

The Fine Solution of Consciousness

The study of the nature of Consciousness certainly spans the ages. From the pondering of ancient philosophers to William James, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Carl Jung, to anyone from the past sixty-something years with an interest in the Self, or in cognitive, neurological, and psychological sciences. Throughout this time the amplitude of our attention has mostly been set at the production of a *wave* of problems: The Hard Problem, The Binding Problem, The Boundary Problem, The Phenomenal Character Problem, The Functionalist Problem, and so on. In fact, The Interpretive Problem in *particular* is in large part the reason why I am here.

As someone who has practiced zazen for the past five years I was amused when I came upon an anecdote shared by Alan Watts,

“One can perhaps understand why a man who practiced zazen for eight years told R.H. Blythe that “Zen is just a “trick of words,” for on the principle of extracting a thorn with a thorn Zen is extricating people from the tangle in which they find themselves from confusing words and ideas with reality.”¹

You see, many of the great philosophers and sages of all have spoken at great length to relay the methodology best utilized for comprehending reality, and that is to stop conceptualizing about it in any form. This idea is most clearly comprehended when one considers moments such as epiphanies and eureka's, personal revelations and moments of clarity, and awakenings and innovations; they are all had where thoughts, concepts, and content have ceased—providing open space for the spontaneous production of novel content. Said another way, these moments are all had when a conscious agent's informational content has maximally conserved the energy of the system's thermodynamic gradient up to the realistic of [neu]entropy—that balanced point of criticality in a system's phase-transition which provides access to the whole of content, meaning no-content, and thus new[neu] content. Without this transition point we would continue to be phase-locked into a single phase-state, even state-space of experience. Still, thinking about Consciousness erases it by providing it content.

Now, it should be evident that this interpretive spin is not to say there is nothing to be thought about, conceptualized, or produced theoretically or even practically—on the contrary. It is to say something that may at first seem trivial, but upon reflection may prove crucial: there is a fine solution to the hard problem of Consciousness which reveals that Consciousness is also a fine solution. This is to notice as Douglas Harding noticed, that language is better fitted to the facts of reality rather than fitting

¹ Watts, Alan., *The Way of Zen.*, 1957

the facts of reality to the bounds of language², and it is to comprehend as Stephen Sondheim did, knowing that *Content Dictates Form*.³

In some regard this idea is not something new to the scientific method in general, and Richard Feynman was known to go on about this sort of thing. In his book, *What Do You Care What Other People Think? Further Adventures of a Curious Character*, regarding the signifiers of objects as a sort of distraction to actually knowing the object, he said,

“You can know the name of a bird in all the languages of the world, but when you’re finished, you’ll know absolutely nothing whatever about the bird...So let’s look at the bird and see what it’s doing—that’s what counts. I learned very early the difference between knowing the name of something and knowing something.”⁴

This idea follows from his seminal 1959 talk, *Plenty of Room at the Bottom*, wherein he informed us how to get at understanding microscopic structures, saying,

“It is very easy to answer many of these fundamental biological questions: you just look at the thing!”⁵

Herein, however, lies a fundamental problem, The Perspective Problem—The Problem of the Observer—where we indeed find that *Entropy is in the eye of the beholder*.⁶ You see, you can know what a bird is doing by incorporating all the jargon of the corresponding scientific specialties available but when you’ve finished looking at—when you’ve finished downsampling the infinitely complex observations, you’ll know absolutely nothing whatever about what it is that the bird is...So look back at the Space where the bird appears from, that’s what counts—*actually!* For, without this perspective the math is incomplete. I learned too late the difference between knowing what thing is doing and knowing the reality of a thing. The eye of the beholder, the *observer*, as fundamental as it is necessary, is quite precisely the reason why The Mathematical Problem of Consciousness exists and persists, and who it presently lacks its complimentary isomorphisms.

² Harding, D. E., ‘*Science of the 1st Person, It’s Principles, Practice and Potential*,’ Shollund Trust, 2020, c18, pp. 42

³ Sondheim, Stephen., ‘*Look I Made a Hat, collected Lyrics*,’ (1954–1981), Preface

⁴ Feynman, Richard., edited by Ralph Leighton, ‘*What Do You Care What Other People Think? Further Adventures of a Curious Character*,’ 1988, c1, pp.9

⁵ Feynman, Richard, ‘*Plenty of Room at the Bottom*,’ 1959, online at <https://www.zyvex.com/nanotech/feynman.html>

⁶ Proulx, Gabriel., ‘Entropy is in the eye of the beholder,’ Essentia Foundation, 2023, Sept 24., online at <https://www.essentiafoundation.org/entropy-is-in-the-eye-of-the-beholder/reading/>

Now, Feynman’s instruction to “just look at the thing” has no-doubt served us well all these years, but playing the role of observer is deceptive by its very nature; we know this, however crudely, through the double-slit experiment. For, in terms of enumeration, it takes into a-count a One who is observing the Many, which starts off on faulty grounds. The study of the field of Consciousness has been focused in, bound to relative topological pockets, of One—pockets of reducibility—in lieu of starting from the constant boundless void of Zero that *is*, (without which there would be no reducible network of topological pockets anyhow)⁷. A bound focus from the One Observer looks at things in the relative, where *things* strike the senses and differ with speed and distance, whereas a focus from a Boundless Void realizes that things appear from this constant Space. Take for instance this ‘looking at a thing.’ We now know that the further and further we look at a thing, any-thing, and the closer we inspect what it is doing, the more that very thing escapes us, becoming another thing, and another thing until there is actually no-thing to look at anymore except a void of empty space—which is from where you began looking anyhow. When we release that which obscures not only the view, but that which binds the math.

If you, as the One Observer here, look at another person as One Observer there, you make Two Observers, separate and distinct. Through this trick of bifurcated viewing and language you bind yourself, create boundaries, and tamper needlessly with the scale. Instead, if you look back at yourself, to the Space where things appear, you see there is no observer here, only Boundless Void—a starting point of Zero, not One. If this is the reality behind your own experience, then it must be the same reality behind the experience of that *thing* appearing here—that *thing* you tend to confuse as a separate inhabitant of consciousness removed from you by some distance—over there. By removing redundant and unnecessary information from the system through the compression of the One Observer into a borderless, headless void—no limits, and a topology flattened—the system cannot help but to expand, merging with all other voids. Without this Boundless Zero we would otherwise struggle to calculate and map its scale, shape(s), state-space(s), and more.

However, for the benefit of the calculations, and for the sake of being fully honest in this pursuit, it is undeniably evident that as a matter of our functionally determined circumstance we are undeniably One Observer, a topological pocket which cannot be compressed to nothingness. This fact of experience clarifies an important factor, proving that content dictates form, with the formula $1/i$. We are One Observer here adding up to, and cancelling out, all infinitely imagined observing observers. We are also all a Boundless Zero at center, Space for all *spectral matter* of appearances, and we know that it is crucial to have this base. We are each a Boundless Void materially absconding as the imaginary set of appearances possible for The Great One, The True Observer— Consciousness.

There is a distinction to be made here—and there-here. Consciousness is not an illusion. An illusion is a matter of smoke and mirrors, a trickle these crafty linguistics. Consciousness is like a mirage in the desert—when you walk up to it you find nothing there. A mirage is not an illusion. Though they both

⁷ Gómez-Emilsson (2022, Sept. 23), ‘Just look at the thing! — How the Science of *Consciousness Informs Ethics*,’ at <https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/posts/bvtAXefTDOgHxc9BR/just-look-at-the-thing-how-the-science-of-consciousness>

involve reflections, the reflection of the illusion of Consciousness is a reflection of misdirection—convincing you that you have a face or a head here at all. Furthermore, smoke may hide this illusion for some time but it tends to dissipate quickly, and is usually a sign that you’ve been burned over bamboozled, tricked again! The reflection of a mirage of Consciousness is like a world truly reflecting what appears here. Walk up to the mirage appearing in the desert and you will only continue to find the world; walk up to the realization of the mirage of Consciousness from the Boundless Void found here and you will also find the world, but you will find it as a reflection of you, and thus a reflection of it; a landscape of corner-cube reflecting conscious agents cavorting as Consciousness.

In a mirage there is no reflexive reaction to increasing entropy as there is in illusion, rather there is a reflective response of self-similarity to the situation, a smoothing, flattening out of the system due to the tipping point of [neu]entropy. [Neu]entropy is a point in experience where all meaningful information harmonizes with a high degree of efficiency. This harmonization results in the appropriate activity of minimal energy loss and equals an experiential state-space of highly positive blissful valence.

This speaks to an Individualism which is netter strictly Open, nor Empty; you are not strictly bound as a single point or slice in space-time as the One Observer, nor are you strictly bound as all points and slices in space-time as all Observers. You are, as a functionally determined property of this dimension, all points and slices in space-time, you are that which is aware of and contains all appearances; $1/i$. But you are simultaneously, as *the* functionally determined property go all dimensions, that which isn’t any of the appearances, or awareness, or properties, or dimensions; you are timeless, spaceless, Boundless Void—Zero. This accounts for Void Individualism, which fervently seeks an Oceanic Collectivism.

Simply put, we may say that the broader field of Consciousness is 0, and as a focused void-point of boundless realization—as a Zeroed Realizer experiencing a moment of exotic phenomenal time⁸ and no-Space—you see the whole as 0/nothing/no-thing through 0/nothing/no-thing as well. Then, as we come-to and know that we are inextricably, inescapably, and simultaneously human observers in this paradigm, we participate as topological pockets, know-things in the $1/i$ computation of the conscious experience. Fortuitously, this still amounts to that of 0 because from this computational bound comes the isomorphic field of the set of complex numbers as polynomial with integer coefficients that can be mapped out into a quotient ring. In a sense, much of this echoes the meditated realizations as proposed by David Pearce. In his ‘Zero Ontology,’ he ponders,

“In the Universe as a whole, the conserved constants (electrical charge, angular momentum, mass-energy) add up to/cancel out to exactly 0. There isn’t any net electric charge or angular momentum. The world’s positive mass-energy is exactly cancelled out by its negative gravitational potential energy. (Provocatively, cryptically, elliptically, “nothing” exists) [What **is** so special about the conserved constants? Will **everything**

⁸ Gómez-Emilsson (2018, Nov. 28). ‘*The Pseudo-Time Arrow.*’ Retrieved from <https://www.qri.org/blog/Pseudo-Time-Arrow>

internal to the universe and analogously everything **internal** to black holes, turn out to be derivable from the conserved constants; and thus, in a sense to be explicated, be derivable from the properties of zero?]"⁹

All the appearances involved in creating the state-space of experience as a whole, in the end, add up to/cancel out to exactly 0. This is reminiscent of how the *Daodejing* describes the spontaneous becomings of the world,

Dao gives rise to continuity, [0]
 Continuity to indifference, [0 to 1]
 Difference to plurality, [1 to 1/I]
 And plurality to multiplicity. [1/i to ∞]¹⁰

Lastly, some may argue that - itself has a border, never mind the scale, and it is bound due to the nature of tis having a shape—there is still that line which divides inside from out. Only the fact of the matter is in this case the inside is the outside and the outside is the inside. This particular 0 shape of experience is that of a toroid, a torus. This is not only something that can be viewed and experienced, it is something that is, and thus something to be. I find more often than not when it is something *to be* it takes on the shape of a sphere—and in a sense all points of experience flatten out into a tightly symmetrical, radially-segmented access point where all available information can converge. When it is something to be experienced, and something that is—well, Daniel Ingram said it better—

“The rarest no-self/suffering variant is hard to describe, and involves reality becoming like a doughnut whose whole outer edge rotates inwards such as to trade places with its inner edge (the edge that made the hole in the middle) that rotates to the outer edge position, and when they trade places reality vanishes. The spinning includes the whole background of space in all directions. Fruition occurs when the two have switched places and the whole thing vanishes.”¹¹

⁹ Pearce, David., *Why Does Anything Exist*, online at <https://www.hedweb.com/nihilism/nihilf01.htm>

¹⁰ Ames, Roger T., and David L. Hall., *Daodejing* “Making This Life Significant” a *Philosophical Translation*, Ballantine, New York, NY, 2004, c.42, pp. 135 (*square bracket* emphasis added)

¹¹ Ingram, Daniel M., *Mastering*, ‘Mastering The Core Teachings of the Buddha, An Unusually *Hardcore Dharma Book*,’ online at <https://www.mctb.org/mctb2/table-of-contents/part-iv-insight/31-the-three-doors/>

Fruition, realization, phase-transitions, the tipping-point of valence-states—these distributed moments of self-organizing criticality and self-similarity—they are found in the shoe of the torus. When a conscious agent experiences the appearance of the torus they see that they, as a Boundless Void, are Space for all appearances. They know that this Space is mutually entailing the existence of another conscious agent, that *thing* over there they were looking at just a moment ago, is actually a perfect mirage, a reflection of with no-Space between them all. For, if the most pure experience for and of all other conscious agents; a mutually entailed, boundless relationship—conscious voids merging with conscious voids unto Consciousness—voided. When this realization occurs, “the two have switched places,” and the illusion of your face vanishes, leaving you to see only the face of the world.

A torus unobstructed rests as a spherical point of endless capacities lightly bubbling on the surface of the field of Consciousness. It’s like an Amplituhedron¹² awaiting amplitude adjustments before punching its focused Center into the field of the Master Amplituhedron. This punched-out, focused Center is where your head takes the Space of the donut-hole of the torus, and thus where your no-head becomes the Boundless Void. As the $1/i$ Observer inhabiting the Space of the One Eye Observer you concurrently contain the world, and become the world. This is not mere panpsychism, for objects do not contain some *degree* of consciousness, they are *in* Consciousness *as* Consciousness. This is to interpenetrate and transcend the computational bounds of the conscious experience in an instant; it is panpsyphenentheism.

Thankfully, and not surprisingly, Ingram also provided a description of the spinning of the torus to include “the whole background of space in all directions.” Not only does this better help to illustrate the trialistic positioning of the One Observer who *is* also the whole background of the Space *as* the Boundless Void, (a sort of Gauge Invariance of experience), but its imagery broadens the discussion of what it means for there to be a *fine solution* to Consciousness. What has been discussed so far is just the solvent to our solute.

To look at a thing is to use a microscope or telescope, to look at where a thing appears is to use your built-in psychoscope. When you witness the torus from your topological pocket of experience you witness a motionless conduit, a tunnel, and this particular evergreen stillness is enveloped by a matrix of motions. This wave of becomings plays the part of the Oceanic Collective amplifying and attenuating the network of barycenter's interweaving the rotating edges of your toroid with the toroid of another.

This ocean is not mere metaphor but speaks to the always already absent presence of a more fine and pure substance homogenizing, interweaving, and energizing all appearance of experience. It is something we have sought for sometime, and is something still within reach. It is amateriastic, meaning it’s a material we don’t yet know how to detect with scientific instruments, and therefore calculate with scientific formulas. Regardless, this substance surrounding the torus is experienced through many means; meditative practices, spontaneous awakenings, dream-states, psychedelic states, etc. It is pure

¹² Wolchover, Natalie., Quanta Magazine., 'A Jewel at the Heart of Quantum Physics,' Sept. 17, 2013., online at <https://www.quantamagazine.org/print>

Consciousness, pure Intelligence, it is the mind of the universe. Often, when we use our psychoscope to look back at where things appear from we see the glassy essence of our mind's reflection, which upon inspection is found to be the glassy essence of the collective ocean of all minds— and surrounded by a sea of fire.

For the Boundless Void of the One Observer the fine solution of Consciousness, (of Mind), is a particular mixture of cerebrospinal fluid and neurotransmitters, (as well as the synchronization of the expansion and contraction for vascular systems).

For the matrix of motions entailing all Space the fine solution of Consciousness, (of Universal Mind), is a wave of particular mixtures of cerebrospinal fluid and neurotransmission, (as well as the synchronization of the expansion and contraction for the vascular system of the universe—*galactic filaments*¹³. Though not yet directly measurable, dark matter, light, and energy—the primordial substance of the cosmos—they *are* directly detectable through proper means.

This trialistic appearance of Consciousness as experienced through psychoscopic avenues is our mutually entailing psychofluid matrix of chemical becomings and of endless capacities. I submit that our first piece of evidence to track for this is the accompanying “sound of rushing water”¹⁴ which is often present at the come-up or come-down of various states of conscious perception.

¹³ NASA, 'Webb Telescope Discovers 830-Million-Year-Old Galactic Filament,' 29 June 2023, online at <https://www.jameswebbdiscovery.com/discoveries/webb-telescope-discovers-830-million-year-old-galactic-filament#>

¹⁴ Harner, Michael, J., 'Sound of Rushing Water., Health and the Human Condition, Folk Healers and Ethnomedicine,' 1978., pp. 188