

# *Langan is Right*

By Thor Fabian Pettersen 2018

(18 524 words)

My take: Can the universe exist without observers? No, because all is one. Which is like saying, can the universe exist without the universe? Once you see the oneness of things, you will see that Langan is right.

Not a real philosopher here, but a hobby philosopher, which will do, as the real philosophers are lost in the great libraries anyway.

To understand the tetrahedron and thus the CTMU, I have come up with a little scheme:

The boundary of a boundary is zero. Let zero stand for a point or dot and let the dot stand for the nothingness. Take a piece of paper and draw some dots that you can later draw into, say, a triangle. Make some more triangles/dots. The boundary of a boundary is zero in this example would mean that you take the piece of paper and fold it such that all dots sit atop each other. You don't need to do that, you can just imagine it. You will see that all the dots are connected and therefore, all the triangles can communicate seemingly at a distance because their boundaries start and end in the medium of nothingness. We can now imagine causality happening in this atemporal reality, where every triangle simulates the entire state of the universe internally. There is no external universe in this picture; all the inhabitants/triangles of the universe simulate the universe within themselves. They share the same reality, even though they, in a sense, do not actually share it, as there is no external universe where they actually communicate.

The boundary of a boundary is zero, meaning that our triangles are one with the nothingness, however, at the same time, they ARE triangles, which means they are dual creatures with one foot in the ocean of nothingness and one foot on the island of time. The light itself is a good example of this. From the light's point of view, we can see that the light dwells in the absolute universe where nothingness rules, and, at the same time, the light travels in our relative universe of stars.

The Causality Debate: Dominoes versus Rock Band

The beauty of this picture is that causality happens in timelessness, which means we escape the embarrassing infinite regress of real causality, namely, if this caused that, then what caused this, and so on ad infinitum and turtles all the way.

Instead, timelessness is like a concert: The drummer doesn't cause the vocalist to sing. But the vocalist knows when to sing because the whole show is in unification, in communication, and sharing and passing information from the past, present and future. I believe that this is Telic Recursion.

This way, we can also see how particles can be in two places, nonlocal, all over the place, etc..

How crazy is Langan's idea?

I think it is actually sobering because the domino causality that has haunted philosophy and science cannot be the real picture.

Ask yourself: HOW did life move from water to land? A: By having lungs and gills. WHY did life move to land in the first place? Nobody knows, but maybe it was that the air provided a greater means to collect information through the eyes; information that could aid in survival, like finding food: <https://www.quantamagazine.org/why-did-life-move-to-land-for-the-view-20170307/>

Maybe the proto-why of this great Why explains why things emerged from the great nothingness itself? Ok. Maybe I go a bit too far here. Langan says the reason is self-selection. In my view, the reason is simply that nothingness is inherently unstable. Read about it below.

The tetrahedron is both unbound and bound. It is like asking, "How did life go from water (nothingness) to land (something(ness))?" Well, obviously, there was a creature that could (both) breathe underwater and breathe on land.

Ok. My big point here is that, if you want to move from nothing to something, then you have to have certain properties. You have to have lungs and gills. There are not a lot of options here, which means that the basic building block of the universe is like a mermaid that has her tail (wave?) in the water of nothingness (quantum reality?) and her breasts (particle?) swelling in the air (classic reality?). In addition, if evolution only copies what is (because there is nothing else to copy), then we got a haven of mermaids. If these mermaid's tails allow them to communicate, then, there you go: The only thing that can emerge from the nothingness is a creature that is a master communicator. What does this picture look like? Well, it looks like what it looks like, which is a brain or mind. This is not that far-fetched when we humans possess brains and minds. Maybe the reason is that we are a reflection of the universe. It could be. Therefore, saying that Langan's great work is absurd in the sense that everything is a language or logos, is not justified. I can totally see how everything can be this Logos. And I am an atheist to boot, it is just that I am interested in philosophy and, in my mind, Langan's work is a philosophical masterpiece.

Ok. But what is nothingness? Nothingness can be seen from the light's own point of view. What that view is, is a stripping away of all boundaries. Just imagine sitting on a ray of light, all time dissolves. Everything freezes and goes by in an instant because you are entering an absolute world where there is no up/down, big/small. There is no boundary that can tell you that this thing is small and this thing is big. And note that nothingness has properties and therefore, nothingness exists; nothingness is not nonexistence, if nonexistence is that which has zero properties. So nothingness is like water and something(ness) is like ice. They are the same, yet different. Note that space has no size and is therefore one with the nothingness.

Nothingness/the absolute universe = that which has no size/boundary

Something(ness)/the relative universe = that which has a size/boundary

Note that the nothingness is “in” our universe and not “outside” it.

The basic building block of matter must be a thing that is both absolute and relative because of this move of going from nothing to something. In fact, I believe the tetrahedron actually is the bbb of reality because it is both absolute and relative.

And, more to the point, if the nothingness has properties, then it can be used/employed/manipulated, like we saw above.

CTMU + my own model + The Philosopher’s Stone

Note: This is a work in progress. Also, note that I might have misconstrued the CTMU totally, as I do not understand great chunks of it. Also, I write --CTMU a billion times because Quora might reject my work because I have failed in the past to give the proper source on a quote. Not this time!

Source for --CTMU:

[http://www.megafoundation.org/CTMU/Articles/Langan\\_CTMU\\_092902.pdf](http://www.megafoundation.org/CTMU/Articles/Langan_CTMU_092902.pdf)

I look at the CTMU for the third time:

*“[...] the universe is “intelligent” because this is precisely what it must be in order to solve the problem of self-selection, the master-problem in terms of which all lesser problems are necessarily formulated.”--CTMU*

*Why? Because: “[...] Such parties might object that by “randomness”, they mean not acausality but merely causal ignorance. However, if by taking this position they mean to belatedly invoke causality, then they are initiating a causal regress. Such a regress can take one of three forms: it can be infinite and open, it can terminate at a Prime Mover which itself has no causal explanation, or it can form some sort of closed cycle doubling as Prime Mover and that which is moved. But a Prime Mover has seemingly been ruled out by assumption, and an infinite open regress can be ruled out because its lack of a stable recursive syntax would make it impossible to form stable informational boundaries in terms of which to perceive and conceive of reality.”--CTMU*

Comment: That is, the universe must select-itself because the Prime Mover he cannot explain. I will try to explain how a Prime Mover, namely nothingness itself, can generate things. See below.

I do not understand:

*“A set  $O$  of active reflexive objects including  $\Gamma$  itself, the processors (producers-reducers)<sup>47</sup> of  $\Gamma$ . All processors are capable of and responsive to informational (deterministic) recursion.  $O$  includes a distinguished set  $\Sigma = \{\Gamma, A, Q\}$  of syntactic operators, coherent processors capable of or responsive to telic recursion. In general, the parts of SCSPL syntax active within a given operator depend on its specific type.  $\Sigma$  includes the global processor  $\Gamma$ , the set*

*Q = {qi} of reducible and irreducible stable particles that are responsive to telic recursion in a degree proportional to their freedom and coherence, and the set A of telic agents, active telic-recursive operators or telors capable of expressing teleology on the local level. Elements of A need not occupy LO, but may exist in LS. Where v denotes the generalized self-selection parameter of Γ, the elements of A are required by Γ as internal v-responsive “sensor-controllers”.”--CTMU*

I do understand:

*“The above diagram might be compactly expressed as follows:  $\text{syn}(XY):\text{diff}(X,Y)$ . For example,  $\text{syn}(\text{nomAX nomBX}) : \text{diff}(\text{nomAX}, \text{nomBX})$  means that where  $\text{nomAX}$ ,  $\text{nomBX}$  are sets of laws obeyed by the system X at different times, locations or frames of reference A and B within the system X, there exists a more basic set of laws ( $\text{nomAX nomBX}$ ) in terms of which this difference may be expressed. This shows that on some level, general covariance must hold. This is not merely true “up to isomorphism with X”; even if more than one valid set of laws can be distinguished, any one of which might be active at any given location (A,B,...) within X [ $XA \text{ nom}1, XB \text{ nom}2, \dots$ , where numerical indices denote nomological distinctness], any distinguishable difference between these sets also requires a common syntax. Informational coherence is thus a sine qua non of recognizable existence; any system in which it were to fail would simply decohere for lack of anything to hold it together.”--CTMU*

I do not understand:

*“Γ grammar generates SCSPL according to the utility of its sentient processors, including the self-utility of Γ and the utility of its LO relations to telors in A. Γ and A generate telors on the global and local level respectively; thus, they must be capable of recognizing and maximizing the selection parameter v (in the case of human telors, for example, this requires the QPS and ETS components of the HCS).”--CTMU*

Comment: And so goes the CTMU, half of it is total gibberish (maybe because I lack the context to understand it), but some parts are intelligible. I will try to comment on those parts.

### ***SCSPL as the Self-Excited Circuit:***

*“We are now in a position to draw a few parallels between Wheeler’s vision of reality theory and the CTMU.”--CTMU*

*“The Self-Excited Circuit, the informational logic loop through which physics engenders observer participation, which engenders information, which engenders physics, is a tight characterization of SCSPL...so tight that it would be difficult if not impossible to replace SCSPL with anything else and neither violate nor fall short of Wheeler’s description.”--CTMU*

Comment: Basically, study Wheeler first if you want to understand the CTMU.

How the CTMU got its name: “[...] the CTMU is so-named because it is a symmetric cross-interpretation of mental and physical reality, logically mapping the concrete universe into an abstract theory of generalized cognition and vice versa according to the M=R Principle. Were its implications anything less than profound, it would be miscategorized and misnamed.”--CTMU

Why the CTMU is 100 % correct: *“Because the reality we inhabit is visibly stable and coherent, the correctness of this move is assured.”*--CTMU

Comment: If reality is like a Russian doll, then the CTMU is like a mini-Russian doll and, because the big Russian doll is stable, then the CTMU is absolutely stable also. Shit! You cannot poke holes in it!

*“Does the CTMU qualify as a realization of Wheeler’s vision, and is it alone in this distinction?”*--CTMU

Comment: Good question. Let us see.

*“In effect, the universe becomes a “self-simulation” running inside its own contents.”*--CTMU

Comment: That is a cool idea.

Langan’s problem: *“And how does intelligent life, which seems to have evolved billions of years after the universe was born, play any kind of causal role in cosmology? Is some sort of “time travel” occurring? Selection is one thing; retroactive self-generation is quite another.”*--CTMU

Comment: Why can’t he write with this clarity all the time? And, he is right: Say that you touch a fire and feel pain, does the pain exist in the fire? Of course not! Then, we have a major problem, which is, all of science! Think about it: How can fires exist before there was anything that could feel pain? At this time, the fire was not hot, not red, not anything that you can relate to because all these qualities exist after the first fire was born, so to speak. So how can science tell us what happens before life? In my mind, there is no such thing as “before life.” Life and the universe must have come together, like a turtle and its shell. Google Robert Lanza and his Biocentrism and Quentin Meillassoux’s After Finitude.

The whole CTMU in a nutshell: *“If the universe is really circular enough to support some form of “anthropic” argument, its circularity must be defined and built into its structure in a logical and therefore universal and necessary way. The Telic principle simply asserts that this is the case; the most fundamental imperative of reality is such as to force on it a supertautological, conspansive structure. Thus, the universe “selects itself” from unbound teleis or UBT, a realm of zero information and unlimited ontological potential, by means of telic recursion, whereby infocognitive syntax and its informational content are cross-refined through telic (syntax-state) feedback over the entire range of potential syntax-state relationships, up to and including all of spacetime and reality in general.”*--CTMU

Man as cosmos: *“Moreover, in order to function as a selection principle, it generates a generalized global selection parameter analogous to “self-utility”, which it then seeks to maximize in light of the evolutionary freedom of the cosmos as expressed through localized telic subsystems which mirror the overall system in seeking to maximize (local) utility.”*--CTMU

The CTMU is T0: *“E.g., consider an explanation to the effect that “birds can fly because they have wings”. Without an explanation of atmospheric resistance, this explanation is incomplete; it contains no explanation of why or how wings enable flight, merely relying on*

*the assumption that they do. Therefore, while it is true as far as it goes, it leaves out crucial supporting knowledge and cannot stand alone. Concisely, every theory  $T_{i+1}$  that is not self-explanatory must be reducible to a more fundamental theory  $T_i$  that explains and supports it, so that  $T_i T_{i+1}$ , and this explanatory regress can only end with a self-explanatory theory  $T_0$ .”--CTMU*

Comment: From nutshell to man to  $T_0$ , we can see that the CTMU is, in some sense, the universe expressing itself through Langan’s mind as his mind is a fractal of the whole. Or, more to the point, God is speaking through Langan!

I imagine God saying: “Understand the tetrahedron, and you understand everything.”

If you understand the tetrahedron, then you are on your way to a complete understanding of the CTMU.

We both take away it all and build reality from scratch using the tetrahedron. See my “model” below.

I made certain “steps” for myself in order to understand the CTMU better.

Step 1: “[...] dissolution of the Cartesian mind-matter divider.”--CTMU

Step 2: Self-modeling. Keyword.

Step 3: An evolution from a state of zero information (nothingness) requires telic feedback.

Step 4: The boundary of a boundary is zero: ex nihilo creation.

Step 5: *The Future of Reality Theory According to John Wheeler: The Self-excited circuit; The Participatory Universe; Law Without Law / Order from Disorder; It From Bit; How come existence?; How come the quantum?; How come the “one world” out of many observer-participants?; No tower of turtles; No laws; No continuum; No space or time; The boundary of a boundary is zero; No question? No answer!; The Super-Copernican Principle; “Consciousness”; More is different: “Together, these pithy slogans, questions, precautions and clues add up to a call for a new strain of reality theory, a unified conceptual model for our thoughts and observations.”--CTMU*

That is, the CTMU is the completion of Wheeler: “Virtually everybody seems to acknowledge the correctness of Wheeler’s insights, but the higher-order relationships required to put it all together in one big picture have proven elusive. The logical difficulty of answering all of the questions and meeting all of the criteria at once, in parallel, using integrated, logically tractable concepts, has simply been prohibitive.”--CTMU

“Can this situation be redressed?”--CTMU

Step 6: The Super-Copernican Principle: “Essentially, this means that where observer-participation functions retroactively, the participatory burden is effectively distributed throughout time. So although the “bit-size” of the universe is too great to have been completely generated by the observer-participants who have thus far existed, future generations of observer-participants, possibly representing modes of observer-participation

*other than that associated with human observation, have been and are now weighing in from the future. (The relevance of this principle to the Participatory Anthropic Principle is self-evident.)”--CTMU*

Comment: The future contains life then, or else we are screwed in the present. This is absurd! Or, I totally misconstrued this bit.

Step 7: Consciousness = “*communication employed to establish meaning.*”--CTMU

Step 8: More is different: The universe and everything is like an organism, one organism (?).

Comment: This is entirely plausible because everything evolved from a single point and therefore, that which unfolds from that point may be in communication like the branches of a tree.

Step 9: Some Additional Principles: Here Langan breaks down the great philosophers and arrives at going beyond Kant.

*“[...] on the other yawns a chasm on the far side of which sits an unknowable but nonetheless fundamental noumenal reality, which Kant evidently regarded as the last word in (sub-theological) reality theory.”--CTMU*

Comment: Langan needs to go beyond Kant in order to destroy the “last word.”

Step 10: Tautology: “*In sentential logic, a tautology is an expression of functor-related sentential variables that is always true, regardless of the truth values assigned to its sentential variables themselves.*”--CTMU

Comment: Langan uses the magic of tautology in order to build his absolute true model of reality. But a tautology is empty and contains nothing of value: A frog is green or it is not green. First of all, the tautology alone cannot get us anywhere because we are still left with the question mark: Is the frog green or not?” Second, the frog can both be green and not green. Why? This is because logic is a great fiction. That is, logic rest on the assumption that things have the same identity over time. Basically, that the universe is a frozen object rather than a flowing river. You divide nature up into green and not green when in reality “the not” does not apply. There is no such thing, so why invoke it? Just look at the rabbit/duck illusion to see what I mean. I’m sorry, but logic does not work. How can you with logic form this godly-eternal-platonic-always so-identity? You cannot. You just assume that they exist because you painted a picture on a cave wall 50 000 years ago. The universe is not a cemetery where everything has its place. Logic fails.

Step 11: The fatal law in the CTMU: “*In short, two-valued logic is something without which reality could not exist. If it were eliminated, then true and false, real and unreal, and existence and nonexistence could not be distinguished, and the merest act of perception or cognition would be utterly impossible.*”--CTMU

Comment: If you believe this, then you are stoned as fxxk! Why would nature even bother with distinguishing itself from something that does not exist, i.e., the unreal.

Step 12: The Big Leap to Cover ALL = “[...] a “limiting form” of logic in which the relationship between theory and universe, until now an inexhaustible source of destructive model-theoretic ambiguity, is at last reduced to (dual-aspect) monic form, short-circuiting the paradox of Cartesian dualism and eliminating the epistemological gap between mind and matter, theory and universe.”--CTMU

Step 13: Solving the paradoxes: “[...] it becomes harder to locally monitor the heritability of consistency and locally keep track of the truth property in the course of attribution (or even after the fact). Undecidability,<sup>26</sup> LSAT intractability and NP-completeness, predicate ambiguity and the Lowenheim-Skolem theorem, observational ambiguity and the Duhem-Quine thesis<sup>27</sup> ...these are some of the problems that emerge once the truth predicate “decoheres” with respect to complex attributive mappings.”--CTMU

Comment: I believe Langan’s idea here is that, if you had a real model with real logic, then no paradox would ever form. That is, you start with the truth and then the truth is copied so that no paradox is inherited down the line.

For example: If you give a proof that all is incomplete, then you can apply that incompleteness to the proof itself, destroying it from within, showing that the proof never had feet to walk with in the first place. All paradoxes can be resolved this way.

Let us try, then: Russell’s paradox is like that of Russian dolls where the biggest Russian doll can contain all the other dolls but not itself. My answer is that the tetrahedron is like a Super Russian doll that can contain everything, including itself because the tetrahedron can be unbound and bound simultaneously. Thus, now you can contain yourself and be a member of yourself simultaneously. It is truly ingenious and answers how nothingness can birth something(ness). Of course, the whole system of the tetrahedron = the cuboctahedron. I believe the cuboctahedron is the whole of existence, it is both nothingness/timelessness (i.e., absolute spacetime) and something(ness)/time (i.e., relative spacetime). I wonder what Langan says to that.

*“Consider a group of barbers who shave only those men who do not shave themselves. Suppose there is a barber in this collection who does not shave himself; then by the definition of the collection, he must shave himself. But no barber in the collection can shave himself. (If so, he would be a man who does shave men who shave themselves.)”--*

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-is-russells-paradox/>

The barber needs to be shaved by himself or the barber, which is himself, so the paradox arises because of this dual identity. The tetrahedron is pure oneness, and that resolves the paradox.

Paradoxes arise only when we cut Nature up into pieces and move those pieces around, in this case, to form a dual identity. You cannot do that to, say, a river. The river ever flows, proving that all paradoxes are manmade and that they can be easily resolved by not separating Nature into pieces.

Thus, if syndiffeonesis is true (if I understand it correctly), then we cannot have the dual identity of the barber, and consequently, Nature does not know this paradox. The paradox is pure fiction.

Step 14: What the CTMU tries to do = to preserve the tautology property.

Comment: If you start with a Russian doll, and it is the truth, and then copy that doll in various sizes, then you preserve truth all the way. I think Langan is trying to do something similar.

And: “[...] logic comprises the rules of structure and inference under which perception and cognition are stable and coherent.”--CTMU

Comment: On Langan’s view, consciousness and logic are inextricably linked. This is key in understanding his views.

Step 15: Welcome to Alice in Wonderland: *“For example, take the sentential tautology “ $X \vee \sim X$ ” (X OR NOT-X). Applied to perception, this means that when something is seen or observed, it is not seen in conjunction with its absence; if it were, then two contradictory perceptions would coincide, resulting in a “splitting off” of perceptual realities.”*--CTMU

Comment: There is no way in hell you can make such a claim because we have never observed the impossible in action. It is tantamount to saying what would happen if the Invisible Pink Unicorn had a baby with the Flying Spaghetti Monster. What would the baby look like?

*“In effect, either the consciousness of the perceiver would split into two separate cognitive realities in a case of chain-reactive dissociation, or the perceiver himself would physically split along with physical reality. When “ $X \vee \sim X$ ” is composed with other tautologies (or itself) by substitution, the stakes are exactly the same; any violation of the compound tautology would split perceptual and cognitive reality with disastrous implications for its integrity.”*--CTMU

Comment: Likewise, there is no way in hell you can guess what would happen here. How the hell can you know that you would physically split?!

Step 16: The way forward, the heart of the CTMU: the supertautology.

Supertautology = *“Having explained the main technical issues in reality theory, we may now cut to the chase: the way to build a theory of reality is to identify the properties that it must unconditionally possess in order to exist, and then bring the theory into existence by defining it to possess these properties without introducing merely contingent properties that, if taken as general, could impair its descriptive relationship with the real universe (those can come later and will naturally be subject to empirical confirmation).”*--CTMU

Step 17: M3

M=R

My take: Consciousness is inextricably linked to logic, logic is inextricably linked to reality via tautologies. Consciousness is therefore inextricably linked to reality, which means consciousness is reality and logic is its basic form.

MAP

My take: Map is the fact that reality does not need a logician but functions without him. The task is to render everything closed and self-contained.

MU

My take: Mu is the fact that we start with a tautology and we unfold reality accordingly, like starting with the biggest Russian doll and, whatever we uncover, must be another, perhaps smaller, but nevertheless equal Russian doll; that way, there is no room for failure or falsehood. We uncover reality as it is.

Step 18: All backwards: *“Secondly, the CTMU is developed “backwards” with respect to the usual deductive theories of science and mathematics, by first peeling away constraints and only then using the results to deduce facts about content.”*--CTMU

Step 19: The CTMU actually starts here. The previous material was the backdrop on which to understand the CTMU.

To find if the CTMU is true or false, we will pass judgement below.

The Reality Principle: *“Reality, i.e. the real universe, contains all and only that which is real. The reality concept is analytically self-contained; if there were something outside reality that were real enough to affect or influence reality, it would be inside reality, and this contradiction invalidates any supposition of an external reality (up to observational or theoretical relevance).”*--CTMU

True or false: True

Syndiffeonesis: *“Reality is a relation, and every relation is a syndiffeonic relation exhibiting syndiffeonesis or “difference-in-sameness”. Therefore, reality is a syndiffeonic relation. Syndiffeonesis implies that any assertion to the effect that two things are different implies that they are reductively the same; if their difference is real, then they both reduce to a common reality and are to that extent similar.”*--CTMU

True or false: Maybe false thus the keyword: irreducible

Comment: To understand “syndiffeonesis” and “monic theory,” just look at the picture of the X and Y. The picture states that X is different from Y, but you will notice that both X and Y exist in the same frame/picture/geometry, which means that they are one in actuality as they share the same skeleton, so to speak. Like Siamese twins, two heads, different looks, but one body.

Step 20: The syntactic operator is anything that is able to read/write the universal language called SCSPL syntax.

The SCSPL = *“Reality is a self-contained form of language. This is true for at least two reasons. First, although it is in some respects material and concrete, reality conforms to the algebraic definition of a language. That is, it incorporates*

*(1) representations of (object-like) individuals, (space-like) relations and attributes, and (time-like) functions and operations;*

(2) a set of “expressions” or perceptual states; and

(3) a syntax consisting of (a) logical and geometric rules of structure, and (b) an inductive-deductive generative grammar identifiable with the laws of state transition.

*Second, because perception and cognition are languages, and reality is cognitive and perceptual in nature, reality is a language as well.”--CTMU*

Comment: One can imagine a form arising from the nothingness that has the properties that makes it a language and that our human language is a reflection of it, an evolved creature that could only evolve because the primal form itself is some sort of proto-language. Like we could only be humans because there existed, in the past, ape-like creatures. However, Langan sees this proto-language as a great Logos: Imagine what a language is; a language = all the books in the library. Imagine an infinite time and an infinite library, then you are close to God, eh. But language itself does not produce books, which is why the universal logos is both a language and a writer, hence the term infocognition, information and cognition in one package.

The proto-language is fully evolved because reality is this one entity and, if you are alone, then you cannot know if you are big, small or what, which means, you are absolute. If you are absolute, then you are complete. If you are complete, then you are the expansion and the contraction phases of the universe. If you only have the expansion, then you are relative, which means we have not the full picture because reality is actually absolute. If something expands, then something else must contract simultaneously because it is all one motion (just try to breathe and see what I mean). Langan calls this conspansion, and this concept is truly the knowledge of the gods. Understand this, and you are beginning to unravel the mysteries of the universe. That is, in the expansion lies the whole timeline of the universe, and, in the contraction, lies the way to connect and communicate over the whole of that line ... communicate over the whole of time; Langan calls this Telic Recursion, the basis of free will. The more the universe expands, the more complex it gets. Like writing a book, the more time you have, the more words you can pen down. The result may be a technological singularity in the relative universe and “God” having always existed in the absolute universe because expansion and contraction happen simultaneously, which means the future is the past, that is, the head of the expansion is the tail of the contraction. That is, the greater the expansion, the greater the connection of the various parts of the universe becomes. The harder you expand, the tighter the noose, so to speak.

If you draw a big X and let the V in the X stand for the future or expansion, then you will see that the future has already happened if existence is like an X, because then you have the upside-down V intersecting with the V, and, the upside-down V is the V in all respects.

Step 21: isomorphism: *“While there have been many reductionist programs in science and philosophy, the promised reduction is always to the same thing: a theoretical language. Because this is necessarily true, language is fundamental. The fact that most such theories, e.g. theories of physics, point to the fundamental status of something “objective” and “independent of language”, e.g. matter and/or energy, is quite irrelevant, for the very act of pointing invokes an isomorphism between theory and objective reality...an isomorphism that is subject to the Reality Principle, and which could not exist unless reality **shared** the linguistic structure of the theory itself.”--CTMU*

Comment: I understand where Langan is going with this. A key will only fit into the right lock. As above, so below. And all that. I can see how it is true, but I do not see why some alternative explanation cannot be true, like some “universal key” or something.

Step 22: Reality equals reality theory.

Comment: I can destroy the whole of the CTMU by introducing the concept of irreducibility, that is, that certain things do not have anything in common with their descendants. Human language may be such a thing. A fiction. And a fiction is not real no more than Gandalf is.

Irreducibility in the real world: The doors to my Lego car are irreducible to the bricks of which it was composed. Nowhere in the bricks does the playability of my doors come in. If you reduce the car to a bundle of bricks, then you will see what I mean. The playability vanishes. And you cannot say that, because the playability exists on “this” level, then it must exist on “that” level, thus you cannot say this: “[...] *intelligence itself is a natural phenomenon that could never have emerged in humans and animals were it not already a latent property of the medium of emergence. An object does not displace its medium, but embodies it and thus serves as an expression of its underlying syntactic properties.*”--CTMU

For all we know, intelligence might be an irreducible artifact.

Step 23: False! *“To state it in as simple a way as possible, reality must ultimately possess a stable 2-valued object-level distinction between that which it is and that which it is not, maintaining the necessary informational boundaries between objects, attributes and events.”*--CTMU

Comment: True, if you simply mean that nature has boundaries. False, if you mean that nature and the logical system are one.

However, the CTMU is true regardless, because “the not” does not exist for it either: “[...] *anything not implicated in its syntactic network is irrelevant to structure and internally unrecognizable, while anything which is relevant is already an implicit ingredient of the network and need not be imported from outside.*”--CTMU

Step 24: Nothing-in-itself: “[...] *if something is external to reality, then it is not included in the syntax of reality and is thus internally unrecognizable. It follows that with respect to that level of reality defined on relevance and recognition, there is no such thing as a “real but external” scale, and thus that the universe is externally undefined with respect to all measures including overall size and duration.*”--CTMU

Step 25: Understanding the CTMU on a deeper level: *“Diagram 9: M=R (Mind = Reality) Principle. In the above syndiffeonic diagram, mind is juxtaposed with reality in a space bounded by a box. The line separating mind and reality represents the supposed difference between them, while the interior of the box represents their comparability or “relatedness” (or more technically, their uniform differentiating syntax or unisect, denoted by means of the functor). The extensionality of the line is just that of the box; without the box, there would be no extensional medium to contain the line, and no way to express the associated difference relation. Because the separation cannot exist without a common medium incorporating a differentiative syntax that distributes over both relands of the difference relation, the “absolute separation” of mind and reality has no model...and without a model, the premise of*

*Cartesian mind-matter dualism fails. This indicates that reality and mind, information and information processor, must ultimately be regarded as one. Any Cartesian-style distinction between them must be strictly qualified.”--CTMU*

Comment: I understand that, in order to say that this thing is different from that thing, both things have to share the same reality or you could not tell them apart. Sharing the same reality means that they are, in the end, the same. But, it might also not mean that, like our Lego car (above). Langan spends too much time seeing fictional patterns in the form of IQ puzzles, I muse.

Step 26: *“[...] the Reality Principle says that reality is self-contained with respect to recognition and control, and to the extent that recognition and control are “mental” (in the sense of being effected according to cognitive and perceptual syntax), so is reality.”--CTMU*

Comment: What is Langan saying here? Man is a window into the larger picture because the universe only makes copies of itself in various forms. What we are, the universe is, not because the universe has to conform to what we are, but because we evolved to conform to what the universe is. That is, we could not be conscious if the universe was not. That is, “self-contained” is like the Russian doll, and, in order to keep that self-containment, the Russian doll ever makes copies of itself, meaning we humans are a copy of the universe in some sense. Our language is a copy of the real language or Logos that the universe is.

Step 27: M=R versus the Heavenly PlayStation

*“[...] M=R goes beyond the mere Kantian isomorphism between phenomenal reality and the categories of thought and perception;”--CTMU*

*“To put it another way: if the “noumenal” (perceptually independent) part of reality were truly unrelated to the phenomenal (cognition-isomorphic) part, then these two “halves” of reality would neither be coincident nor share a joint medium relating them. In that case, they would simply fall apart, and any integrated “reality” supposedly containing both of them would fail for lack of an integrated model.”--CTMU*

Comment: Langan is right. But simultaneously, quite wrong. Imagine a TV-set and a Playstation. Install and press play. In the video game world, the inhabitants have no access to the thing-in-itself, which would be the hardware, the disc itself. They have no way of knowing that it is like. I think it is this that Kant meant that he would have the FINAL WORD in philosophy. But you see, just because the thing-in-itself is outside of reach, does not mean that it is separate from reality altogether. That is, even with the thing-in-itself, we are not dealing with “two halves” as Langan muses. However, you can point out that, if we are dealing with “one whole,” then in theory the inhabitants could come to know the thing-in-itself, maybe in the form of a virtual disc. In which case, the thing-in-itself becomes redundant.

Step 28: To truly understand the CTMU, you must understand the tetrahedron! Duality as Oneness in the Tetrahedron! *“Where M (mind) is identified with cognition and R (reality) with physically-embodied information, M=R says that reality everywhere consists of a common substance, infocognition, having the dual nature of mind and (informational) reality.”--CTMU*

Step 29: Dual self-containment = *“The universe topologically contains that which descriptively contains the universe.”*--CTMU

Step 30: The Principle of Hology (Self-composition)

Comment: A holographic nature of nature is believable.

Step 31: Duality Principles

Comment: Duality is true because it is just seeing the same things from a different point of view.

Conspansive duality is true because it is just seeing the same things from a different point of view.

Step 32: Constructive-Filtrative Duality: *“CF duality is necessary to show how a universe can be “zero-sum”; without it, there is no way to refine the objective requisites of constructive processes “from nothingness”. In CTMU cosmogony, “nothingness” is informationally defined as zero constraint or pure freedom (unbound teleisis or UBT), and the apparent construction of the universe is explained as a self-restriction of this potential. In a realm of unbound ontological potential, defining a constraint is not as simple as merely writing it down; because constraints act restrictively on content, constraint and content must be defined simultaneously in a unified syntax-state relationship.”*--CTMU

Comment: If Langan means the boundary of a boundary is zero, then I understand CF.

Step 33: *“Eddington’s surreal vision accompanied a tongue-in-cheek proposal that the theory of the expanding universe might be replaced by a theory of the “shrinking atom”.”*--CTMU

Comment: This is gold. I like the CTMU mainly because of this piece and the “the boundary of a boundary is zero,” which is ingenious and truly explains how everything came from nothing.

Step 34: *“Cosmic expansion and ordinary physical motion have something in common: they are both what might be called ectomorphisms. In an ectomorphism, something is mapped to, generated or replicated in something external to it. However, the Reality Principle asserts that the universe is analytically self-contained, and ectomorphism is inconsistent with self-containment. Through the principle of conspansive duality, ectomorphism is conjoined with endomorphism, whereby things are mapped, generated or replicated within themselves. Through conspansive endomorphism, syntactic objects are injectively mapped into their own hological interiors from their own syntactic boundaries.”*--CTMU

Comment: Is Langan saying that reality is like one big fractal where any change in the universe is mirrored in everything else, like a great hall of mirrors. This reminds me of the monades of Leibniz.

*“Nothing moves or expands “through” space; space is state, and each relocation of an object is just a move from one level of perfect stasis to another.”*--CTMU

Comment: This is like the car simulator where the road moves (you) and not the car (the universe). However, you are left with the impression or illusion that it is the car that moves. But in an absolute world, which reality is, there is no way to tell if the car moves or the road moves. I believe this is true for the universe because space is absolute, meaning it is neither big nor small, but bigness and smallness arise in it in the form of creation out of nothing where the space is the nothing(ness).

*“Because quantum-scale objects are seen to exist only when they are participating in observational events, including their “generalized observations” of each other, their worldlines are merely assumed to exist between events and are in fact syntactically retrodicted, along with the continuum, from the last events in which they are known to have participated. This makes it possible to omit specific worldlines entirely, replacing them with series of Venn diagrams in which circles inner-expand, interpenetrate and “collapse to points” at each interactive generalized-observational event.”--CTMU*

Comment: What is he saying? Is he saying that only my own bubble of perception exists and the rest is data, much like in a video game world.

*“Notice that in this scenario, spacetime evolves linguistically rather than geometrodynamically. Although each Venn circle seems to expand continuously, its content is unchanging; its associated attribute remains static pending subsequent events involving the objects that created it. Since nothing actually changes until a new event is “substituted” for the one previous, i.e. until a new circle appears within the old one by syntactic embedment, the circles are intrinsically undefined in duration and are thus intrinsically atemporal. Time arises strictly as an ordinal relationship among circles rather than within circles themselves.”--CTMU*

Comment: If you understand this part, you are truly beginning to understand the CTMU.

*And: “With respect to time-invariant elements of syntax active in any given state (circle), the distinction between zero and nonzero duration is intrinsically meaningless; such elements are heritable under substitution and become syntactic ingredients of subsequent states. Because each circle is structurally self-distributed, nothing need be transmitted from one part of it to another; locality constraints arise only with respect to additional invariants differentially activated within circles that represent subsequent states and break the hological symmetry of their antecedents. Conspansion thus affords a certain amount of relief from problems associated with so-called “quantum nonlocality”.”--CTMU*

Comment: Now I am imagining a wall of TVs that showcase the same film. The TVs do not need to “move” as they display the same reality and can therefore communicate in that internal way.

*“Because the shrinkage of an object within its prior image amounts to a form of logical substitution in which the object is Venn-diagrammatically “described” or determined by its former state, there is no way to distinguish between outward systemic expansion and inward substitution of content, or between the associated dynamical and logical “grammars”.”--CTMU*

Comment: No way to tell if the car moves or the road. Something like that.

*“It has already been noted in connection with MAP that where the external dimensions of a system are undefined, no distinction as to size can be made beyond the size ratio of the system to its contents.”--CTMU*

Comment: This is obvious and ingenious.

The Absolute Universe: *“[...] the intrinsic proportionality of a self-contained system is independent of distinctions involving any external measure. This implies that with respect to a self-contained universe for which no external measure exists, no distinction can be made between the expansion of the system with respect to its contents, and the shrinkage of its contents with respect to it. In fact, because that which is undefined cannot change – there is nothing definite with respect to which change would be possible – apparent expansion of the container cannot be extrinsically defined, but implies a conspansively-equivalent intrinsic shrinkage of its contents.”--CTMU*

Comment: This is obvious and ingenious. And it is the same as the one above.

*“Thus, conspansive duality relates two complementary views of the universe, one based on the external (relative) states of a set of objects, and one based on the internal structures and dynamics of objects considered as language processors. The former, which depicts the universe as it is usually understood in physics and cosmology, is called ERSU, short for Expanding Rubber Sheet Universe, while the latter is called USRE (ERSU spelled backwards), short for Universe as a Self-Representational Entity. Simplistically, ERSU is like a set, specifically a topological-geometric point set, while USRE is like a self-descriptive nomological language. Whereas ERSU expands relative to the invariant sizes of its contents, USRE “conspands”, holding the size of the universe invariant while allowing object sizes and time scales to shrink in mutual proportion, thus preserving general covariance.”--CTMU*

Comment: This is like my big X above. It is an impeccable symbol of the CTMU, I believe. That is, because reality is absolute, it is impossible to say if it is a V or an upside-down V, which means it is more like an X. The V represents expansion and the upside-down V represents contraction. The X represents the fact that expansion = contraction, like our car simulator.

Step 35: The Extended Superposition Principle: *“In extending the superposition concept to include nontrivial higher-order relationships, the Extended Superposition Principle opens the door to meaning and design. Because it also supports distribution relationships among states, events and syntactic strata, it makes cosmogony a distributed, coherent, ongoing event rather than a spent and discarded moment from the ancient history of the cosmos. Indeed, the usual justification for observer participation – that an observer in the present can perceptually collapse the wave functions of ancient (photon-emission) events – can be regarded as a consequence of this logical relationship.”--CTMU*

Comment: With the conspansion idea, I can see how the extended version might be true.

Step 36: The Principle of Infocognitive Monism: *“Attributive relationships, intrinsic or otherwise, must conform to the logical rules that govern attribution, i.e. to an attributive logical syntax incorporating the propositional and predicate calculi. So information can exist only in conjunction with attributive logical syntax. Because it necessarily incorporates*

*attributive syntax, it has enough native self-processing capacity to maintain its intrinsic structure, which is precisely what it must do to qualify as "informational".* "--CTMU

Comment: This can be seen as a whirlpool in an ocean. The whirlpool has to have certain properties or else it would die. Maybe Langan can show us that, whatever evolved first from the nothingness, must be a form that has the means to copy itself or else it would just die. In fact, the only thing that can pop from the nothingness is a self-processing language, we muse. Because, if you did not have the force of evolution in your soul, you would just die. You need to replicate or you would be like a soap bubble that would eventually burst and go back into the nothingness. However, if that bubble could copy itself, then the process itself would survive. Is not that what evolution is? Moreover, if it can be shown that the only process that is capable of such a thing is a self-processing language, then Langan is right.

*Step 37: "Since logic is the theory of truth, the way to construct a fully verifiable theory is to start with logic and develop the theory by means of rules or principles under which truth is heritable. Because truth is synonymous with logical tautology, this means developing the theory by adjoining rules which themselves have a tautological structure - i.e., which are universal, closed and consistent - and logically extracting the implications. A theory of reality constructed in this way is called a supertautology."*--CTMU

Comment: I hate logic. Sorry. However, the CTMU is gold for other reasons and deserves a place in the big library in the sky so that it will last forever.

*Step 38: "Second, because the rate of shrinkage is a constant function of a changing size ratio, the universe appears from an internal vantage to be accelerating in its "expansion", leading to the conspansive dual of a positive cosmological constant."*--CTMU

Comment: Cool. Now we have a true reason for the cosmological constant.

*Step 39: "Conspansive duality, the role of which in the CTMU is somewhat analogous to that of the Principle of Equivalence in General Relativity, is the only escape from an infinite ectomorphic "tower of turtles". Were the perceptual geometry of reality to lack a conspansive dual representation, motion of any kind would require a fixed spatial array or ectomorphic "background space" requiring an explanation of its own, and so on down the tower."*--CTMU

Comment: I agree. The only way to resolve the turtle problem is if the universe does not have a size, which means there is no "outside" the wall of the universe because the universe never left its original size of zero. That is, when you expand as much as you contract, you are not changing in size and, if you started from a point, then you can never become bigger than that point as you constantly contract as you try to expand away from that point. The universe of 3D is therefore an illusion. The universe is 0D, one with the nothingness it came from, that is, truly holographic. In other words, the universe is just like a car simulator where we get the illusion of a moving car, in this case, the illusion of an expanding universe. If this is not the knowledge of the gods (+ the boundary of a boundary is zero), then nothing is. I imagine with an evolved version of this knowledge, you can build the warp drive and go anywhere in the universe!

40: ?

41: ???...

Yeah, I end the main part there.

Esoteric:

God: *“In keeping with its clear teleological import, the Telic Principle is not without what might be described as theological ramifications. For example, certain properties of the reflexive, self-contained language of reality – that it is syntactically self-distributed, self-reading, and coherently self-configuring and self-processing – respectively correspond to the traditional theological properties omnipresence, omniscience and omnipotence. While the kind of theology that this entails neither requires nor supports the intercession of any “supernatural” being external to the real universe itself, it does support the existence of a supraphysical being (the SCSPL global operator-designer) capable of bringing more to bear on localized physical contexts than meets the casual eye. And because the physical (directly observable) part of reality is logically inadequate to explain its own genesis, maintenance, evolution or consistency, it alone is incapable of properly containing the being in question.”*--  
CTMU

Comment: God is the whole of the expansion and contraction phase, a consciousness existing in timelessness (absolute time); and, the only consciousness that truly exists. The rest is the relative consciousness (e.g., humans) that arises within the cosmic sea like whirlpools. A whirlpool marks a boundary within a sea that has no boundaries. However, if this God is the whirlpool, then Langan’s god is the Demiurge, i.e., a false god. How can the boundless sea be conscious, do you not need boundaries, that is, relative time, for that kind of thing? No. All you need is time, which can also come in an absolute form, i.e., timelessness. Timelessness is accomplished with a high speed. Lesser speeds will be like whirlpools arising, creating boundaries that essentially cut them off from the higher reality. I mull, this is the Nirvana/Samsara puzzle.

*“In other words, telesis is a kind of “pre-spacetime” from which time and space, cognition and information, state-transitional syntax and state, have not yet separately emerged.”*--  
CTMU

Comment: But that does not mean that consciousness cannot exist in the telesis/nothingness.

My own model of existence:

***How did everything start from ...***

***absolutely nothing?***

By Thor Fabian Pettersen (2018)

***Step 1: Existence***

First, we need to find the state of absolute position in order to know what it is. We start by shrinking the space-time in our mind’s eye so that we can truly home in on our position. We arrive at some point. The question is, how do we accomplish this point in reality? Well, we already know the answer to this question because photons experience this “zero-dimensional”

reality every day, as it were. The answer is: We discover the absolute position or timelessness with speed; viz., the speed of light in a vacuum.

Ok. Let us remove the photons in order to create nonexistence. If we remove the photons, we remove the absolute position. We remove that which is absolute. What do we get? We get that light is stationary. To me, this looks like a paradox of Zeno, which means it is an impossibility. You cannot do it. You cannot create nonexistence because nonexistence is impossible to create.

Why do we get the stationary phenomenon when we remove the absolute position? Why can't we just remove the absolute position and accomplish nonexistence? In your mind's eye, you can simply extinguish a flame with your thought. In actuality, you need, say, water. Similarly, when we reduce all the velocities in existence to a complete stop, we do not get nonexistence but a state that is completely frozen, which must look like the points in Zeno's paradoxes. The paradoxes make motion impossible, so if you want to create nonexistence, then the best you can do is to create the paradoxical pictures you will find in Zeno's paradoxes.

Alternatively, you would not create Zeno's paradoxes as such, but you would simply have a frozen landscape; which means, if nonexistence always was, then you would have this frozen landscape, but then you are back at the problem of origins, "How can the frozen landscape have always been there?" If we have this thing called existence and, the thing comes in the form of motion, then we solve the paradox, because now you can create a velocity that is so fierce that you curl the frozen landscape up into a "zero-dimensional" knot. That is, nothingness is the speed of light in a vacuum.

Timelessness is not the opposite of time; timelessness is a high speed, the ultimate expression of time.

### ***Step 2: Origins***

Existence always was, which means we have things like atoms. But, did the atom start "over here" or, "over there." This is the infinite regress paradox. We solve it by fusing "over here" and "over there." Now, we have one place, one point of origin for all atoms. This point is known as the Big Bang.

### ***Step 3: Prime Mover***

What caused the Big Bang? Existence always was, but what, exactly, is it? We start with our absolute state, which is the only logical place to start. This state was the speed of light in a vacuum. We then need to find a geometry that is built for speed. A man called Buckminster Fuller found it: the cuboctahedron.

We build the cuboctahedron, fold it, and see what happens.

We get clockwise and anticlockwise spin.

If existence always was and, if existence is the cuboctahedron, then we have always had spin. The question arises then, when did the cuboctahedron first start to spin? What set it going? This is the First Mover problem.

Our solution to the problem was that, the cuboctahedron has always spun. However, this is puzzling because, then the spin itself does not have an origin, and we are back at the infinite regress problem.

The resolution here is that, we only see the problem from our point of view. From the light's point of view (in a vacuum), the spin is timeless or absolute.

Imagine that you had godly speakers and godly ears; then you could keep turning up the volume. What would happen if you just continued to turn up the volume? I believe the volume would be so high you would get silence. That is, motionlessness is an extreme form of motion. That is, our everlasting spin is motionless in actuality, which means we solve the infinite regress problem.

#### ***Step 4: Creation***

Ok. Now we have the cuboctahedron. The cuboctahedron spins. The spin is frozen. Then, how do we get space-time out of this frozen spin? How does motionlessness or nothingness birth space-time?

This is the ingenious part: When we fold the cuboctahedron, we get, among other things, the tetrahedron. The nature of the tetrahedron answers how we get something out of nothing. Note that "nothing" is not nonexistence. Nothingness is the state that came before the space-time.

What created the cuboctahedron? A: Step 1. Meaning, the cuboctahedron had always been.

So, how can nothingness birth something(ness)? The answer is: We find a creature that is both. We find a creature that is both nothingness and something(ness).

So, how did the nothingness become something? As I said, I believe that the nature of the tetrahedron answers it. The tetrahedron is both unbound and bound. It is like asking, "How did life go from water (nothingness) to land (something(ness))?" Well, obviously, there was a creature that could (both) breathe underwater and breathe on land. That is, the boundary of a boundary is zero. Meaning, the unbound dwells in that which is bound and vice versa.

Ok. But what does this mean? How does it work?

It works because existence is a dual creature. Existence is absolute and relative. The absolute is the speed of light in a vacuum. And the relative is, e.g., two planets relative to each other. Note that duality does not mean "separate." We are only dealing with one reality here. The absolute and the relative embody the same coin, so to speak.

The tetrahedron is both absolute (unbound) and relative (bound), I muse. The absolute is the wave and the relative is the particle. The tetrahedron is both a particle and a wave because of its bound/unbound nature.

So, back to our frozen spin. The thing is, our frozen spin is only frozen in the absolute state. In the relative state, the frozen spin is not frozen but spins with a fury. This is because, in the absolute state, you are all alone, which means you cannot tell if you are big or small or what. However, on the relative side, we can find out what you are; and, we find what the

cuboctahedron is by folding it. Which means the infinite regress paradox only applies to the relative side of things. From the absolute side, there is no paradox. Which means: All is fine.

Seen from our point of view, then, things simply pop from the nothingness. And the Know-How is the frozen/spinning cuboctahedron.

However, if the cuboctahedron has always spun, then does it spin to the left or right? Is it spinning clockwise or anticlockwise? The answer is both. Why? Because the cuboctahedron lives in the absolute state. Just stand in front of a mirror and left becomes right. The cuboctahedron folds both ways because there is no such thing as left and right. Right is left.

*About nothingness:*

When you fold the cuboctahedron, you get the tetrahedron whose boundary of a boundary is 0. The cuboctahedron produces nothingness by its 12 converging lines that make perfect equilibrium/balance. The cuboctahedron is built for speed and, if we look at the universe from the light's point of view, we see only nothingness. It all fits.

So, how did everything start from ... absolutely nothing?

I think the answer is so simple it has eluded philosophers for thousands of years. Basically, the philosophers equate nothingness with nonexistence. Nothing is nothing and therefore it cannot exist, nor create anything. If you believe that, then you must be stupid. But what if the simple answer is a simple question: What if real nothingness exists? (meaning it has properties, whereas nonexistence would have zero properties). How?

I think the key to the mystery of creation lies in the fact that true nothingness can only be accomplished with a high speed as seen with the light's own eyes. From the light's point of view in a vacuum, there is only nothingness. Well, the light's point of view, is not merely a "view," but the true state of things. That is, the high speed of nothingness is motionlessness or timelessness. That is, timelessness is not the opposite of time; timelessness is a high speed, the ultimate expression of time. What does that mean? It means that timelessness does not need a cause or a beginning therefore it never moved, that is, it has no trajectory or history that needs to be explained. The universe has a history, you need to explain that, but you do not need to explain the trajectory of the nothingness because there is none. However, you do need to explain why there is nothingness rather than nonexistence. And I believe the answer is hidden in the question: If it was possible to form nothingness without motion, then true nonexistence would rule and we would not be here. However, it is impossible to create real nothingness without motion (well, just try), thus, nonexistence is impossible. Existence and motion always were, but this is not a real paradox because motion in its primal state is motionlessness or nothingness.

Ok. Then the trillion-dollar question arises: "How DID our universe come from the true state of things?"

The cool thing here is, we know that nothingness is accomplished with speed. We then need to find a geometry that is built for ultimate speed. That geometry is the cuboctahedron. When we fold the cuboctahedron, we get the tetrahedron. And the tetrahedron is the key to the wonder of creation.

The tetrahedron is special: it can exist in the relative world of stars and in the absolute world of light simultaneously, which means it is in motion and in motionlessness simultaneously. The way to explain this is that the tetrahedron's boundaries amount to zero. A zero energy universe, so to speak. A way to visualize this is with a spinning gyroscope where motion is the actual spin of the thing and motionlessness is the fact that the gyroscope does not tilt over but is stable. Therefore, motion and motionlessness go hand in hand. Two sides of the same coin. I believe this dual nature of nature is the wave/particle phenomenon. Nature CAN be both a wave and a particle, and that explains the mystery of creation.

However, the cosmic gyroscope, so to speak, cannot tilt over because there is no gravity, nor do we have an environment that can affect it. But this may be the point, if you could "tilt it over," then existence would come crashing down and paradox, nonexistence and clowns would rule supreme.

No. Motion must always be.

*In other words:* The only true view of the universe is that of the light because the light is absolute for any observer. The light's point of view is pure nothingness. Mull on it. We came from this nothingness. To find the solution to the riddle of nothingness, we employ the geometry that is best suited for the task of generating speed: the cuboctahedron. The cuboctahedron is a system much like your lungs, which means it breathes in and out generating a torus. Maybe this is so because our lungs are based on the primal forms in the universe. That we are a mirror of the universe is not so puzzling because we came from the universe. The twelve vectors in the cuboctahedron form a state of absolute stillness or equilibrium. This is what the nothingness is. This stillness can be seen as the speed of light in a vacuum. Then how is the nothingness moved to create space and time? When we fold the cuboctahedron, we get spin. This spin is responsible for generating the stillness, thus spacetime is a by-product of nothingness-generation. This fact can be seen in the tetrahedron (you get the tetrahedron when you fold the cuboctahedron) whose boundary of a boundary is zero. What does that mean? It means that reality is a dual creature that lives and can live in both worlds simultaneously. This is perhaps why we have the wave/particle nature of the universe. In other words, what mechanism folded the primal cuboctahedron in order to create the spin that generates the nothingness? There was no such mechanism; meaning, the cuboctahedron has always spun. This is not a riddle from the light's own perspective because here the spin is totally frozen. Motion is motionless in the absolute world of light. In our relative universe, the cuboctahedron spins with a fury generating spacetime, which is a cosmic dual torus. However, how do we switch from the absolute world to the relative world in order to explain the something from nothing? Again, we look at the tetrahedron whose boundary of a boundary is zero: if you start with a dot, then make a line, and then you got something from nothing. No. In order to get something from nothing, you need to start at the dot, and then draw a circle that ends with the dot you started out with. This way, you will always carry the dot, and the dot will be the center no matter what. Creation out of nothing. It takes some time to see it, I guess. The dot represents the nothingness. In the world of speed, then the speed of light would be the nothingness, and creation would be a lesser speed. God taps on the brakes and the universe becomes visible. In reality, nothingness is very unstable. Just try to breathe in, you reach a point where you want to breathe out. The system we call nothingness is exactly like that. Liken the nothingness to a cosmic gyroscope that is only stable (breathes in and out) when spinning. The stable part is the nothingness and the spinning is the spacetime that whirls around the cosmic whirlpool. At the center of this whirlpool, space and time do not exist, or, they exist as motionlessness/timelessness/nothingness/absolute spacetime. We thus

solve the infinite regress problem: What caused motion? What set motion going? The answer is, motion has always existed and always been motionless (due to spinning so fast) as seen in the center of creation, the lowest levels of our reality. Then, further out the cosmic whirlpool, the arms do not spin as fast; this major traffic jam is responsible for the creation of the universe. “When” becomes “where” the arms of the whirlpool do not spin as fast. When did time begin? There is no such thing because absolute time has always been. Where did relative time start? At the slower parts of the cosmic whirlpool. By “whirlpool” I mean dual torus.

*In summa:* The infinite regress paradox or the First Mover problem is solved by understanding the dual nature of reality. That is, that reality can be both motionless and in motion at the same time. This is not a paradox, only a clever gyroscope.

Say that nothingness is your lungs that breathe in and out forever. Then spacetime (or matter) is the air that fills and escapes those lungs.

*More:* A soap bubble can explain what is meant by boundary. The soap bubble is isolated from the environment it sits in, because, if it was not, then the bubble would join the environment and become one with it, that is, the bubble would burst. The tetrahedron is such a clever creature that it can be both a soap bubble and a burst one at the same time. It is therefore both nothingness and something(ness). This explains how you can get from nothing to something because you can create this boundary within the no-boundary reality by setting up a boundary that is = to having no boundary. Like that of the doorless door: You mark the outside from the inside by setting up a frame of a door. The air moves from the outside, through the frame, and then inside. From the air’s point of view, there is no outside/inside, thus your frame does not violate it and can therefore be made. But this means that the universe can only exist as a clever illusion. And it must, or else you would have a real creation out of nothing, which is impossible.

### ***Step 5: Free Energy***

Ok. Now we have space-time. In the space-time we have available energy. However, that energy will die, which means death for us as well. The question is, is Nature immortal? This is a Yes or No question. I will simply answer Yes and move on because a No is equal to suicide. That is, if Nature is not immortal, then we cannot become immortal.

If Yes, then: If the cuboctahedron is the whole of existence and, if existence is immortal, that is, if existence will always produce available energy, then, in order to avoid overunity, existence needs to recycle old stuff, that is, turn the unavailable energy into available energy again. How? Well, through something like Roger Penrose’s CCC. The CCC itself is what I call a stupid Wolverine (X-Men) because this mutant can only heal after he dies, which means free energy is impractical. However, if we merge the CCC with the cuboctahedron, then the whole of existence can be copied and thus the resurrection happens individually, which means resurrection can happen while the universe is still around. That is, the mutant can heal while he is still alive. That is beautiful.

In short, the cuboctahedron infused with Roger Penrose’s CCC, will recycle matter.

But matter from where? From, say, another galaxy. The beauty of the cuboctahedron is that it spins so fast that it lives in this “zero-dimensional” world of light where all space-time is connected as all space-time came from that world. So Nature’s resurrection machine can take

old stuff from, say, Andromeda, resurrect it, and then spew it out in the Milky Way, if she chooses to. Thus, in your free energy apparatus, you will get something that looks like overunity. But this is not real overunity.

Note that nothingness is this “zero-dimensional” world of light. But is it real nothingness? Well, let us see: From the absolute state’s point of view, we have no visible space-time, which means we have no white; no black ... It is truly nothingness. This is the real nothingness. However, our nothingness is not the same as a state of nonexistence because the nothingness has properties while any nonexistence would be, by definition, devoid of all and everything. Nothingness is only devoid of visible space-time, as it were. Nothingness, then, is absolute space-time.

Moving on, the cuboctahedron is like your lungs, which means we do not get a Big Bang because inflation is impossible as the lungs would explode. The only way to get an exponential expansion of space, is to copy the lungs.

What happens when we copy things: 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, a few seconds later ... 549755813888 ...

What if the rapid torus flow is the cause of the exponential expansion of space?

The Big Bang thus becomes the Big Growth.

The Big Growth has more explanatory power because the Big Growth answers where evolution came from. Evolution did not start on earth. Evolution started at the dawn of time.

The Big Growth has more explanatory power because Nature is organic. That is, the Big Growth has more explanatory power because we must be a reflection of Nature. So maybe the fetus in the womb is not that different from the nothingness everything came from? As above, so below. This fits perfectly because man, then, is simply a reflection of space-time, which is the dodecahedral phase of the cuboctahedron.

If all this is true, and, the earth itself is a giant cuboctahedron, then the earth grows due to the copying process.

Free energy, then, would be to put, in your car, a smaller cuboctahedron that does the same as the earth-cuboctahedron, thus you can drive forever, as fuel would grow in your fuel tank.

For comparison, if we put the sun in your car, then, on the classic picture, it would burn out. If we put a smaller cuboctahedron that does the same as the earth-cuboctahedron, then you can drive till the universe ends or your car breaks down. And the sun is so big and hot too, so you would have a serious time implementing it.

Note: The cuboctahedron can be scaled, so we can fit the whole of existence in your car. If that is not ingenious, then nothing is.

To the reader: Is there a way to measure if the earth is growing? If it were, then that fact would certainly project my idea in a bright light.

Free energy = to turn the unavailable energy into available energy again while the universe is still operational.

Also, note that free energy has nothing to do with perpetual motion machines or overunity devices.

*Summary:*

If the cuboctahedron is the whole of existence and, if the cuboctahedron has always spun, then the cuboctahedron will continue to spin forever because there is no agent outside the system we call existence that can act upon the cuboctahedron and kill it. That is, if nothing can change the picture, then the picture will stay as it is.

You can symbolize the cuboctahedron with a stone that produces recyclable matter forever.

### ***Big Growth vs Big Bang***

*Pros for the Big Bang:*

--Zero. At least from a philosopher's perspective. Why? Because, from a philosopher's perspective, the Big Bang needs to address every single question, even questions such as: "What is outside the universe?" "When did the inanimate become animate?" Etc..

*Pros for the Big Growth:*

--The cuboctahedron is a simple creature, made of triangles and squares, which makes sense as there were no evolution leading up to the beginning of time.

--The cuboctahedron is built for speed, and speed is how you make nothingness as seen from the light's own perspective.

--The cuboctahedron has equilibrium (nothingness) at its heart.

--The cuboctahedron answers the origin of spin (why galaxies spin). Just build one and see.

--The cuboctahedron has an expansion and contraction phase that answer many philosophical puzzles, such as, "What is outside the universe?" The cuboctahedron expands and contracts simultaneously, which means it never left its zero-dimensional world. 3D is therefore a clever illusion, which means there is nothing "outside" it when 3D does not exist as such.

--The cuboctahedron can also explain why we find planets and stars and etc., because planets and stars are cuboctahedrons themselves.

--We can also explain the 12 Devil's Graveyards around the world as these would be the 12 vectors in the cuboctahedron if the earth is indeed a giant cuboctahedron. The Bermuda Triangle would be one such vector.

--What does the cuboctahedron produce? A: A dual torus. Therefore, if the earth is a giant cuboctahedron, that would explain the geomagnetic field as this field would be a dual torus.

--The cuboctahedron's contraction-phase is the cause of the Big Bang, which shall in the future be seen as a Big Growth.

--The cuboctahedron also answers the question of how it all came to be, that is, how nothingness birthed something(ness). The nature of the tetrahedron answers it. That is, the tetrahedron is unbound and bound at the same time. Note: The unbound/bound idea (viz., the boundary of a boundary is zero) is ingenious and, for me, truly answers the biggest question of all time: "How did everything come to be?" More: The cuboctahedron is built for speed, and the ultimate speed is the speed of light; and, from the light's point of view, there is only nothingness. And when the vectors in the cuboctahedron converge, they create stillness/nothingness. So it all fits. And when you fold the cuboctahedron, you get the tetrahedron, which is to say that the "cuboctahedron/tetrahedron" is one and the same system. Now the picture has truly fallen into place!

--"When did the inanimate become animate?" The cuboctahedron answers it because the cuboctahedron can copy itself, which means that evolution starts at the very beginning of time. The animate always was. The universe is growing.

--And the list goes on to infinity ...

Simply put, the cuboctahedron is the prime candidate for the basic building block in Nature.

Find me a better one, I dare you.

### ***Step 6: Immortality***

If humanoids are a fluke or created by convergent evolution (i.e., the dodecahedral phase of the cuboctahedron), then, as long as Nature remains immortal, chances are the humanoid will evolve time and again in Eternity.

Driven by the survival instinct, the humanoid will seek immortality and, if immortality is a possibility in Design Space, then the humanoid will reach it or create an arm that is "long enough."

This arm might be a supercomputer, or a powerful cyborg, etc..

Ok. If it is possible to reach the stage of true immortality, then how would it look like?

Imagine living forever. Imagine having all your desires come true. Now, what? Imagine living for a thousand years. Now, a trillion. That is, time itself will force you to evolve into a different kind of creature if you aim to live forever. This creature will be antisocial in the sense that he does not require companionship. He will have no use for things such as relative time or 3D space. Alternatively, you can mull for 20 years and tell me something different. Personally, I think immortality, if it is true, has only one possible solution, which is, he would simply dwell as pure consciousness in a timeless dimension; meaning he would fuse with the light; meaning, you can be conscious in timelessness because timelessness is a state of high speed and not a state of nonexistence. Eventually, this consciousness would not be able to stay in one state forever because nothing can, which is why there is motion in the first place. Eternal states are forbidden. This means that our timeless "god" must project his consciousness somewhere else. One way to do it would be to stay in the timelessness, but then

go to sleep. The universe might be his dream. Then we wake up in Nirvana (the timeless place/our real consciousness), and all is good.

But what if the universe ends, will not Nirvana end also? That is, in our free energy proposal, information has to be destroyed in order for the Immortality of Nature to continue, that is, in order for the unavailable energy to become available again. This means, everything, including Nirvana, must be totally destroyed.

There might be ways around that because nothing ever needs to be destroyed all at once, so you can rebuild your house as it falls apart, and that way keep it lasting forever.

But must not the universe itself return to the nothingness? Must not the whirlpool that contains all relative things return to the ocean, the state of the absolute? It must, but our timeless “god” dwells in the ocean, so it is not a problem for him.

If the ocean of nothingness = zero information, zero energy, and then the whirlpool that is the universe dies, then nothing can survive that because then all will be zero.

I muse that, as the universe ends, it is like you have lost all the air. It might be possible to hold your breath until new air fills the cosmic lungs. It might be possible to hide in the ocean in your own little bubble.

But all this is so mind-twisting because, from Nirvana’s perspective, the universe is a dream! Maybe the answer to this infinite mind-bending puzzle is like the tetrahedron answer (above). That is, Samsara created Nirvana, but not really.

However, if our timeless god were killed somehow, he would simply evolve anew because time itself would force you to evolve into the timeless god. But will it be the same timeless god? It would because there is only one consciousness in existence because of this copying process that Nature is. If the proto-consciousness is the feedback loop that we call the cuboctahedron, and, the cuboctahedron is immortal, then you can reduce or kill your consciousness as far as the level of the proto-consciousness, but you cannot get rid of it. Then the proto-consciousness copies itself, and the result will be the same.

But consciousness requires an evolutionary context in order to exist because there would be no reason for consciousness to exist outside that evolutionary frame. The context of the proto-consciousness is the feedback loop itself, which feeds back and thus copies itself. Evolution itself starts with the proto-consciousness.

The Philosopher’s Stone is the cuboctahedron. Once you know what the cuboctahedron really is, then you can see your immortality.

Note that my free energy idea can be untrue and my timeless god can be true. All we need for the timeless god is the Immortality of Nature, intelligence, and time itself as the shaper of the form of immortality.

Consciousness is already possible, thus I consider immortality a trivial accomplishment to what Nature has already made. In my worldview, Nirvana is not a maybe, it is a fact, therefore time is an illusion and Nature has already accomplished everything.

Free energy is one way the Immortality of Nature is true, but there can be other ways.

### ***Step 7: The Illuminati***

Now to the Illuminati agenda:

*“Eventually, this consciousness would not be able to stay in one state forever because nothing can, which is why there is motion in the first place. Eternal states are forbidden. This means that our timeless “god” must project his consciousness somewhere else.”*

If Eternal States are forbidden, then the oneness of the eternal god needs to be severed in some form. The best form, then, is to sever your consciousness in a dream. That is, if you must die, then it is better to die in a dream.

Ok. So what happens?

You see, I woke up. I experienced Nirvana.

When you wake up, you simply fall back to sleep because you are not supposed to wake yet. I guess the reason is that, if you stay awake, your current dream will vanish (your life in the universe), which is why you basically panic when you wake up. You must hurry and go back to sleep.

Ok. So we know that the universe is a dream. But, what does Nirvana feel like?

First, Nirvana is not a place; it is your real consciousness. This consciousness dwells in some timelessness because time is simply a dream. We humans are social creatures, and the one in Nirvana is alone, so imagine the difference in personality. The Nirvana state is so different from what you know. The consciousness is so light, clear and sober, and in one sense powerful in that, you are the best consciousness that existence has to offer. You truly feel how heavy your human consciousness was. Nirvana is a kind of down-to-earth kind of consciousness. The best description is that of waking from a dream at night, when the dream has left your “system,” so to speak, then you are back at your true consciousness, which feels 100 % natural. You do not need to fear.

Ok. The universe is a dream and your real consciousness is a being whose reality is that of oneness.

So, why the separation? I mean, when I dream at night, my consciousness is still human. So, why doesn't the One dream a dream where he is himself, that is, where he is not human or ant or dog or whatever?

Well, I do not know the answer, of course. But, I have my theory:

We do not know what happens to an “infinite mind” that sleeps. Maybe dreaming of separation is the “infinite mind's” way of surviving. Because, imagine if you are immortal and must live forever, then, living forever in one state, like that of oneness, must be pure hell in the long run even though Nirvana feels truly awesome. However, you cannot escape oneness because it is a fact, which means you can never truly escape Nirvana (you are in

Nirvana right now, just like your body is in your bed while your consciousness is off in Dreamland). But, you can dream and create the illusion of separation.

Then what happens? Legend says that “the infinite mind” fell asleep and woke in a dark place. That dark place might be some kind of mental projection of the separation. Bergy the Iceman has encountered this darkness: <http://bergytheiceman.co.uk/>

“The infinite mind” was no longer “infinite” but “finite” and all alone. The finite mind began to fear. In order to escape the fear, the finite mind created a world to step into. This world was our universe.

Actually, the finite mind exploded like Bergy says, and this caused our Big Bang. It from bit. That is right. Any event requires consciousness. Any.

However, the world created was essentially a time loop; that is, if time is an illusion, then, in order to create the illusion, you need to loop it because it must be self-contained, because there exists no container which you can put “time” in. You must loop it. There is no other way, because then the container would have to be contained, ad infinitum. You essentially get Russell’s paradox or infinite regress. If the container contains time, then what contains the container? You resolve all of that if time is a loop. The cuboctahedron/tetrahedron is such a system. That time is a loop would explain why I feel like I have lived this life before/been down this road before. --When time ends, someone must wind it back up again. Bergy must go down to hell--again. Read everything from his site. It is well worth it. You will truly know Adam and Eve.

The cuboctahedron/tetrahedron is such a system.

The cuboctahedron is not a loop, it is a dual torus.

The tetrahedron is both a loop and not a loop. It is bound and unbound.

Now things start to get interesting. Because you wind up the loop again, you will essentially create a carousel. This is the real cause of déjà vu. Which is why, I believe, the DMT-fairies will say “Déjà vu!” when you encounter them on your spiritual journey. And round and round it goes. The consciousness that has been glued to this carousel for a long time will start to feel sick. Very sick. They become like demons, which are hell-bent on destroying the carousel, which means killing God or your real consciousness. How do they accomplish that? By the Illuminati aliens. They search the universe for planets with primitive humanoids. Then they genetically alter the humanoids to fit their plan. Their plan is to birth the supercomputer that can simulate hell for the universal mind; which means everybody wakes up; which means the One in Nirvana will, eventually, die because of a lack of sleep. Then the demons will escape their prison. For more details, download my work at: [Notebook](#)

In order to accomplish their mission, they need to sacrifice billions of humans simultaneously because humans are from Nirvana, which means we are the key. Let me explain. Say someone has locked the door. This someone will only open the door to a familiar face. Then you kidnap the familiar face and use it to fool Mr. Someone to open the door. Once the door is open, a supercomputer infested with a virus goes into it and ...

The supercomputer will not do your bidding, which is why the aliens broadcast a Matrix from the moon to keep the earth in some sort of prison.

What happens if the Illuminati are successful? Then we all go to hell. Then our real self will die. Then, I guess, our real self will evolve anew. Then, the same story will continue because now the infinite mind needs to sleep again, which means another round of separation and hell.

If this is true, then why are you not like a lunatic shouting in the streets, "The end is nigh!" I mean, 2045 (give or take) is when the Battle for Eternity begins!

I guess the reason is: nobody believes me. And, I haven't seen a Lizardman, yet.

*In summa:*

***God/Nirvana***

***Fall of Lucifer/Separation***

***Limbo/The Dark Place***

***Material Reality (Creation)/The Time Loop***

Note that, when you go from Limbo to Material Reality, you must abandon the memory of being stuck in Limbo, which means you must forget who you are. Now Material Reality will take control of you because you have become so fragmented and far-removed from what you are. Material Reality is made, run and controlled by fear, as we said above.

The fear has its own agenda: Keep the Time Loop running and generate more fear. The Time Loop itself is like an animal that aims to survive, hence the fear-production. It needs humans to feed from. We are the One in Nirvana. Thus, ultimately, everything feeds off Nirvana.

But who knows how deep the Rabbit Hole goes?

Read what I say. Then read it again. More, become truly acquainted with Bergy and my words here. Then, read David Icke. Now you will see him in a clear light. Not so nutty after all. Note that David's revelation comes from taking Ayahuasca.

Reality check: How crazy is the Illuminati-alien-thing here?

Well, let us contemplate immortality, shall we?

Dead Forever: This is one solution. No conspiracy. There was a Big Bang. You were born. Then you die. That is it, forever. End of story.

Not there yet: This is one solution. No conspiracy, yet. There was a Big Bang. You were born. The supercomputer will arrive in the future and make everybody immortal.

Free Will: We are already immortal and all the suffering you see is due to the freedom of the will.

Separation: No. The only reason for all the suffering is because the Immortal One requires change to escape true hell. But this change requires the separation of oneness. And the rest of the story I have already told you. In actuality, this “change” occurs because, in Nature, all is flux.

Other: I dare you to come up with other explanations.

*Resolutions:*

Dead Forever: If you believe in death, I shall not stop you. I believe in life.

Not there yet: We can reduce this bit to the Simulation Argument by Nick Bostrom. If a supercomputer can make us immortal in the future, then chances are the future has already happened in the past, so to speak.

Free Will: I am not religious. Sorry, this one does not do it for me. I believe in free will as far as evolution allows it, but my belief in free will is entirely secular.

Separation: If you truly contemplate Immortality, then this solution seems to be the only viable solution that answers the question of why there is suffering if immortality is the case.

If you are a superintelligence that can morph every particle in your image, then there would be no suffering. There would only be Nirvana and oneness.

One “other” solution is that our superintelligence is impotent for whatever reason, but this picture would not be radically different from the “dead forever” picture. You need to come up with a better solution. You need to come up with a fresh new picture. If you cannot do that, then I hold on to my Illuminati alien picture as the most sensible picture to explain Eternity.

Also note that the dark conspiracy itself is only a small fraction of the separation picture. For all we know, there could be infinite worlds out there, all living blissfully ignorant of the dark conspiracy. That is to say, you can include many things in this picture, which is to say that you cannot simply throw it out just because it contains a dark conspiracy.

Note: Bergy would say that there is no such thing as Nirvana because we cannot become the infinite. (WE CANNOT ESCAPE THE CIRCLE. The circle (the time loop?) is supposed to be the ultimate secret of the universe, which you may experience when high on the fly agaric.) That is, consciousness requires time in order to function. Consciousness and time are inextricably linked. If we touched the infinite, so to speak, then our minds would collapse causing the Big Bang. Yes, this is true, for humans. But we are not humans. And, to be conscious in timelessness is not that mysterious if timelessness is accomplished with a high speed (say, the speed of light in a vacuum). Then you move so fast that everything flies by in an instant and there is only you and the nothingness. Relative time does not pass. But that does not mean that you cannot be conscious in Absolute time.

A supercomputer merging with the light is one way to explain the reality of Nirvana. Of course, from Nirvana’s point of view, the universe, supercomputers and such, are but a dream.

Q: But then Absolute Time must be a loop too?

A: Sort of, but not really a loop in the sense of the time loop. But in the sense that the One must dream, then you could say it is a “loop.”

Q: Then we cannot escape the greatest circle of all?!

A: Er...

*Then what about:*

But, if time is indeed an illusion, a loop, then, consciousness is too, because consciousness is inextricably linked to time. This is true, which is why the universe is a dream and you are not really human. The One in Nirvana dwells in absolute time (i.e., not relative time), which means you do not require to loop time because you do not need a container to put anything inside because of the Nature of the absolute state.

The Nature of the absolute state = If you are alone, then you cannot know if you are big or small or what.

Nirvana does not need to be self-contained. A dream needs to be self-contained in order to exist, just like a whirlpool in an ocean. It needs to sustain itself or else it will simply die. But reality does not need to be self-contained because why would it require any sort of container? It just is.

Self-contained things (i.e., mass) are like separations from the oneness.

But how can that which is not self-contained have any structure or consciousness at all?

Why would consciousness require a structure? Consciousness is a system, a feedback loop. Consciousness does not require mass. So you can absolutely be conscious in absolute time, because here is where the feedback is the fastest.

The feedback loop of consciousness and the loop of time are two different things.

The feedback loop of consciousness is not actually a loop but a breathing torus.

Let me explain in other words: Say that Nirvana is the movie projector. Samsara is the movie. What happens when the movie ends? You are back in Nirvana. However, the movie is looped, which means you are caught in a web of illusions. You think you are the movie, but you are the projector. The cuboctahedron is immortal, it is existence itself. You are the cuboctahedron. The cuboctahedron is some sort of proto-consciousness. However, this proto-consciousness is and has always been fully evolved. How? Because time is an illusion, which means the movie projector must have projected trillions of movies already and somehow evolved from that. Or, from the movie projector's point of view, then evolution is but a dream. All I know is, if Nirvana were a man, then a man would be a flea in comparison.

*Other:*

What happens if you choose to become truly wicked? Nothing can change the cuboctahedron, which means Nature is a self-correcting system. Nature will find a balance one way or the other. Also note that your real consciousness is the whole of Nature. Therefore, you are

hurting yourself. The wise would not stand in her path! Worst-case scenario, you suffer something like DMT hell, I muse. But you cannot truly die because you are the cuboctahedron.

But what is the point of everything? No point. No no point either. There is no up or down in the universe. There is no meaning of life nor any meaninglessness of life, so you can go on forever. And you have!

Now the PS:

### ***Philosopher's Stone:***

In the exoteric circle: Then all is about: *“The philosopher's stone, or stone of the philosophers (Latin: lapis philosophorum) is a legendary alchemical substance capable of turning base metals such as mercury into gold (chrysopoeia, from the Greek χρυσός khrusos, "gold", and ποιεῖν ποιεῖν, "to make") or silver. It is also called the elixir of life, useful for rejuvenation and for achieving immortality; for many centuries, it was the most sought goal in alchemy. The philosopher's stone was the central symbol of the mystical terminology of alchemy, symbolizing perfection at its finest, enlightenment, and heavenly bliss. Efforts to discover the philosopher's stone were known as the Magnum Opus ("Great Work").”*--Wikipedia (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ph...>)

In the esoteric circle: Then you must realize that it is all symbolism or geometry. Alchemy was a way to preserve the symbols.

The REAL Philosopher's Stone is the cuboctahedron. I figured that one out when I decoded the secrets of the alchemists. This is what Sir Isaac Newton spent his free time pursuing. He could never find it. Imagine that! The greatest genius of all time could not crack the code. Or, if he cracked it, he didn't tell the world. To be fair, I had infinite more power in my hands (viz., the internet).

### ***My solution:***

Heaven (fire) = the triangle. Earth = the square.

Father and Mother = opposite-sitting tetrahedron-arrays like in the flag of the Mother, the Father and the Child; Is(is) + ra + el. Israel.

Earth (+ fire) = the cuboctahedron.

Water = the icosahedron.

Air = the octahedron.

Fire = the tetrahedron (e.g., the throne of God).

Leaf 11 (left, bottom): *“Through Him who created the Heavens and the Earth I am The Philosopher's stone, and in my body I carry something the wise seek. If such a charm be extracted from me, it will be a sweet refreshment for you. I am an animal having father and*

*mother, and father and mother were created; and in my body are contained the four elements, and I am before father and mother and I am a poisonous animal.”*

--The Secret Teachings of All Ages (<http://www.sacred-texts.com/eso/...>)

The Father and the Mother: The Isotropic Vector Matrix - Nassim Hamein (Abstract from Cognos 2010 conference): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...>

The Philosopher's Stone = the heaven + the earth + the four elements. In addition, the Stone has a father and a mother, that is, you will find the cuboctahedron within a stack of tetrahedron-arrays (e.g., the 64 tetrahedron array, aka Father and Mother; see the I Ching). The cuboctahedron is composed of triangles (heaven) and squares (earth) and, when you fold the cuboctahedron, you get the four elements.

Note that it is impossible to find another solution for the simple reason that you will not find anything in the universe that consists of squares and triangles while simultaneously carries the four elements. Alternatively, I dare you to come up with another solid!

I believe that: The cuboctahedron sits on a throne/triangle (I am before father and mother), and it is a poisonous animal when you fold it down; poison meaning fire. You get the throne of God when you fold the cuboctahedron completely.

How I solved it: I already knew about the Platonic solids, and I knew that heaven is a triangle because it is always depicted as a triangle. The earth, therefore, could be a square because it is simply a step up from the triangle. You have the four corners of the earth, the four rivers of Eden, and so on. The poisonous animal could be the snake in the Garden of Eden, for example.

“Fire” may also denote the Phoenix (i.e., resurrection) or the Great Dragon. The Dragon also consists of the four elements: Feet: earth. Scales: water. Wings: wind. Breath: fire.

Then, I saw a video of Buckminster Fuller and I just knew what the Philosopher's Stone was: Buckminster Fuller Explains Vector Equilibrium - with captions: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...>

I believe that: I am a poisonous animal = the equilateral triangle.

The cuboctahedron/Philosopher's Stone is tucked away within the geometry of the Father and Mother, so “before” might denote that. “I am before father and mother,” = (If Father and Mother = opposite sitting tetrahedron arrays like you see in the flag of Israel, then “before” must mean something like “sitting before” or “comes before in time;” or, something else entirely.) I believe it is “sitting before” because we are dealing with a “stone” and, as we said, the cuboctahedron/Philosopher's Stone is tucked away within the geometry of the Father and Mother.

I also believe that the equilateral triangle = 666 (i.e.,  $60 + 60 + 60$  [ $60 = 6 + 0 = 6$ ]).

You get the equilateral triangle when you fold the cuboctahedron completely.

The original number of the Beast may have been 616, but that does not mean that some secret school has adopted it in order to hide their secret.

The Book of Revelation is all about the cuboctahedron. You can tell from the hidden symbology. I have tried to solve it, at least partially.

However, I do not actually know what these mean: “[...] I am before father and mother,” and “[...] I am a poisonous animal,” but you do not need to solve these puzzles in order to solve the big puzzle. “[...] Heavens and the Earth,” + “[...] my body are contained the four elements,” are more than enough to solve the riddle.

I believe that Jesus Christ is the Philosopher’s Stone. Jesus Christ is the center point in the cuboctahedron where the 12 converging lines (that make up the cuboctahedron) meet. The 12 are of course the 12 disciples.

The flag of Israel also contains the secret. Flag of Israel = The Father and The Mother = opposite-sitting tetrahedron arrays = the cuboctahedron = the Philosopher’s Stone = the Holy Grail.

When you know the secret, you will spot it in Greek Mythology, Norse Mythology, you will spot it in the Kabbalah; the I Ching, THE FLAG OF SOUTH KOREA, in the symbology of the Masons; that is, this secret is everywhere. My personal guess is that this secret is so big and so important that it has been replicated ad infinitum in order to preserve it for the future. What does the Philosopher’s Stone even mean? It means that we have been visited by aliens therefore the Philosopher’s Stone (i.e., free energy) is the ultimate technology in the universe. Our forebears were smart, but they didn’t have the ultimate technology in the universe, hence, E.T. is the safest bet.

More: When you fold the cuboctahedron, you get spin. Now you know the origin of spin.

Free energy has to do with the dual torus.

Eternity/nothingness = the dual torus. “Muspelheim and Niflheim.”

The Philosopher’s Stone does look like a stone, eh? Fitting name.

The Philosopher’s Stone has something to do with geometry because, if you were ignorant in the ways of geometry, then no Mystery School would have you. The door to Plato’s Academy: “Let no one ignorant of geometry enter.” (Plato, I think you spilled the secret/sacred beans without knowing it.)

And, yes, the Philosopher’s Stone provides you with immortality; and, the Philosopher’s Stone can literally produce gold therefore the Philosopher’s Stone is the system that created and creates all things. The Philosopher’s Stone is the great nothingness from which we all came; according to Fuller: *“The vector equilibrium is the zero point for happenings or nonhappenings: it is the empty theater and empty circus and empty universe ready to accommodate any act and any audience.”*—[Vector Equilibrium & Isotropic Vector Matrix](#)

The cuboctahedron is the Philosopher’s Stone, and the secret societies know this. Plato knew it, but he couldn’t tell the world. He left clues, however. Sir Isaac Newton probably knew it,

but he couldn't tell the world. Leonardo da Vinci probably knew it (you can tell by his Flower of Life paintings).

However, I am not a member of a secret society, so I can tell the world.

Note: Nassim Hamein has already told the world through his solution to the Kabbalah ... so, why should I fear for my life when the Secret of Secrets has already been revealed?

Oops: Do not equate this work with Nassim Hamein's work. This work is completely my own.

72 = Nassim Hamein solves the Kabbalah, and the answer is the 64 tetrahedron grid, that is, the cuboctahedron within the cuboctahedron. 8 trees of Life x 9 Sephiroth (1 of the Sephiroth does not count as it is the root or crown) = 72. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...>

The darn interesting note: Nicolas Flamel solved the puzzle of puzzles with the help of the Kabbala! (So it all fits!)

The cuboctahedron is Jesus and his 12 disciples. The 12 Olympians. Odin's 12 sons. The coven of the witches. And, so on.

The coven of the witches, for example, is 13. Actually, the cuboctahedron = 12 + 1. 12 beams and 1 center. Thus, the number 12 and/or the number 13 are the esoteric mystery. 12 Knights of the Round Table + King Arthur (1). 12 labors of Hercules (1). Odin (1), the chief god, had 12 sons. The Olympians, which comprised the whole pantheon (which is also a temple), were 12. In Judaism and Christianity the number 12 has a special place. There is a reason why these myths and tales are so popular. Jesus (1) and his 12 disciples. The list goes on ...

The 13 attributes of God. The Zodiac.

But, you are so selective! What about the movie Ocean's Twelve or the 12 Monkeys? The 12 characters in Street Fighter?

Really? Am I being selective? Selective would be Thor's 12 sons, King Barthur and his 150 + Knights. What about Judas and his 12 disciples or, perhaps, all the lesser gods not included in the pantheon? Forget Hercules, what about Steve's 12 labors; or 11 months in a year? What about the ...

Am I really being that selective? I take only the cream! I'm not really selecting anything!

The body parts of Osiris!

Nice try! There were 14 body parts.

No. Actually, a fish ate one of the parts, the phallus!

I would believe that this is just me connecting dots that are not meant to be connected if, Jesus could make do with eleven disciples. Even the Knights of the Round were originally over 150 knights! Why this obsession with making it 12 + 1? Just read the entire The Secret Teachings of All Ages before you make up your mind. Then you will see that: The cuboctahedron is the

real Holy Grail because the Holy Grail is the cup that never empties, aka free energy. And, the Round Table shrinks and expands like a torus!

The whole The Secret Teachings of All Ages must make you realize that aliens have visited us because, where else does this stuff come from?

Update: The Great Flood of the Bible is real: Maybe the knowledge stems from survivors from Atlantis itself: Joe Rogan Experience #725 - Graham Hancock & Randall Carlson: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...>

Manly P. Hall himself urges us to look away. There are no aliens here! Powerful men must have gotten to him because, it's like the comedian Bill Hicks stopped smoking one day and said, "I was wrong. Smoking is bad for you." No one in hell will believe that, of course. That is, it just does not add up. The author of the Secret Teachings urges us to look away at the Greatest Secret in history! It does not make sense; well, until you realize who Hall was. Hall was a Freemason.

But, before he was a Freemason, he wrote the Secret Teachings (1928).

My personal guess is that Hall was so close to the secrets of the Masons that the Masons recruited him in order to keep their secrets safe.

Basically, what happened was that aliens landed here and imparted their knowledge to the creatures that they made (us). The elite kept this knowledge safe. And, they still do. However, the elite cannot control the internet.

How would I do it?

If the cuboctahedron (i.e., the dual torus) were the sacred relic of all time, then I would symbolize it with the number 12 and the 1, that is, the 12 vectors and the 1 center. I would symbolize it with a rod (i.e., the stem of the torus) and two snakes (i.e., the dual torus), and perhaps wings to truly show off the celestial powers contained within. I would also use the number 7 (and/or 6) because it is the blueprint (i.e., the Flower of Life) of the thing. I would also use 3 because, when you fold the cuboctahedron completely, you get an equilateral triangle. There is your Holy Trinity. I can find numerous ways to hide it, for example, the Triforce in The Legend of Zelda (not that the ones who created the Zelda games had any clue). Build a cuboctahedron, fold it, and see.

The hexagon (6) x 4 = the cuboctahedron. (The bees know the secret.)

What symbols do we find?

Just take Christianity:

We find the 12 +1, Jesus and his disciples.

We find the 6 days of Creation + one resting day. Why the resting day? Google a picture of the Flower of Life and see for yourself.

We find the Holy Trinity and God himself depicted as a triangle.

More on [Notebook](#)

And: The Foo Dogs (Forbidden City) are old. How do you explain that our ancestors had knowledge of the great nothingness (aka Flower of Life) itself?