Handouts for Discussion-6

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 – How can you tell if PMR is an objective or virtual reality -- Proof and True believers

Jeanne212: How could you ever really know this is not a virtual reality?

Tom: This is actually a very simple logic problem: Here is how you know :

PMR is an objective reality:
If there is NO such thing as an intent based placebo effect. If no one has ever actually experienced precognition (dream or otherwise) and all fortune tellers are always wrong when predicting the un-guessable. If the Stanford University physics dept validation of remote viewing (Puthof and Targ) and published in the IEEE journal NEVER happened. If all the experiments that have been done by top tier university scientists demonstrating reverse causality and mental intent biasing random data have NEVER happened. If telepathy, empathy at a distance, mothers who know the moment their children get hurt away from home, and people being able to both hurt and heal others with their mind's (intent), have NEVER happened. if only mentally ill, the uneducated gullible, and the not too bright have paranormal experiences instead of much of the entire population (well educated actually has a positive correlation for such experiences). If the Readiness Potential had NEVER been demonstrated and measured at a dozen research institutions. If no one had ever had the consistent ability to predict (better than chance would allow) which card will be shown next in psi experiments. If particles were actually particles instead of probability distributions … etc.. If all the "if statements" listed above were known facts, then one would know that reality COULD BE (was likely to be) objective, rather than virtual (logic would require one to allow for the possibility of any of the above thing happening sometime in the future.

But if any one of the above things that all clearly violate objective causality ever actually existed or happened EVEN to one individual ONCE in the history of mankind, then logic would tell you that this reality absolutely could not possibly be objective. It takes only one violation of an absolute rule to shatter it absolutely. Of course, fact is: Such violations of the assumption of an objective reality have always happened and been experienced, recorded, witnessed and studied in every culture in every time throughout all human history. Violations of objective reality have been proven with careful valid studies over and over again by literally hundreds of scientists using immaculate protocols over the last century. We don't need (logical process does not require) more "proof". Establishing "proof" has long since become an irrelevant non-issue except to the uninformed and those described below.

So you see, it is really not difficult to tell if this reality is objective or not --however, it is exceedingly difficult for those who possess the following two characteristics: 1) They must be in complete denial of the facts (care to dispute the placebo effect or the Princeton PEAR labs experiments, or the Stanford research or

the Duke research or the Temple U research to name a very few) and 2) are fanatical "true believers" in objective physical causality as the only possible cause of anything. (i.e., A "true believer" holds to their belief against all reason and rationality). Furthermore they know for sure that none of the above listed things are real or ever happened – all have been imagined in the minds of the gullible and deceitful and can be rationalized away by any true believer in a heartbeat because they are simply, by definition, impossible -- and that is all you need to know.

Never argue with a true believer -- no matter what they believe.

An interesting fact about true believers: They see themselves as rational, logical people in possession of the facts (the truth) and see those who disagree with them as true believers in some sort of nonsense. Thus beware: if you see all those who disagree with you as true believers, you may be one yourself.

Tom

----

2 – The most direct way to progress is generally not through a doorway into NPMR

Living gracefully with uncertainty is major challenges for most people. The companion to that lesson is to learn how to make progress with effort and focused intent but without exerting any control/manipulation of self to make things go the way you think they should. Growth is natural and follows at its own speed as you change at the being level – that process cannot be rushed very much or pushed by the intellect. To optimize progress: 1) make each tiny great and mundane choice reflect doing the right thing for the right reason. 2) Search for beliefs, fears, and expectations, as well as attitudes and feelings that reflect ego, and eliminate them at the being level. 3) Live fully engaged in the moment, in the present, and approach existence with love, compassion, and open minded skepticism. Learn everything you can learn about everything, engage others in relationship, travel, and experience (this will broaden and deepen your experience base and thus enrich and support accurate interpretation in all the realities you experience. Focus on those four and everything else (including your facility and exploration of NPMR) will fall out naturally around your interests and intents.

----

3 – The real brain does not create virtual consciousness, real consciousness creates the virtual brain

Maciej Tudek :
I have two questions to You (or maybe I should say problems I do not agree with).

First - You said that only something that is conscious can learn - from my view and view of mathematicians / informaticians who work in the field of artificial intelligence that is definitely not correct. Simple example: the chess program. It is learning during each match. Do You really think that programs are unable to learn? Or maybe I misunderstood that part.

Tom:

I agree with you completely, lots of different algorithms can learn. A computer based neural net can learn, even voice activated devices can learn individual voices. That does not mean these algorithms are conscious. Being able to learn is only one attribute of consciousness. A deterministic algorithm where every possibility is fixed can never be conscious. Consciousness cannot exist without free will and free will cannot exist without consciousness. Logically they are necessary conditions for each other. See chapter entitled "Mind, Brain, Body" in the middle of Book 2 (Discovery) of the MBT trilogy for the logical derivation of free will. (Books are free on Google Books)

Maciej Tudek :
Second - the consciousness/brain problem. If there were no brains Everything [in your theory] would be fine to me ;) But there is such a thing as brain and it is VERY DEEPLY correlated to consciousness and senses/experiences/memory. For me the existence of brain is the most important fact against non-materialism or that the consciousness is something primordial. I feel that consciousness cannot be described in categories of matter, atoms or just Newtonian physics. But - You can't deny that brain can be described like that. And that experiences/memory/sense of the world we have are bound with electro-chemical activity of brain. Why is that? Why something like brain activity (world of matter) causes changes in my consciousness (nonmaterial?) and (?) vice versa. That is duality problem. Even that I feel that consciousness is something that differs from matter, there is a lot of evidence that consciousness is generated by the brain:

1. It (consciousness) develops gradually as the brain develops (animal evolution) - it is an assumption but I thing most agree with it

2. It ceases during dreamless sleep

3. It ceases during most comas

4. It is affected - even changed significantly - by damage to the brain If consciousness is the fundamental element of Universe, why there is a brain and its evolution. Why we aren't just some kind of dots in space or something nonmaterial, even in world that seems materialistic. I feel that my consciousness is in brain. Maybe if I had OBE or similar experience that would change, but I'm not sure of that. The fact is that there is a brain which is so correlated with consciousness that it is most likely that consciousness is the product of brain. If You'll find some time to answer to me on that problem I would be very thankful :)

Tom: Email limits replies to short answers but here is the logical progression. To better understand the first several steps below watch the Hawaii Seminar 14 part video on YouTube (http://www.youtube.com/user/twcjr44) and read the "gems from the forum" starting with 1 (http://www.my-big-toe.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=75&Itemid=82)

1. We live in a virtual reality (PMR). This virtual reality (VR) is nothing but information – much like a multiplayer VR computer game. There is no physical reality, and no physical brain – both are virtual – just information. The larger consciousness system is the only thing that is fundamental – all else is virtual.

2. This virtual reality (our universe) has evolved (big digital bang began execution) according to a rule-set (science uncovers rule-set facts and logical consequences).

3. If you are a player (an individuated unit of consciousness) in this virtual reality, you must abide by the rule-set

4. Your PMR body reflects the constraints of the rule-set because it has evolved as part of the evolution of the VR according to the rule-set

5. In our PMR you cannot jump 20 feet high because the rule-set doesn't support it (we have not, under the rule-set (physics and biology), evolved that capability)

6. In PMR you cannot learn advanced calculus and differential equations from scratch in ten minutes because the rule-set doesn't support it.

7. In PMR you can learn calculus, play the violin, get angry, appreciate art, music, and beauty, love, hate, scheme, dream, laugh, plan, eat, invent & use computers, make love and have babies, because the rule-set does support it.

8. You are consciousness, however everything you experience as a character within PMR must be supported by the rule-set.

9. Consciousness leads, and the body follows – if it can -- according to the rule-set (e.g., the placebo effect)

10. If you as a conscious being in the PMR virtual reality game develop (within the game) a great capacity for empathy, then that portion of the PMR virtual brain allowing empathy must change to support and reflect what you have developed – within the constraints of the rule-set. Your capacity for empathy today within PMR is thus constrained by both the extent of your current growth and learning as well as what can be physically supported (brain and body) by the rule-set.

11. If someone cuts that part of your brain away that supports your ability to empathize, and no other part of your brain can be trained to support that ability, you can no longer display the quality of great empathy because the rule-set, as it is reflected by your body within the PMT VR, can no longer support you feeling empathy any more than it can support you jumping 20 ft high.

12. You cannot, while in PMR, live beyond the evolved "physical" capability of your brain otherwise you would violate the rule-set, so if your brain is damaged, your potential in PMR is damaged. The same logic holds if your knees are damaged.

13. Any ability or quality, positive or negative that you, as consciousness, develop within the PMR VR game must be supportable by a PMR brain and body or you can't develop this ability or quality in the PMR VR.

14. Any ability or quality, positive or negative that you, as consciousness playing a PMR character, develop within the PMR VR game that is supported by the PMR rule-set, creates a virtual brain that will support it (causes the virtual brain of your virtual character to change in order to support that new function. Like earning "hit points" or spells in a VR computer game enhances your characters virtual brain and virtual body (new abilities and skills in the VR game).

15. The brain and body, initially defined by the rule-set (physics, biology and chemistry) and subsequently modified by consciousness, represents the accomplishments (personal growth, abilities and skills) earned, within the constraints of, the PMR rule-set.

Maciej Tudek :
Thank You for Your reply Tom, it is very comprehensive. Your theory looks really attractive to me. I'd love to see some evidence and mathematical basis to it, but it probably cannot be done.

Tom:

1. Our mathematics represents the logic of quantity and is very good at describing the mechanics of PMR and the PMR rule-set (not as good at describing biology, terrible at describing individual behavior).

2. Digital science is not so much about quantity as it is about process.

3. Relationship is not so much about quantity or process as it is about the subjective perception of intent.

4. Reality is digital. Only consciousness itself is fundamental; all experiential reality frames are virtual.   The purpose of existence (consciousness evolution) is most effectively satisfied through relationship.

5. Math, then, is a weak player in describing the larger reality composed mainly of individuated units of consciousness interacting within a digital consciousness system in pursuit of lower entropy (positive evolution).

----

4 – Loneliness and Emptiness

Question: Have you at any time in your experiences experienced an emptiness with the realization there is no other with a crushing sense of loneliness like I can never describe?

Tom: No, never. Our reality system is what it is... our job is to become love which is all about other rather than self....and in the process of doing that we find joy, peace, and fulfillment. There are many others with whom we interact even though we are all one. It is the intent exercised during these interactions (along whatever path we take) that is significant, not the path, game, or goal. Reality is personal.

Growth, joy and peace, like reality and perspective, are personal -- and when actualized, exists at the being level.

Lonely is about self. Emptiness is about self.

Expectations that do not reflect truth can be a downer, but then the problem is the expectation, not the truth.

The glass is overflowing -- it only appears to be empty because one's perspective is centered in self.

Let the downer go...find the joy of growing up and letting go of the self along with all of its beliefs, needs, fears, and expectations. Then your glass will be more than full.

----

5 – Fear in PMR

OM: There are fears we don't even realize sometimes. I have been working on a PMR fear (not npmr) that seems to be related to a PMR security/vulnerability feeling.

Tom: Such a fear may have many causes but there is one major influence that aggravates and worsens all of them -- our culture (Western culture and the Western gene pool) feeds on fear. Marketers, advertisers, politicians, media (both news and entertainment), religions, anybody who would like to influence you will use your fears (many of which they have purposely created in you) to do so.   Even most relationships are based on fear. Fear feeds and is the motive force for almost everything that takes place in our culture. Fear, violence, fighting, and competition for dominance permeate everything we see, do, and think. We in the West are genetically derived from a fear-based, competitive, dominating, violence prone, aggressive self-focused gene pool created through many centuries of warring with each other (yes, much more so than many other cultures). Fascism (rule, manage, or lead by force or dictate) and militarism as an organizational imperative comes naturally and quickly to us if we can easily impose it on others while we intuitively struggle against it if it is imposed upon us. This ethic dominates all of our relationships: International, national, economic, family and personal. We are aggressive in everything we do – that is why we have the technology we have, the university systems we have, the sports we have, the 10 hour work days. Our people aggressively pursue education, self betterment, consumer goods, efficiency of process, science, knowledge, and each other, as well as money, fame, and glory.   We are generally driven to pursue OOBE and consciousness evolution in the same way – go after it, reach out and grab it, force it to our will, own it. We think that people who are not aggressive and driven like us are lazy. We assume that people who are content to watch their sheep graze have no ambition, and are doomed to live miserable lives in poverty because they are indolent and slothful. Generally, this is not true. They think we are driven and aggressive, manic and greedy, that we are missing what is important in life because we have chained ourselves to the treadmill of material success. Generally, they are correct.

Not being fearful while immersed within a fear based Western culture is difficult. The solution for Westerners is to find balance within their culture, not to find a few acres and buy a sheep. As simple Shepherds, our aggressive genetic proclivities would soon drive us crazy. Just as putting a shepherd on our treadmill to material success would soon drive him crazy. Eventually, we Westerners would sell the sheep, go back to a good paying job in the city, or end up with a large ranch, fifty employees, and 100,000 sheep. Ones man's success in another man's nightmare. If you can let go of fear and ego, find balance and maintain it, you can be both the shepherd and the business executive simultaneously – and nightmares of all sorts will be banished forever.

----

6 – Assorted questions

1. Is it possible for a person who possesses many belief traps and fears to have a low entropy consciousness? For example, my grandparents are very strict conservative Christians, but they are some of the most loving and caring people I know.

There are many facets and sides to an individual. All do not evolve together equally and at the same time. Yes, it is possible to be lower entropy in one area of your development and higher entropy in another area – less extreme cases (a little higher here , a little lower there) are common while more extreme cases are unusual.

2. I agree with the majority of what you say about the use of consciousness altering drugs, but are there any boundary conditions that could be applied to this? Although I have never used LSD or any other psychedelic drugs, I have heard about the potential therapeutic uses for LSD. Apparently people on their death bed who take LSD will be much less afraid of death and are more ready to leave this world. Also, a study noted that the use of psilocybin mushrooms relieved the anxiety in terminally ill patients and people with depression/other psychological disorders. This happiness and relaxation obtained from the use of these drugs might just be temporary or false, but there might be some beneficial uses if the users motivation and intentions are in the right place. Also, couldn't a one time use open the mind of an intelligent and responsible adult to the point where their interest in further exploration of reality is sparked? Obviously these drugs are widely abused, but perhaps there are **some situations** in which their use could be beneficial.

I agree completely with what you say. But those "some situations" you refer to are highly specific to individuals with very special needs and circumstances – generally under the prescription and supervision of professionals within a supportive environment -- the relatively teeny tiny upside tip to psychotropic drug usage is attached to a huge downside that is all too ready and willing to explode with enthusiasm if encouraged. However that upside should be both encouraged and implemented as long as it does not also energize the downside at the same time (e.g., it is very easy to seriously affect (in a negative or counterproductive way) the consciousness quality and evolutionary potential of 100,000 people with something as trivial as a careless comment by an influential person). The point here is to very carefully devise processes and environments that end up doing more good than harm, helping more people than they hurt.

3. This was probably mentioned in your book, and I will attempt to find it, but I would like to hear more about it anyway if that's okay.. How is the phenomena of quantum entanglement explained through your TOE? Does it have something to do with the psi uncertainty principle? Is it an actual instantaneous reaction, or is that an illusion generated by our limited view?

Take a look at the 14 segments of the Hawaii seminar on YouTube: http://www.youtube.com/user/twcjr44. The best metaphor to describe Entanglement is that it generated with an "IF, Then" statement. Still not instantaneous from a bigger picture (the "then statement is executed the very next delta-t through the timing loop) by a single DELTA-t. But it is as "instantaneous" as it is possible to get from our PMR perspective within a digital simulation running.

4. When exploring NPMR, how is it possible to tell the difference between an unactualized past/future state and a present reality?

The data within the probable future data base is simply arranged by the probability of all the possibilities – one must query it carefully by specifying the allowable error bars (for example: only see those associated probability chains that are .87 or greater of being actualized). The historical past database (actualized and unactualized) is all one big database. Again one must query it carefully (select advanced query ☺) to get the output desired. Queries are generated by one's intent and must be very specific.

5. Do you have any thoughts on lucid dreaming? I am a little confused about how this fits in with your theory. If dreaming is just another area of NPMR, then when one realizes that they are in a dream state, what happens? Is it just a greater level of awareness inside that area?

Their decision space within that reality frame grows.

And why do lucid dreams feel so much different from OOBEs?

Because of the way (beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and cognitive awareness) in which one comes to each experience.

6. I must admit that one of my main reasons for wanting to explore NPMR is for entertainment. I definitely want to explore, discover, learn, and experiment, but I am also greatly looking forward to flying, seeing things I have cannot yet imagine, experiencing incredible environments, etc.. Will this hinder my progress?

That depends how much ego you have invested in it.

7. In addition to this, in my recent lucid dreams I have not been able to fly when I attempt to. I am wondering if my intentions are not in the right place

Possibly but Probably not

or if I am doubting my ability to fly in that state.

More likely. It is not "doubting" as much as it is deep seated fear/belief/expectation and an intellect that is analyzing and judging the process in real time. Just do it and analyze it later until you gain more control (drop more ego)

8. This is a bit of a stretch, but I find it amusing to think about. Is it possible that AUM is just a simulation run by an even bigger reality that produces the illusion that consciousness is fundamental?

Yes. Once one extrapolates beyond ones possibility for direct or even indirect experience one reaches the realm of pure conjecture -- then many things might be possible. A better question that is less ambitious is: does that possibility seem likely or necessary. Though one can get a little farther with that inquiry, no final conclusions are possible – error bars are very wide (there is much uncertainty). An even less ambitious question, though still intractable, is : Does it matter to us -- and from our local PMR perspective and purpose, does it matter if it matters.

Tom

----

7 – The IUOC in Relation to the Individual

Nathan: Tom, you say we are a projection of a fragment of our individuated consciousness. So does that mean that there is a large part of ourselves existing in NPMR that the average PMR resident isn't aware of? Are we really like a leaf to our individuated consciousness' tree? So that means that there is a large part of ourselves that we aren't aware of? How big is that part in relation to our PMR fragment awareness? That is quite a thought to ponder-- I have no idea who or what I am! Is that larger part where our intuition comes from?

Tom: Nathan, let me modify the metaphor a little. Look at a leaf from a silver maple tree -- it has multiple projections like fingers from a hand. Let's say that Nathan, with his unique history and experience, is one of those still growing projections... -- part of a whole leaf that contains the experience of each of its projections. The tree this leaf is connected to the Larger consciousness System. Just a metaphor, but perhaps one that you will find useful.

Ramon: Tom, would you say that the awareness we have as the focal point of our current personality (the I of oneself that receives the data) is, in fact, the same awareness that is the I of our IUOC? Or at least one focal point of it? In turn, wou...ld the awareness of our IUOC be but one focal point of the LCS' total awareness? One continuos stream from the top down simply

passing through various filters and constraints creating the illusion of separation within the one. As we grow up, are we simply expanding the scope of our awareness back up the chain?

Tom: Ramon, different metaphors are not so much more right or more wrong as they are more or less useful to a given individual. The top down model/metaphor sorts us from higher to lower levels and functions in a cascade of dependency like parent and child. The simplest model has no levels -- it is simply the LCS manifesting whatever it needs to further its evolution and development. It bubbles us up into existence from the historical database (or from scratch) along with guides and PMRs and whatever else is necessary to most effectively facilitate consciousness evolution. Just the LCS and subsets/expressions of the LCS. One level, one thing -- consciousness and all the information and learning and data it has accumulated. Or perhaps, more poetically, a self optimizing (evolving) consciousness system with a good memory and a good imagination.

Ramon: Tom has mentioned this "bubbling up" concept before and it creates a conflict in my thinking and understanding of reality as I have come to understand it personally.

I long ago came t...o grips with the fact that "Ramon," as a temporary personality in PMR, is transient and impermanent. "Ramon" is just a title that is given to the subset containing all the data "I" have accumulated in this lifetime/experience packet. At birth, all I (Ramon) came in with was awareness, potential, and the free will to develop this awareness/potential however I choose. When I die, "Ramon" is finished, wrapped up. Yes, the data is recorded and persists in the historical record but I have always taken it that the individuated unit of consciousness, that is the source of the awareness/potential/free will, and all of the data it has collected over the course of many packets (including Ramon as data of course) persists as a separate and distinct entity (though still just an artificially bounded subset) within and of AUM.

Perhaps I am misunderstanding Tom, but it seems as if this bubbling up concept insinuates that even the individuated unit of consciousness is dissolved and called back up and doesn't persist consistently and indefinitely as a separate entity with awareness and free will. This seems different to me than how he used to describe the process. As he said though, he is describing it in the simplest way here. I'm comfortable with the fact that the only fundamental reality, of existence and beingness, is AUM so either way I'm good.

Yessin: My thoughts "Bubbles up" is just a metaphor, obviously, for what happens when TLCS wants to facilitate it's own evolution. And if the path of Ramon, with all his lifetimes, have been learning experiences or potential learning experiences,... the historical record which that is important for TLCS to grow more from and to make more change from. And that's basically what

we all are, a present mechanism of the whole: a constant choice-making observer, and a historical record, we call that "individual". TLCS is the only separate entity with awareness and free will

----

Tom: You are both correct in your thinking.

The consciousness system has free will -- freewill is necessary for consciousness. Little and big you, as an individual character such as Ramon and as an individual IUOC (defined by the historical data of your experience within virtual realities) are always a potentiality within the larger consciousness system. This is more accurate than saying that you are an independent piece of the LCS – you are not independent, you are one with the LCS – you have the potential to be independent, to have an independent freewill, within a virtual reality within the LCS. Your independent free will requires a virtual reality. Otherwise you are simply data, a potentiality within the LCS. The LCS has free will and you are one with it, not independent or separate from it.

From the historical database, the LCS selects a historical individual, like Ramon, or a sequence of historical characters that have progressed through multiple lifetimes, like Ramon's IUOC. To this information, the LCS adds a freewill -- which means it inserts this Ramon and/or IUOC into a virtual reality where it can make free choices within an evolving decision space appropriate to their ability/quality/awareness. Recall that consciousness itself is the only thing that is fundamental and that everything else is virtual. This "everything else" includes all structured (within the bounds of some sort of rule-set) realities where experiential interaction takes place. All experiential realities are virtual.

Consciousness creates the structure. The structure defines the reality, and the reality creates the possibility for an interactive experience between subsets of consciousness. The quality of the subset of consciousness (as specified by its history) and the structural bounds defining the reality together determine the available decision space and the nature of possible interactions. Some examples of virtual realities from our point of view: PMRs, dreams, where you end up after dying in a PMR, OOBE "locales", NPMR in general.

The historical record of these subsets or entities grows or evolves as choices are made and their intent is expressed. What is gained by a subset of consciousness (either Ramon or his IUOC) participating in a virtual reality is a new historical record that (thinking positively) accumulates quality (reduces entropy) as it engages in exercising its freewill intent.

To this point we have used language that implies that Ramon and his IUOC are two different entities. Assuming that Ramon is a subset of his IUOC, both he and his IUOC could each be considered individual subsets of consciousness with a history and could be "bubbled up" or be chosen by the LCS to engage in a virtual reality appropriate to their evolutionary needs. However, that assumption of separateness seems little more than a habit of PMR thinking when one considers that Ramon is a representative of his IUOC. Ramon participates in this PMR virtual reality as a manifestation of his IUOC, and as such he brings with him all the quality and history that his IUOC has to offer at the time. He is, in more technical terms, a specific instance of his IUOC that is restricted to abide by the PMR rule-set. As Ramon experiences and chooses in PMR, his IUOC collects the data and integrates it in real time (as the action happens and the choices are made).

1) If that IOUC is simply collecting data to be processed by the LCS, it is no more than a history file in the process of having data uploaded to it. 2) If that IOUC is making freewill decisions and choices within one or more virtual realties **that subsume PMR** then it has two or more tracks of evolution running at the same time that may influence each other. For example, two separate experience packets in PMR at the same time (that may or may not interact) plus the IUOC actively interacting acting with one or each of them would constitute three tracks of evolution running at the same time. 3) If that IOUC is making freewill decisions and choices within one or more virtual realties **that are independent of PMR** then it has two or more tracks of evolution running at the same time that do not directly interact or influence each other. For example, two separate experience packets each in a separate PMR plus the IUOC is engaged in some other virtual reality that has nothing to do with either PMR packet would constitute three independent tracks of simultaneous evolution. All configurations/combinations of 1, 2, and 3 are possible; and several are probably used very commonly, however, I suspect that each specific instance is individually optimized.   No doubt, the LCS implements whatever seems like the best use of available resources to further the systems evolution in the long run.

1) represents the simplest arrangement, and thus one that is probably used often, especially in the beginning stages of consciousness evolution.   2) is probably more common for a lower entropy consciousness and 3) is not very efficient use of system resources unless more than one independent subject is being learned at a time. Consciousness evolution, because of its cumulative nature, is usually considered a singular subject that is better approached serially than in parallel. Of course, there are always exceptions and special cases.

The bottom line is that there is no fixed one answer to how the IUOC relates to the individual PMR character – the system is intelligent, aware, and flexible enough to optimize the huge array

of possible choices and processes always available within a large complex digital information system. We humans don't like uncertainty – we tend to develop closed solutions for every problem – its simpler that way. People need metaphors they can easily grasp and feel comfortable with – as we grow our understanding, our metaphors change.

----

8 – Title

----

9 – Title

----

10 – Title