

## Handouts for Discussion-5

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](http://www.MyBigTOE.com) and click on "Discussion groups") that I think you may find interesting.

---

### 1 – Moral code – a definition of "correct action"

Moral code Part I and Part 2:

Part 1: <http://www.my-big-toe.com/forums/viewtopic.php?f=6&t=2944&start=0>

Part 2: <http://www.my-big-toe.com/forums/viewtopic.php?f=6&t=2945&start=0>

---

### 2 – A conversation with Claudio about epistemology:

Claudio: If I got MBT model correctly, the perception of color is a feature at least of the NPMR level, since we can project colors while in NPMR. We can project other things. How can we perceive colors from just being information?

Tom: Consciousness is an information system that exchanges and interprets data into "perceived" information. The interpretation is based upon previous experience – we interpret new in terms of the old. When past experience fails to be able to interpret new data succinctly, we come up with our best shot (pattern match) or if we are more experienced with unknown uninterpretable data, we may be aware of the interpretation issue and perceive the data as indeterminate, often giving it nonspecific content with emotional coloration, i.e. we perceive a nonspecific feeling (which may be strong or weak) about it – whatever it is. However, even the feeling is likely to be attached to past experience (which always contains expectations, ego, needs, wants, beliefs and fears among other things). The more we fear uncertainty, the more we force an interpretation upon the uninterpretable. If we are sufficiently aware, we can collect experience from many reality frames upon which we base our interpretations but the experience we use for interpreting must be available to our analytical function (for the most part that means: available to our intellect). If we reside in PMR and are primarily aware in PMR, then we must interpret everything in terms of PMR experiences in order to form coherent thoughts and communicatable metaphors and symbols.

Claudio: In other words, in your theory I couldn't find an explanation on how some basic sensory system (at NPMR level or higher) works or it is formed. Are colors something, only explained by the pure root level of Consciousness? I think, feelings, like love, touch, etc., can be explained in a similar way as colors, since they both have in common that are derived from information itself.

Tom: The brain produces nothing – every interpretation that is produced is produced by consciousness from the experience of consciousness. The brain is virtual, and because it evolved in the PMR simulation according to the rule-set, it represents a constraint of the rule-set upon the virtual reality game – as does

the rest of the body – that is its only function -- the body and brain of any individual defines the possible and potential interactions an individual can have with its surroundings (all other). Damage it and potential/possible interactions within PMR decrease. There is no NPMR sensor system or PMR sensor system other than metaphorically. Our PMR body based senses and our brain represent rule-system constraints for the PMR experience. The only active ingredient (the only thing that is receiving and interpreting data) is consciousness. Thus each of us lives in our own unique reality that has some similar elements shared with others because it is a multiplayer game focused around learning through interaction. We are taught to define and differentiate colors in PMR when as infants we are consistently given the same different words to go with same different experiences. Those words (metaphors and symbols) become part of our FWAU's experience and awareness here in PMR. We apply those same learned metaphors when trying to pattern-match new data (from any reality frame) to the present working experience database of which we are aware (these pattern matches enables us to form meaningful thoughts within the context of our experience). Without that context we cannot form what we would consider a coherent meaningful thought -i.e., we cannot interpret the data into information we can meaningfully process to some result.

Claudio: Bonus question: In your experiences, were you able to experience senses beyond colors (new colors?) or other pure ways of sensing (not derived) different from what is already written by other experiencers?

Tom: The larger one's experience database, the larger one's decision space, and the larger ones reality. We each live within a reality that can be no larger than what we have learned and grown to support.

Claudio: Thank you for the fast response, Tom. I appreciate your response and it will take me several reviews. I have no clue from there though of how the Consciousness hardware works and how it develops the perception of a color from experiences. I can put AI Guy through millions of video input, but how would AI Guy perceive yellow?

Tom: However it is defined for him – or however he and another define it together. Somebody sends him some data and tells him that the experience of this data is described by the word “yellow”. After that he knows what yellow is. The word “yellow” becomes a symbol for his experience. Eventually AI guy and his companions define enough words and experiences in common that they can now communicate – they have created language. Language starts very rudimentary and then slowly builds by consensus toward a richness of metaphors and symbols associated with various common shades of experience. In PMR Color is defined in terms of both a word associated with an experience and again much later in terms of rule-set causality (the electromagnetic frequency causing that particular experience in this simulation). Color is not necessarily a component of every reality frame – but it is a component of our PMR, so its definition in terms of intellectual, emotional, and metaphorical associations become a part of our experience base. When we get some data from some reality frame (whether it is a component of that reality or not) that triggers one or more of those associations, we see yellow – because that is how we interpret the data, no matter what was intended.

Claudio: Am I wrong by saying that the yellow I perceive is part of my hardware, not just bits? I know, the frequency of the color yellow is data but my perception seems to have "something else" which I don't know if it is defined by our original hardware or is just new develop software.

Tom: There is no hardware... only data and experience of data – from these and interactions with others we consensually develop associations (language) that lead us to interpret data.

Tom

---

-----  
-----  
**3 – Perception in NPMR**

Helge's Question: If we look say into the clear night and see the Milky Way, and of course being prevented from travelling there in physical form. Still our soul can go there in an instant. What is the difference, what does the soul experiences, relative to the five senses and what the conscious mind constructs based upon that perception and memories.

Tom's answer: Remember, reality is information. When we get information about the multiplayer PMR reality game we interpret it in the way we have learned since we were first infants born into this lifetime of experiencing PMR reality. We interpret it in term of our body (5 senses and central nervous system (CNS)) because our body represents the constraints of the rule-set within this PMR frame. Reality is nothing but data. When we as humans in PMR travel with our consciousness (soul) to a distant star system within our galaxy what we are doing is accessing data about that star system from the PMR past data base which is very current since its last entry is only one DELTA-t older than the present. Recall that our virtual reality (like most all large complex virtual realities) is probabilistic and statistical rather than objective (listen to the Hawaii seminar on YouTube) and that detail is computed according to probability based on the rule-set, and brought into this PMR reality frame when a measurement is made by some entity operating (being aware) within PMR. When you are OOBEE you are not operating in PMR, you are operating in NPMR. The data you get about that star system is whatever is probable at whatever level of detail that has been produced by the system thus far according to the rule-set and the needs for detailed data by direct observation (measurement) from within the PMR system. If no PMR aware entities are making measurements there (live there), or if the only measurements are from our telescopes on Earth, then not much detail would have been computed and your data would be very top level and preliminary. That is, that part of the "objective" map of our universe hasn't been computed yet and will not be computed until measurements by PMR aware beings are demanding the data (making measurements) -- why waste cycles in a virtual reality computer game if the calculations are not needed for anything relative to game play?

First, you only get data from the database that you ask for. If your query is not specific, what you get back is not specific. It is sometimes difficult to ask very specific questions unless you understand the possibilities (something about the potential answers). If you are not careful with your query you might end up in the unactualized data base instead of on our PMR history

thread. Often the query process is an iterative one that eventually digs down to what you want to know through a series of more specific queries. This takes practiced skill. Secondly, you must interpret the data you do get (e.g., what is available in the database on our history thread or some part thereof depending on the completeness of the query). Your interpretation is limited by your fear, ignorance, ego, knowledge of the possibilities, understanding, expectations, and beliefs. If you are not very knowledgeable about your subject you may not be able to interpret the data correctly. These reasons and explanations should give you a good idea why what you get about some star system is not the same as the data you get when inspecting something here on Earth.

Reality is not objective though it approximates being objective when the conditions for historical continuity and abiding by the rule-set contain little uncertainty. When zipping about places largely unknown, the uncertainty is great, thus the “physical” reality in these places is ill defined and mostly still probabilistic, i.e., non objective, undecided, not part of the objective PMR yet.

Expecting what you “see” in NPMR to be just like seeing things in PMR is a big mistake based on an incorrect understanding of the nature of reality. Probability (what is actually in the database), querying skills (how effectively you are at accessing that data, and uninformed interpretation (not being to understand what the data means relative to your personal experience and fear and belief and expectations.) all make a big difference in what you can come away with. The nature of perception is very different in NPMR than it is in PMR, though sometimes, depending on the situation, the results can be very similar.

-----  
-----

#### **4 – Virtual reality and perception**

Claudio’s question is similar: “I think that there is a tree (represented as a subset of information), and there are woods. I also think there is a "potential" sound, but yes, agree you need a listener. Well, what about an NPMR traveler that happens to go to the historical database to hear that?”

Tom’s answer: Things come into PMR reality based on a measurement by those in PMR reality. An observer in NPMR does not cause the PMR wave function to collapse to a physical particle or happening within PMR. Only an observer in PMR can do that. What is in the PMR database was actualized by a PMR happening or event. The PMR virtual reality is set up to be consistent for those experiencing, measuring, observing within PMR. Historical consistency is required only among the data that resides within PMR. If certain constraining data disappear from PMR, then new future possibilities may open up due to the disappearance of constraints. That the original data is part of the database in NPMR means nothing. Reality is not objective – the PMR VR must be self-consistent in terms of history and the rule-set. VRs elsewhere (which are considered nonphysical by those in PMR) must also be self-consistent. Each VR is its own subset – there is no consistency requirements between VRs. Like there is no required

consistency between World of Warcraft and EverQuest – even if both were manufactured by the same company. That doesn't logically imply that there can be no consistency – consistency is allowed but not required. Again – reality is not objective. Our belief that it is objective (habit of thinking) causes us to make assumptions that a probabilistic reality does not support.

-----  
-----

## 5 – Virtual reality – the purpose and function of the brain

The virtual brain inside our virtual body applies the constraints of the PMR rule-set to our perception

-----  
-----

## 6 – PMR Math and physics describing NPMR

Mathematics is the logic of quantity, and, as such, it is limited. All things that are significant cannot be reduced to quantity. Thus there is much beyond the reach of math. Most things that are significant in the big picture are beyond the reach of math. In a physical reality like PMR, quantity appears to be fundamental because the rule-set that generates PMR operates upon quantity -- ours is a simulated world whose mechanics can be described by relationship between quantities because that is how it is simulated. Virtual realities run on statistics. However virtual reality is in itself not fundamental – it is a tool created to provide interactive learning opportunities. Our math reflects our environment, our rule-set our reality but it won't help you grow up or assimilate experience at the being level because these are activities of consciousness that do not answer to the mechanics of quantity or interaction. One must separate the description and mechanics of a tool, from the processes of being that created the tool.

It is unlikely that PMR math or physics will ever describe consciousness because PMR is the subset and consciousness is the superset. The subset cannot describe the superset.

-----  
-----

## 7 – AUM is a metaphor

One quick caution on the question: what data stream does AUM get? Is he aware of us?

The question carries an implicit assumption that AUM is a separate thing relative to us. If you think of us being AUM and AUM being us, that shines a different light on it. AUM doesn't necessarily live in its own little separate corner of reality from which he can visit the little people when he wants to. AUM is a metaphor for the abstract concept of a larger consciousness system. We PMR bound humans require our metaphor to be separate from us in function and perception (an individual) because we are separate individuals with independent perceptions and cannot conceive of an aware being, being anything else -- but it is our specific PMR rule-set that makes us separate and independent. AUM is not bound by such a rule-set.

Metaphors such as AUM are absolutely necessary otherwise we could not speak to each other, but do not lose sight that the reality behind the metaphor is beyond our comprehension in terms of our PMR experience. Although giving independent attributes and functions to AUM does indeed further our ability as a group of individuals to conceive and understand the larger consciousness system, do not wander so far down that path as speculating on detailed separate PMR human-like characteristics (such as what is in AUM's private data stream), that you get lost in meaningless specificity of characteristics that lie beyond the necessary logical function of AUM. To burden the concept of AUM (the larger consciousness system) with our own belief system places logically unnecessary constraint (belief trap) upon the concept and its metaphor - - thus muddying the water rather than clearing it. Better to just live with uncertainty and remain open-minded and skeptical than to specify out of habit and belief (it must be that way, how else could it be?) what is un-specifiable. Details Unnecessary to the logical exposition just clutter the result.

Tom

-----  
-----

## 8 – You in PMR and NPMR

Tom: Given PMR and a PMR database, what is the difference between the data associated with (related to) 1) a tree and the data associated with 2) your long dead uncle Fred, and the data associated with 3) your life in PMR up to this moment? Nothing I can think of (though it is late). The fundamental difference between you as opposed to the tree and Uncle Fred is that you have a finite decision space and exercise free will within that decision space within PMR in the present moment. The major difference between uncle Fred and the tree is that most of the time, an Uncle Fred will have a larger, richer data set associated with him than the tree has; and most of the time, the tree is being perceived more often by sentient beings in PMR than uncle Fred is.

Physical things do not have an independent existence -- they are simply interpretations of data in the "mind" of a consciousness engaged in an interactive experience game with a specific

rule-set that evolved in a simulation. Cells are imposed by the rule-set -- they are a constraint that defines how things work here. They have no fundamental existence.

The function and purpose of the PMR virtual reality (e.g., virtual body/brain/cell/tree/rock/universe) which evolved within the PMR simulation, is to apply the constraints of the PMR rule-set to our perception. They (virtual body/brain/cell of any type/tree/rock/universe ) are only rendered (added to someone's data stream) as required. No doubt a given cell could possibly have some data related to it (a history) if it was a key player in some event, just as a tree or you could. But the system only saves what it needs to run the PMR evolution trainer. Data that has a very low probability of being needed to help the PMR trainer perform its mission within its constraints should be dumped -- otherwise it becomes useless overhead to carry along.

Tom

-----  
-----

## 9 – Virtual reality and trees in the woods

A piece of a conversation with Claudio that may be of interest to others:

Tom: The “perception” of trees is very undifferentiated (lots of uncertainty rather than lots of specificity -- thus the historical continuity requirement is very loose) and like the perception of people it takes place in the realm of consciousness within the constraints of the rule-set and the constraints of consistent, available, PMR records (history). Within these constraints, perception is redefined every moment (DELTA-t) in the present.

Claudio: In your model, cells don't actually exist in Consciousness Space unless measured? So cells don't relate to the "feelings" of trees and their awareness? The tree "feelings" are real in Consciousness Space but the development of the tree follows probability. Cells of a tree (virtual) and tree feelings are not coupled in your model, apparently?

Tom: Data is sent to a consciousness in the PMR game who interprets that data as a tree. Other data is sent that the consciousness interprets as its PMR body. If the body inspects the tree closely it may find cells, or molecules according to the game's rule-set -- then additional data must be sent that will be interpreted as cells and molecules. If the body doesn't inspect so closely, no cell or molecule data will be sent. The inspection is the measurement.

Claudio: If a human observer O1 sees just 4 trees in position A,B,C,D (3D coordinates, well almost 2D if they are in an almost flat surface) and no other living creatures in a big area. Would an observer O2, later on observe them in 4 other positions or may see 3 or 5 trees. Would TBC

invent the new position and number of trees or it will keep the positions and number of trees from the last observation (observation of O1)?

Tom: That depends.

O1 sees 5 trees leaves the woods, and is immediately is eaten by a bear. Next day O2 arrives in the same spot -- will he see the same thing O1 saw? Probably not, his interpretation is slightly different. But will he see something very similar? Probably so – especially if the rule-set had very little uncertainty the first time when O1 looked (constraints provided little room for differences) then O2 is likely to get a very similar result (approximately objective reality – what we have). If the rule-set had no uncertainty (only one specific thing satisfied the constraints) and if O2 interpreted thing exactly like O1, then O2 would see that exact same one thing that was allowed by the rule-set and history (absolute objective reality – what we think we have). If the rule-set and history had oodles of uncertainty to work with (multiple significantly different outcomes satisfied all constraints) then O2 might get something significantly different. What O1 saw became insignificant when the bear ate him. It only matters what data is in PMR -- (the historical continuity constraint is about PMR historical continuity) (The rule-set constraint is about PMR's rule-set

Tom: O1 sees 5 trees and uses his camera with GPS to mark the exact spot and orientation and takes high resolution pictures which are immediately sent by internet to his news paper doing a special on trees . Next day O2 arrives in the same spot and looks the same direction. If he interprets the same as O1, he will see the same thing O1 saw to the resolution of O1s photos. This is true whether or not O1 is eaten by a bear and regardless of how much uncertainty there might have been in the constraints before O1 took his pictures. When the news paper sends out a crew to verify what O1 saw, they will see the same thing O1 saw. It will look just like the photographs. If, while they are there, they look at the tree with a microscope they will see things that O1 didn't see and that measurement will bring new data into PMR. If they all totally forget what they saw in the microscope, then that data leaves PMR. If someone else brings a microscope the next day and looks they will get something similar, exactly the same, or something different depending how tight the constraints were (how much uncertainty there was in what the LCC could produce within the rule-set and history consistency in that circumstance in that moment.

Tom: [The question assumes that Claudio was blind and or numb and could not see or feel his arms] Of course TBC must describe the probable location your virtual arms if they might interact with something like a virtual wall or another virtual being (a measurement is likely made whether you feel it or not – this is a multi player game with a rule-set and an environment that is part of the record.

Claudio: Why would the position of my virtual arms be probable when the simulation can calculate exact positions using Kinematics (rule-set)?

Tom: Why perform a high resolution detailed deterministic calculation when a simple probability at 1/000 the cost would do perfectly well (meet all the constraints)?

Tom: If you don't remember where you were sitting (multiple places to sit) and there were no witnesses, a spot belonging to you could be in a multitude of places – all about equally likely.

Claudio: This is something I feel skeptical about. TBC knows what happened because it collapsed the probability when my position was measured by myself. Even if I don't remember, why would it choose a different location when by looking at the history it knows the actual one? Why complicate it by choosing a location when the VR knows what happened and the exact location from historical records.

Tom: The VR simply sends data to PMR players. It sends data requiring the fewest calculations that meet all constraints. It does not have to track and compute data that is irrelevant to the constraints. "TBC knows what happened because it collapsed the probability when my position was measured by myself" Once you forgot, TBC couldn't care less because that information is no longer part of the constraints it must satisfy and goes on to answer the next call for data with a minimum effort that meets constraints – that minimum effort may have to look up and retrieve your old position data or it may just grab a random position that meets constraints and go with that – whichever is easier and quicker at that moment..

Claudio: Hello Tom:

Well, enough to say that my estimated 99% inconsistency collapsed to the 1% :) You win, but I won too and not only me but the world with all the learning here with these exchanges.

Now, to tighten some details for confirmation... and I would like with your approval to post these exchanges in your forum. I already came back to post.

Claudio: Why would the position of my virtual arms be probable when the simulation can calculate exact positions using Kinematics (rule-set)?

Tom: Why perform a high resolution detailed deterministic calculation when a simple probability at 1/000 the cost would do perfectly well (meet all the constraints)?

Claudio: I wasn't thinking of detailed deterministic. I was thinking of a virtual forearm as an hexahedron (just 8 points) moving with Kinematics calculation. It would be nice to simulate these approaches in a computer program. Like, for example model a 2D object that observes in different directions with certain angles and change the VR according to the observations of this little 2D being (may be square simulated FWAU).

Tom: Yes, but kinematics is not cheap and even more expensive with a small delta-t -- it is much more complex than drawing a random number from a constrained subset for a likely place to put the spot. High level (low detail) statistical models are in general quicker than physics

models because there are fewer inputs and fewer calculations – less specificity. As long as it meets the constraints, the cheaper the better. So depending on how much detailed calculation the constraints require and how complex the situation is that produces those constraints, whatever method meets the constraints more efficiently would be the calculation process used. My point that much of the time in the PMR game as it is interactively played by uncertain humans engaged in uncertain interactions for uncertain reasons within a hugely detailed but uncertain physical environment, the process will more naturally and efficiently be statistical. A statistical approach to reality simply makes more sense. Otherwise you end up like all the group of physicist who support the “many worlds” theory of QM -- having to create a new world every time an electron changes spin state. Talk about wasted bits!

Claudio: In your model, cells don't actually exist in Consciousness Space unless measured? So cells don't relate to the "feelings" of trees and their awareness? The tree "feelings" are real in Consciousness Space but the development of the tree follows probability. Cells of a tree (virtual) and tree feelings are not coupled in your model, apparently?

Tom: Data is sent to a consciousness in the PMR game who interprets that data as a tree. Other data is sent that the consciousness interprets as its PMR body. If the body inspects the tree closely it may find cells, or molecules according to the game's rule-set -- then additional data must be sent that will be interpreted as cells and molecules. If the body doesn't inspect so closely, no cell or molecule data will be sent. The inspection is the measurement.

Claudio: So when I asked you above the "coupling" question? Feelings of the tree are in Consciousness Space and the "observation of its cells" may reflect the "effect" of the feelings. So to confirm your answer, tree feelings are real in CS, but cells don't have a "real" existence but rather a response from the VR.

Tom: Correct!

Claudio: Rolling back to the roots of my assumptions, I think by taking some aspects you mentioned in the forum, I applied them to a broader range and perceived these apparent inconsistencies. You mentioned that the brain is a constrain applied to the FWAU, and that the FWAU mind leads and the brain shows a representation of it. I took this as something general, so I assumed the trees should represent their "dim mind" (with feelings and possible response to FWAU thoughts) in Consciousness Space in their PMR structure and therefore should not be called just "probabilities". But from what you were saying in these emails, the brain representation analogy does not apply to trees (to represent tree feelings). That was the source from me thinking of inconsistencies. I don't know if you can add something from what I just said.

Tom: Correct! Trees don't have brains.:-) When you touch an old tree on an old battlefield and you think of what that tree might have “witnessed” and if you are intuitive you will connect with the database and “see” glimpses of what that tree has “experienced”. But you are not reading

the tree's mind, you are accessing a relational database for data related to that tree. When you love and cherish a plant, the loving intent modifies the rendering of the plant (by modifying its future probable reality) and you see the plant respond. We anthropomorphize the plant into a "plant being" that is interacting with us. Beautiful natural environments or art may cause a resonance within you that caused you to "respond to them" by relaxing and connecting to a bigger picture that is relevant to you. You, as consciousness are the cause of the response. It is in this way that trees and rocks have feelings – we feel all the data that is related to them when we "connect" with them. Our feeling, our connection. Data is data whether it is related to a tree or a rock or to the adventurer of our bodies or whatever. Information is all the same – reality is information -- in the best relational databases there are no masters: everything is related to everything.

Bonus question:

Claudio: I am interested in promoting Big Picture exploration and MBT and it would be good to try examples like the ones we discussed and also do some computer programs to simulate simple scenarios. Now another aspect that it would be nice for you to give us (the followers and future of MBT) is experiments we can try in PMR to explore and understand the probabilistic nature of PMR as a VR. You said that the probabilistic nature applies in a macroscale to everything, but what kind of PMR experiments we can try to explain and prove this, if possible?

Tom: In my Hawaii talk, and the TMI talk as well, I give an example of an experiment that is quite doable but has never been done that would verify the nature of reality as I describe it. You will find it in the part where I discuss reverse causality.

Thanks a lot!

Claudio

-----  
-----

## **10 – Understanding IUOC and FWAUs in terms of the larger consciousness system**

Somewhere earlier in this thread I cautioned about taking metaphors beyond where they are useful and adding assumptions to them (burdening them with personal beliefs) as you go. There is nothing wrong with extrapolating them as far as is useful to do so but do be careful to be aware of where the intended metaphor ends and your beliefs masquerading as obvious logic begin. An author states that "her eyes sparkled like stars" and two guys get in a fight over whether the stars were bright pulsars, angry red giants, or more subdued brown dwarfs. They write the author demanding to know exactly what sort of stars was he talking about because this issue has become critical to their understanding of the book. A few hundred years ago the answer to the question: "How many angels could stand on the head of a pin" became a life and

death matter as an extremely limited metaphor morphed into a test of dogma versus heresy. What I said above about the metaphor “AUM” holds equally true for the metaphors “IUOC” and “FWAU” – indeed for all metaphors. The conclusion of that discussion was: “Better to just live with uncertainty and remain open-minded and skeptical than to specify out of habit and belief (it must be that way, how else could it be?) what is un-specifiable. Details unnecessary to the logical exposition just clutter the result.”

With that being said, let’s see what specificity can be brought to our understanding of Individuated Units Of Consciousness (IUOC) and Free Will Awareness Units (FWAU). The term IUOC is born of the need for The Larger consciousness system (LCS or equivalently AUM) to lower its entropy (evolve itself) by experiencing and interacting with itself. Thus it breaks itself up into interacting pieces called IUOCs. Thus, The One is “All there is” and “All there is” makes up The One. The LCS is a conscious information system, thus the IUOC, as a subset, is also a conscious information system (self-modifying interactive memory, processing, and purpose). We say that only consciousness is fundamental and that all reality frames are virtual. That is to say that consciousness is the source and all else is derived. The Source (LCS or AUM or The One) is an information system, that means that what it does is transmit information in the form of data and interpret information from data received. That is exactly what we as IUOCs do, which is not surprising since we are subsets of the LCS. We are it (at least a part of it), and it is us. How much of a part, you ask? Well, isn’t any part that might be left over after all the IUOCs are counted also fit the definition of an IUOC? What else does the LCS have to do besides interact with itself in order to evolve rather than dissipate? Is any management of the IUOCs required or supporting infrastructure needed? Is it other IUOCs that perform those functions? All IUOCs are not equivalent – all are in a state of change and at different stages of evolution). (Caution: naming all the types of IUOC along with what they do and how and why they do it is pushing these metaphors too far.) The point is that we are it and it is us – period – the LCS is a collection of IUOCs – but, they are not all just like us in understanding, decision space, and the size of their big Picture. However, they all transmit personal, subjective, information in the form of data and interpret personal, subjective, information from data received. That is what digital conscious beings in a digital information system do – that is all they can do besides operate on their data to lower their personal entropy and focus their intent (use their free will) to interact in such a way that helps others do the same.

All information, and thus, all reality is individual, personal, subjective, and uncertain for all IUOCs and thus for AUM (consciousness as a whole) – even if there are shared components as in a multiplayer game. Consequently, significance and content within communication – i.e., productive interaction -- must be assessed in terms of probability. Probability is a logical process invented to deal with uncertainty. The whole consciousness system is evolving in its own uncertain probabilistic way as required by evolution. Recall that I have often said that people captured in the historical database (e.g. your last incarnation) are (when you interact with them) just as they were when they were “alive” but without free will. That they represent a probability model of the character they played in that lifetime. They exist in the database as a collection of all the choices they could possibly have made and the probability of making each. That is the

information that defines them within that incarnation – exactly the same information that flows from the future probable database through the present (where free will follows intent into action within the virtual reality) then on into the past database as DELTA-t cycles tick away. That is literally true. An IUOC interacts as a collection of information (self-modifying interactive memory, processing, and purpose) that has, at its present moment, a probability (based on past interactions) of how it will interact with future possibilities. Moreover, it has within its processing function a freewill intent that can modify any of those probabilities that lie within its decision space, thereby redefining the IUOC into a new being or perhaps better said: into a new state of being with a new entropy level.

Because, experience shows that an IUOC can have multiple incarnations (FWAUs) simultaneously and can serve as an intuitive conduit to those incarnations (higher self), two new metaphors are invented to facilitate our conversation: The FWAU (soul) is the interface (receives the PMR data stream) within the consciousness system that is committed to a specific PMR virtual trainer experience packet and the higher-self is the connection between the PMR character and the IUOC/LCS. In fact, the IUOC is not separate from the LCS. It is not distinct in the way we think of a PMR thing having weight and taking up space. It is a piece of the LCS that bubbles up to the surface as needed and disappears back into the LCS again when not needed. A rough analogy: Think of a Word document. It is not stored (it does not live) in a little corner of the hard drive, it is scattered all over the drive and is pulled together whenever it is needed. It is “One with the drive” until gathered back up into a document 9. The LCS is indeed a group of IUOCs but they do not all live in separate corners of consciousness-space. They melt back into the LCS – the source – and a new one is reassembled (bubbles up) out of the LCS as necessary with the appropriate constraints, histories and portfolios required to do what needs to be accomplished next as an interactive part of the system – this is AUM, the conscious digital data field interacting with itself. The FWAU, IUOC, Oversoul, Higher-self, guide are, as you have heard me say many times, simply metaphors for your interface with the LCS. So communicating with your IUOC, higher self, guide, etc, is the same as communicating with the LCS. The LCS with self-modifying interactive memory, processing, and purpose generates a collection of rules and rule-sets, data and information to define and serve the concept of evolution through the interactive experience of IUOCs. I use these metaphors to help you put these concepts into a form you can understand and profitably deal with. You may find this new exposition unhelpful and not to your liking – if so, let it go. Use metaphors that work for you – let go of the ones that leave you feeling cold and naked on the side of the road wondering what to do next. It is not so much that some metaphors are more accurate than others (that is true but not particularly important), as it is that some are more useful than others to facilitate growth in different individuals.

At PMR character death, what is left in the historical data base is the record of that lifetime (all the data that is important from a big picture perspective) in terms of the probability (updated by this lifetime) of all the decisions both made and not made. One can come back 100 years later and interact with that historical character and it will be just like interacting with that individual within that incarnation -- including all the physical, spiritual, emotional and egoic content --

except there is no free will since the processing function stayed with the IUOC/AUM. Meanwhile, after death, the old FWAU dissolves after uploading and the IUOC is at least partially regrouped out of the LCS again (as needed), centered in a new virtual reality (with its own rule-set, purpose, probable information field, free will choices and decision space) that helps it reorient and integrate the just past experience packet (into the IUOC and thus into the LCS) in order to maximize lessons learned and plan future sessions in the PMR trainer.

What do we mean by virtual? We call something virtual if it is a creation of consciousness – i.e., it exists only in an IUOC's mind or AUM's mind. More specific to us: Something is virtual if it is an interpretation of data received by an IUOC/FWAU. All of the content of consciousness is virtual – only consciousness itself is fundamental.

All information results from an interpretation of data received from "other". Other is just another part of AUM being used to create interactive learning opportunities through the successful processing of experience into new growth (decreasing system entropy). Are not the IUOCs themselves a creation of AUM's mind", then they too are virtual but at a higher level – like a simulation within a simulation. IUOCs are virtual probabilistic subsets of rules/data/information whose output must be interpreted by AUM and by other IUOCs. IUOCs, like AUM itself, represent self-modifying units of interactive memory, processing, and purpose that take in data and output data. Between the data input and data output of these virtual beings there exists an intent and free will which generates (through the processing function) personal subjective information out of input data and memory. AUM's plan is that massive free will interaction between IUOCs will generate inputs with effective feedback that, when run through the IUOC's self modifying processing function, will lead to the lowering of the entropy within the IUOC. That is its function and purpose – to transform interactive experience data into understanding leading to love and personal growth.

Every sentient (consciousness) virtual being in PMR has, by definition, a free will intent that operates within a finite decision space inherent to that individual being. This category has a wide span ranging from people to insects, worms and perhaps even protozoa. Some decision spaces at the lower end of the scale are infinitesimal while some at the opposite end are expansive. Among humans, who have the potential to hang out at the expansive end of the scale, there is an extremely wide variation. Determining whether a critter has a finite decision space is very difficult as one progresses toward the lower end of the scale. We may assume that independent decisions are being made but it is problematical differentiating at that level between hard wiring and actual free will decisions. For an easy example of hardwired: plants are alive and responsive (interactive) to both light and gravity among other things. But a plant stalk belonging to a plant that needs light doesn't make an independent decision whether to move its leaves toward the light or keep them facing the dark. Where the light strikes the stalk cells are constricted and the stalk automatically moves toward the light. The process is hardwired, no decision is made. The same goes for plant cells passing water, nutrients and information to wherever they are need to help the plant survive and reproduce. Simply reactive behavior -- evolutionary hardwiring to make the plant more adaptable.

Now in the animal kingdom there is also compulsive hardwiring called instinct. Where instinctive

hardwiring leaves off and true decision making appears in any critter is somewhat hard to tell. However, that is the line of demarcation (a finite independent decision space) between a conscious being and a biological non-conscious robot running a program. All critters have instincts and run hardwired programs (including humans) but some critters have independent decision space as well, and it is these critters, no matter how big or small, that I am calling sentient conscious beings with connections to the larger consciousness system. All living things (critters and plants) are interactive to some extent with their environments – they take in data and react to it. However the non-consciousness ones are simply obeying a rule-set like your desktop computer or an industrial robot – doing what their rule-set says they must do in each case – they have no independence from the rule-set in how they react. Consider these to be biological computer generated players that need no FWAU interface to the LCS – aware of their environment, but not conscious.

Although every conscious being is connected to the LCS through some sort of interface, all interfaces are not the same. Now, the metaphor I used in MBT to describe this interface for humans was an IUOC. As discussed above, how well this metaphor can be extended to fit other species depends mostly on the “I” – how independent is the unit of consciousness. Some dolphins, whales, dogs, birds, monkeys, pigs, foxes, and many others would seem to be pretty obviously independent with individual personalities that demonstrate creative problem solving behavior. With humans, the connection to the LCS is direct where intuition and “guides” (two more metaphors) provide an individual interface. All conscious critters (including humans) have a FWAU and thus are, as Claudio says, an avatar for an IUOC. With some humans that is the extent of their interface, they have not developed communications through intuition or guides. Many non-human critters show what appears to be intuition, and a very few may even have individual guides. Most have what are typically called “group souls” which is a metaphor to indicate that there is not enough differentiation between members of a species to warrant individual attention from the LCS so the species shares a single interface that supports a huge number of parallel lines.

This is enough clarification for now, hopefully it covers the basics – it’s already enough to puts most readers into a coma. I will save the rest until additional questions focus on where this needs to go next.

Tom

-----  
-----