Handouts for Discussion 2

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.

3 The nature of OOBE

Question:

I have 2 questions after absorbing all of the material in the lectures. The first question is in relation to the difference between OOBE and what you referred to as shifting your awareness to different reality streams. I get your description of an OOBE as leaving the house with no windows and being able to walk around and see in your back yard. You describe shifting awareness to a different reality stream as essentially being open to experiencing everything outside of your yard. But what is the difference between an OOBE experience and shifting awareness to a different reality data stream? Is there a difference in how each is accessed? If not then how do you go from being able to OOBE to being able to access different reality data streams? My assumption would be that it lies within your intent. But as I have never done either of these I am having trouble understanding why you would only want to hang out in the backyard instead of traveling the world?

Tom's Answer:

The difference between OOBE and exploring the larger reality is only belief and intent. What is generally thought of as the OOBE reality frame is a subset of the larger reality just like PMR is a subset of the larger reality.

All explorations beyond PMR are attained by focusing your intent to realize or accept data from data-streams that are different from the PMR data-stream.

The OOBE is limited Because of limiting beliefs and limitations of individual imagination and understanding.

One's intent must seek out the data bounded by a specific rule-set that describes a particular reality frame.

Because your consciousness can only follow your intent, exploring the larger reality is something like being in the greatest of great libraries, where you must tell the librarians what you want and they bring it to you, and not realizing that this great library could possibly contain anything other than romance novels because that is the only type of book you have ever seen or heard about. The only picture that many individuals have of the larger reality is from reading about the personal and thus limited interpretations of data others have experienced and then translated into PMR sense data according to the best pattern match they could find in their own database of PMR experience. Believing these interpretations to be facts rather than symbols and metaphors limited by their own experience, they share their experiences of OOBE, or dreaming, or lucid dreaming -- or perhaps religious experiences or drug experiences as accurate descriptions of the larger reality. All of these sources together are probably no more inclusive of the larger reality than romance novels are of all books. The actual larger reality exists to us only as

information/data (what we have been calling virtual reality) and is not limited in any way by some confused observers ability to pattern match it to their PMR experience-base.

To get to a reality frame that you have never heard of you must:
1) be sent/led/taken by someone who does know.
2) Have contact with someone who has been there or knows of it -- or knows someone who knows of it.
In other words you must link through another's consciousness.

This is normal enough. I and others use this process all the time. For example, if your friend Joe tells you that he knows somebody that needs your healing help. Any time later, if you want to go to that person you simply direct your intent to "that person Joe told me about" while remembering the instance of Joe telling you. That provides a unique address to that person since there is only one specific person on the planet that Joe was referring to when he said that to you. You don't need pictures, addresses, names, or a lock of hair – the link through Joe's consciousness is sufficient whether or not Joe is still alive in PMR – it's all in the database (which is what you are really using anyway).

However, the point is, if you do not understand the nature of reality and think NPR is just a funky PMR (standard belief and assumption) you go about exploring NPMR like you would go about exploring Central Park, or the Grand Canyon. You believe everything in NPMR must be continuous and contiguous because in PMR space and reality seem continuous and contiguous and your limited understanding cannot imagine that it could be any other way. That belief limits you to your back yard – or in a different analogy, to romance novels. To leave the OOBE reality you need to take a discontinuous jump to another frame just like you had to make a discontinuous jump from the PMR frame to the OOBE frame (even though your awareness is continuous throughout the jump). You might say that you have to go out of your out of body body, but that terminology just confuses the issue even more – it's about consciousness, not bodies. You can make the jump directly from PMR to any other frame for which you have access to a unique address.

It is really simpler than it sounds – much easier to do than it is to explain. I hope I have answered your question and not just confused you.

Tom C
----

4 Meditation and OOBE
AJ Fisher: How will the use of this meditation affect me? I.e. what results would I expect to see?

Tom: Results are individual. In general, your personal reality will change as your perspective grows larger. A little like the difference between existing as a nine year old and then gradually over six months, existing as a 20 year old. Neglecting the obvious special physical conditions of puberty and size, what would you tell the nine year old to expect to see in six months?

AJ Fisher: Is this pin-point consciousness state a springboard for OBE? I.e. through consistent use, is OBE initiation possible in this state?

Tom: Yes. Once your awareness has left the physical – you are already out of the PMR reality frame. After that, your intent is in charge.

AJ Fisher: If so, is this initiation a "classic" OBE, or more of a phasing experience?

Tom: A "classic OOBE" is an OOBE the duplicates the experience, and thus the beliefs and limitations, of someone or several someone's who have described their personal experiences to a wide audience. Reality frames are the way they are – it is individual interpretations that are different. I was once caught in that belief trap – experiencing (on demand) only classical OOBE -- eventually I learned that reality was much, much larger and more rational, consistent, and logically structured as limitations and beliefs fell away and a more coherent integrated big picture came into view. Much in this forum already addresses this subject: Look at this: viewtopic.php?f=19&t=2907
And this: viewtopic.php?f=9&t=2915&start=0&st=0&sk=t&sd=a

AJ Fisher: I'm sure it ranges from individual, but how long (on average) through consistent use, would one be able to become proficient in using your technique, and be ready to step it up a notch e.g. start exploring other energy systems?

Tom: About 3 to 9 months to get sufficiently proficient at meditation and 3 to 19 years to eliminate the fear, beliefs and ego that limit your awareness -- that limit, what you can experience, and how you interpret what you do experience are very individual.
----

5 Experiencing and interpreting the larger reality.
Kathy: From a practical standpoint of reducing entropy how are metaphors useful to us or are they only belief traps?

Tom: They are only belief traps if you believe in them. Religious People sometimes kill, dislike, or feel contempt each other because of their strong beliefs in differing interpretations of the same data. That is a seriously counterproductive belief trap. A metaphor is a way of expressing information by analogy and symbol. Analogies are seldom perfect representations of complex conceptual content. Consequently, the content of an NPMR experience communicated by metaphor is likely to contain much uncertainty depending on your ability to find an accurate combination of analogy and symbols within your experience base and the receiver's ability to interpret your analogy and symbols accurately in terms of the content of his own experience base. Our language (any spoken or written language) is nothing but symbol and metaphor – that is what words are – simple symbols and metaphors that describe PMR experience. Every word's meaning must be interpreted independently by both the sender and the receiver. Consequently, meaning always has some uncertainty attached to it due to the limitations of the language itself and to both the sender's and receiver's individual skill, ability, and experience. That is why one is often not certain what someone means when they speak -- we must interpret their meaning. How much more difficult is that interpretation when the content they are trying to communicate lies outside of the languages natural reach and beyond both the speaker's and listener's experience data bases.

In summary, words are metaphors and symbols for concepts, ideas, feelings and types of things. "rock" is a metaphor for hard lumpy clumps of minerals or up tempo music with a pronounced beat or … several other things. Each of us interprets words in our own subjective way based on what we come in with, our abilities, and our personal experience base. Those from the same culture understand each other better because they share many of the same (understand each other's) metaphors and symbols.

In either case (believing in them or not) metaphors certainly can be useful. For example, healers do heal with their light beams. The light beam metaphor is simply a tool that helps its user focus her intent. If they believe their light beams are fundamentally real and essential for healing, they are stuck with them. If they realize they are just metaphorical tools, they can develop any number of useful custom tools for their unique selves that will be just as good if not more effective. Belief, as always, is limiting. Metaphors are very useful as communication tools for complex experiences even though they are subject to individual interpretation on both ends of the communication – that is the same in PMR and NPMR. In NPMR, the bounds of interpretation are typically much wider because we don't study NPMR carefully enough to understand its nature or become a part of its culture. Like zinging into china for an hour and reporting the significance of what you saw and heard – bound to be lots of misinterpretation unless you are a part of their culture. Keep in mind that NPMR is a lot stranger to us than China and most of us have very little experience with it.

Kathy: Applied to NPMR, is darkness or what's called the black void also a metaphor?

Tom: Yes. It must necessarily be a metaphor. However a metaphor of something very basic and fundamental is more likely to be interpreted accurately by almost everyone. Thus the concept of the void is more easily and accurately communicated to a large heterogeneous audience than a green guy with pointy ears selling vacuum cleaners, or a fox hunt.

Kathy: Also do feelings such as love or fear exist in NPMR. If I understand correctly our interpretation would be metaphors, but what about the feeling itself? I'm thinking of the light being that I felt love radiating from. Was me feeling this love a metaphor?

Tom: Yes feelings exist in NPMR and they are interpreted in terms of feeling-metaphors (as opposed to language or picture metaphors) based on our personal experience data – the same answer applies to feelings as applied to the void. Feelings that are fundamental and basic, like love and fear are very likely to be interpreted accurately by almost everyone. Many feelings are fundamental and basic (are therefore cross-cultural or pan-cultural). Consequently, feelings received in NPMR tend to be interpreted accurately while feelings in PMR that must rely on words (instead of body language) are very easily misunderstood. The result is that feeling is a more solid mode of accurate communication in NPMR than it is in PMR. People who don't process feelings well are at a disadvantage.

Tom C
----

6 Objectivity and experience
Arthur: So - while NPMR is itself an objective reality (it exists, is a thing), all perception of it, from within, or from outside, (PMR), can only be subjective, and perspective-related. Is that a fair summary, over-simplified, or just plain wrong?

Tom: That is correct.

One's reality is individual. Consciousness is information. Information must be interpreted and that interpretation must be subjective. The concept of objectivity is a local VR concept generated by the more stringent constraints found in PMR type VRs. The experience of an objective reality is approximated

within a PMR VR illusion when a large number of people share the same rule set defining their perception. There is no such thing as an objective reality in the way that PMR residents use the term.

Indeed, consciousness does exist, it is fundamentally real -- so we borrow the local PMR illusionary concept of objectivity and call the consciousness system "objective" because our language and cultural beliefs will not let our intellects consider anything to be fundamentally real unless it is also objective – a habit of PMR thinking that has no use or meaning beyond PMR.

Tom C

Bette,

Yes, objectivity exists as an illusion, an approximation, only in a PMR -- outside of PMR it has no meaning. But don't let your habits of thinking, your PMR cultural beliefs, lead you to think that therefore nothing can be known or that nothing is or can be real.

Perhaps nothing can be know for sure, but that is a very different thing. Certainty is rarely experienced in any reality outside of a VR simply following its rule-sets. Uncertainty is a fundamental aspect of our perception in a digital information system where the information received must be interpreted by each individual according to its own experience data base.

Tom C

----

7   Of people, critters, trees and rocks: Some things (sentient beings) have consciousness (however bright or dim), but everything has some form of awareness (however bright or dim).
Stroker : A forest isn't sentient, but have any of you sat in silence and opened up in an old growth forest? There is a presence, and I feel a wordless whisper from a collective awareness that is timeless. Or felt the wind-riders passing in the sky like great invisible sailing ships, on errands with purpose unknown. Perhaps you've been in a place far away from the works of man and felt the presence of the land, a feeling of ages and wonder. I always listen. What does this all mean? I'm seeking to find reason in things I've felt since a child and have known to be facts without explanation. They felt as if they had purpose in a way that is alien to our thinking. Usually interaction with them was an acknowledgement of my respect which was returned as they went about their business. When I tried to see into their business with any success, I was strongly pushed away unless my intent was pure and of limited focused. All that I could see was they were aware and they were an active part of PMR that was non-physical, and a bit more impossible to put in words.

Tom: I do share your sense of some primal awareness connected with nature much as you describe it in the above paragraph. However I am not sure of the necessity of RWW web crawlers to feed data to the VRRE. And I wonder why old growth forest would be different than new growth forest as far as rendering goes – and how and why these web crawlers would develop so much emotional attachment and feeling content while performing their data collection services. These primal spirits you and I have encountered seem more personally connected, more like the soul of the forest than data collectors and processors generating information about the forest. But your post did get me thinking. I think you have an interesting hypothesis, but let me pass another one by you for your consideration.

No, trees are not sentient because we define sentience as an interactive being having decision space – and thus possessing free will. What we define as being conscious requires a free will. However, I think there may well be continuum of awareness from people to pebbles. In MBT we focused on that part of the awareness continuum that starts with the sentient entity (being) who has the smallest decision space and goes upward from there to the most highly evolved consciousnesses among us – i.e., all beings with free will – or equivalently: decision space > 0.

Decision space requires an aware "intellect function," however tiny or dim, that makes the decisions that fall within its decision space. However, there is more to awareness than intellect. All awareness has a feeling component as well as an intellectual component. My thesis here is that the feeling component continues after the intellectual component drops out (when the decision space goes to zero and the ability to make and execute free will choices disappears).

Thus trees, for example, though not sentient or conscious, would still have awareness at the feeling/spirit/presence level of existence as opposed to the intellectual/being/consciousness plus feeling/being/consciousness levels that beings with a finite decision space and free will enjoy.

At the feeling/spirit/presence level, evolution still works in the same way but is slower do to the more general and fuzzy nature of feelings as compared to very specific and detailed nature of thoughts.   A lower data rate (experience only at the feeling level) feeds a less structured and defined content, which slows the Fundamental Evolutionary Process of assessing profitability criteria against experience and implementing change to satisfy the purpose of lowering system entropy. Nevertheless, the organization of feeling-content into more meaningful, less random, and more powerful configurations lowers the entropy content of the individuated feeling/spirit/presence just as it does within consciousness. Though each tree would have this individual feeling/spirit/presence awareness, groups of trees could combine (communicate) their feeling awareness into a common group awareness that would be much stronger and pervasive than a single feeling unit. This process of interactive group awareness works entirely on the feeling level just as group consciousness works primarily on the feeling level.   Awareness at the feeling/spirit/presence level is aware of other awareness at the feeling/spirit/presence level (i.e., another more limited (lower bandwidth) set of users communicating via the RWW net just like the rest of us). Consequently one should observe the older and more evolved presence associated with an ancient or primal forest as deeper, more profound, more structured, less random, more powerful, and more highly developed – thus more easily felt and able to communicate to a human consciousness. Consciousness connects to this evolved feeling/spirit/presence through its own feeling/being component. That is why you cannot pursue it intellectually – the information exchange must be exchanged only at the feeling level.

In Strokers words: "When I tried to see into their business with any success, I was strongly pushed away unless my intent was pure and of limited focused".

There is no reason that all trees would have an identical awareness – there would no doubt be variations between species and within species just as there are among sentient beings.

No doubt communication at a feeling level takes place all the time among trees and other plants, between trees and animals, and between trees, animals, and people. City trees may have completely different "personalities" than forest trees of the same species. Saplings, would have a different level of awareness than more mature trees.

Trees and forests were just one example; the same would work for all living things.

Just as living but non-sentient things duplicate the fractal process of consciousness at their own level of awareness, could not inanimate things repeat that process yet one step lower to include the earth beneath an ancient trade route or battlefields of a particularly bitter civil war. It would seem reasonable that these inanimate things would retain some of what they experienced at their own level of awareness (digital data is never lost). A person sensitive to those feelings might communicate (sense or feel) this accumulated feeling-experience data when they visit such places. So, what about buildings and cities, The stones that make up a particular house, a home and the people in it. The clothes and belongings of a particular person; a man and his favorite chair, place of work, car or motorcycle; a woman and her home, kitchen, garden, clothes, or jewelry? Would not each retain something of the other at a feeling level – if the feelings were deep and consistent?   Could not inanimate objects duplicate the fractal process of rudimentary feeling awareness at a lower and dimmer level than living things – not so much feeling as we think of and experience feeling, but a rough, simplistic, limited, less detailed, lower data rate, more basic version of feeling awareness that communicates interactively with other stuff and with living things. At this level of communication, evolution would be so slow as to be nearly nonexistent.

In this model, everything has awareness while only sentient beings have consciousness.

I have laid out just the bare minimum of this concept. There is much yet to be thought out – these ideas have just bubbled up in the last hour (a late hour at that) and will no doubt need refining and adjusting. But I thought I would share them with you even though they are just a work in progress. They do nicely answer Stroker's question and cover a good bit more of many peoples subjective experience. Thank you Stroker for pointing out a piece of reality not addressed by MBT.

Tom C
----

8 Thinking of consciousness in terms of PMR
Jer,
You seem to be focused on the media and the code and missing the message content. A poem may be digitized as audio or by a word processer. That poem may then be duplicated precisely -- all that duplication gains for you is distribution -- it serves no other function. The meaning of that poem must be interpreted. In this forum we mostly talk about the meaning and significance of information -- the distribution mechanism is beside the point because every sentient being is already on the distribution list by being plugged in to the RWW -- within The One consciousness system, distribution (all information) is universal -- one draws in what one can process. Another way to say the same thing is that "distribution" being based upon a spatial concept, is only relevant to PMR. Consciousness is not constrained by the

rule-set defining PMR. Consciousness is the media. We assume code must lie behind any message because that makes sense to our PMR habits of thought. Don't confuse reality with the model of reality. The model must be cast into the language of PMR.

There may be only content (whole thoughts and feelings relative to interactive relationship that can be strung together to form content) and no underlying "objective" code. Thoughts and feelings are fundamental to consciousness and even at the most basic level must be individually interpreted. The Consciousness system generates rules that define virtual realities within which one must distribute/share/communicate normally or locally by code (such as acoustic vibration and language) according to the allowable energetic interactions defined by the rule-set.

Within consciousness, communication is about sharing content. Personal growth is about decreasing the entropy of the content of an individuated unit of consciousness. Everything of importance is about meaning and significance of content i.e., the sharing and evolution of individual significance and meaning. The meaning and content of any message, speech, picture, or feeling must be interpreted uniquely by every unique individual. In the big Picture, a red cube only has value if it means something, has content and significance to some individual sentient being. In the little picture, a red cube is a PMR phenomena defined by cause and effect -- the logic of the rule-set. Consciousness is the only real fundamental thing -- all else are virtual reality frames with specific purposes and rules-sets to support those purposes.

Jer: Do you think there will come a time when a sufficiently evolved being could analyze and transmit a simple enough consciousness unit, utilizing the language of the consciousness unit itself, so as to have exact copy, a small part of consciousness that can be moved from the first category of unknowns to the second category of knowns?

Tom: Yes, no doubt exact copies can be made of any given content, but the value, significance, and meaning of that content must be interpreted. However, there would be little point in doing so since the original is already available to everything that exists that is capable of generating an interpretation of it. The two categories you describe do not exist in consciousness as they do in PMR. Bottom line: The code underlying consciousness is an unnecessary concept and thus probably does not exist. In PMR the code is necessary because of needing to abide by the rule-set defining allowable energetic and spatial interactions between entities.

It seems you are trying to conceive of consciousness in terms of PMR rules.

Tom C

----

9 The origins of consciousness.
Dan: I don't think I am under any illusions as to the fact that there is NOT only ONE PMR-centric way of modeling those superset concepts. …. one concept of the mystical cannot be better than another EXCEPT solely in it's ability to model, describe, define experienced reality (and predict future experience) from/for a particular perspective.

Tom: You certainly got that right – speculation is a fun game – but in the end it is just speculation. The down side to speculation is that it tends to contain a substantial personal component because it is, by definition, beyond the reach of logic -- yet well within the reach of being influenced by personal limitations. My speculation is not likely to be any more correct than anybody else's.

Dan: But, as I (thought I) understood it, at that "point in the cycle", there is no capacity, time (nor space or anything OTHER) yet right? So, what is there to constrain One? There are limits which cause the prudent millionaire to BE prudent with his money but at that "point" there wouldn't have been ANY limits on the One except that one "limitation" of oneness itself which it subsequently "solved" by manifesting. Without limits, I guess I just don't see the capacity for (or point in) "holding back" anything "in reserve".

Tom: First of all, in your own words: "…there can be no change (which would include evolution - entropy reduction) without (some concept of) time." Now let's take that concept back to the beginning. The First Change within some large but finite potential awareness (digital potential energy that some call the void) was the ability to generate a binary state (uniform vs. not uniform; distorted vs. not distorted; this, then not this). It was at that moment that incipient baby AUO was birthed out of some this mystical (unknown) potential -– i.e., the mystical digital potential energy void thingy became baby AUO.   Furthermore, when that potential discovered an intentional difference between "this" and "not this", also marked the birth of time – the birth of "before" and "after". AUO and time were birthed together – twins, joined at the hip, that need each other to exist –- in other words, AUO was ready for primal time. That "primal time" was, no doubt, wild and woolly, not at all like our sense of time because it did not come in the form of regular tic-tocks – that came later – but it was time, just the same.

Secondly, you asked: What was there to limit or constrain baby AUM from populating the entire digital potential energy firmament-void-thingy that was now no longer a void with multiple instances of "this" and "not this". The only reason to think baby AUO would do that is: "Why not?" That is a very weak argument. Of course you are right that there were no external constraints – but what about internal constraints? Internal constraints are far more likely and significant in this particular game. How about: He didn't feel like it or think of it because he was so busy playing with, and totally overwhelmed by, all his new toys which only consumed 1 gazillionth of the available –used-to-be-void-thingy's capacity to support "this/that" binary pairs.

 In MBT, I believe I called "this/that" pairs "reality cells". Now, put just enough reality cells together with some evolved rule-sets that can structure its digital content data into something it finds meaningful, remember what it is doing, and modify its own content in an effort to decrease its entropy and thus become more able and capable, (you know, bigger better, faster, smarter) and you would get a baby consciousness. Perhaps, if you were a guy and not resonant with babies, you would call it a consciousness cell. I may have called it that myself, but tonight "baby consciousness" seems more appropriate because I think that confusion between the terms "reality cell" and "consciousness cell" may be a contributor to your and Ted's differences.   Would that baby consciousness have to contain all the reality cells that had been created? No, logically it would need just enough to support consciousness. Could it have commandeered all the reality cells it had been playing (evolving) with? Sure. In either case, could it make more reality cells – as many as it wanted? Why not – it certainly would retain that ability since the newly birthed AUO is the new and improved model of that digital potential that first started manufacturing reality cells in the first place.

Perhaps several of these baby consciousnesses would have evolve independently within the digital primal binary sea of the now not so void void. They could combine into one entity or start sharing what was meaningful to them with each other, or begin to split off even more baby consciousnesses once they developed/evolved sufficient excess consciousness capacity. Or perhaps, the one singular baby consciousness would grow and mature to the point that it could undergo consciousness cell division and create smaller subsets of itself – etc. The point being that there are 50 ways to leave your void – all of which might lead to the situation we find ourselves in today (speculating about the origins of consciousness from a tiny point on the far edge of the empire that has to use PMR English symbols and metaphors to communicate). Like a nest of cockroaches trying to Decipher the corporate structure of Dominos by examining discarded pizza boxes.

Dan: So, did the total (apparently infinite but REALLY finite) number of "cells of consciousness" come into existence during the "time" that the One was becoming Many (AUO evolved AUM), or are "cells of consciousness" constantly being "created"

Tom: Let's say many consciousness cells (baby consciousnesses) were formed one way or another during early waves of evolutionary activity (independently, or chipped off an Old Block) and that new baby consciousness can be created by a form of cell division wherein an entity (including AUM) with sufficient excess content and structure can partition off a portion of their reality cells and let that newly formed partition evolve on its own.

Dan: Will we actually have CREATED consciousness thereby??? Won't we just be creating a "container" that we hope is CAPABLE of "housing" consciousness (sufficiently limited/unlimited for the consciousness's purposes), not actually creating the consciousness itself? Or is that just semantics?

Tom: A semantics problem – it just depends on how one wishes to define terms. Let me be more specific: We will have created a new individuated unit of consciousness – a newly formed subset of the seemingly infinite but actually finite larger consciousness system. Even in the description above of consciousness cell division where an entity creates another by partitioning some of its capacity, the only thing new that has been created is the boundary defining the new subset. Same with AI Guy. We create the machine with the appropriate capacity and ability, and because all is consciousness, a subset of available reality cells are pulled together to represent that potential. That potential is now able to evolve. Think of a sentient entity as a bounded digital potential with enough of what it takes to support a free will awareness unit. There appears to be an unlimited supply of available reality cells.

Dan: Because time passed much faster, evolution occurred very quickly until VR1 was evolved which had a larger basic unit of time (time quanta) which means time passes more slowly "in" VR1 than prior (in AUM) and the same slowing of time subsequently happens as VRn within fractaline nested VRn's continue to evolve. As time becomes "more dense", in a very similar manner, the "matter" of those VR's that are nested each would become similarly more dense than it's "parent" - this could account for the progressive densities of the various planes as passed down through the various spiritual traditions (Perennial Philosophy).

Tom: It is my impression that the larger consciousness system is much broader than it is deep. In other words, a broadly flattened organizational structure (many nests at the second and third and perhaps fourth level of parent child Hierarchy and few deeper than that) rather than a few nests with many levels

of parent child Hierarchy within each nest. But then, that's my guess from my extremely limited view. The data I have supports that view, but I am sure there are a lot of data I have never experienced.

Tom C

----

10 Needs and fears
Bette,
Needs and fears are a fact of our lives. Some have their utility and serve a useful function within our imperfect world. All of us would be better off if we and the situations we have generated for ourselves found no utility or useful function for the fear in our lives.

The fear, needs, wants, and requirements of our ego as well as our embedded entanglements with the fear, needs, wants, and requirements of others is a large part of our daily lives. This is the stuff out of which our opportunities to be better flow. Simply rejecting your fearful self and surroundings and entanglements is not the solution, or the way of growth. Applying your intention and free will within the ego soup you swim in to improve your own quality of consciousness and to provide an environment that helps others improve theirs is the way of love. One does not succeed by dropping out, but by dropping in. One does not grow by disengaging from the fearful world or disentangling from the limited reality of others -- one grows by interacting wisely and lovingly within the environment one has created for oneself.

The fears and needs of our everyday existence represent the challenges we have to work with – one should not think of them a negative, evil, or bad things to be avoided, rather as challenges to be met. Dealing effectively with them, reducing them, and overcoming them for ourselves and for others define the PMR virtual reality game we are enrolled in. The point of being here is to learn and grow – not to be perfect. Feeling flawed or guilty because you are not perfect is counterproductive, useless and silly. That you have fear, needs, wants, and ego is not nearly as important as how you deal with them – how affectively you learn and grow from the opportunities they represent.

Tom C

----

11 The structure of consciousness: the system, the individual, and PMR experience
Roland: What is the difference between the 'data stream' that is one's 'experience packet' and consciousness itself?

Tom: Consider three nested levels of The One digital consciousness.

First some fundamental concepts: A consciousness represents a specific collection of data, rules, and evolved intent along with the memory, processing capability and feedback loops required to learn and evolve through entropy reduction. Entropy reduction is achieved by a more profitable organization of one's consciousness resources. Consciousness resources are the accumulated data from experience, the rules and constraints that define internal processing (awareness) and external interaction (data transfer), and the evolved level of organization (represented by intent) along with the memory, processing capability and feedback loops required for self modification (learning/evolution – self awareness motivated by individual purpose).

Subroutines inside of subroutines – the outer loop rules.

1 Your local PMR consciousness.
The 'data stream' that defines one's 'experience packet' does so by defining one's local awareness within the PMR virtual experience trainer. If, from the PMR viewpoint, there appears to be no other reality frame more fundamental than PMR, then the PMR awareness generated by the data stream from the experience trainer (VRRE as Ted named it) is simply interpreted as one's consciousness.

2 Your larger consciousness.
However, there is both the you that is a character IN the experience generated by the data stream from the VR experience training device, and the larger You that decided to let a portion of Your digital consciousness resources be dedicated to participating in the PMR virtual experience trainer in order to expose Yourself to a potentially productive growth stimulating environment. That is, there is the virtual you trudging through the virtual landscape of a multiplayer PMR game simulator and the larger You who supplies the free will intent to that character by making the choices. From this perspective, Your consciousness is much more than the data stream creating the virtual reality experience taking place in the PMR VR trainer.

3 The larger consciousness System.
From yet a larger perspective: Just as a portion of Your digital consciousness resources are dedicated to participating in the PMR virtual experience trainer, Your larger consciousness is just a portion of a LARGER YET digital consciousness resource that is dedicated to representing You as an individuated consciousness unit.

Tom C
----

12 Being of and beyond PMR. The difference between lucid dreams and OOBE
Dan: What is the difference between lucid dreams and OOBE

Tom: I live in a continuous balance between being a spectator and being a participant -- I suspect that this is true of many people and has to do with how far the centroid of your personal reality is out from under the fat part of the normal probability curve. If the fundamentals of your reality fall 20 sigma beyond the norm you can't help but feel somewhat like a spectator. I can choose to shift my perspective to be 100% spectator or 100% participant, but a practical balance that can easily shift from one pole to the other as required is most functional. As a 100% spectator, you are no longer a participant in this reality frame (i.e., you are outside PMR) -- you can stick around and observe PMR or leave and go elsewhere.

Lucid dreams and OOBE approach leaving PMR from different awareness's and perspectives. Because of that difference people who have little operational control tend, by default, to remain tied to the spaces through which they enter the out-of-PMR experience --- i.e., lucid dreams (entered from a dream state) are more dreamlike and OOBE (entered fully conscious) is more awake like. However it is only habit and belief that ties someone to the spaces through which they enter the out-of-PMR experience. Once free of PMR, your focus and intent (and, of course, your ego, fears, expectations, needs, and beliefs -- if you happen to have any of those things :-)) are solely in charge of what happens next.

Tom C

----

13 EGO:

First some definitions: Ego (ego) -- the sense of self defined in terms of separation and differentiation from others -- is a result of fear. The sense of self defined in terms of oneness with others is not called ego and is not a result of fear. In our culture, a sense of self defined in terms of oneness with others and All That Is is practically non-existent, both in fact and in concept, consequently, "ego" by common usage is the sense of self defined in terms of separation and differentiation from others. And, the sense of self defined in terms of oneness with others is not given a name since it does not exist in our collective reality.

This definition (the way I use the word, ego) subsumes the common psychological definition of ego -- the sense of "I" as a separate individual. The word "separate" logically implies "others", i.e., relative to, or contrasted/compared with, other individuals. Ego is the "I" in counterpoint to "you" and "them". The ego describes unique individual existence among other unique individuals in terms of relationship to those individuals.

Ego is about me -- me in juxtaposition/relation to others -- thus ego is represented by an inward pointing arrow (pointing toward me). How does that affect me? "Me" is the subject and object of ego   Love is about others. Thus Love is represented by an outward pointing arrow (pointing toward others). Ego is fear based. The unnamed antithesis of ego is love based. Ego is generated in reaction to fear (me in contention with them). Ego is a strategy, a device, to ensure that dealing with interactions with myself and others is positive for me – it is about what you get. Love is about what you give. Love, being about giving unconditionally to others, requires fearlessness. Conditions are needed to allay fears.

Tom C

----

14 About Guides:

Guides are not there to do things for you or engage you in conversation. They are there to help provide specifically needed growth opportunities, valuable learning experiences, and nudge you in the right direction. If talking to you does not accomplish one of those three goals, they are not interested. They anticipate how their interaction with you might affect you and make their decisions accordingly. Many guides care little about what you process with your intellect -- they know the intellect is generally in service to the ego and has little effect upon long term entropy reduction.

Some guides feel working with the intellect is a waste of time -- others do not -- there is data to support both sides of that long simmering argument.

Author,
Thinking of intellect, is it purely a PMR attribute, or can some aspect of it be present in NPMR also? The idea of a 'simmering' debate amongst guides about the pros and cons of working with the intellects of their 'clients' (for want of a better word!) perhaps implies some intellectual side to the guides also?

Tom: The intellect exists within all awareness in all reality frames -- and is primarily the servant of ego in most of them.

However, in the highly constrained PMR frames where "I" appears to exist at the center of existence separated from, and set to struggle in competition with, all else ("me" pitted against the universe of "not me" in an interactive game of survival and accumulation of self-referential power and control) the intellect's connection to and awareness of the core of one's being is especially tenuous. In Western cultures (in both the East and West) the intellect is more subservient and tightly bound to the ego because the sense of separation from the whole of existence is more intense and pervasive. Thus, dealing with a self-focused left brained intellect in order to affect the quality of consciousness typically generates little traction for change. Somewhat like trying to move an object by pushing (as opposed to pulling) on a string connected to the object.

On the other hand, some individuals, with good right brain - left brain balance who live in fuller awareness of the larger reality, have a stronger connection between their intellects and their inner being. With these, a guide might well facilitate growth more quickly by employing intellectual engagement.

Guides who chose to work more overtly and who engage intellectually with their charges must work much harder, be more creative, clever, attentive and focused, and be constantly aware of the risk of digging themselves and their client into a hole by feeding the ego which leaves their client worse off than before they started. They tend to be "hands on" and more assertive type individuals. Such proactive guides produce by far the best positive results (highest learning rates) but also produce the highest percentage of negative results. Some proactive guides (it's an art more than a science) consistently produce great results, others, not as gifted or as inclined to take risks, opt for the more conservative slow but steady route. Guides are allowed to interact in the way they think is best for them and their charge. Matching a guides approach with the personality and potential growth rate of his/her charge is key. Sometimes serious mismatches occur leading to problems of devolution or the stunting of potential growth. If a mismatch is pointed out, the system tries to accommodate but consistently effective pro-active guides are usually in short supply. Those guides who use opposite approaches sometimes look askance at each other -- it is an ongoing debate with some tension and occasional strong feelings on both sides.

Tom C

All,

Remember, the concept of individual "guides" is our metaphor, i.e., our model for describing the individuated learning support feature, structure, and function of the larger consciousness reality system. The information I gave above is my interpretation of my direct experience and interaction with many guides besides my own and with my direct experience and interaction with the system that manages and controls this particular learning support function.

Our vision of a team of humanoid "people" individually assigned and hovering over us 24x7 to help facilitate our entropy reduction (our spiritual growth, consciousness evolution) is produced by us overlaying our PMR conceptual habits onto the causality of NPMR. We must model things in a way that makes sense to us from a PMR perspective so we can talk about it using PMR language. Do not assume

that the larger reality is constrained by our limited perspective just because we are. Again, don't confuse reality with the model of reality.

Tom C

---

15   Evil: Positive and negative consciousness evolution:
Either you are evolving or devolving.
In Book 2, Chapters 8 and 9 you will find a discussion of this subject. Here is a short summary:
Consciousness evolving in the positive direction, evolves toward states that produce individual profitability and lower entropy, as well as generate profitability and lower entropy for the larger consciousness system – creating internal and external balance. On the other hand, consciousness evolving in the negative direction evolves toward states that produce a limited individual profitability and lower entropy, while generating higher entropy and chaos for the larger consciousness system. By total control of self (controlling their personal energy) and by control of everything external to them that can be controlled, they are able to create an unstable approximation of internal balance while throwing the larger consciousness system out of balance. The potential of negative beings is very much constrained. Control, driven by desire and need, is a desperate and self-limiting attempt by the disenfranchised effete to appear powerful. Control is, and always has been, a poor substitute for love.
AUM is dim consciousness evolved into brilliant love-consciousness – which is how positive consciousness naturally evolves. The negative intent consciousness critters and beings (evil) can evolve only toward power-control-force. That is as far as evil can go – i.e., the establishment of an inherently unstable (self destructive) external network of fear bound together by power-control-force. Minimizing entropy by growing or evolving in the negative direction is extremely limited and relatively worthless compared to the advantages gained by a consciousness evolving positively toward the expression of itself as love. In PMR, power-control-force is a way of life – a primary motivator. That fact should tell you there is much low quality consciousness, negativity, and evil running loose in our local reality.

Tom C

It is not particularly useful to model individuals, or people in general, in terms of good and evil. It is better to see each individual as simply expressing the quality of consciousness that they have evolved thus far. Each is here to make the best use that they can of the learning opportunities they have. Each is limited in their ability to do so by by the extent to which they have already evolved -- that is the nature of having to pull yourself up by your bootstraps. It is better to see individuals who have jumped into this learning lab as doing the best they can -- given the limitations of what they have to work with (themselves). Having compassion and understanding for the severely limited consciousness-toddlers that inhabit this pre-school of hard knocks and grand opportunities is a more useful approach. Seeing yourself as one of those toddlers is more useful than bifurcating the population into "them" versus "us" (that approach only generates more fear).

Ted's description is brutally accurate. The larger social structure and our cultural beliefs are simply the vector sum of all the individuals that make it up. What Ted describes is an accurate reflection of the collective quality of us. That is how, where, and what we are. The way to change the collective quality is by changing the quality of the individuals who make it up. The way to change the quality of the individuals who make up our culture is to evolve the quality of your personal consciousness and provide an

environment that encourages others to evolve the quality of their consciousness.

Tom C

----

16 The mechanics of Exploring the larger reality:

Meditation is a technique you use to quiet the constant jabber of your brain-based or PMR-based thoughts and ego which are about "me in PMR" -- an operative little picture intellect jabbering away about nothing and everything -- like a 13 year old girl with her first cell phone.

One typically starts this journey to explore beyond PMR attachments with meditation. With enough practice one learns to let go of local operative thoughts and PMR sensory inputs and experience pure consciousness, pure awareness with no thoughts and no sensory input from PMR -- this is the void -- perfect sensory deprivation and a perfectly still mind aware of nothing but its own existence. The void is a good place to just float around and feel totally integrated and connected with All That Is at a visceral level -- to experience your own consciousness as a point of aware existence within The One. Because in this state you are aware of your existence but have no direct awareness of PMR, you are no longer body centered -- you are out of your body. Some take 20 years to get to this point because their beliefs and expectations put this experience outside of their reality. Some get there in a few weeks. At this point you can use your intent to focus or drive your consciousness to do what you want it to do -- heal someone, remote view, walk around on Mars, explore the available data bases, or communicate with some other consciousness in either PMR or NPMR. You can think rationally, make decisions and express your will coherently – your mind is clear, easily focused, and at your command rather than being submerged within your randomly chattering ego. Your intent is what you will. Your intent/will is normally obfuscated beneath a pile of self-referential high entropy jabber and ego junk but because you have learned to reduce that to zero -- now it is just you "the consciousness" and the void that is The One. You are now in control of, the captain of, your mind.

An expectation is a belief. It is what you want or what you have come to believe will or should happen if you are successful and "do" it right -- it primarily expresses the ego. It limits what you can actually experience because you refuse all experience that does not fulfill your expectation. You simply interpret it away. You expect to experience what you read in some very entertaining book (something that represents somebody else's personal interpretation).   Thus you throw away you own experience as being invalid and valueless while waiting to duplicate your interpretation of somebody else's interpretation of their experience because you believe that your interpretation of their interpretation represents an objective result: "the way" it must be.

Collective or universal objectivity does not exist in any reality, though it is approximated in PMRs because we all have very similar sensory apparatus within our highly constrained virtual reality rule-set. In NPMR, reality is highly personal because the rule-set is so loose it cannot support a collective objectivity like PMR's rule-set does -- but you believe that NPMR must be like PMR since you can only extrapolate from what you know -- your imagination is limited to variations of what you have already experienced -- and what you have already experienced is nothing at all like NPMR. Rather than except ignorance and

remain without expectations to experience open-mindedly and dispassionately, you are driven by your PMR habits to become a believer in the objectivity of your personal interpretation of a personal interpretation of someone else's experience that resonates with your beliefs about the way things must be. Belief piled upon belief. Now, after careful shopping, you have created an expectation or belief (which, because it is masquerading as a solution, becomes a requirement) thus limiting the possibilities of your experience.

What you are trying to do requires no effort whatsoever -- except that which is required to tear away the fear and beliefs that have trapped you. How long that takes depends on the depth of the trap -- the commitment you have to your limiting beliefs. It also depends on what you need to experience to optimize your learning potential at this point in time. Experiment. Follow your intuition and go in the direction of progress rather than define progress with your beliefs and intellect and push on that string to the exclusion of all else. You are your worst enemy because you want to be in control and cannot fathom that you do not know enough to effectively run your consciousness evolution from your intellect. Relax, don't try too hard – but always try, adjust, experiment, learn, grow, change.

The key is to keep working at it year after year after year -- and slowly and surely you will figure it out -- that is the nature of bootstrapping. Plan for the long haul but stay engaged and focused or you will just drift aimlessly like your thoughts.

I hope this is not too much tough love -- I do not want to make it sound much harder than it is -- in many ways, it is much easier than you think -- it is right there in front of you -- it just takes a while to overcome the belief and fear barriers to recognize it. If you keep at it you will succeed -- because that is the way the system is built and managed.

Tom C

----

17 Getting started: Exploring the larger reality:
OM: Until one's ability to explore the larger reality becomes proficient, one only has fragments of one's own experience and other peoples stories of the nonphysical to go on, no?

Tom: That is true, but there is no reason to turn these experiences into beliefs "This is the doorway, the way I must go" That Is not a statement of experience, that is a statement of belief. Remain open minded and skeptical. Learn to live with uncertainty, let go of the need to assume answers so you can pretend to be in charge.

OM: --- Now this happened, I had no expectations when I was doing it, I was too green to have any. The results happened and were then repeated! Though only twice. This is no longer something I read (given Monroe mentions you experience vibrations before separation etc). Doe this qualify as an objective measuring?

Tom: Yes it does. It is a valuable learning experience – there is much to learn from it. At the very least, It pried opened the doors of your mind a little bit. But don't turn it into the Holy Grail. Go forward. How does one go forward while trying to repeat the past. You had that experience for a reason, and the reason was not to produce a sacred template that you must apply forever more. That was then – new better opportunities are now, but they will only come through their own experience. There is still much you could

learn from that experience that eludes you because it doesn't fit you preconceived notions and expectations. Too green to screw it up – how fortunate.

OM: My point is, given the experience and awareness I have gained compared to that period of my life, I may still be holding on to that experience as my expectation. Belief-Expectation you say, are the same but it happened to me, so its a fact of my individual experience now not a belief.

Tom: It – your experience -- is a fact. If you stuck to your experience and assessed it from a less encumbered perspective, it would be a more useful fact. It is what you believe about your experience that is a burden that slows you down. The experience is a handhold to pull yourself up with. Your beliefs about the experience are like a rope tethering you to a stake in the ground so you just go around in circles.

OM: So now When I meditate I ' may ' be waiting for the eventual onset of paralysis and then vibrations and the doorway to be walked through this time with fearlessness. I guess that may be the specific belief to be shed that the original experience is the goal to get to. But it still is my experience and a fact. However, on the flip side coupled with what others have said I may be 'believing' that this is the doorway?

Tom: there are many doorways. Dozens and dozens of doorways -- all leading to the same place (point consciousness and the freedom to explore the larger consciousness system. The only one that you are unlikely to walk through is the one that your intellect/ego has chosen to focus on – simply because your belief generating intellect/ego has chosen to focus on it.

Tom C

----

18 Consciousness and the brain – the mechanics of virtual reality
Seven: Which comes first: PMR, PMRn and NPMR evolution, or AUM self awareness?

Tom: That reminds me of the chicken and the egg -- and the answer is the same. They evolved together.

The brain is an expression of the abilities and qualities of consciousness within the PMR rule-set. As personal growth (change) takes place (evolution of one's personal unit of individuated consciousness), one's brain changes to reflect that growth. Consciousness leads and the physical expression of that consciousness within the constraints of the PMR rule-set follows. The virtual PMR is a creation of consciousness -- consciousness in not a creation of the virtual reality, though it is modified by its experiences within that virtual reality. Much like a pilot is modified (gains skill and experience) from working with a virtual reality flight trainer.

Seven: I am somewhat confused here, as I have read on these boards that the "virtual" brain is not extant until it is observed, so to speak. This would seem to be diametrically opposed to its importance in the development of self aware consciousness.

Tom: In a virtual computed reality game/trainer nothing is extant until it is "rendered on the screen". Before it is rendered on the screen, it is just potential bound by logical consistency with what has gone before and the defining rule-set. That fact has nothing to do with the importance of what eventually gets

rendered, or the importance that eventual rendering has to whoever is "playing" this particular virtual reality game, or the importance that the virtual reality game has to its creators. It is just a fact of the process of creating a virtual reality. The directly experienceable virtual reality is composed only of what is rendered into that reality -- much can be presumed as probable that does not have to be rendered (e.g., that everyone has a brain in their skull). Unless the skull is broken open, that brain does not have to be rendered. This is simply a mechanical or logical aspect of virtual realities defined by rule-sets. The reality is defined by what is rendered – only what is rendered can be directly be experienced – what cannot be directly experienced (measured) exists only in probability (does not have to be rendered) -- it has nothing to do with relative importance.

Seven: The book also points out that there is nothing that says a technically advanced computer could not become self aware. Again, pointing to the importance of the "brain'" to the development of self awareness.

Tom: Normally, to be an aware entity within PMR requires that you have a PMR form or body that "contains" or represents that awareness in PMR. That body can be a computer or a human body with a brain. The computer or brain may be said to host the awareness that represents a particular consciousness. Damage that brain or computer and the amount and type of awareness that can be effectively hosted is changed -- damage it enough and it will no longer be able to host an awareness of any sort. Being self-aware as a PMR entity (a part of the virtual reality that must abide by the rule-set) requires a "body" capable of hosting that awareness. That awareness interacts experientially with other. Through that experience, the awareness may becomes more aware and knowledgeable and thus produce modifications to its physical system (body) that represent that new larger awareness. The brain doesn't drive the development of self awareness, it reflects it -- embodies it within the PMR virtual reality in terms of the PMR rule-set. Experience in PMR drives the development of self awareness and the development of consciousness quality since PMR awareness is just an extension of the nonphysical consciousness into the nonphysical virtual reality as an apparent "physical player" within that virtual reality.

Seven: The brain, it seems to me, is a tight iterating rule set (mirror) that "forces" a consciousness into a self reflective mode [interactive experience within rule-set constraints], thereby catapulting the evolution of [both the individual and] AUM.

Tom: I agree -- that is one way to express it.

Seven: Where then, is there room for a returning NPMR personality? The virtual brain would seem to be already be "occupied."

Tom: A sufficiently complex self modifying computer will spontaneously develop consciousness, but that computer can also be pre-loaded with data defining all or part of some other computer's (one with extremely similar hardware) self developed consciousness. Immediately after that software load, the two computers may have very similar attributes, but begin to diverge into their own uniqueness as they learn and grow in their own ways (approach problems with multiple solutions that can be assessed in multiple ways). Same story with any digital consciousness system.

I hope this produces more clarity than fog.

Tom C
----

19 Awareness of others – guides and crowds:
John,

The belief is that when you are surrounded by a crowd of other's you have to listen to the noise they make -- that their psychic energy will necessarily interact with yours -- that you, like an antenna, or pair of ears, must receive whatever impinges upon you. Walk into a busy K-Mart, a carnival, or a cocktail party and the "vibes" are almost overwhelming and unpleasant – you can't wait to get away from it. This is a belief, like so many beliefs, that extrapolates the conditions of PMR into NPMR and consciousness in general.

In fact, you can actively shut off what you don't wish to interact with. Doing so requires positive action (focused intent) on your part. Take no action to limit input and the default setting is wide open -- connected to everything. When on a spirit warrior task, you automatically let your focus on the task shut out everything that is not pertinent to the task. With a little effort you will learn how to tune out the annoying clutter.

When you are away from the hubbub, the crowd, though still there, lies outside of your awareness and focus – thus you do not connect to it. When you are in the crowd, you are aware that they are right there in front of you filling the consciousness "air waves" with drivel and swill. The more you consider it drivel and swill, the more annoying it is and the more strongly you connect to it through ego attachment.   It is that awareness of the crowd, perhaps coupled with a general distain for the level of consciousness evolution displayed by the crowd, along with the belief mentioned above that appears to "force" you to tune into a noisy background that swamps out other more productive signals.

Remember, the concept of "guides" is a very general concept -- a metaphor for the individual guidance and help we receive from within the larger consciousness system. The application of that help could be from any number of sources (individually and simultaneously) and you may perceive it (it may be presented to you) in different ways at different times.

The key concept is that we are all one, and of the same consciousness. The vision of "them" being aspects of yourself was intended to communicate a sense of how personal and committed the relationship is between you and your guides -- that they and you are, more or less, all in the same boat together -- working together as one. Any success on the part of one piece, is a success of the whole. This generally describes the nature of successfully evolving consciousness.

That you expressed or interpreted the quality of the relationship you have with your guides in term of the metaphor of your higher self is an accurate enough interpretation of the content -- but don't take the details too seriously -- the specific form that description or metaphor takes is not important – only understanding the content (the message) is important. We, by habit of thought, tend to categorize, structure, and define separate actors (other than us) with whom we interact -- because that is the way it

works within PMR. Thus the concepts of "Higher-self" becomes a useful metaphor for us to use to interpret that Oneness of consciousness, the oneness of us, into a more expressible (demarcating between us and other) terminology.

Tom C

___

20 Personal survival: Selves, higher selves, guides and the larger reality

Shin: Was the "rote" I received all those years ago with "killer of ego, I'm without limit" sent from my total self? Many many more questions that begged to be answered that surround the idea of an I-there as guides.

Tom: You are still trying to put everything into its proper pigeon hole. That is a PMR habit of conceptualizing -- there is you and then there is everything that has independent existence outside of you -- you are sometimes related to those pieces but they are not you -- they are separate.

An alternate view is to see yourself as one with all creation (of which PMR is a tiny virtual sliver). One with The One -- A unique subset of the whole, but at the same time, a portion that is well integrated with the whole (where the whole is the larger consciousness system), or in computer terms, a partitioned subset of dynamically allocated memory and shared computational resources used to gather experience and exercise intent while engaged in a multiplayer entropy reduction trainer. Differentiating self from other is more like differencing your digestion system from your circulatory system -- both are integral interdependent parts of one being -- not two separate things each with their independent existence. It is a matter of perspective – of how you think of something. It is the context that changes, not the facts.

The larger consciousness system is self-designed to optimize its entropy reduction -- i.e., to facilitate its own evolution. You get all the help you can profitably use because it is the nature of the system to support the evolutionary needs of its parts. From your PMR perspective, you are driven to categorize and define this help as specific independent entities -- guides, higher-self, I-there, oversoul, super-ego, and many other such characterizations because as a resident of PMR you can only relate your personal interaction with "other" to specific independent entities that are outside of you (not you). You cannot think in terms of being one with The One – integrally interconnected – a virtual subset only by definition, by partition, by function and intent. When you try to describe the details of the larger process while limiting your conceptualization to physical forms (using PMR language), your model of your connection with the whole will always be in terms of you as a separate individual interacting with other separate individuals.

Within our minds, we give each of the separate metaphors and symbols of our imagined "logical" structure an independent factual existence, make up names (PMR awareness, NPMR awareness, higher-self, highest-self, oversoul, god), and then try to work out the relationships between them and derive the proper organization chart that explains it all. Of course, we drive ourselves nuts in the process of trying to be more and more specific in how we describe the larger consciousness system in terms of highly limited PMR concepts that are inherently unable to accurately describe the larger consciousness system. We inevitably generate logical problems and inconsistencies in the details of our hierarchical mapping of individual roles and responsibilities. We don't seem able to get it right when we try to be very specific because our conceptualization, which requires everything to be in its own pigeon hole, is fundamentally incorrect.

We have this burning need to know, "What about us? Does our personal PMR character survive intact?", because in our mind, and with our ego, we are it, the supreme embodiment of us-ness, an individual separate existence, and to lose that individual separateness is to die. (Enter: a lack of self-importance/significance and a fear of death. Discomfort, fear.) That individual separateness you call you doesn't actually exist (never has existed) as an independent fundamental separate being. It exists only as a virtual character of an individuated subset of consciousness playing in a specific evolutionary trainer. Yet, every thought and feeling and action and intent of that virtual character (you) is saved (lives forever) in the historical database. And every tiny decrement in entropy earned by that character is a very significant prize for the individuated virtual being, the interactive process that created the opportunity, and for the whole system – a critical success worth remembering and emulating. See the larger consciousness as a single interactive system, not a collection of individual separate parts. A matter of developing a bigger picture, a larger perspective. The "facts" of individual perspectives remain the same but get reinterpreted in light of the bigger picture.

If this discussion has dragged you into areas where you are not prepared to profitably go, forget about it, let it go, and work within models with which you feel comfortable. Learning is an iterative process, leaping beyond where you are ready to go is discomforting and confusing -- not on anyone's path to successful evolution. You must get there one step at a time by absorbing and integrating new understanding into your being (as opposed to your intellect).

At a higher metaphorical level, the concepts of higher-self, oversoul, etc, are very useful and helpful -- they generate a "physical" expression (process models in terms of PMR language and concepts) that explains how we are connected/integrated to the whole in a way that PMR constrained awareness's can understand. Integration is actually much simpler -- there doesn't have to be intermediary mechanisms between us and the larger system -- we are already fully integrated with that larger system. We just cannot see our separate selves as anything but separate -- us versus them -- if it is not little picture PMR us, then it must be "them" or somebody else. We are individuated (partitioned) units of consciousness as opposed to individual (separate) units of consciousness, and are more directly interconnected to the larger system than you think.

Shin: is the future that Bob Monroe described actually possible?

Tom: Bob's picture of the future was presented to him as "The Future" of PMR. My interpretation is that it was not literal (an extremely rare occurrence in such situations because at that level virtual PMR machinations are not important – getting the big picture is important). Bob, as always, just reported it the way he got it—i.e., the way he processed it or interpreted it into a PMR conceptual context.   Bob's description is about the nature of our reality. That the physical is virtual, ephemeral, imaginary, not fundamental -- while consciousness (mind) is fundamental, the source, the creator, the foundation. Showing that in a way that could translate well in terms of PMR constructs produced an experience where the physical (in a PMR context of course) was totally dominated by the intent of low entropy consciousness – obviously this was not now, so it must be in the future. It is indeed the future of individuals who succeed in evolving the quality of their consciousness – but not of the PMR virtual reality trainer. That would put the trainer out of business for which it was designed and there will be plenty of need of PMR trainers – consciousness is a big system, still very young in its potential, with lots of room for growth.

Why would these folks in Bob's vision need or want to do what they were doing in this la-la land of perfect mind over matter? Back to angels sitting on clouds playing harps – a belief that the point (endgame) of existence is to have no stress in an environment of pleasant surroundings (a favorite PMR fantasy and salve for the perpetually banged up ego). There is no effective functionality or purpose in this picture as a literal event – instead, think of it as a simple demonstration of the nature of low entropy consciousness relative to the mirage of virtual reality interpreted in terms of the physical future of PMR – something understandable and concrete to report. Bob's vision is a vision that accurately conveys truth -- just not literal truth – yet something much better and larger and more useful than literal truth.

What is PMR centric and literal in the little picture is of importance only to those within the little picture. When such PMR centric material is delivered from NPMR it is usually either personal (for specific use by a specific individual) and/or metaphorical (a description for the masses).

Tom C

----

21 Individual evolution and personal survival:

JoshM: If everything I do gets written to the database and all my entropy reduction affects the whole, that's wonderful, but if my awareness isn't around anymore once my PMR time is up it seems pointless to the individual beings doing the actual entropy reduction.

Tom: Such a process can only seem pointless from the limited perspective of the PMR "I" ego. That is a problem generated by limited knowledge and a self-focused perspective. Imagine that you are employed by a company of 100 people. You might feel that it was pointless to work particularly hard or diligently so that the company (as opposed to you) will make more profit. However, in a bigger picture, your livelihood depends on your company being profitable -- furthermore if your company is profitable enough to triple its size -- there will be plenty of opportunity for rapid advancement and promotion for those who worked hard to help make that happen -- the company especially values and takes care of those individuals who materially contribute to its success (they get more attention, help, and opportunity because, from the company's perspective, they are more ready and willing to make good use of it.

So what about the guy in the small reality who puts in minimum effort because anything more is pointless -- you know the stock holders and executives suck up all those profits -- they don't give him any of it -- whether he works minimum or maximum it's all the same, so why should he bother -- extra effort is pointless. His attitude creates the reality of his expectation -- 20 years later he is still turning that same crank at that same (now much larger) company -- they never did anything for him – and that fact is proof positive that it was very clever of him to get by all these years doing as little as possible.

Everyone knows that the secret of success is: maximize what you can get while at the same time minimizing what you have to give for it. What could be more obvious and logical than that?

The larger consciousness system has the attributes of a nearly perfect small company with a good approximation of an all knowing and wise management team who have excellent insight into the attitudes of their employees and the value of each employee's contribution.   A company where nobody gets overlooked and everybody has the same opportunities to show what they can do. With a deal like that it is amazing that so many employees think that extra effort put toward personal growth is pointless because they do not see any immediate reward accruing to the exclusively important "I" -- so the rest of

the animal attached to, dependent upon, the little "I" for growth and good entropy reducing decisions, has no choice but to live in the branches of a dead tree and eat dirt -- which, of course, leaves the little "I" with a bad taste in his mouth (as well as bad attitude) and just reinforces his belief that extra effort is pointless. Let's all quietly hum a sad song for poor "I" -- trapped in a pointless system that sucks.   Bummer!

Now, on to your questions:
You have a very simple picture where there is one set of rules, one path, and all must use it. What happens after you die depends on where you are in the evolutionary process, which is evidenced by what happened before you die.

The typical cycle of a high entropy little-picture-you with decent growth potential: You (your little I) dies; you transition; you are placed back in PMR to gain experience; You (another little I) is born.
In this case, your big you is not yet well defined and still has a relative small decision space. Because it is young and not well defined, it tends to incarnate very different little "I"s in an effort to gain broad experience and develop itself. It is guided by others who have a bigger picture and a larger decision space.

The typical cycle of a reasonably evolved successful little picture you: You (your little I) dies; you transition; review your opportunities (those that fall within your decision space) and assess what you made or failed to make of them – and why – learning/growing/ gaining any insight you can from that review; planning and organizing the next trip to PMR to optimize your potential to learn what you most need to learn; You (another little I) is born.

Now, for each experience packet a new expression of big you is put forth – male, female, retarded, mentally ill, cripple, brilliant, athletic, intuitive, ugly, handsome, etc. depending on what provides the best opportunities for your growth in concert with the growth of others around you. Do you consider this "new version" to be the same little "I" from the last experience packet just dressed up in a new outfit, or a wholly new little "I"?   (in other words do you identify with the old little "I" persona which is now "dead" (part of the historical database) because the next incarnation is a mildly retarded but beautiful female, or do you identify with the immortal consciousness which is optimizing its evolution by incarnating in whatever form provides the best opportunities for specific growth needs? Certainly this female version of big you will feel a very real sense of her little "I" identity and it may not be at all like what you feel is your present little "I" identity. This is because your personal identity (what you think of as your little "I" is for the great majority of individuals within PMR largely shaped by your experiences in PMR.
After you grow up, your personal identity tends to gravitate to what is more fundamental to your quality of consciousness rather than what is created by your experience in PMR. Thus when you die your little you sense of "I" is not so little and not so self-focused and PMR based – in fact it is a good integrated representation of what has become a well defined big you.

JoshM: If everything I do gets written to the database and all my entropy reduction affects the whole, that's wonderful, but if my awareness isn't around anymore once my PMR time is up it seems pointless to the individual beings doing the actual entropy reduction.

You appear to be saying that if the big you does not always incarnate the same little you persona – the same awareness that you identify as your current "I", the one that preserves the basic personal attributes of the current little "I" you know and love (attributes that, for the most part, just happened to develop by

chance during this particular incarnation), then your existence, from your perspective, is pointless. The most productive solution to this problem is to gain a larger perspective.

It would appear that the tail, so puffed up with its self importance and unique specialness, wants to wag the dog.

Of course, I am sure that is not what you meant at all. You don't want to wag a dog or to hamstring your oversoul's evolutionary progress. You guys just wanted to know how it all works – and that is a very good thing to want to know. Because your questions are held in common by so many people, I wanted to take this opportunity to let the others who are more or less locked into a PMR perspective by habit of thinking, know that such a limited self-focused " but what about me" perspective is counterproductive to growth within the big picture.

Tom C

----

22 Conquering fear with the intellect:

OM: If I were in a more awake, fully consciousness state, I think experiencing would be different and the fear would be less of a factor due to more clarity. We'll see what happens

Tom: You would like to use your intellect to control your fear. However the problem is not how well you control your fear but that you have fear. You have these experiences in a foggy state (or, more likely, they are provided to you in a foggy state) precisely so you will interact naturally and be who you actually are rather than confuse and cloud the issue by engaging your intellect (with your intellect comes your ego). The system is designed to support your growth. You are asking to explore the larger reality – your request is likely being answered with a test to see if you are ready to profit from such experience.

You must eliminate fear; not act as if you had no fear. Acting will get you by in PMR most of the time -- A typical life in PMR is mostly about appearance and very little about what is actual -- what is actual is usually kept out of sight whether you are interacting with your loved ones, coworkers, or negotiating a deal. Often, revealing what is actual is considered either "bad form" or impolite by our culture. You are conditioned from birth to suppress your actuality so you may project the appropriate image and behavior instead. That may be civilizing or duplicitous or even culturally necessary to get along, but it is not helpful for enabling self-understanding to mature into personal growth. Discovering your beliefs and intents is made difficult because you do not know who you really are inside – the real you is a deep mystery – often more so to yourself than to others (because your ego is such a good liar and you are so willing to believe those lies). Applying this PMR habit of being to NPMR just creates bigger problems. You must be who you are in NPMR -- you cannot hide from yourself there or be any other way than exactly the way you are -- therein lies the greatest barrier to mastering the larger reality that most people have to overcome.

That is why working on improving yourself is generally more productive than working on having an OOBE. That is also why most people would rather focus their efforts on having an OOBE.

Tom C

23 How does evil spring out of goodness (the big picture mechanics of individuality)

Lisa: My question is very specific. How would you, and your BT, explain that ½ of 1%? How can the universe create people with a built-in desire to torture? How can a victim's soul grow spiritually by being chained, beaten, stabbed, and raped, sometimes for months or years on end? At some point, doesn't the universe say, "enough is enough?" These are really tough questions, and the best answers the experts can give seems to be "no one knows why." Please help me understand.

Tom: Such dysfunction is not one dimensional, there are many possible contributing factors. That it only happens to 1/2 of 1 % of the "bad guys" (a probability of 0.005 -- thus perhaps a probability of only 0.00005 within the general population) tells you that it is the result of an extremely unlikely combination of factors.

1) A large portion of our personality, how we interpret data, and what rings our bell (drives us to action, turns us on, upsets us, encourages our attitudes, set us off, piques our interest, captures our attention, makes us feel good or feel bad) is biologically influenced. A consciousness gets a body/brain that must exists and develop according to the PMR rule set. Within that physical process there is much randomness (notice 6 billion people and they are all different). There is interactive feedback between the environment and the body/brain -- each changing the other. The brain modifies how the entity interprets its reality while the environment causes the brain to modify itself in adaptation to the environment. In other words, the brain changes the perceived environment and the perceived environment [both experience based (love, trauma, fear, etc) and bio chemically based (drugs, pollution, food additives, allergens, glandular dysfunction, etc.) changes the functioning of the brain. Sometimes that randomness (which includes the possibility of combining just the wrong series of environment-brain interactions at just the wrong series of times) produces a dysfunctional being who has a much higher potential than normal to become a monster. Bottom line: it is not just a corrosive environment that raises one's potential to become a monster. The environment is usually not even the dominate influence. Environment, biology and chance conspire to only very occasionally produce a seriously elevated potential to become a monster. It is not surprising that some of these monsters come from what appears to be a very benign environment (at least it appears that way from a very coarse, after-the-fact examination that must necessarily miss (because of the passage of time) most of the important developmental detail). In fact, it would be very strange indeed if none of these monsters came from benign (good) environments.

2) The consciousness that inhabits the body/brain must work with what it gets from these random interactions -- once committed it is in for the duration of the experience packet -- however long or short that might be. If an entity gets dealt a bad hand by chance, then, all the more the challenge -- and at worse, hey, it's not often you will draw a 1 in 20,000 card .... and it's just one experience packet -- there are a thousand more of those where that one came from -- no big deal, just do the best you can with what you get, maybe next time you will get a piece of cake. In evaluating your score, the system allows for the difficulty of the game you are playing. You know, suck it up....cookies sometimes crumble. Now a more evolved consciousness will be able to deal more effectively with the challenge -- it might be able to reprogram the brain and apply great inner strength to resist and nullify the dysfunctional proclivities that come with the body/brain. Unfortunately, because of the elementary school nature of PMR, highly evolved consciousnesses are a rare breed and with a little more bad luck (more of that chance we were talking about in 1 above) a real weak low life individuated unit of consciousness (already failing to learn or perhaps de-evolving in previous packets) happens to get connected with this high monster potential. The environment may actually be all peace and light but this ill prepared puppy is all but doomed to go bad no matter how much "guidance" and help it gets. That's free will and chance in the PMR game -- you gotta let it unravel however it does and do the best you can. Outside interference in the game once the game

has started is a no-no. Rules are rules.

3) So the 0.00005 (1 in 20,000 of the general population) monster is loose -- what about the rest of us? The fact is, such a person generates lots of lessons for hundreds if not thousands of the rest of us as he leaves destruction in his wake. And what about those hurt or destroyed? The answer is just the other side of that same crumbling cookie the perpetrator had to accept. For highly developed consciousnesses there is a difficult but high gain lesson to maintain fearlessness and a loving, caring intent and turn the encounter with the monster into something positive in the big picture. [Because that is hard to imagine, here is an example: read Victor Frankel's book, "Man's Search For Meaning". As a Jew in Auschwitz and other death-camps, he received an up close and personal encounter with a multitude of five star monsters as well as having to deal with the murder of his wife and family. He turned all that into a positive personal learning experience and eventually used that experience to help many others.] For less evolved individuated units of consciousness, the trauma is mitigated to the extent possible by those in NPMR so as to minimize lasting effects. Again, keep in mind that this is just one experience packet among thousands and it fades to dream status very quickly under normal circumstances and even quicker than that under the help received in NPMR. Being terminated from PMR by some monster would be similar to waking up from a barely remembered nightmare. It would be a little inconvenient (a minor waste of time) if one's experience packet was ended prematurely but, there's always another. Just like the perpetrator, the victim must also accept that sometimes the cookie crumbles, suck up the misfortune of drawing a 1 in 20,000 card, and go on. Jeez, for crying out loud, it's just a simulator for gaining experience. You are jarred to your bones by such a horrific tragedy because of your little picture PMR perspective -- which is good -- that's the perspective you are supposed to have while in PMR.

Now combine all three paragraphs in various amounts and degrees of each and you get a Big Picture of an unpleasant set of circumstances that must play themselves out because that how PMR must work in order to be effective. After you have read all three books, this discussion will probably make more sense and be much clearer. Hope this helps.

Tom C

---

24 A series of posts about the significance of you – A big picture look at you and your higher self
Post by Josh:
Quote from Tom: To become apparently or practically immortal in some partial way, PMR identity Cole will have to be successful enough in the evolution of his consciousness to add significantly to the accumulation of quality within the core of his being, his individuated unit of consciousness, sometimes called his "higher self". Likewise his higher self will have to evolve to be a contributor to the larger systems evolution.

Josh: I got this impression when reading MBT and have tiptoed around this subject on this forum since then. I guess there is a difference between what you are talking about with immortality in the larger system and the survival of PMR death in our system. From the topics where I keep bringing it up (and usually get more confused), you seem to generally agree that the PMR entities survive physical death. From there, it usually depends on the level of entropy reduction and fearlessness that determines the next step. Let' say that Cole is still fairly high entropy, that would be the end of PMR identity Cole, but Cole's larger self, which he is a part of and actually "really" is (since Cole is a virtual projection) would

continue on incarnating and learning, but the Cole personality is stored in the database and no more learning comes from it.

How is this different for Cole than ceasing to exist at the point of death of the physical body that materialists believe happens? You answered a question recently about what happens when an atheist dies, so it is a little confusing as to what survives and for how long (forgive me for harping on this subject).

Assuming that immortality is meant in NPMR terms and not just PMR incarnation terms, would it be true that the higher self continues evolving as long as it is profitable and that, once it stops lowering entropy and is a significant player in the larger evolution of the system, then it might cease to exist? In that way, immortality is something every being has to keep working at to earn and keep, so it really isn't immortality as most people think. And if 90% of the beings make the cut every time internal n, for a sufficiently large n, wouldn't all the beings eventually die off?

Comments to Josh by Ted:
Josh,

You have apparently missed the post in which Tom stated that it is very unusual for a being to be terminated in this way. There is not normally a 'cut' which you must make to be continued. I believe that this was also covered within **MBT** somewhere. You have to be very persistently negative and devolving seriously for this to happen. The whole system is set up around development, as many tries as necessary, rather than culling those who are judged as insufficiently productive. Nothing says that this is other than an open ended system without a pre ordained result in some kind of quest for perfection and survival of the fittest.

Tom's reference in the quotation that you included in your post was to a particular identity being sufficiently productive within it's PMR experience to make a significant advance in development, standing out as an excellent combination of traits and experience such that it would be maintained with a minimal amount of tweaking into further PMR experience packets. Thus essentially as that individual. And then his mention of the contribution of the individuals higher self to the larger system evolution is a reference to the fact that that is the purpose of this process, the evolution of the system as a whole. It was not a reference to the potential that a being in total might be culled if not sufficiently productive from the viewpoint of the system.

Forget the concept of immortality. The higher self will continue to evolve as long as it exists because that is the way that the system is set up, to evolve into the future without set endpoint. The system is an open ended dynamic equilibrium of opposing forces however. Not a system to generate perfection. There will always be 'beginners' starting up the ladder of development/evolution of consciousness. There will always be 'negative' beings causing disruption. There will always be more to learn and higher levels of being developed.

If I err, Tom will speak up and may have a further contribution to make anyway.

Ted

Reply to Josh by Tom:
Josh,

Ted's comments were right on. Consciousness appears to be an open system designed to encourage success. Marginal players don't get tossed out, they get helped. There are always new players entering the system. Capacity does not seem to be a problem. The system appears to be very patient, compassionate, loving, and supportive. Abject failure requires steady effort and dedication to negative evolution.

The words are confusing you because they are being used within different contexts and because you see yourself, relative to your "higher-self", as an independent being.

Physical death is no more real than physical life -- neither one exists. Saying that you are immortal in the normal sense of that English word means that you survive physical death. That concept of immortality (surviving physical death) is nothing more than an erroneous little picture view lost in the habits of limited PMR thinking. If there is no such thing as physical life, how can there be such a thing as physical death?

Let me try to develop a more accurate, less limited perspective with some computer game metaphors. Like any metaphor, the fit is never perfect but I think it might lead you to a more useful perspective. Hopefully it will not scare you or depress you. If it does it will be because of a small PMR perspective becoming inadvertently twisted around self focused ego.

You, the Josh-guy you identify with as being you, is not an independent being. Josh-guy is just a character in a virtual reality simulator game that is animated by your consciousness. Very much like the lizard-man or wizard or barbarian you make up in World of Warcraft. Except in the PMR game you don't roll dice or pick from a list to determine a character's characteristics which define the abilities and limitations (decision space) with which you must work as your free will makes the choices that determine what that character does within the game. Instead you "birth" a character and let it develop and interact while you, as before, are at the helm making choices and generating intent for your character. So, your individuated unit of consciousness (IUOC) is playing in the PMR virtual reality trainer and he picks a situation (perhaps as part of a plan with some friends who are also playing the game) and births a potential character onto the playing field (Virtual Earth) to suit whatever strategy he has in mind to raise his characters "level" as quickly as possible. He may or may not get exactly what he wants in a character because the birth algorithms within the games rule-set contain a lot of uncertainty which keeps the game more interesting and challenging since it inhibits players from stacking the deck in their favor by always dealing themselves pat hands.

The Josh-guy character birthed in the VR (generated by the PMR rule-set) is really just a set of data and rules that must remain consistent with the causality defined by the PMR rule-set (i.e., the Josh-guy is a computer model -- a probability and statistics model -- just like lizard-man). It is the players consciousness (the IUOC player provides the free will and intent) that animates the Josh-guy character with motivation/intent and makes the choices available to the characters decision space (just like you do with lizard-man). As the IUOC player makes choices in the present moment of game play from the array of future possibilities, he "collapses the probability wave function" to a specific result that becomes part of the historic database of the virtual PMR game. (See how the process fractal pattern repeats at each level?) The player has to "level up" his character through his characters experience so he can evolve that

character to a larger decision space which gives the IUOC more choices and possibilities to work with. The virtual Josh-guy character, generated by the computer in the mind of the IUOC, is limited to the virtual PMR game play viewpoint in which he was birthed and in which he experiences (just like lizard-man). He calls his IUOC his soul or higher self because he thinks of himself as a real, independent being within PMR making decisions with his own personal consciousness that belongs just to him. Thus his higher self must be a "different" being (because everything that is not him must be different and independent of him from the PMR viewpoint). Josh-guy believes that his independent consciousness will one day merge with the quite different (bigger, better) IUOCs consciousness because he cannot fathom that his consciousness is nothing other than the IUOCs playing a PMR experience game in a virtual reality trainer.

When you play your Lizard–man in World of Warcraft (WOW), can you not parallel process and eat some Pizza and talk to your friends who are also playing WOW with you at the same time? If you are young enough, you can probably handle all that while pretending to do your homework. Because you are doing these other things (and lizard man only gets some fraction of your attention) does that mean that the intents and choices you make when you are playing your lizard man character are somehow no longer precisely representative of you? Does it make sense that you are actually a whole lot wiser and more evolved and better at playing the PMR game than the way you play your lizard man? No. You always play lizard man pretty much to the best of your ability – his consciousness is, in fact, your consciousness. There are not two separate consciousnesses here (yours and a higher self) – just one consciousness trying to evolve its quality by playing a multiplayer virtual reality game as best he can and doing a little parallel processing on the side to meet the larger demands of existence (like eating pizza).

Could you have two computers going and be playing two characters at the same time? What if a friend came over who was really good at getting through a particular situation; would you get help? When your character slept, would you use your "dream spell" or OOBE spell to try to give him or her some insight or special experience that would help them level up sooner? Would you test him or her below the intellectual level to find out what is really under the hood (and to avoid the useless PMR ego based jibber jabber you would otherwise get) to determine what the best learning strategies might be? Well, you might if your own success depended on how much your character leveled up – i.e., if what you learned in the game leveled you up as well. After all that is what VR trainers are for.

Do you see that your questions don't make sense? A character like Josh-guy is an imagined virtual being, a character in a chapter of a book generated by a rule-set that may or may not pop up again in subsequent chapters depending how useful he is to the story. In the real world there is only consciousness. The little man behind the curtain running the Josh-Guy character (providing the Josh-guy's character with consciousness and free will, is the real Josh – the character/personality (the suave debonair, cool guy) you are today in this particular chapter (experience packet) is just a creation of the VR trainer – a virtual wrapper for the IUOC to use in the trainer so that the IUOC can evolve more efficiently through the interactive experience of PMR. The only thing real and fundamental about Josh is Josh's consciousness and that is effectively immortal. Josh, the personality, is a virtual being in an experience packet story that, if it happens to be productive, will be used over and over – a favorite persona. However other personas (male and female, grumpy and happy, bright and dull) are required at times to produce a more rounded experience base. Obsessing over the immortality of some largely random, virtual persona-wrapper generated by the trainer's rule-set for the consciousness to wear in one or more of ten thousand experience packets makes no sense. Do you obsess over the value of the wrappers your candy bars come in – do you save them all?

You need to identify with your consciousness, not your body, personality, sex, IQ, cool index, or quirky habits. Next time you birth a wrapper in which to learn, all that stuff will very likely be different – only the consciousness will be the same. The personality is not integral to the consciousness – it is in large part a function of your body – driven by your biochemistry and genetics and influenced by the experiences and interactions you just happened to have in this experience packet. The more you grow, the more your consciousness and personality become intertwined.

Tom C

----

25 Experiencing the larger reality

Thynes,

To your question: Was that you in the classroom? The answer is yes and no. Don't take what you experience too literally. The classroom is a metaphor that characterizes how our existence overlaps – our interaction/relationship within consciousness. The classroom is an interpretation, the shadow of something more fundamental projected on the screen of your awareness. Look to the dynamics of the relationship rather than to the set in which the interaction takes place.

You are correct. Changing reality frames is like changing dreams -- as one becomes clearer, the other fades. Parallel processing in two or more reality frames is like having several simultaneous dreams. To be aware in a dream, to own or command the dream (not just the action in the dream but the dream itself), you must operate from the being level, not from the intellect. As soon as you let your analyzing intellect step in front of your experience at the being level, you the multidimensional being who naturally experiences the larger reality from the perspective of wholeness, begins to focus through that intellect into an exclusive relationship with a specific VR. The multidimensional you operates (is animated, motivated, or makes choices) by expressing an intent that flows without being directed from its internal core. Such choices are a perfect, effortless reflection of that core (no ego, no fear). The unidimensional (single VR) you, operates (is animated, motivated, or makes choices) by thinking (mentally manipulating and calculating and comparing relative to the wants, needs and desires of self) and doing (as opposed to being), by analyzing, and applying his intellect (the servant of the ego) to whatever is the object of his desire.

When you permit your intellect to direct your being to serve wants, all but the VR that is the focus of the intellect turns to smoke as multidimensional awareness collapses to the focus of the intellect. Meditation is no more than a tool to help you control the intellect and thus enable you to find and integrate with the core of your being. Ego and fear calls the tune to which the intellect dances and thus must be eliminated to free the core of your being (your individuated unit of consciousness) from the prison generated by the narrow, limiting focus and preoccupation with self that defines an operative intellect.

Tom C

----

26 A choice of Swallowing the Red or Blue Pill

Question from YAD:

One of the things that catches my attention when random thoughts enter my awareness such as a thought of dying or an irrational thought that I might die today. Obviously, this is some inner fear program that is spawning inside my mind to trigger some kind of response. What is interesting in this however, if I give it a very serious look. I literally have a shift in perception where my focus in PMR starts to shift and let go, I start to see a more holographic fractal world in front of me. It's almost like every atom and particle in my view is starting to shift, and separate in an outward wave, even thought nothing bad is happening other then a thought of death triggering this kind of unique response.

Am I just triggering a mechanism of release from physical in this moment of thinking? Is it a natural coded response to death? It seem very strange to say the least when it arises from time to time. PMR focus suddenly shifts into a more surreal mosaic.

Another very odd thought is encapsulated in self-realizations of my personal reality. This may be harder to explain but imagine standing in your kitchen and you suddenly realize that you fundamentally exist in a linear moment where everything you are is suddenly summarized into a second-by-second tracking of the "now" or present moment of focused awareness.

Often, I can feel very small or impotent and rendered as a fly on the wall so to speak. I often deal with that sudden anxiety of hard realization with an interpretation of how a moment in the "now" such as this is also reflective in the consciousness of other lifeforms, that what I am experiencing not much different then how an ant would experience the same moment in time, in a sense of it's "now" as it perceives it's reality. I then stretch my mind to other examples of other consciousness observing itself in a "now" moment, and see synchronicity with reality as a part of conscious perception. Which then makes me feel better about being me and more trusting that these feelings are not actually trying to hurt me, or make me feel less significant, rather make me understand that everything that exists has moments of realization that stem from being formed as a consciousness in a focused reality state.

Anyways, that can be triggered if I start to worry about my future, worry about success, worry period. Which is ego centric, the response always seems to ensure that everything is as it should be so that makes everything ok.

Tom's answer:

YAD,

What you are experiencing is you being stimulated to connect to the bigger picture. These are purposely induced spontaneous breakthroughs or bleed-throughs that lead you to touch the larger reality with your experience. Such experiences are usually a precursor to a more substantial connection.

The first experience is derived from a belief that death is a doorway to the greater reality. The idea of death is dropped into your awareness just to produce a reaction. You could react with fear (afraid of the idea of your death or quickly push the thought out of your mind) which would mean you were not ready to proceed. Or you could follow the thought with exploratory curiosity just long enough to experience where it leads. Without the fear attached, the experience is not about death at all -- say hello to the larger reality.

The second is in response to a need to gain perspective -- nowness is dropped into your awareness -- you could react by pushing it out of your mind and refocusing on your anxiety, it would be no more than a split second aberration that you would dismiss as stress related. That reaction would mean that you were not ready to proceed. Or, you could flow with that awareness and discover that in the bigger picture the event that has you in a whip is not that important. Both you and your ego issue are cast in a big picture perspective (small and insignificant) that leaves you more balanced -- you have no choice other than to just be you and go wherever your intent leads each moment one step at a time and everything else will necessarily work itself out however it does and that is OK. Ants may live more in the now but they do not have the realization that "... everything you are is suddenly summarized into a second-by-second tracking of the 'now'".

Both experiences produce a larger perspective that that slowly is leading you to a firsthand acquaintance with the larger reality. These feelings (episodes) are not out to harm you (that's the fear talking); they are out to help you grow up to a larger perspective and introduce you to the larger reality.

Taking the first choice (quickly pushing these thoughts, which are dropped into your mind from elsewhere, out of your mind because they are intrusive, disturbing, and frightening), is equivalent to swallowing the blue pill.

Many of those who claim they have been abandoned and are not being given any help from the larger consciousness system are those who ask for the blue pill every time opportunity knocks. This is called "not being ready" at the being level – it makes no difference how much the intellect claims the contrary. Being ready invariably leads to greater more challenging opportunity and yet another choice of whether to swallow the blue or red pill.

Tom C

----

27 Title
Paste here