 'consciously observed' and thus caused a probability wave to be collapsed into an observation and thus fixed as a reality. Anything not yet observed [in PMR and made a matter of record], past, present or future, is thus open to conscious manipulation of the probability wave that represents it's existence, within the limits of that probability wave, until a conscious observation is made and the reality is thus fixed. Once observed, the reality becomes fixed.[Yes, but not necessarily forever]

Tom: Yes [with the brackets added], that is a correct summary.

Tom C

This handout was sourced from the My Big TOE Forum
Thomas Campbell (www.mybigtoe.com) MBT Events (www.mbtevents.com)

12 OOB – text goes here