**What**

**An autobiography of my psyche for consideration**

**My purpose is to increase peace through conversation.**

By Joseph Meyner and released into the public domain in 2024. You can read it for free. You cannot alter the site. You can copy, paste, print, publish, and sell for your personal profit. Please credit the source. Peacemaking conversation is not peaceful.

**Introduction**

**The human complex**

 I view myself as a set of attitudes, considerations, and behaviors. My complex is the form of this self-understanding. At the core of my complex are my attitudes. My attitudes protect both my taste and my fundamental beliefs. Surrounding my attitudes are my tastes and judgments. My tastes are my likes and dislikes. My judgments are simplifications and generalities that I make to retain less knowledge or that I keep to protect my attitudes. Bounding my tastes and judgments, are my considerations; those unjudged thoughts that have an influence on my behavior. It is here within my considerations that I can change my mind.

 My environment surrounds my considerations. I cannot consider all of it. I select parts of it to consider. I might consider that what is, reality, fate, sapient beings, human beings, church members, loved ones, friends, family or just myself. I might choose what to wear or wear the clothes laid out for me. I might refuse to taste spinach or after consideration try it to find out if I like it or not. I choose what to consider. My human complex within the environment reduces to a functioning chosen unit.

 Behavior, attitude, and consideration frequently result in feelings. Feelings frequently cause behavior, attitude, and consideration. Then sometimes feelings just happen. Feelings are what they are.

**How beliefs are formed**

 If the individual considers before words remains a question. What he considers before words remains a mystery. How he considers before words is one of my great curiosities because I believe that curiosity is gracious. Attitudes, behaviors, and considerations without origins from cause are gracious.

Most churches propose that there are two life forces. Each culture determines what they are called, Yin and Yang, renewable and non-renewable chi, flesh and spirit, nurture and nature, good and evil, reality and fantasy, strong force and weak force.

I like to call them beauty and the beast. They are the forces that will combine, reform, and re-emerge in a balance between beauty and the beast.

The beast originates (an internal force) in the will to live. It needs to eat, drink, sleep and have sex to survive. However, the beast is predominantly disciplined by external force. His attitudes, behaviors, and considerations in attaining these needs are bounded by law and order. The focus is on behavior.

Beauty originates in grace. He relates to others. Early on beauty is predominantly disciplined by external force, usually the words of family and other authority. Later, grace disciplines as well. Differing from the beast, the discipline focuses on attitudes (faith) rather than behaviors.

**Fragments**

The chronology is not always linear or continuous. Fragments are considerations “from the rabbit hole”. The intellectual order; What?; What, is everything.; What is everything?; What, is.; What is?;What. Circular, just like the rabbit hole.

Fragments are the gateway to empathy. What, is the rabbit hole!

**Events**

Environmental events disrupt my psyche sometimes causing discontinuity of behavior and thought.

**Thoughts**

The chronology is continuous but not always linear. They come from fragments. They are my attitudes. They are sometimes disjoint (like footnotes) but follow a continuous content toward fulfilling the purpose.

**What**

**Event**

A close writer friend of mine died when I was 19. I wrote a balm of pretentious nonsense. It served me. I started writing in his stead. Having no respect for trivial facts, within a short time I discovered I had nothing to write about except myself, so I decided to take notes, fragments, until I had lived long enough to have something to say. I know this because of two forgotten memos I found in the margin of my notes.  They said, "Hello old man from your 19-year-old self", and "I want to write the greatest book ever written”. I am presently 85.

**Fragment**

Let me sit in an empty church.

It is a time for it.

Let no priest come or woman either.

They may want something from me, my attention to their will to help.

Let the walls disperse in simplicity.

They may want something from me, my attention to their architectural will to please.

Let no breeze blow or note sound.

For myself alone in an empty church needs all my attention.

Whether church be field, street or crowd, the time is the time of needing a visit with myself.

**Event**

I met my wife to be. We became acquainted, got married and had children. The book went on hold.

**Fragments**

**Family 1961**

Soft she wakes,

throws a petal and spies a demon with a knife to snip her newest bud.

 A rose looks at a man.

Toes are so intriguing.

In what direction do their projections run?

If these projections were objects,

how we would stumble and fall

until

we learned to use them as bats for baseball’s,

as stilts to walk on

and as grabbers for giant barrels.

What fun they would be

and how we wouldn’t notice them.

**Event**

When I was 28 years old, I got a math teaching job at a private prep school.  I had never taught a day in my life.  One of my classes was for high aptitude low interest seniors. That evening, I put together everything I thought was worth teaching; how to make and use order.   The next day I taught all of it without any thought of an encore.

 The headmaster's daughter was in my class.  She thought it was fascinating but didn't understand any of it.  He told me I had better explain it to her. It took a semester.  I taught it for 9 years. It was the first thing I had to say.  I called it" the Creation of Order". Finally, I had something to say. At my present age of 85 I have made the judgment that the creating and teaching of " the Creation of Order" is the single most important accomplishment of my life. At that time, I did not realize that the method I used taught people (who know how to count) how to reason. I do not know if this goal was ever accomplished.

 30 some years later, I noted that, “The creation of order” can aid in understanding.

 The years between the two involved much mental maturation. Yet the processes, although inverted, are the same. I have violated the chronology by including "peacemaking conversation”, with "the creation of order".

thought

**The Creation of Order 1966 and Peacemaking Conversation 2000**

Tedious, but understanding conversation is essential to peacemaking conversation.

**Introduction**

The world is massively chaotic. The complexity and complications of living within an increasingly populated and technological world are steadily growing to enormous proportions. The ability to create order in this chaos is a prime criterion to individual and world sanity, and the mind is that basic tool which can create such order.

 Our educational systems today fill our minds with massive knowledge and the preferred analysis. Then they reward the student for the “right" answer. The result is we no longer think for ourselves.

 Knowledge is important, but only when it is linked with other skills. Einstein said, "Imagination is more important than knowledge". Today with these educational institutions supplying you with knowledge and their analysis at the price of creativity and the ability to analyze, imagination is more important than ever. It is not your job to simply answer questions, but rather to do your own analysis, speculate, create order, and solve problems.

The very same tools can be used as a structure for peacemaking conversation, a structure which people can use to talk about important things without loss of face by conceding "truth" to belief and morality to taste so that through understanding they can merge ideas into more tolerable ones.

Peacemaking conversation is generally not peaceful. It involves talking about disagreement. The tools make it possible to disagree with understanding and without anger. When we refuse to talk about politics and religion, we give up self-determination in favor of copying the beliefs of our political and religious leaders.

**Mathematics as a Science of Use**

Intuition has been evaded as a mathematics for a long time because generally people have chosen to deny that it can be organized. This text will show how. Not only can organization give intuitive people the power of mathematics, but it can also give mathematical people the power of intuition.

The purpose of mathematics is to aid people in dealing with real problems. It makes it possible to predict a result without performing the corresponding experiment. This ability to predict is accomplished through the utilization of a method: first, to assume facts; second, to symbolize these facts; third, to rearrange the symbols according to assumed working operations; and fourth to re-associate the symbols with the facts. Thus, they can make a prediction of what would happen to the facts if these facts, rather than the symbols, were manipulated. The more accurately the facts can be symbolized, the more useful is the symbolic outcome. The more the symbols can be accurately manipulated, the more ways facts can be predicted. Language is such a symbolism.

The usefulness of our assumptions assumes that we have agreed to symbolize something in the same way and have used the same set of rules. Since nouns are arbitrarily associated with objects there must be a shared understanding that we will call any given thing by the same name. For instance, we might agree to call an object “table “when speaking with English people but call it” mesa “when speaking with Spanish people. In the world one person would concede the word to the other. The concession would only be in naming the object.

The same is true for all the other parts of speech. The concession is the same in that we only agree to what a word means.

The same is true for grammar. The concession we make is in agreeing on how we structure the words.

People, as they learn, assimilate the symbols of their language and tend to force their various observations to fit those already fixed symbols. Often highly educated people have difficulty grasping a foreign idea. Difficulties in translating books stem from the same limitations in language. Literal translation of a phrase into another language often does not convey the same meaning since connotative elements in both languages may be radically different.

Consider the difficulty in translating an eastern philosophy for western readers. Every idiom, phrase, or word which does not have a translation must be altered to something which can be translated. The altered version has lost some meaning and the westerner does not receive exactly what the eastern writer wishes to convey. If the westerner could free himself from existing language limitations he would understand more.

The easterner must coin new words while the westerner must forget his existing language. The easterner would coin a new word, elaborately define this new word, and finally convey the idea he wishes the westerner to have. He would be able to recall this idea by writing the word when he needed it. By continued use, the meaning of the word would become clear. The easterner has invented a mathematics; he has coined a new symbol because it was useful to do so.

If we have a simple declarative sentence written within common (agreed to by both parties) grammar using words with common definitions, it is generally easy to agree to what a sentence says on the face of it. In problem solving where you begin with the problem rather than a set of words, you create common definitions and grammar. The declarative sentence is king.

 In mathematics anything can be symbolized; connotation, denotation, differences, similarities, changes, abstractions, and operations are only a few. These symbols can be arranged in any way that helps solve a problem. You are not limited by your initial vocabulary or previously established rules of manipulation.

 Language is a mathematics with the purpose of understanding one another. Words and word sets are symbols. When they are arranged and manipulated according to rules, they convey meaning.

 In peacemaking conversation, you frequently are attempting to understand the same text. When confronted with hyperbole, simile, metaphor, idioms, parables, words with heavy connotation, poetic structure, stream of consciousness, imagery, bad grammar or simply purposefully confusing, then the parties must identify meaning. Sometimes it is enough to say, "It is a parable" or "I am speaking figuratively". It is usually necessary to bring in all their witness to find a common understanding. It is not a common belief. The understanding is only an agreement to the meaning of the phrase, paragraph, chapter, book, et al.

**"****The Axiom of Choice and the Theory of Unity"**

The natural order of everything is called chaos. I find it beautiful. However, because I cannot tell what part lies between what other parts, it is useless.

 There is nothing and there is everything. They measure zero and one. With algebra we fill in the middle by counting the fractions. We numerate (count) the denominations (the sized pieces) and relate them according to rules (there are only nine rules in algebra). That is, we choose units and manipulate them.

 The axiom of choice says we get to choose how to count and what we count. The theory of unity shows us how we size the pieces. Choosing units and the rules of their manipulation are the basis of all mathematics and possibly the basis of all reason.

 Unitizing is the process of representing something with a useful symbol. Nothing and everything are not useful symbols.

 If we combined all the Quantum’s of energy into one thing, we would have a unit with great meaning. However, we cannot manipulate just one thing and it would be useless.

 We must define a unit that has a bounded meaning and can be usefully manipulated.

 In peacemaking conversation and problem solving the units are all the words in all the dictionaries plus all the words we might invent. The rules are all the grammars of prose and poetry plus those we invent. That is everything.

 For the sake of peace or problem solving we will choose subsets to make the system useful. That is, we will size the pieces.

 To make a useful unit, then, we must eliminate all those parts of the idea that don’t concern us in the context of the problem and include all those parts that do concern us in the context of the problem.

 For example, an apple in the eyes of an artist has a different meaning than an apple in the hand of a cook. When the cook and the artist are cutting down an apple tree, they do not bother with defining apple. They define cutting down the tree.

When two cooks talk about an apple they differentiate between tart and sweet, crisp and soft and more. Rather than talking about apples, they talk about Macintosh, Granny, or Delicious.

 In general, you do not want to plant a seedling with a bulldozer or a toothpick. A trowel is better.

**The Axiom of Choice and art**

An aside to anyone attempting to teach reason. This process will be carried throughout this book. It is instrumental to understanding each other as well as the universe.

The method I found was to have the students pick a word with the purpose of understanding the word in context. They fill the blackboard with words that enhance the context. Connect the words with line segments representing relationships. Connect the relationships with line segments. Some segments would necessarily need to cross. This takes space. Then relationships could move from linear to planar to spatial. " Einstein's axiom of choice" says you can put symbols together any way you choose. That's what they were doing using words as symbols.

 Next, the students removed all the words and segments not relative to its use in the context. This resulted in a meaningful and manipulatable understanding. They used the theory of unity.

 They changed the context and did it again with a different result. They had used the theory of unity to get two different useful understandings.

 In previous illustrations I have used nouns because they are simple. In contrast to nouns, “Assemble the bicycle”, has a well-defined meaning to every parent who has ever assembled a bike on Christmas Eve.

Later in the book I will put “feelings” in a matrix and manipulate the matrix. That is, I will put words in a special array we mathematicians call a matrix and use a mathematical idea called mapping. I could have painted a picture that induced the feeling. Choosing the nature of your art and artform is the right Einstein gives you.

**Consistency**

 A mathematics is called internally consistent if, when used accurately, it produces approximately the same result regardless of the manipulator. For example, if two people read the same paragraph and both apply the same mathematics to summarize a paragraph independent of each other, their summaries should be similar, or the mathematics is not internally consistent.

 Internal consistency is destroyed most often by statements that can be interpreted in more than one way relative to the problem, or by leaving several paths open that do not lead to the same conclusion. Imperfect internal consistency is frequent outside of classical mathematics. It should be kept in mind as a guideline.

 External consistency is more elusive. For a mathematics to be externally consistent it must be consistent with the real world. Everyone has heard of the perfectly designed bridge that collapsed or the perfect gambling system that bankrupts its user. In these cases, no matter who used the system, they achieved the same result. It appeared to solve the problem on paper, but when applied to the real world, it failed. It was internally consistent but externally inconsistent.

 External consistency is a major guideline to mathematics design. For mathematics to be externally consistent all assumptions must be universally and completely accepted. As there is nothing that is completely accepted by everyone, then everything is not accepted by everyone. That would be one complete universal truth, something I do not deal with. Design your mathematics so that it is useful.

 In peacemaking conversation consistency is everything. Declarative sentences are rare, yet most helpful.

Let us assume we wish to know (and agree upon) what a sentence means. We would each bring our common (agreed to by both parties) experience to the table. First, we would use our common objective definition and grammar. The legal question for this is, “what does it say on the face of it?”

If we have a simple declarative sentence written within proper (common) grammar using words with common definitions, it is normally easy to agree to what a sentence says on the face of it. Most legal documents contain only simple declarative sentences.

On the other hand, one might say “da da da da da”. Now to me it sounds like gibberish.

If communication is our goal my suggestion is to add from our common witness our common grammar and definition. In this case (“da da da da da”) we would probably agree to throw out grammar and select instead to view it as verse. If we were to agree that it expresses a rhythm of baby sounds, then it would require that we bring in from our witness an understanding of rhythm and baby sounds. We agree that it's a baby singing. That was easy.

In peacemaking conversation sometimes knowledge and wisdom collide. Let us try something with some meat.

 Let us look at the first line of the gospel according to John, King James Version. "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God."

 You might accept it as true without attempting to paraphrase and view it as part of the whole testament. It is called “verse” and not subject to the laws of grammar.

 On the face of it, it is nonsense. Correcting the grammar, the sentence would become, "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was “God”. If the “Word” is literal, then the word is “God” and God possessed his name. You would be hard pressed to find anyone that believed John wished this to be the understanding.

 If “the Word” is figurative such as a specific holy knowledge, then God is this knowledge and God possesses this knowledge. There would be a sizable body of people whose witness agreed with this understanding.

 If “the Word” is a metaphor for existential existence, then in the beginning there was God and his existential existence. Bringing some more witness you might paraphrase this as God and the Holy Spirit.

 If “the Word” is idiomatic as in “give me your word”, then in the beginning there was a covenant with God.

 If “in the beginning” refers to the time when Jesus would come, then “the Word” might refer to the Old Testament. Then at the time of Jesus there was the Old Testament which was God’s Word.

 The important point is that every understanding requires that you bring what you have witnessed, judged, and understood to communicate your understanding of what John meant us to understand rather than what we believe to be the truth.

 When dealing with new problems and new concepts we coin our own words by agreement. When two people agree that they will agree, they are reasonable. They are only agreeing on what to call something. They can change their mind about the meaning and invent a new word later. As an example, from here on, when I use the word “he” I will mean he or she.)

**Basic definition,** agreeing on the instinctive understanding of a word.

 "There is nothing as difficult as the obvious" (Einstein). A person without a language or other mathematics has only one way to establish meaning; by using his senses.

 Basic definition is the agreement to recall non-verbal understanding by name. To establish basic definition people must agree to a specific name for an agreed understanding. It is an intuitive understanding independent of words.

Babies have only one way to establish meaning, by using their senses. Therefore, to basically define something such as mother, he must see it, touch it, smell it, and taste it. He must experience mother before he can know what it is. Finally, because mother repeats the word “mother” over and over he gets it. He calls the experience “mother”. He says his first word.

The word has no functional value until another person understands what “mother” means. My mother and your mother are not the same mother. What we do then is show and tell. I show you my mother and tell you, “This is my mother”. You show me your mother and tell me, “This is my mother”. Finally, when I say “mother” you recall the experience of your own mother, not mine. Through a process of show and tell, we have a common understanding of mother.

 We all have our own mothers. Though the experience of mother is different for each of us, we agree that experiencing “mother” is common. This is not to say that our understanding is the same, for my mother may have disciplined me by reward while your mother may have disciplined you by punishment.

 Let us explore further the difference between common and same.

“A rose by any other name would smell as sweet”. When the word “rose” is exchanged there is usually some basic understanding exchanged based on the smell of a rose. The agreement between reasonable people is to call it a “rose”. Even to a person who has smelled but never smelled a rose, the word has use because the person has a basic understanding of smelling.

If smelling were the only sensation that identifies a rose, then a person who cannot smell would have no understanding of “rose”. But a rose has more. It has romantic imagery. It functions well that a rose induces more feelings than just sensations. This allows almost everyone to experience a rose. As each person has their own experience it is by agreement established through show and tell that gives common meaning to words. Though I can never know your experience, I can agree to agree. We share common experiences that we name.

 Basic verbs are also learned by show and tell. When a baby suckles his mother, he feels she is. When the baby chews his hand, he knows it is. When the baby sees a toy, he knows the toy is. When others say she is, it is, or the toy is, the baby understands what “is” means basically, that is without words.

 Back to communicating. To basically define something such as a rock, a person must see it, touch it, smell it, and maybe even taste it. He must experience a rock before he can know what it is. At this point the rock has meaning to the person.

 However, every rock would be different. Therefore, the next step the individual must take is to experience many rocks and compare them, attempting to collect a sense of commonness between them. He must associate abstracted characteristics and compromise extremes of dissimilarity until any rock may be called a rock. Now, for himself, he has defined the concept, "rock". However, he cannot yet communicate it.

To communicate, “rock”, let us introduce a second person and expose him to the same collection of rocks. This second person by using his senses establishes a different concept of “rock”. Let the two people meet and agree to say “rock” for the collection of objects before them. They can now exchange the word rock.

 In “Gulliver's Travels” there exists a society in which conversation takes place at a basic level.

 “...Many of the most learned and wise adhere to the new scheme of expressing themselves by things, which had only this inconvenience attending it, that if a man’s business be very great, and of various kinds, he must be obliged in proportion to carry a greater bundle of things upon his back, unless he can afford one or two strong servants to attend him. I have often beheld two of those sages almost sinking under the weight of their pacts, like peddlers among us; who, when they meet in the streets, would lay down their loads, open their sacks, and hold conversation for an hour together; then put up their implements, help each other to resume their burdens, and take their leave.”

If I wished to convey "rock" to another person in this society I would have to carry a lot of rocks in my sack. The word "rock" is easier to carry than a bunch of rocks. After enough experience I have a vocabulary of basically understood words.

**Secondary definition**, the naming tool.

 If a definition can be worded, then the definition is a secondary definition. Secondary definitions have the form of dictionary definitions. You are only agreeing on what to call some understanding so that you can recall that understanding by saying the word.

The foundation of secondary definition is basic definition. To illustrate let us go to the dictionary and select the word “obelisk”. Rather than showing a series of obelisks as we would have to do to define the term basically, we say an obelisk is “a four sided usually monolithic pillar tapering as it rises and terminating in a pyramid”.

If we understand the definition of “terminating”, “pyramid”, “rise”, “taper”, “monolithic”, “four sided”, and “pillar”, we know what an obelisk is.

Note that all these terms are understood as secondary definitions based on other secondary definitions or basic definitions. For example, in my case, I need the term “four sided” to define obelisk. I use the secondary definition of “four sided” as having four sides. Four I define as one plus one plus one plus one. “One” and “plus” I understand basically. “Side” I define in this case as a plane. “Plane” I define as a locus of points equidistant from two fixed points. “Locus” and “point” I understand basically. “Equidistant” I define as equally distant. “Equal” and “distance” I understand basically.

You, on the other hand, may have seen a collection of obelisks and understand what they are with no need to refer to a dictionary.

 Another person may have a basic understanding of "line" because he draws a lot of them. He uses a secondary definition of "point" as the intersection between two lines. Still another person may have no concept of "plus". But he knows what four is because he has counted to four many times.

Because the dictionary uses words to define other words exclusively (it never says; you must know what this word means basically), the dictionary goes in circles. For example, the dictionary uses "point" in defining "line" and uses "line" in defining "point". If you keep looking up all these words you get circles of knowledge. By understanding at least one point of the circle basically, you get to understand all the words in the circle. This is not to say that my understanding is the same as your understanding for I may basically understand a different point of the circle because I have had different experiences. It does imply that our understanding is common.

 The dictionary’s total dependence on secondary definitions is illustrated by its difficulty in conveying a basic definition. For example, "is" is basically understood by almost everyone. We all know what it means yet the dictionary (because it is obliged not to leave out a word) uses a lot of words to attempt to convey the obvious.

This leads to a lesson to be learned, a middle ground between basic and secondary understanding. How do you convey basic understanding with words? You use the same technique that dictionaries use to define "is". You use hyperbole, simile, metaphor, idioms, poetic license, et al. You use words as if they were rocks taken from your "Gulliver’s Travels" bag that you carry.

Secondary definitions are useful because they can be tailored to our needs. Consider again the word “obelisk”. If we need the definition to distinguish between a solid object and a planar surface, it would be sufficient to define an obelisk as a solid object.

Note that this definition cannot be freely used outside the context of our specific need. It would be simpler to use "solid object". The definitions are to be useful, that is close to common meaning yet specialized enough to our need. A thesaurus might help. Of course, you can always invent a new word if you cannot find an appropriate different word.

In peacemaking conversation, the reverse is true. We start with words and write their meaning. The problem is frequently that each word carries many connotations.

For example, "abortion". First, we must agree on what it means objectively. We might start with "to interrupt before completion". In the interest of exchanging our understanding we may later agree to "the surgical removal of a fetus". The first is a broad definition. The second is what we want to talk about. It suits the need to understand each other.

Now that we agree on what the word means we can go on to the connotation of the word. Is it good or bad? This is not a matter of definition. This is a matter of judgment. Expressing judgment will be discussed later under "principles".

**Criteria**, placing boundaries on words

A criterion is a boundary that uses words.

A criterion of the specific is generally a list of criteria. The order of the criterion in the criteria is not a consideration.

A criterion needs naming to identify what you are trying to specify. For example, if you wish to specify what a pencil is write "a criteria for a pencil".

The purpose of a criteria is more specificity. For example, if you wish to define a pencil as a practical writing implement, you may do so by making several observations. You may note that a pencil shorter than two inches or longer than nine inches loses much of its effectiveness. You have limited the length of your “pencil” by defining the endpoints two and nine inches and stating that anything falling between these points is a pencil. This first observation must be supplemented with additional observations before it becomes specific enough to be a useful definition since a tumbler, and a Chihuahua dog fall between two and nine inches in length and are obviously not pencils. Our observations are standards against which we measure the object we are trying to define.

The criterion for a pencil might be as follows,

 1. It contains something that marks surfaces that have a coefficient of friction greater than .1.

 2. It is lighter than 2 ounces and heavier than .1 ounce.

 3. Its diameter is less than 3/4 inch but greater than 3/16 inch.

 4. Its mark remains visible under normal wear and tear.

 5. It is longer than two inches and shorter than nine inches.

Notice that pencils, pens, crayons, and chalks are all pencils under this criterion. This would create problems only if it were necessary to differentiate between various writing implements. If this differentiation is not important, then this criterion is useful.

We can add meaning to words by changing tense or by adding a suffix. For example, if we know what the word, “see” means, we can with criteria establish what the word “saw” means. However, we may choose to write a criterion for past tense instead.

Criterion for the past tense of the verb:

 1. The meaning of the present tense of the verb applies.

 2. The meaning is applied in the past.

Every time you use an adjective or adverb you refine the definition. You can write a criterion (a definition) for "girl". You can write a criterion (a boundary such as over 6 feet) for "tall". You can write a criterion for "a tall girl". Now "a tall girl" is no longer a judgment. It is a girl who is over 6 feet tall.

Most of the time the judgments expressed by adjectives and adverbs can be made more specific by writing a criterion. Sometimes it is more practical not to do so. "She is a pretty girl" is most often more practical than writing a criterion for pretty.

In peacemaking conversation, a criterion may help you specify your differences. A criterion has excellent use when we wish to differentiate shades of meaning. We can handle words with different connotations by establishing their criteria.

Sometimes criteria can help us focus on the connotation. For instance, teach and brainwash may mean the same if our only criterion is conveying information, but they have different meanings. Using two criteria will clarify the difference. To teach is to convey the truth. To brainwash is to convey falsehood. Now it is possible to compare the processes (how we convey information) unencumbered by context (truth or falsehood).

Sometimes criteria can help us transcend a connotation. Consider "prejudice". A criterion for both faith and prejudice are prejudgment. Before any judgment is ever made there is prejudgment. We all have our prejudgments.

A criterion for faith.

 1. It is a prejudgment.

 2. It is believed to be true.

A criterion for prejudice.

 1. It is a prejudgment.

 2. It is believed to be false.

This levels the playing field. Now we can see another's prejudice (prejudgment) as we see our own faith (prejudgment). Faith is my prejudgment while prejudice is yours. We have transcended the connotation of faith and prejudice. Now we can compare our beliefs without being insulted by the connotation attached to the word "prejudice". We can talk about our prejudgments.

Sometimes in peacemaking conversation transcending the problem is counterproductive, the purpose being clearer understanding. In this case writing a criterion is usually not practical. For example, instead of writing a criterion for a good person, you could write a process to determine what a good person is (though it might contain some terms determined by criteria).

 Criteria forces upon you a timeless and universal standard for what is a good person, while a process instructs an individual how to determine a good person at any one time and place.

Whether engaged in problem solving or peacemaking conversation, a criterion can be altered like a secondary definition. You are only agreeing on a specific meaning of a word. You are not agreeing with any belief.

**Axioms**

An axiom is a statement of cause and effect. Axioms in problem solving create branching order.

An axiom is in the if/then form. Its purpose is to establish alternative paths based on alternate conditions.

For example, assume you want to sort apples. Each apple can be hard, soft, or rotten. You know that hard apples are best for supermarkets, that soft apples are used for canning, and that rotten apples can be sold for pig slop. Therefore, you may employ the following criterion of three axioms,

A criterion to sort Apples

 1. If you select a rotten apple, then put it in the slop bin.

 2. If you select a soft apple, then put it in the sauce bin.

 3. If you select a hard apple, then put it in the market shipping bin.

Another purpose of an axiom is to describe possible alternatives. For example, assume you wish to make applesauce and canned sliced apples from your soft apples. You have an apple grinder and an apple slicer. Two axioms that would serve as guidelines might be,

If you place soft apples in the grinder, then you will make applesauce.

If you place soft apples in the slicer, then you will make sliced apples.

**Algorithms**

Algorithms establish performance order. In most cases it is an instruction to accomplish a specified task.

It can be a rule that determines order or an actual listing of items (events, ideas, things, even algorithms, et al) in a specific order. One might be “the election of Lincoln preceded the civil war”. It helps us agree on an organized past (when, where and what happened). Another might be “release the ball and it will fall”. When there is agreement, algorithms become our accepted history or an accepted process.

Algorithms establish counting order. Items are in counting order when comparing items, you always know which one is first, which one is second, which one is third, which one is fourth, continuing until you know which one is the last one.

An algorithm to wash your hands in a sink.

 1. Turn on the water.

 2. Pick up the soap.

 3. Lather your hands.

 4. Put down the soap.

 5. Scrub the hands together.

 6. Rinse hands.

 7. Turn off water.

 8. Dry hands.

By inserting axioms into algorithms, you can branch to other algorithms, or you can put them in outline form.

An algorithm to process Apples

1. Pick the apples.

 2. Sort the apples.

 A. If you select a rotten apple, then put it in the slop bin.

 B. If you select a soft apple, then put it in the sauce bin.

 a. If the demand for applesauce is higher than the demand for sliced apples, put it in the grinder.

 b. Put the apple in the slicer. (if not a.)

 C. If you select a hard apple, then put it in the market shipping bin.

 3. Process the apples.

**Algorithms** in problem solving.

In problem solving the order is created. We use personal experience to guess what might work and alter it until it does work. The standard is internal and external consistency.

Every mathematics contains at least one performance algorithm for every mathematics has a purpose and to accomplish this purpose you must instruct the user on what to do. "An algorithm to wash your hands in a sink" is an example.

Another example of such an algorithm is the law of order in algebra which says that to compute the value of an expression, first raise to powers and take roots, second multiply and divide, and third add and subtract. If you follow this instruction, you will always get the same answer. It is completely internally consistent.

Algorithms can occur in an algorithm.

An algorithm to determine if a person is good.

1. Determine the moral standards of the time. (This would require an algorithm to determine the moral standards of the time)

2. Determine the moral standards of the person. (This would also require an algorithm to determine the moral standards of the person.)

3. Compare the moral standards of the person and the society. (This would require an algorithm to perform the comparison.)

4. Draw a conclusion.

The nesting of algorithms turns into an outline. Looking only at the first item,

An algorithm to determine if a person is good.

 1. Determine the moral standards of the time.

 a. Contact religious leaders and ask them to write a statement on what is a moral person.

 b. Survey existing laws that are being enforced regularly that protect individual rights.

 c. Compile a compromise between these views and call it the moral standards of the times.

 2. Determine the moral standards of the person. (as above)

 3. Compare the moral standards of the person and the society. (as above)

 4. Draw a conclusion.

Sometimes the mathematics fails. When different people applying the algorithm come to conflicting conclusions and the need to determine if a person is good is essential to the purpose of the mathematics, then rewrite the algorithm.

**Principles**

Principlesare judgments.

**Principles** in problem solving.

In creating a mathematics to solve problems, principles are facts. You create facts that are useful. The test for usefulness is whether they are internally and externally consistent.

An illustration of a principle is the commutative principle of multiplication in algebra (B times A equals, A times B). Certainly, B times A is not identical to A times B. Yet when you perform the identified operations, you get the same answer. That is 3 times 2 is 6 and 2 times 3 is 6.

You may have a mathematics involving screw driving. A knife, a screwdriver, and a dime all drive screws. They are not identical. They all have the same value in that they drive screws. In principle they are the same.

Another example, “A Ford is a Cadillac” is a principle if they are being considered as ground transportation. “A Ford is a Cadillac” is not a principle if their cost is the consideration.

Sometimes we forget that our facts are judgments. "It is true that for every action there is an opposite and equal reaction". This is a principle. We are judging truth. It is common to drop the judgment (it is true that) and say, “for every action there is an opposite and equal reaction”. We call it a fact rather than judgment. If we agree, there is no problem.

Remember the "fact" that the earth is flat. Galileo disagreed. Remember the "fact" that matter cannot be created or destroyed. Einstein disagreed. Now we know they were judgments.

Sometimes our facts have strong evidence contraindicating them, yet we use them because they are useful. In physics, the Bohr model (the planetary model of masses for atoms) has been superseded by quantum mechanics. Because the Bohr model is so useful in understanding Newtonian physics it is presented as fact in most high school physics courses.

With human morality it gets even trickier. However, if your purpose is to solve a problem, you can transcend unnecessary judgments.

Let us illustrate with a mathematics designed for criminal recourse. You might start with several principles; a thief is a bad person, a thief is a person who steals, bad people must be punished, a person who steals bread to feed his family is not a bad person, and more. All the moral questions can be put aside by the following practical principle; the judge, whose authority is established by due process, shall determine the course of action forced upon a person that is determined guilty by a jury of his peers.

A more personal example, in biology we arrange all the animals and plants in an order that is useful. The source of the order ("intelligent design" or "Darwin's theory of evolution") can be transcended.

**Principles** **in peacemaking conversation**

“It’s the principle of the thing!” Sometimes people will not allow their beliefs to be transcended. In the example above, was the order a matter of "intelligent design" or "Darwin's theory of evolution"?

A principle is a statement of judgment. Once it is accepted by all it becomes the common truth. This rarely happens.

Peacemaking conversation cannot deal with truth, only belief. The solution is not to agree on the principle but rather to understand (by talking fragments breeding empathy) each other’s motivation until the solutions (given later in the text) are preferable to threat, force and violation.

Once again, we are working in reverse. We are not creating a principle but rather we are starting with the principle and the willingness to understand the people who believe it. It is not that we wish to arrive at the same principles but rather to arrive at a common understanding of each other.

There is a way of writing principles so that they can be commonly understood. The way of writing is to include the author of the alleged fact.

For example, we may not agree that "the sky is falling". On the other hand, we can agree that "Joe said, 'the sky is falling'". By identifying the authority, in this case the author of the judgment, and associating that authority with the judgment we arrive at a common understanding.

In most cases the individual is not the author of the fact. Rather he agrees with a group to which he belongs.

For example, some proposed principals might be “life is ongoing and should not be prevented by contraception”, “life begins at conception”, "life begins in the second trimester of pregnancy" or “life begins at birth “. A mixed group would reject these principles.

Let us include the judgers (the authorities) with the judgments. “The Pope insists that life is ongoing and should not be prevented by contraception, pro-lifers believe that life begins at conception, the Supreme Court of the United States established that legally life begins in the second trimester of pregnancy, and a plurality of people believe that life begins at birth” would be a principle accepted by the group. Note that each judgment now contains its authority; that is, “the pope, pro-lifers, the Supreme Court, and a plurality of people”. We have given each authorities "truth" equal value. That is, since the value of each authority is the same each belief carries equal weight. Not only have we established common facts (a listing of who believes what) but we have also removed our own individual superiority.

It is possible that you may need to do even more refining. You might propose that a minority of people believe that life begins at birth. A change to "many people believe that life begins at birth" would probably be acceptable.

Understanding does not require that we all believe the same thing. It does require that we find a common understanding. In this case it might be "there is no common agreement about when sacred human life begins".

Sometimes by specifying precisely where we disagree leaves us open to sharing why we disagree. Let me introduce the Chinese government's view. They have a recent history of overcoming starvation through forced population control. They postulate that controlling the population is more important than a woman's right to choose. They limit the number of children a family can have. They would have us understand starvation.

Then the world principle contains three principles and becomes "population control people believe it is most important to abort birth, pro-choice people believe that a woman’s right to choose is more important than preserving a fetus, and pro-life people believe that preserving a fetus is more important than a woman’s right to choose”.

**Axioms in peacemaking conversation, the principled axiom**

Sometimes the purpose is to agree (or understand the disagreement) on what caused what. An example might be “the election of Lincoln caused the civil war”. This might become “according to 'Outline of US History' competition between a slave economy and a free economy led to a balance of power in Congress that was offset by Lincoln’s election which caused the South to secede which caused Fort Sumter... “

Sometimes you can transcend the middle and agree on the judgment. In the above case “according to 'Outline of US History' the election of Lincoln caused the civil war” may be enough. This is a principled axiom.

Sometimes you can transcend the middle and agree on the axiom. In the above case “the election of Lincoln caused the civil war”.

A major function of axioms in peacemaking conversation is to speculate on cause and effect. It is an expression of one's belief of what will happen given a specific cause.

A religious example. "if you do not accept Jesus as your savior, then you will go to hell" is an axiom only if everyone agrees. "Joe believes that if you do not accept Jesus as your savior, then you will go to hell" is a principled axiom. Like every principle, it contains its author.

As with all principles, a principled axiom need not identify the author as a single person. I could have said "the Catholic Church believes that if you do not accept Jesus as your savior, then you will go to hell".

Two political examples.

 Joe believes that the removal of all our troops from Iraq will cause a bloodbath. Bob believes that the removal of all our troops from Iraq will cause an end to the present bloodshed. By stating their positions Joe and Bob might notice that their positions are not mutually exclusive. They may wish to consider bloodshed now with bloodshed in the future, whose bloodshed and how much bloodshed.

Two historical examples.

 Joe says Hitler's rise to power was the result of the wealth generated by stealing Jewish wealth. Bob says the stealing of Jewish wealth was the result of Hitler's rise to power. Note that their positions are mutually exclusive.

Sometimes it is the cause that needs understanding. As an example, let us look at the passionate principle "pro-life people believe sanctified life begins at conception". How do you know?

One might say they had an epiphany. Another might say it is in the teachings of Buddha.

Let us look at the one who says the bible establishes the fact. How does he know the bible establishes the fact? We are exposing branch after branch of understanding and the source of that understanding.

By searching for common ground, we arrive back at an understood definition of a group who call themselves pro-life and have a common understanding that sanctified life begins at conception. The fact that pro-lifers come from many places has been transcended.

Some will find it necessary to deal with the cause of all belief. An axiomatic investigation helps but care must be taken to end at understanding. In peacemaking conversation, you can say "I believe". You cannot say it is just plain true without the agreement of all.

**Summary of the creation of order**

A mathematics to solve a problem looks like an outline with footnotes. The outline is always an algorithm. The footnotes are secondary definitions, criterions, and principles.

The practical purpose of peacemaking conversation is less threat, force, and violation. The conversation itself is the tool. The primary result of the conversation is understanding each other. The secondary result of the conversation is a list of commonly understood principled axioms and principles with footnotes. The footnotes are secondary definitions and criterions. As a result, we maintain intra tribal peace rather than our tribes.

**Fragments**

**Being God, I knew everything. 1967**

Every book is a one-sided conversation with a bigot.

Such a man.

He smells.

His clothes are stained.

He grabs up scraps to use.

What he discards is exhausted.

He walks so often.

He saves the earth.

 The worker pays many hours of life for so few moments of pleasure that he is without blame for protecting the money that buys it.

But in hating the loafer who manages continuing pleasure without magnitudes of slavery he forgets where his chin begins.

 A slave does something because he must.

A free man may do the same thing because it’s right.

 You can be hurt by the truth,

but it is the most practical way to deal.

Maybe humanity was born when two Gods agreed to be enemies so that people might have a choice.

“Wake up you bitch, it’s time to put the world together.”

So we got up and got to it.

Even Gods do no better or worse than what they do.

By glorifying God, people glorify themselves.

Have a bit less than all you can get.

Leave something for the gods.

It is not only possible to be perfect, it is downright rewarding.

 Every snowflake is unique because it is different from every other snowflake.

 Every snowflake is common for it is a snowflake like every other snowflake.

Every snowflake is a perfect snowflake.

The snowflake is not an imperfect snowball; rather it is not a snowball at all.

Each person is a perfect person.

 Each is unique and common.

 Only when we consider ourselves other than what we are, are we imperfect.

We are people rather than imperfect images of God.

Peace is not something you escape to,

it is something to enjoy.

Beware the truth. You may fall in love with it.

I am learning that peace is a concept of a conspiracy.

It is a conspiracy, but in the conspiracy the only question is of the conspirators, and they seem sound enough.

 Every complete thought is a selective description of the universe.

Out of the depth of sadness comes peace.

Out of the depth of peace comes gentleness.

Out of the depth of gentleness comes contentment.

Out of the depth of contentment comes love.

Out of the depth of love comes dependence.

Out of the depth of dependence comes want.

Out of the depth of what comes desire.

Out of the depth of desire comes joy.

Out of the depth of joy comes sadness.

Do not measure eternity in lifetimes but in passing.

**God and God concept.**

God is the synthesis of the righteousness of man.

God is the flakes of the best of us all.

I wish my life to be a prayer to God.

         The universe has an ambient order we measure against.

This is the order we call random.

What is the taste of the universe?

 To cluster and disperse as by gravity and nova or socializing and isolating.

What does the universe do?

 It behaves randomly.

How does the universe do?

 It attends to its soft spot until the taste of its parts can interact to become what it wishes to become.

How do I find my taste?

 By doing.

How do I do?

         I attend to the soft spot on the top of my head until it changes the thought to words,

then speak the words,

till my heart feels

till I can express the feeling by doing.

What do I do?

 I behave as the person I wish to become.

How do you decide what you wish to become?

 My taste tells me.

How do you attend to the soft spot?

 By spending time not doing.

What happens when you are not doing?

 Others, like ants, share the universe with me through their soft spots.

Is the soft spot of a rock, a cat, a light, and a man different?

Only in the amount of time spent in not doing.

 God enlightens me through the soft spot on the top of my head.

 I think about enlightenment until it is organized.

 I share the organized truth by speaking.

 I feel the truth with my heart.

I do as I must.  I am five integrated parts, the soft spot, brain, voice, heart, and groin.

 I am perfect

or

that moment ago, I thought it, I was.

However,

at this moment I realize my past imperfection and am once more again perfect.

 I never was perfect but always am.

Be perfect.

It is something to do, not to strive for.

Perfection is in trying rather than in being.

You start where you are, which is perfect.

As if God acts through me, I hope to fulfill God’s will.

As if God acts through me, I hope to fulfill the commandments of Moses.

As if God acts through me, I hope to fulfill the good news of Jesus.

As if God acts through me, I am a God of imperfection.

As if God acts through me, I am a man of God’s perfection.

So is everyone.

 The Gospel of David.

Life is for the living.

 The Gospel of Krishna.

What goes around comes around.

 The Gospel of Tao.

All things happen.

 The Gospel of Confucius.

Everything matters.

 The Gospel of Buddha.

Wake to the altruistic path.

 The Gospel of Jesus.

Love one another.

 The Gospel of Mohammed.

 God is compassionate and merciful.

 The Gospel of Gandhi.

 All paths lead to God.

 The Gospel of Joseph.

Cherish fate.

Have a bit less than all you can get.

 We who are Christian are brother or sister to Jesus.

Our lord-and-master is the God of Abraham who is our uncle.

We who are Jew are brother or sister to Moses, a cousin of Jesus.

Our lord-and-master is the God of Abraham who is our uncle.

We who are Muslim are brother or sister to Mohammed a cousin of Moses and Jesus.

Our lord-and-master is the God of Abraham who is our uncle.

 And there should be peace and love between us.

 And the God of Abraham had brothers in Krishna and Tao and the lost father of the Hindus and others.

They had sons and daughters in Buda and Confucius and Masaw and others and they are our cousins.

 And there should be peace and love between us.

 And there is the grand sire of us all,

what was and what is and will be,

the whole and its spirit,

the holy spirit that from which we are made,

also called Nirvana, Tokpela, the Universe and other names are from which we come.

 And there should be peace and love between us for we are of the same family and the same flesh.

  And of the same flesh there are the beasts and the plants and the earth and the stars.

 And there should be peace and love between us.

 And we sustain ourselves by eating of the beasts and the plants as the earth sustains itself by decaying our flesh.

 We thank God for our daily bread out of respect for the spirit.

We ask for a funeral blessing at each death out of hope for the spirit.

At communion we eat the flesh of Jesus out of love of the spirit.

 All paths lead to God.

Event

Divorce happened. Finally, I failed.

Fragments

**Reconstruction. The Trip Down. 1975**

Soothe my soul’s wounds with strokes of red semen bled from sorrowful eyes led by my own monster’s pain at that moment he discovers his soul mine.

Such may be my fair in life,

to tell the hours of my bleeding.

One day, but only at the instant before my death, I wish to know if word or belief comes first,

and if they occur together then how are we the greater master of these views than random order?

In every day there are times of loneliness.

Loneliness is still a contributor to full life.

I have quit one thing in my life, being a slave.

I have quit it many times because I have frequently found I am my own master.

When enslaved I plan my future for it allows me to celebrate what I will become.

Ciphering itself is a joy for I look forward to behaving as I have behaved.

This is the essence of pride.

All information does is give me more authority.

It does not make me right more often.

“What is the question?”

appears to be the master riddle and the answer appears to be,

“What is the question.”

I observe the truth and write it.

I have never found the truth or expect to find it for it changes.

Rather than my life serving my goals I allow my goals to serve my life.

Life is lived in passing.

Each generation must find its own pride,

and each group in its generation,

and each thing in its group,

while remembering all drummers are different and the same.

Youth is frequently credited with temper for not realizing they may be telling the old what they have not seen before.

Pause, a term with a useful meaning.

To a diamond uncut is more attractive.

I live in the universe.

It makes me feel secure.

A house keeps weather from me.

It contributes to my counting.

Temperance is not a virtue but has its rewards,

which makes it worth consideration,

which is one of them.

When I decide things with myself, I find what I believe slowly.

When I use rules, things go faster.

Both have advantages.

It does not matter that the world is doing fine without me.

At least trying to save the world is fun.

The busy mind has made education for educators,

government for governors

and business for businessmen.

But life is for the living.

I am a beer snob because I enjoy every sip.

It is probably because I have not resolved whether I like it or not.

Hardness does not make a task worth completion.

Then humor tells me not to work it to death.

I have many thoughts which are my own, a satisfying possession.

The only use of possession is satisfaction.

To use does not require possession.

It is possible to have the satisfaction of possessing the universe while offending no one.

Possession of another person’s needs is no person’s right,

yet what is needed is a matter of judgment and needs give way to wants.

Pleasure derived from what I must do is no reason to stop enjoying reducing what I must do.

I always ask except when I don’t.

A little indulgence is good for the soul and the sole.

I will migrate toward others like me who enjoy finding what they don’t know and using what they do.

I play with a full deck.

I hope the game never ends.

I will die soon enough.

The price of living is a willingness to gamble life.

In this way I fill myself with wonder

while recognizing by being alive

I have denied peace in favor of life,

though a dip in peace now and then is refreshing.

Humanity is a paradox.

Knowledge cannot be used to effectively predict or guide,

only to consider and know you have considered.

A man’s word is more his bond than law.

His promise is a promise to himself.

Life is lived in passing.

Everything answers a question by producing quest.

This is the time of the quest.

Living is the process of putting myself together.

It is difficult to explain with more words what is clear with less, but it is fun to try.

I take pleasure in counting my pleasure which creates the pleasure I count.

If optimism is a humorous disease, I glory in sickness.

If it is not, I laugh with glory.

**Thoughts**

**What the tree taught me about feelings.**

 I wished to help a friend with rage. In my meditation I asked Jesus for help. I had been struggling with the dimensions of feeling. The old man came, not the young Jesus, but the old man who would damn no one. He helped me find the why of it but not the understanding.

        The next day was the Saturday between Good Friday and Easter Sunday. Jesus was not available. He was in hell. I went to my old friend the tree from before the time I meditated on humanity. I talked to the tree, and it infused me.

 The mantra to put aside feeling is comfort, serenity, and emptiness.

 My friend with rage was suffering from nausea. I asked my friend to use the mantra in hopes that replacing emotional anxiety with serenity would give positive results. My friend could not attain comfort. I then discovered my friend had not eaten for fifteen hours. He refused a cup of soup. When chicken soup is the cure hocus-pocus is not.

 I went back to my tree. A worm crawled out of the ground. As the worm crawled toward me, I became afraid of him. After a trip of no more than 8 inches I determined that he might crawl upon me. I carefully moved him away with a stick. For a moment I wondered if he felt lost. I wondered if he was afraid to die.

 I guessed he did not contemplate life and death. Then I thought of the tree. The tree loses its leaves with all the consideration that I have when I wash away my skin. I was curious to know if the tree contemplated the loss of its root. The earth was our common ground and vibrations were our common communication.

 In the back of my mind was, "vibrations", a thought from a peacemaker. He referenced "truth" as common human vibrations. He was promoting peace through common prayer.

 As I departed, I hugged the tree and felt vibrations. The hug was a reinforcement I needed in my venture toward healing.

 My friend with rage died of anxiety. There was no blame. So that he should not die in vain, let me state here what I have learned.

**Feelings**

 Feelings are the foundation of all understanding. Feelings are as basic as basic definition and are exchanged in the same way. That is the nature of basic understanding. You must hear it, taste it, smell it, touch it, and see it.

 If you need help understanding your own feelings or the feelings of someone else or need to communicate your feelings to someone else, then you may need words that don't exist. A map, an arrangement of the words rather than the words themselves, and the manipulation of the arrangement may help.

 We all have our own feelings. We use words to describe them, yet everyone's feelings are different. Different people would map the same emotion differently. Mapping increases common understanding.

 Consider feelings occurring in a two-dimensional plane. One dimension goes from the beast on the top to beauty on the bottom. The other dimension goes from negative on the right to positive on the left.

 There are three parameters of feelings. There is the sensual continuum at the top. Its middle is comfort. Its line is pain-comfort-pleasure. It is all physical sensation. It is about me.

There is the emotional continuum in the middle. Its middle is serenity. Its line is depression-serenity-elation. It is how we judge ourselves among other people. It is about us.

There is the spiritual continuum at the bottom. Its middle is emptiness. Its line is desire-emptiness-fulfillment. It is about grandeur great enough to make people insignificant. It seems outside our control. It is about everything.

 Start with this array of words. Put them on a plane of feelings. Arrange them in a three-by-three matrix.

the beast

pain-comfort-pleasure

depression-serenity-elation

desire-emptiness-fulfillment

beauty

 Understand the map by understanding yourself. Manipulate the map with the freedom of the axiom of choice and the theory of unity, but follow the technique given in the following.

 Consider the emotional parameter. It may be nothing more or less than vanity. Vanity may be nothing more or less than status both as you view yourself and as you believe others view you. Elation may be nothing more than the feeling of being liked. It may also be having more importance, power, sex, and money than others. Depression may be no more than the feeling that you do not have as much as others or what you deserve. It may also be the feeling of being disliked. That is the feeling of self-pity.

 Consider the physical parameter. Pleasure may be orgasm, tasting, being touched, being warm and smelling. Pain may be nothing more than the feeling of too much pleasure, that is being sore, cut, abraded, burned, frozen, aching, nausea or subject to unpleasant tastes and smells.

 Consider the spiritual parameter. Dreaming covers the spiritual dimension. Certainly, many dreams are desires. Hope can be seen as desire. Love or belonging can be seen as fulfillment that is ethereal. Prayer and meditation are dream forms. Fulfillment may be nothing more than the feeling of belonging because of grace.

 Some feelings, attitudes and/or behaviors are easy to map. They fit in one place. I have put several of them on the same map. Make your own entries.

the beast

bone breaking -itching-comfort- - eating- -orgasm

suicidal-melancholy-serenity- - happy-joyous

despair-longing- -emptiness-belonging- grace

beauty

 What do external forces make me feel? Sometimes understanding is served by substituting for the words. Make your own substitutions.

the beast

punishment -freedom- -reward

criticism -attention -praise

temptation—respect- -love

beauty

 Consider sex or some other strong behavior. Masturbation, casual sex, and lovemaking can be compared. Masturbation is pleasant. Casual sex is elating. Lovemaking is fulfilling.

the beast

pain - -comfort-masturbation

depression - -serenity- -casual sex

desire -  -emptiness - -lovemaking

beauty

 Sometimes understanding can be increased by considering the map to be binary. To indicate the on condition, CAPITALIZE the word. Process your behavior selection.

A child before being told that masturbation is wrong.

The beast

pain-  -comfort- -MASTERBATION

depression- -serenity- -elation

desire- -emptiness - -fulfillment

beauty

Masturbation accompanied by masturbation shame.

the beast

pain- -comfort- -MASTURBATION

SHAME - -serenity- -elation

desire - -emptiness - -fulfillment

beauty

  Casual sex accompanied by morality guilt.

the beast

pain- -comfort- -ORGASM

GUILT --serenity- -SEX

desire - -emptiness --fulfillment

beauty

  Casual sex by an accomplished adult.

the beast

pain- -comfort- -ORGASM

depression- -serenity- -SEX

desire- -emptiness - -fulfillment

beauty

 Those few lovemakers.

the beast

pain- -comfort--ORGASM

depression- -serenity- -ELATION

desire- -emptiness - -LOVEMAKING

 beauty

 What of my friend who died of rage?

 Sometimes understanding is served by rearranging the map.

 Anxiety is dimensional confusion. Sensual anxiety is to confuse pain and pleasure without comfort. Emotional anxiety is to confuse elation and depression without serenity. Spiritual anxiety is to confuse desire and fulfillment without emptiness. This changes the two-dimensional lines into directional vectors.

In anxiety this;

the beast

pain -  -comfort- -pleasure

depression -- serenity- -elation

desire - -emptiness --fulfillment

beauty

changes to this

the beast

 comfort- -pleasure/pain-

 serenity- -elation/depression-

 emptiness - -fulfillment/desire-

beauty

 Since dimensional confusion is anxiety, the map becomes the following.

This is to live in fear.

the beast

 -comfort- -anxiety -

 -serenity- -anxiety -

 -emptiness - -anxiety -

Beauty

This is rage.

the beast

 -comfort- -ANXIETY -

 -serenity- -ANXIETY -

 -emptiness - -ANXIETY -

beauty

Morphine or heroin properly administered.

the beast

pain- -COMFORT--pleasure

depression--serenity- -elation

desire- -emptiness --fulfillment

beauty

Prozac or marijuana properly administered.

the beast

pain- -comfort- -pleasure

depression--SERENITY- -elation

desire- -emptiness- -fulfillment

beauty

Ritalin properly administered or peyote religiously administered.

the beast

pain- -comfort - -pleasure

depression--serenity-  -elation

desire-  -EMPTINESS- -fulfillment

beauty

Too much of a drug.

the beast

pain- -COMFORT- -pleasure

depression--SERENITY- -elation

desire- -EMPTINESS- -fulfillment

beauty

Withdrawal from too much of a drug

the beast

PAIN --comfort --PLEASURE

DEPRESSION- serenity- -ELATION

DESIRE - -emptiness --FULFILLMENT

beauty

causing dimensional confusion becoming rage

the beast

 -comfort- -ANXIETY -

 -serenity- -ANXIETY –

 -emptiness - -ANXIETY -

beauty

event

They called it suicide, but it killed my friend.

**A Therapy**

The method is to introduce the novice to taste, then teach them how to find their own. Metaphorically, the novice will learn to write his fragments in a safe environment.

 The novice makes a list of words that describe his feelings and places them on the feelings map where he thinks they belong. The list should be neither long nor short. Stop when you are done. Think about them enough so that you feel you know what they mean but not so much as to become tedious. As a guideline, be done in fifteen minutes.

 Meet with the dendocky group. (A group of two to seven people who love each other consisting of novices, journeypeople, and observers; such that the novices never outnumber the journeypeople.

 Observers are important people in the novice's life requested by a novice.

 Express respect and love. Bowing, nodding, smiling and words of greeting are appropriate. Teasing and loud noises are not.

 Bow respectfully to each other. Drink water together. Invite God (god), named as the novice names God, to join us. Make eye contact. Begin the healing. If you wish, use any appropriate relaxation instructions such as focus on breathing or muscle relaxation et al.

 Move your feelings to the map’s center (comfort, serenity, emptiness). If you are a journeyperson, get out of the way. If you are the novice, let yourself be overcome (by god). Allow the eye contact to melt into comfort, serenity, and emptiness. Short sentences are appropriate. Fragments are appropriate.

 Ending is done by the novice. To end simply see with your eyes into my eyes. Break any physical contact. Raise the water and toast thanking God for his (the gods for their) help. Bow respectfully to each other.

 Place any of the words made clear to you on your feelings map. Repeat.

 When the novice’s unwanted condition is gone or his wanted condition established, it is expected he be a journeyperson for someone else.

Fragments

**Reconstruction. the trip up. 1976**

Rip context from content till angels run on demons’ wings.

Rip a dog’s yell.

Hope a cloud’s rain.

Live a stone’s throw.

Hammer vicariously upon lodestone to find any way.

The stroke is static,

music without sound,

words without object,

sight with only vision.

Freeze in the breath of olive trees caused for need of energy.

Woo a seed to grow.

Piss from an airplane’s view.

Forget death.

Wonder life.

Reek of onion odorless till nothing smells but everything emits.

a closet’s heat,

a broken pen,

a living heart.

Sometimes you must go South until it becomes North.

Either the world is going to change, or I will. Having a choice, I think it had better.

May I never miss the pain in life.

May I never miss its pleasures.

May I never miss the longing of its past, its present or its future.

May I take it by its becoming.

I would as often be incredible as credible.

Whether you make a joyous sound unto the lord or a joyous sound within the universe,

it hears as the croak of bumping shoulders passed with laughter.

Know your past.

Learn your rhythms.

Alter one thing at a time.

Do it again.

In war there is offense.

In peace there is defense.

To win you must be on the offensive.

Is the point of living to win or to play?

To see yourself your curiosity must be greater than your fear.

Learning is the sparkles in the sky, the continuous pops of news.

Knowing is tedious.

I tell myself stories without ever determining their truth.

Truth is the value we place on a selection of the rationale that is in our taste.

You are taught to want peace.

Left alone you would want life.

I am addicted to food.

Should I try to eat less of it?

I am addicted to life...

When I want to use something, I read the directions.

When I want to enjoy something, I play with it.

Those that wonder have taste.

Those that know have talent.

I would serve taste above talent.

Take pride from living as the person you admire.

Beware of taking pride from thinking you are the person you admire.

That I believe of myself I believe of others I believe of myself.

Others might feel the same.

There is a conspiracy of nice people.

The commonness of the conspiracy is their desire to give.

Sometimes the difference between telling your best guess or the truth as it serves you

is that which you choose to give away to the universe.

On an occasion of grief remember to grieve.

At times I believe I live without protest.

At times I believe I live with protest.

It would be atrocious to know.

It appears at times that I plot and scheme, yet having done everything by chance,

I believe the appearance is a deception.

I have a passion.

It is not of my flesh.

It is of myself.

Be proud of your attributes.

Let each pride be onto its own attribute.

This is a way people count.

I seem to flavor in that which surrounds me.

When you need, you fear.

When you want, you wonder.

I believe I am abnormal and plan to enjoy all of it.

I know other people by knowing myself.

I need nothing.

I want much...

well...

Nothing is a great deal to need.

Though I am bound by my agreements I will feel free to argue for replacements.

If everybody is doing it does that make it more wrong or more right?

It begs the issue of thought in favor of doing.

A free man plans what he will do next.

A slave plans what he will do.

Amorality is to not consider many interesting questions.

Morality is to demand doing.

Between the two is taste, a topic of acceptable conversation.

There is a reason to speak well.

It is to communicate.

Quiet.

Do not frighten away the sound of the meek.

I wish to hear the wind and the squeak of the ice in the trees and the bird sounds.

Grandeur is a part of life frequently missed by those made peaceful.

Only one question answers itself by itself,

“What is the question?”

Similarity builds comfort builds peace.

Difference builds curiosity builds life.

I live as an example of what I wish to be,

and discover I am an example by having been.

To have a bloodless useful revolution, be an example.

I slap my own hand as gently as I can tolerate.

Your choice is as big as your ability to create possible considerations.

I am part of an identity perpetuated by birth.

It is called humanity.

Morality is leaving something for the universe.

Pursue ethics, morality, and virtue not as a quest, but for the way of it.

To preserve the spirit, it is better to be natural than more.

If we each do our part, all will be done.

I will attempt to find faith from hope through prayer.

I do not know whether meditation and prayer yield fact or fiction.

They are the fabrics of my faith.

**thoughts**

**The steps of life**

 Curiosity, identity, family, discovery, knowledge, wisdom, wonder are the steps of life. Some people skip some steps. Some people stop and stay in a specific step.

The age of curiosity

A child is born curious. Being curious the child touches, tastes, hears, smells, and sees everything available to him. Having no witness (life experience) the baby is undisciplined and free to discover his body and environment.

The child's needs are all cared for by family. With the help of mother, sucking produces food produces satisfaction. The habit of sucking is formed. Many habits are formed in the same way.

Children are given freedom within safe and convenient bounds. For safety's sake the child is not allowed to chew on electrical cords. For convenience’s sake the child must learn to sleep through the night. For curiosity’s sake the child is allowed to chew all kinds of stuff that's not dangerous during the day. Except for curiosity, family members (most often his mother) have complete authority over him.

All the first words are understood basically. Everything he is told he knows is true. There is little contradiction in what he is told. He has attitudes and behaviors and very few (if any) considerations. When he asks questions, he is given one answer and one rationale. He has no need to consider. His dominant attitude is to get what he wants.

Broadly, the individual believes that everything he senses and hears is true. What he knows is without consideration. Because he does not consider alternatives, he makes no judgment. What he knows is before judgment; that is, pre-judgment; that is, prejudice. It differs from grace in that it has the cause of hearing or sensing. Grace is without cause while prejudice is with cause.

 The child's next environment is the school. The teacher establishes greater external discipline making the environment feel safe. She is a new authority.

Now there is a peer group of equals. Being curious and safe, they are fun. From the lips of a peer, he hears a contradiction to one of his truths.

Somehow, he becomes aware that it is a contradiction. Being curious and aware, he considers (he thinks). If the consideration lies outside his discipline, he chooses one view over another or expands his discipline. He may choose to believe the peer as an authority, or he may choose to believe a specific truth. If the consideration is within his discipline, driven by his internal curiosity, he continues to consider the accuracy of the authority and the specific truth. This is the beginning of judgment.

Practicing curiosity becomes consideration. Through consideration he discovers that other people have different beliefs. Through consideration he can put himself in their shoes. If he tries to think like they think he not only considers their ideas, but he may become considerate of the authority of others. He may even become considerate of others. This is beauty coming into being.

But the maturation clock is ticking. Beauty only gets a beginning.

The age of identity

 Along comes puberty and drives the child into becoming a girl or boy.

 It manifests as obsessive-compulsive behavior. Without discipline it would be a disorder. He needs to know who he is. He needs to know what he wants. He must find an identity.

To find his identity he tries on the identity of others. One week your teenager dresses and behaves one way, in the next week another. Considerations are resolved by arguments, some internal. Advice to parents; when your teenager becomes unbearable be grateful you don't have to be one again.

 The burden of constant consideration forces judgments. He chooses which rationales to believe. Eventually boys and girls find themselves and what they want in a mate; they find their ego, an identity shaped by curiosity, maturation, and environment. It is an identity arrived at through consideration and judgment.

The beast, the need to procreate, has come alive. The beast justifies his actions according to Nietzsche's, “if you have the power, then you have the right “. But reward and punishment (external discipline) have shaped the beast. If successful, the beast is obedient to the more powerful yielding authoritative order.

 With the beast the fit of us survives. There is selection before procreation. The beast is the idiot who serves the id, his base taste, and, in its service, survives.

 From the age of curiosity, beauty expressed as the need to relate, survives.

 From the balance between the need to have sex and the need to relate (beauty and the beast) comes love. Then time consuming family interrupts the investigation of the self.

Some remain self-centered and self-absorbed, never surrendering to the need to relate (teenagers forever).

The age of family

 Families (with exceptions) have babies. Then this happens. You're running a little late, your wife calls and tells you she will not be home from work until late so that you must buy some chips for a party that starts at eight. You must pick up your son from soccer practice at six. You must drop off your daughter for lacrosse practice at 5:45.

The functioning family has little time for much else. Behavior is dominated by routine (habits). Attitudes are fixed. Consideration is disciplined because there is no time for new thoughts.

 The couples act out the roles learned from their culture during the age of identity including the highly time-consuming roles of bread winning and child rearing. They come to feel they belong with each other and their children in their defined roles in their defined society.

 In families their beliefs remain fixed because they are busy raising their children. Whatever authorities they respected they continue to respect. It is an intellectually stagnant time.

 Some couples do not have children. Some others do not find mates. They find a substitute obsession. Some become saints, politicians, pet owners, workaholics, alcoholics, sexaholics, over eaters, adventurers, et al. Some may even become obsessed by discovery. They play out the identity they have chosen.

 With or without children many people never leave the age of family. Whether happy or sad with their life they choose to stay there forever. A hundred years ago, few people lived past the age of family.

Eventually the family is grown and/or the obsession is satisfied or climaxed. There is time to think and consider and discover. Sometimes there is a lot of consideration and sometimes just a little.

The age of discovery

What can you do with freedom? You can reconsider.

The process of discovering, used throughout their life, is noticed, appreciated, and used. Everything from art to physical intimacy is rediscovered and reconsidered. Everything is discovered to have an essence of beauty.

 In contrast to the age of identity where you knew little to nothing, you now have a history of witness. You see contradictions. There are competing authorities. There are competing rationales. Rather than copying the conclusions of authorities, you think for yourself.

It is a time of reconsideration, the time to look at your past and reflect on what you wish your future to be. For those that find it in their taste, appreciation of beauty and enlightenment are reestablished. For those that find it in their taste, greed is established. For most there is a new balance between beauty and the beast.

 Discipline is redistributed and/or reduced. There is experimentation within new boundaries. There is more variety of behavior. Attitudes change. Reconsideration creates doubt. Doubt changes absolute truths to best guesses. Self-judgments are made. Unwanted obsessive-compulsive behaviors are displaced, replaced, eliminated, or disciplined.

There are many results. Divorces happen, not all bad. New careers begin, not all good. Midlife crises happen, not all bad. New religious convictions are discovered, not all good.

The need for order leads to the need for discipline leads to the habit of doubting our doubts. If we understand the process, we can once again walk in another's shoes for in doubting our doubts we had to have embraced another view.

 The need to make sense of the discoveries develops understanding. Understanding turns discovery into knowledge.

 What else can you do with freedom? There are things to see and do. For as long as our bodies hold up, memories can be built. Old disciplines can prevail. You need not reconsider. You can skip the age of discovery. Many do.

The age of knowledge

 If you live long enough and see enough things, you believe you know things. You do.

After witnessing years of rainfall, you know the water flows downhill. After reading many books, you know the water flows to the ocean. After teachers explain it to you, you understand the water cycle. After giving respect to selected authorities, you know that carbon dioxide emissions are having a bad effect on the water cycle even if you don't understand the arguments.

 Some people learn and remember by organizing what they know. They know a lot generally, though they may be weak on specifics. An organized memory makes them more efficient. They take pride in what they know. Their considerations become more disciplined to preserve their pride and their efficiency.

 Some people learn predominantly by rote rather than organization. Because they practice little reconsideration their beliefs are strengthened during the age of knowledge. After having copied the reasons of others, what were prejudices become judgments. They take pride in their learned arguments and judgments. Their considerations become more disciplined to preserve their pride and help their memory.

 They incorporate knowledge into their lives. With well bounded considerations, fixed attitudes, and habitual behavior they feel pride when they share what they know with others.

Eventually most people discover and acknowledge their own mistakes. The belief in what they know is diminished. They are humbled. Humility turns knowledge into wisdom.

 Most people have some beliefs without doubt. In these areas they never become wise, merely knowledgeable.

There are those who never acknowledge error. They have no humility. Without humility they never become wise.

The age of wisdom

 With time comes understanding of knowledge born of finding errors in your own guesses. Unlike knowledge, where there was a burden of disbelief to each opposing fact, with wisdom you can honestly extend the benefit of doubt. Doubt changes faith into hope and prejudice into judgment.

 Once you understand that knowledge is dependent upon yourself and gain tolerance for each individual understanding of the same knowledge you become wise. Wisdom requires understanding yourself and the world with doubt and respect.

 It is also possible to arrive at the age of wisdom without ever gaining knowledge. Discovery can be so fulfilling that judgment is not necessary. Hence there is always doubt and respect attached to every discovery. Being considerate becomes more important as being right becomes less important.

You begin to believe you have considered everything. Life becomes boring. You need new thoughts. The boundaries of consideration need expanding. But now the answers are unimportant. Questions are everything.

 Creating questions rather than answers turns wisdom into wonder.

The age of wonder

 After living long enough it becomes apparent that you cannot know or control anything. There is no choice but to trust in tomorrow. The smaller you make yourself the easier it is. The more peace in your heart, the more comfortable it is. Without the need for fear there is no fear. Finally, without fear it is enough to wonder.

 Wonder is the reward of fearless curiosity. I wonder what comes next.

The age of majesty

 The body and the mind are wearing out. Memories are confusing and contradictory. There are aches and pains. Disorientation is momentarily unpleasant.

 Trusting others to remember more accurately emerges as increased humility overcomes pride. Holding still in bed turns aches and pains into mere signals. Sometimes they seem completely gone. Trusting in the compassion of others relieves the embarrassment of disorientation.

 Yet, the spirit remains. With the ability to dream, watching a child play makes you feel playful. Dreaming through your past inspires gratitude. Being with others while dreaming intensifies love. It is magic that lacks any judgment. It feels as Buddhist emptiness salt and peppered by others with life.

 And you have the rest of your life.

Fragments

**Beginning to find my footing 1980**

The last winter leaf clings to its tree.

At the first moment of spring, it knows it is the only leaf to see a second summer.

It is then that it is pushed from its base by new growth.

As a leaf it is over.

As part of the tree, it is reborn.

As part of the earth, it is unchanged.

As part of the universe, it is eternal.

I only know up from down when my feet are on the ground.

Do one impossible thing at a time.

When I look at what I was I wonder why I ever changed from the image that I was.

Now older I so answer, and my answers are the reason why I wonder.

But while I wonder I forget that which I am and ask again,

when I look at what I was how did I wonder?

Live with what you have been, what you are, and what you will be.

The past alone is without change.

The present alone is without thought.

The future alone is without joy.

Without death what would there be to strike down each person equally?

The universe is the uncountable clustering of nothing.

Truth is the metaphor of the scientist.

A singularity is every place where mass enters or leaves our time.

Physics is the nonsense necessary to explain the simple.

A flower picked by a child given to a mother is beautiful.

A child who calls his mother to watch the flower grow destroys beauty by establishing greater beauty.

Remember yesterday’s beauty when you judge yesterday’s life.

Without thought I would be completely happy and, like the dinosaur, completely extinct.

As it is with each of us singularly, so it is with us collectively.

Maturity is determined by the point of view of the mature.

I love a good circular argument, especially one corrupted by use.

Secondhand knowledge builds loving minds.

Firsthand knowledge builds fearing saints.

There is only one choice, consideration.

Once considered destiny dominates.

I hate being a peacemaker for kids unless by some freak, they listen.

Then I hate being a peacemaker for kids.

Curiosity when analyzed can be answered by one statement.

“What?”, is the question.

The struggling man says that the grass is greener on the other side of the fence,

until he gets there and discovers it is.

It would take an hour to explain why free will and predestination coexist in every person.

Even then it would be rejected if unwanted.

So instead, I propose that we pretend to believe in this coexistence for this belief functions well, excluding neither.

My house is falling apart around me bit by bit,

not all at once but by gentle strokes,

reminding me that if I wanted my house could be preserved.

I would rather preserve other things.

If my eyes turned inward,

if taste regurgitated from my stomach,

if smell was odor from my lungs,

if my heart was constantly heard,

if the flow of blood were felt,

then exploring the world would be called introspection and nothing,

being backwards,

would be different.

I, being a student by belief rather than practice,

find the teacher to be my greatest enemy and the school to be his greatest tool.

I like learning.

I hate to be taught.

Knowledge is so elusive when thinking gains little and learning gains much.

Brainwashing is inescapable.

Fight to choose your soap.

Educated people think of answers.

Great people think of questions.

Simple people have questions.

I would rather be simple than greatly educated.

A good teacher teaches to make himself obsolete.

A good shaman shows how to heal oneself.

War is preserved by the hate of sons over lost fathers.

Revolutions, to be successful require,

no escape route,

personal oppression,

and more pain than fear.

Start a revolution!

Start listening.

To resolve the argument, I consider you have no choice and I have.

thoughts

**How people know the truth.**

"The truth" does not refer to a special group of people. Everyone with belief is a knower of the truth. It establishes the groups to which we feel loyalty. By understanding how people come to their beliefs, we might understand that reason is most often secondary to group loyalty. We are more often rational than reasonable. Since peacemaking conversation is between people from different groups, this is an important key to understanding.

We witness our life; that is, we pay attention to our thinking and doing. We use the left side and the right side of the brain to remember what we witness. We witness and remember by rote, and we witness and remember by considering how each specific truth is related to our past witness.

Because we just can't remember everything, we must make some decisions. We must judge some things are true to function.

We arrive at the truth in four ways.

We guess which always contains doubt. What you know with doubt is your best guess. It is always the result of consideration.

We believe what we are told without consideration. This requires either great naiveté, absolute belief in an authority or a lack of time or willingness to consider.

We have an epiphany establishing truth without doubt. It may be a single event, a series of similar events, a series of events that appears directed or even years and years of ongoing meditation experience.

We accept a truth overcoming our doubt by doubting our doubts according to the instruction of authority and our need for discipline. This is frequently strengthened by affirming a declaration. An affirmation simply insists that a declaration is true without doubt.

 This also considers humanity; that is, the knowers of the truth as integral to the truth. In all cases you either accept or you doubt.

 I witness my life. Some things I take for granted. Some things I think about. Some things I ignore. These things can be words, sensory observations, epiphanies, feelings, or combinations. My life is my witness.

The things I ignore I forget. They never become part of my witness.

The things I take for granted I call the truth. They become part of my witness. They are part of my attitudes. They influence my behavior.

The things I think about I call my considerations. They influence my attitudes and behaviors. They are the source of the changes that I can choose.

**Three kinds of belief**

postulating order to belief.

First, there is a belief with doubt. It is called your best guess. This kind of belief is the source of most principles.

The strength of your conviction, the importance of that conviction and the relevance of the conviction determines whether it is worth mentioning in peacemaking conversation. For example, if we are talking about abortion, then when your church believes life begins needs stating. Whether the icecaps are receding or not may be important, but it is not relevant. Who wins the World Series is not important to most people.

Then there are those weak convictions that give us so much trouble. Assume your church has a position on the damage done to the woman who has an abortion (vs. the woman who gives her child away). You agree predominantly because you are in the church, yet you have much doubt. It is important and it is relevant, but your conviction is weak. You have your best guess, but it is too weak to fit the category of truth. It is best to continue the consideration rather than declare that a weak conviction is a principle.

Second, there is the agreed to truth. It is called the common truth.

 Every common truth is only true within the group that accepts it. For example, a group that is debating abortion under the law may not agree that life begins at conception, but they can agree that most pro-lifers found their position on the belief that sanctified life begins at conception.

 Third, there is the truth without doubt. It is called the absolute truth.

As an example, assume that you and I just shared a slice of apple pie. We both agree that we just shared a slice of apple pie. Because we agree, it is a common truth. Because we have no doubt, it is an absolute common truth between us.

Bob enters the room and asks us who ate the slice of apple pie. We tell him. The three of us have a common truth but Bob did not witness the eating and has a slight doubt (maybe he saw someone else eating a slice of apple pie and knows we are forgetful). Common truth is enough.

 In some cases, some people feel the common truth is not enough. They point out that there is something about the absolute nature of God. A translation of the “Tao Te Ching, One” agrees with this view;

One

“The Tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao.

The name that can be named is not the eternal name.

The nameless is the beginning of heaven and earth.

The named is the mother of ten thousand things.

Ever desireless, one can see the mystery.

Ever desiring, one can see the manifestations.

These two spring from the same source but differ in name...”

My taste agrees with their taste and there are no words to describe it. I do not deal with this absolute truth. I feel there is no need. Herein lies the problem.

**The trouble with the truth**

 Belief does not refer to a special group of people. We all have beliefs.

Our groups define the common truths to which we feel loyalty. By understanding how people come to their beliefs, we might understand that reason is most often secondary to group loyalty. We are more often rational than reasonable. This is an important understanding in peacemaking conversation.

There is no universal common absolute truth because there is no one commonly accepted absolute authority. There is no universal common truth because there exist mutually exclusive absolute truths. Hence there is no universal tenet.

This neither denies nor accepts universal absolute truth. As already stated, I do not deal with universal absolute truth.

Illustrations of “truth”

 “If a person jumps off a 40-story building that is surrounded by a concrete parking lot without the support of aids (such as a parachute), then he will die. “Is this a universal common truth?

There is probably a person (maybe he lives in an institution) who believes that he will fly rather than die (maybe he believes in time of need his angel will save him). Therefore, though it may be a broadly accepted common truth, it is not universal.

I would point out that Galileo recanted from his outrageous lie that “the earth is round”. Galileo was a minority of one and comparable to a man who thinks he can fly. What has changed is that the size of the group believing Galileo’s truth has greatly increased in recent years.

 A wealth of scientific “facts” falls into this category. The size of the group believing determines the relative strength of the truth rather than the validity of the truth. That remains a judgment of each individual.

 A second illustration believed by most children, “Santa Claus brings Christmas gifts. “There probably was a Santa Claus, Saint Nicholas, who is credited with re-starting the fad of giving gifts at Christmas. So, there is a sense of truth in what most adults believe to be a literal lie. Besides, the children may be correct, and the adults have simply screwed up the whole matter.

Those that know they may be wrong about everything know that some man might be able to fly and that the children might be right about Christmas.

 Once again, going back to the beginning; how do people come to know the truth?

 "We accept authority overcoming our doubt by doubting our doubts according to the instruction of authority and our need for discipline." Almost everyone forms most of their beliefs in this fourth way.

**Discipline**

a parameter of belief

Discipline is the boundaries of what you are willing to think about, the boundaries of the conclusions your thoughts have led you to and the boundaries of what you are willing to do. That is; discipline is the boundaries of our considerations, attitudes, and behaviors.

Everything you ignore, have judged to be false, will not consider or won't do is outside your discipline. Everything else is inside your discipline.

To better understand the word, consider arithmetic as a discipline. If you add within the discipline, you get the same answer as everyone else. You think inside the box; that is, inside the discipline.

Discipline is essential. For example, after putting your finger in a gas flame once and considering the results you make the judgment not to do it again. If you did not make that judgment, you would burn yourself repeatedly. Your judgment has placed a boundary on your consideration (you will not consider putting your finger in the flame), your attitude (you believe you will burn yourself if you put your finger in the flame) and your behavior (you will not put your finger in the flame).

There is not enough time to consider everything. Your considerations are disciplined (bounded). A very realistic example: you're running a little late, your wife calls and tells you she will not be home from work until late so that you must buy some chips for a party that starts at eight. You must pick up your son from soccer practice at six. You must drop off your daughter for lacrosse practice at 5:45. You get a call from a pollster who asks you what you think of the new mayor. You hang up the phone without consideration.

Your attitudes are bounded by discipline. You do not find your beautiful sister sexually appealing. It is the result of the boundaries of your attitudes.

Your behaviors are bounded by discipline. With exception, you do not break the law.

If you consider nothing, habitually maintain your attitudes and act only through habit you are self-disciplined. Most of us go through periods of self-discipline. It is temporarily comfortable not to think. Self-discipline is the boundary of our considerations.

If you obey your boss, live within the law, believe what you read, and in general do as you are directed, then you respond to authority. That is, you are socially disciplined. Most of us are socially disciplined most of the time. Social discipline is the boundary our society places on our behavior.

If you consider everything, neither accept nor deny anything, behave according to the moment, and lack any fixed attitude, then you are undisciplined. Almost all of us have our undisciplined moments.

If you have complete discipline, you live with safety and without consideration. If you have no discipline, you live with complete freedom and danger (You would burn your finger in the gas flame repeatedly).

I wish to feel safe and have some freedom. Within my discipline I can consider all things. Within my discipline I can roam without fear. By not considering going outside of my discipline I feel safe. My range of action is reduced by my discipline for the sake of comfort. My new freedom, although reduced is more comfortable. I think inside the box. I do not think outside the box.

But thinking is fun. Sometimes I will choose to reconsider my discipline. I will become momentarily undisciplined. I will think outside the box.

Habits anchor discipline. Habit reduces consideration of action outside of our discipline. If you act completely out of habit, you never consider change. Initially habits are the result of conforming to the forces and morality within our environment.

To develop discipline form habits. First do the deed, then do the deed again, and again, and again... until the thought of not doing the deed disappears. After this happens you have a habit of doing the deed.

When faced with a consideration do not do the deed, then at the next consideration do not do the deed, and again, and again... until the consideration of doing the deed disappears. Now you act out of habit, that is you act without consideration. You have self-discipline.

If you continue a behavior long enough, it affects your feelings. An example, you work at a food bank which makes you feel good which encourages you to work at the food bank. You have an attitude of charity. Your feelings discipline your attitudes.

**Class**

a Hindu view, a parameter of belief, a social order

Although religious and government institutions attempt to establish and maintain “peaceful “ order, the population remains compliant to peace predominantly because it is immersed in social order.

Unlike the classical Hindu view where you cannot change the caste into which you were born, I refer to class rather than caste. It is possible to change your class. In the U.S. all people are born with equal rights under the law.

The Brahmin Class. The Brahmin growing up in leisure has a chance for enlightenment. His enlightenment gives him a sense of morality. The most orthodox Brahmin’s behavior is self-disciplined to eliminate distraction from enlightenment. Hence, he lives in poverty, is obedient to enlightenment, and exercises no authority over others. He lives off the alms of others. His enlightenment leads to morality.

The Ruling Class. The ruling class grows up in a socially disciplined environment of reward and punishment that does not overshadow freedom. Society succeeds when the ruling class rules disciplined by law and Brahmin morality. The most orthodox ruler lives in luxury, is not ostentatious, and applies his authority with ethics.

The professional class. The professional class grows up in a disciplined environment heavily influenced by reward due to their own competence at success. Among their duties is the creation of ethical law. Ethics are applied pragmatic (Brahmin) morality. They feel successful rather than free. Society succeeds when the professional class does the intellectual work without excessive greed. The most orthodox professional lives in enough luxury to be motivated to continue to obey authority.

The working class. The working class grows up in a disciplined environment heavily influenced by punishment due to their own incompetence at success. Society succeeds when there is enough abundance that the working class has its leisure filled with enough pleasant activity that they continue to obey the law as specified by the professional class and demanded by the ruling class and continue to work. The most orthodox worker prefers to obey authority rather than be punished.

The untouchable class. The untouchable class grows up rejecting discipline. They are free. Society succeeds when they are contained, either in prisons, or through shunning, or by their own chosen separation from the other classes. The most orthodox untouchable is kind enough not to hurt others. As they are the victims of vengeance, they are the source of revolution. As they are free, they are our artists.

Note that the untouchable class and the Brahman class can be easily mistaken for each other. Hindu order goes full circle.

The reality is that every person is in part within every class. For example, I get up and look out the window. I know it's going to rain (Brahman). I tell my mate it looks like rain (professional). I tell my children to wear their boots (ruler). I pack everyone's lunch (worker). I sneak a doughnut (untouchable). I am loyal to my mate. I had a little trouble when I was young but hard knocks straighten me out.

This person might describe themselves behaviorally untouchable, morally professional, and historically a worker.

The reality is also that every person generally fits predominantly in one class. If you are a monk, you are a Brahman. If you manage a business with employees, you are a ruler. If you are an architect, you are a professional. If you work on an assembly line, you are a worker. If you are a sole proprietor, you are untouchable.

Class is a tool of understanding how and where you fit in the social structure. It peacefully disseminates authority without the appearance of authority.

 In judging the importance of the truth. accept people with grace, give their beliefs the benefit of doubt, feel yourself human, and both like and love fates unfolding. That is accept people, tolerate ideas, love life, and cherish fate.  To limit this to within your own chosen group is less than filled.  It is not that the prophets were wrong but rather there is more right.

fragments

**Learning that I am common.**

Every morning I get up just at the time I did before.

Every evening I start sleeping at the time I start to bore.

All the moments in the middle I do over every day.

But you know it took me years to lay the moments out this way.

I have lost my problems.

It’s not that they don’t exist,

I just can’t find them.

Ask, what is the question, rather than what is the answer.

I once believed in argument for the sake of truth.

Now I believe in transparency for the sake of understanding for the sake of peace on earth.

We are idiots getting civilized.

Tolerate ideas.

Accept people.

Love life.

Cherish fate.

It’s not everything I believe.

It’s believing in everything.

Praying is one of the fun things.

I did things.

I did things with God’s help.

I helped God do things.

Fate unfolded.

I wondered.

With wonder questions are fulfilling.

I cherished.

I still do things but it’s different.

In dealing with hypocrites remember two things,

the hypocrite believes his lie is true,

and

You may be one.

If the wise man gains his fame from the questioning idiot,

then where is the knowledge contained?

Tolerance is a rest stop on the path to acceptance.

Tolerance is a stop at the heart on the way to the groin.

If you take your work personally you will fail happily.

If you take your work objectively you will succeed miserably.

Old people are kind, tender and smile a lot.

That’s what I want to be when I grow up.

By being the best of yourself there is room for even better.

The efficiency of giving words is you get to keep them as well.

Curiosity is answered with a question.

People speak with authority when time does not permit explanation or when they have none.

A thought before its time passed to me by others before its discovery builds not.

That thought which is discovered in its own time has image and meaning.

It’s nice to have a reason.

That’s why we invent them.

An honest man is often only a man guilty of being bright enough to protect his honest image.

Quiet.

The neighbors might notice something beautiful!

The good father tries to build what he wants and wants to build something better.

The good society develops from the father who isn’t sure what he wants.

If we pretend to believe in lies, our students are pushed to live by them.

This is neither good nor bad, but convenient to liars.

Dependence has picked up a bad name.

In life settle for less than all you can get and gain by what you give away.

An oft told lie makes the truth sound ridiculous.

The man who swears to always tell the truth puts a burden on us both.

If you want to find out if a man is a liar, believe him.

If you are ashamed without guilt, write upon the walls and your honesty will resolve itself.

Honesty is an exaggeration in the mind of a man’s defined view of his rationalization of reality.

If you try to tell the truth actively you take your best guess even if you must appear a liar.

If you try to be honest instead it passively causes you to conceal yourself in an attempt not to lie.

There is no such thing as the truth,

but let us attempt to preserve trust from one person to another by striving for as much consistency between talk and action as practical.

They say that life on earth will perish with the cooling of the sun

if people cannot learn to live in confinement with each other,

with gentle resolve of personal conflict,

with tolerance and

massive charity instead of justice.

People learn fastest when most necessary.

Therefore, being impatient myself, let the sun cool!

event

Cancer happened. I was confronted with the frailty of my life. Solutions were not political but personal. Saving the world was not a matter of politics but as living as the person I wished to become. Besides, the world did not need saving but rather I needed the purpose of saving the world.

Sometimes two steps back.

thoughts

**The significance of death**

\_ When a rock brakes or a man dies his identity cannot be touched as a hand touches, yet he can still be touched from behind my eyes where his identity lives. Having never died I do not know what I will feel.  What I guess is only the end of an identity no more moving than a man leaving town for the one universe is unchanged.  I only observe it differently.  Death is only destruction.

 What is destruction?  To live requires the destruction of identity.  Some destruction, like the breaking of a rock, is of less consideration, and some, like the killing of yourself, is of greater consideration.  In the consideration of both, there can be much joy. Merely breathing destroys the identity of oxygen and produces the identity of carbon dioxide.

 Then to live you must destroy.  There is, as with all things, a continuum of significance to destruction even from the point of view of all things.  The more at one with the universe you are the larger is your chosen group of identities until by only breathing you can note the destruction of identity without affecting the existence of the universe and know that you will be one with the universe even if you are destroyed.  In the meantime, to observe the destructions that create your identity gives the joy of feeling alive.  To know that within the universe there is death for you is to feel the flattery of the universe toward yourself.

 Every man has the right to take, but by not using so much I feel the joy of giving whether it is not to kill a person or to break a stone.  I spend time considering myself in the universe.

 I feel wealthy because I possess the universe.  I covet only what I use which leaves plenty for the universe.  Since I have plenty to give away, I seldom feel taken.

 Breaking things repulses me so I try to learn to give away what is stolen as graciously as I can. For in the end the universe will still be there and as part of it I go on. My entity will be gone but it wasn’t special.  It is now and that is enough. Breaking things is killing.  Killing is necessary to be so breaking things is necessary to be.

 When another covets something I covet, I am filled with the challenge of learning to give.  When I see myself progressing toward giving, I am increased. I feel the wealth of the man who possesses everything and is not threatened.

 It is interesting that in the Hindu Geta and the Jewish Torah, without reference to any heaven, life is ongoing.

Event. With cancer came impotence

Fragments

**Beauty and the beast, focus on beauty**

 I was an idiot trying to procreate.

Without this nature humanity would cease to exist.

Egotism is the necessity of procreation.

 With impotence there is still something about myself that I like.

 I am an idiot trying to get civilized.

Vanity is my ego’s facade.

Life on earth is blessed with passion.

Peace is a good rest.

Shame is the anxiety felt when concealing a behavior.

When the behavior is wrong, the shame is also guilt.

Guiltless shame is anxiety felt when concealing a natural behavior.

Removing the behavior and mending the damage can end guilt.

Judging the behavior natural and exposing it to everyone can end guiltless shame.

My taste for hope frees me from my will

except when it does not.

My taste for hope frees me from conflict giving me comfort

except when it does not.

Inaction frees me from choice.

Yet life is for living.

Throw the dice, choose, judge, act, will, take.

 Unlike will, taste is always mine.

 It is the essence of my identity.

Get help, conform, hope, believe, reconstruct, and live as the person you wish to become.

Upon the removal of judgment tolerance becomes acceptance.

Accept people.

Tolerate their ideas.

 To have humility is to listen and accept that what is heard can be true.

To have pride and humility is to talk and listen rather than teach and/or learn.

          When humility is added to knowledge the result is wisdom.

Hence the wise man knows he may be wrong about everything and is without knowledge.

The burden of knowledge is rigidity for each fact blocks the wisdom that truth is and is not.

 Knowledge is about what was.

Wisdom is about what may be.

I hope I love.

I don’t know that I do.

I say I love.

I don’t know if it’s true.

In love it is enough to wonder.

Love is made in the first touch of magic in the universe,

 the clustering.

Love is the feeling of being touched while touching.

Grace.

The free lunch.

Find grace through thanksgiving.

Thanksgiving is lovemaking.

Give me hope and I will dream again.

I live as the man I wish to become.  In this way I save the world.

The creation of order begins with the universe, and ends with myself.

thoughts

**Epiphany, God, and all that.**

There are as many choices as there are moments.

First you choose the faith you are given. How might we view the Godhead? There may be a unity (no matter how you look at it there is one God). There may be a trinity (There are only three ways to look at God.   They are views of God as creator, human being, and spirit.). There may be an infinity (No matter what you look at it, it is only a view of everything).

 I belong to a group that changes the definition of God to a power greater than me.

 Yet in your choosing you live within fate unfolding (God is the human manifestation of the unification of all fate unfolding).  Your choosing is your expression of everything.  It is not a matter of control.  Fate (sometimes called God) is in control.

 Have you had a moment of doubt? Not Allah, God, Jesus, or Buddha would damn you for it. If you accept that moment with wonder rather than fear, you will share a common wonder with other faiths.  There will be a bridge to peace. If you find you live with the morality and ethics of other faiths though the motivation is different there can be love between you for you live in a common way.

 After you accept that you have no control you will find it easier to get peace in your heart.  After you find materialism and winning unimportant, you will be able to make yourself small.  With humility will come wisdom, then wonder.

 As fate unfolds you will see your taste.  You will like fate unfolding.

 As fate unfolds you will know you are part of fate.  You will know you belong in fate. You will feel the belonging and call it love. Driven by fearless curiosity you will wonder about what comes next.  You will like and love fate.  Although you will keep your faith as it belongs within you by cherishing fate, absolute knowing will become unnecessary. Wonder will be enough. With wonder all paths have hope for all paths might be true.

 We come to the realization that we are part of everything and that everything is grander than humanity.  This is the love of everything.  This is the love of that what is no matter how you call it.  It sits in the background yet cherished more than life.

 If you believe in cause and effect, then you believe in karma.  If you believe in creation, which is that something can start from nothing, then you believe in grace.  I witness that grace and karma have both been active in my life. It can be thought that those who escape karma live in grace.

**Love life and Cherish fate.**

**Love life.**

 “Love one another even as your father in heaven loves you”.  This may be too much to ask.  We hurt each other and have a fear of being hurt. Through preservation we choose who to trust.  Through greed we select fun people who agree with us.  It is a beginning.

 You can choose where, when and with whom you wish to feel.  In this way you let your taste, your likes and dislikes dictate love. That is, you only feel a shared feeling when conditions are met. You love a specific alternative conditionally.

 How are love and like (conditional love) different?  A dog lover loves his dog no matter how he behaves.  The dog is accepted as he is.  On the other hand, in making friends we choose them based on their behavior.  We choose friends that we like.  Love has little to do with it.

 The lesson of Jesus was that we should love one another the way we love our dog.  We should even love our enemies the way we love our dog.

 Going one step farther, we should love all dogs the way we love our dog. This is as it should be with people, dogs, our self, life, and everything.  This requires accepting without choosing.

 Intimacy with a concept or object (god, a dog, life) is easier than intimacy with a person.  Trusting that which is understood to the extent that there are no surprises makes trusting a concept easier than trusting a person.  Hence it is easier to love God, a dog, or life than another person.  The hurt a person might deliver to you cannot be fully anticipated because people are real (therefore inconsistent), and concepts are ideal (therefore consistent).

 “Love one another even as your father in heaven loves you”.  This feeling, the feeling that you are part and belong there, is the feeling of belonging. And you are more than just human.  You are part with everything.  When you touch, you feel touched.  As feeling is the reward for living you feel life. This is what it means to love life.

**Cherish fate (or a specific alternative such as God).**

 “Without fear it is enough to wonder.”

The events of life find you thankful. Without fear you expect more of the same. You like fate.

 Not only do you like fate, but you also believe you are part of fate. You feel this belonging, the feeling of love. There is no fear of fate (Tao, God, et. al.)  ending.  You believe with doubt and without fear.  This is what it means to cherish fate.

**more from the tree 8/31/2003**

 What did I feel when I visited tree today? Comfort, serenity, and fulfillment.

 We could not talk in words. It gets easier to be wordless with tree. Tree lacks ignorance.

I was filled with questions. Wonder is to be filled with questions without anxiety. It is elating. The self-flattery is possibly a matter of vanity.

 I thought again of the importance of questions, of thought, of consideration. This is the place that gives me much feeling. When I answer a question, the consideration becomes an attitude. Rather than behavior and attitude it is thought where change is easiest manifest. It may be the source of all anxiety.

 Rather a map of questions opens a realm of feeling that can be manipulated. For example, I feel depressed when I question my country's war making. If I don't ask, then I am not depressed by my country's war making. If I ask, then answer, I feel an attitude of shame in being a citizen of the United States. It is all a matter of vanity. This brings to me the thought that understanding vanity is a prerequisite to exchanging my feelings with others. Tree understands this. Lacking ignorance tree is without judgment.

**Steps to change**

Locate the bothersome idea. Make a list of all the questions you have about the bothersome idea. Don't bother to answer the questions. Rather place the questions on the feelings map where they belong.

What did the tree teach me about feelings? Tree taught me that the desire to be part is ever satisfied.

**Event** A narrative (with editing) as it was revealed to me in meditation with Tree. 2003-2006

**Vanity, choice, majesty, and love.**

 I negotiated with a bug that was in my space today.

 Giving acceptance allows freedom to others.  If you find a bug in your house the problem is that you have judged the house yours. Because I fear snakes, I cannot accept snakes in my house. Judged differently the bug and the snake could live in the house, and all have freedom.

 When I do not judge anything mine. I sit among friends.

 It is a beautiful day.  Yet the beauty is the emptiness.  By accepting but not possessing the emptiness I sit among friends.

10/3/2003

 Emptiness is without vanity and sensation.  Yet by naming the place my own self-importance brings vanity to me.

 Before Lao Tsu was asked to write the Tao Te Ching, Tao was unnamed. By doing as described in the Tao Te Ching Two, "work is done, then forgotten”, he may have escaped vanity.  Having desire, I do not.

 By being named emptiness is communicated even though by being named it is lessened.  Reality lies in the named as in “The theory of unity and the axiom of choice “.  It quantifies and qualifies the unbounded Essence into finite subsets of the All.

10/6/2003

 I am not ready to be holy (or empty called hole or whole) for I desire to express myself. This serves my vanity.

 I am not happy.  I am not sad.  Mostly I am serene.  Yet I have desire, not just for fulfillment, but for self-expression from which would come elation and depression. And this is vanity.

 The tree has taught me emptiness.  The tree has taught me I lack emptiness. The theory of unity and the axiom of choice taught me I lack emptiness by my own choosing.  I choose by naming.

 I came to sit with tree today filled with different food.  I have eaten fats, proteins, and carbohydrates rather than fiber.  I witness a change in my whole body.  I feel bloated (bloated lies between pain and comfort).

 It is my responsibility to pay attention to my body. Responsibility is a desire to please myself. It is a vanity. I live in vanity.  I live in the All.

**To be part as in love or part of it all?**

 I came to tree with an agenda of peace and negation. Vanity was interfering.  To add to it people appeared. The people were like the worm that frightened me by its presence.  I could not move them aside with a stick like I had done with the worm.  My communion is fragile, yet my witness is real.

 I recalled last Saturday asking a friend (who also is a priest) to touch me on my sore neck and feel grateful.  I recalled that I prayed for a friend under the knife on Monday afternoon.  I recalled Tuesday afternoon telling a friend (who also is a shaman) that I was putting aside developing my healing skills (for now).  I recalled that healing and miracles were in the Tao group conversation.  I have witnessed a series of low probability events, this after putting aside the desire to heal.

 Through my vanity they are related. Through my vanity I see them as beautiful. Through vanity I view healing as moral.  Through spirituality I view healing as amoral.  This is one small part of my vanity.

**Choosing my groups**

 There are two choices upon which I place importance.  They are me, and everything. The essence of everything and the essence of myself are the same. The path from myself to everything through the manifestations is of my choosing. Then the path of all manifestations is circular connected through the essence.

 One continuum between everything and myself is the human path. I make judgments at every subset.  That which I do not consider I exclude.  This exclusion can be overcome by others bringing excluded people to my attention. Once I judge them as human, they become included. I might make a general judgment of the importance of humanity.  I might not.  In my case, I judge humanity important.

 I choose my groups.  I choose real groups. I choose according to my taste.  I choose to promote (a level of influence) the end of killing (a judgment) between people (the chosen group is humanity). This makes me opposed to war and capital punishment.  Because I doubt, I may change my mind.

 I might have chosen to violate (a level of influence) the oppressors (a judgment) of Americans (the chosen group is Americans).

 If I were to choose everything, then living would involve inescapable violation, for by eating the corn I violate the earth. If I hold very still, take the smallest sustenance, do nothing more than necessary for existence and judge nothing then I realize the Lao Tsu sage (as I choose to understand his poems).  I choose to live between the fodder and the sage.

 The emptiness, the abyss, the chaos, the essence of Tao is beautiful.  Its order, which also is itself, is called random. It is amoral. It is sensed in passing.

 The order of the All is said, manifested, created and always present.  It is the result of a process described in,” the Creation of Order“.  It is done using continuum, and betweeness (and more) to separate into finite units from the infinite abyss. The union of all units is the All of Tao. It is the existing world.

 Judgment lies within my manifested world. That which I do, I judge. It is a character in the All.

 To sense beauty, stay in the declaration but keep your doubt.  Declaration is the center. Doubt will remove judgment from declaration. Then, in contemplation (doing nothing) you will be without judgment/no judgment (called “principle “in “the creation of order”). With questions and without the need to judge you will be ready to feel the passing.  You will question without answer.  This is the beginning.

9/11/2004

 With desire to damp my political anger I visited tree.  I asked for comfort and serenity again and again.  But when it was time to say emptiness, I said majesty.

 I looked at the growth of tree as beauty and was struck by majesty.  In wonder I asked, “is majesty mistaken or true?”

 I noticed that rather than comfort I felt the pleasure of a gentle breeze.  Rather than serenity I was elated by vanity in the ease of which I laid aside my anger. Rather than emptiness my desire was fulfilled by majesty.  I asked “when majesty fulfills desire is emptiness gone? “

 When you have the vanity of an external God, then God’s touching gives majesty.  I touched the understanding of those who strive for peace as fulfillment rather than live within life. Like a drug you quickly lust for more.

 But Tao varies. It is enough to wonder.  It is to be more or less.

5/28/2005

 I began by speaking allowed.  I knew that by calling I was vain.  I noted that tree may not call. I put words aside and felt the breeze and smelled the odors. Without calling myself man I was tree and tree was I and we were everything.

 A fly landed upon my leg. I was wordless.  I did not feel his touch.  I was free to be the fly. I freely twitched and moved. I was fly, tree, myself, and everything.  Once again, I wondered, "Is majesty mistaken or true?"

 When I left, I hugged the tree as I always do.  I was hugged in return.

 From this I knew that it was not that I was in love with God but rather that I was living in love.  Only my vanity kept me apart.  My identity, my vanity, may be the only thing that ends with my death.

 Further, I knew that my vanity was the nature of myself.  It was my nature to embrace my vanity for as long as I live in the same way that I embraced the fly, without judgment.

Fragments

**Under the influence of Tao**

Is Tao essence or all?

Tao as named specifies.

Tao as manifested clarifies.

Tao as desired fulfills.

Unnamed, unmanifested and undesired Tao is essence.

Alone we are together.

Tree, me, and Tao.

Alone we are together with Tao.

This is the essence.

However, by naming (by saying “alone we are together”) I feel belonging.

This is vanity born of fulfillment.

Naming leads to desire leads to manifestation.

This is living.

This is the All.

That which I know I do not know.

This is Tao.

10/13/2003

Death is the essence of the witness of Tao, the hole.

To study Tao is to prepare for death.

Life is the All of Tao, the whole.

Life and death are the same.

They manifest at different times but view the same whole (hole?).

The Essence of Tao is without time.

The All of Tao is with all time.

 10/17/2003

Question without desire (to know) and wonder is fulfilling.

To question without desire is to wonder.

This wonder is fulfilling.

Then desire and fulfillment are balanced.

This is the beginning and the end.

This is bliss.

Yet it is less than essence.

It is balanced.

Anticipation is desire.

I wanted the tree to hug me back and it did not.

When I put this desire aside, I felt trees hug.

10/24/2003

The All of Tao, like the beast, is amoral.

The Essence of Tao is beauty.

 Life lies between them (see “feelings and a therapy”).

 It is felt.

Through desire I can be benevolent.

 Without desire I can only be wise.

 I am neither wise nor benevolent.

 Both have been put aside for wonder.

 Both are kept for vanity.  There is always more.

Rather than embracing Tao, live within it.

 Embrace the feeling of wonder and live.

 Be the fodder.

10/31/2003

What is the nature of touching?

(an embrace, a thought, a feeling, all linear combinations, Tao the All, Tao the Essence)

I wonder and am fulfilled.

Tao asks every question and answers none.

(See “reconstruction up, what is the question?”)

11/1/2003

What is the sound of one hand clapping?

Essence.

What is the sound of two hands clapping?

All.

There is no difference.

**tree**

Tree can talk!

There is enough time.

The bellows fills.

Patience.

11/3/2003

 Thanksgiving, the result of gratitude, heals me.

I speak.

You say.

Our conversation is null and silent.

You speak by shedding your leaves.

It’s nothing, merely life and death, beauty, Tao.

The wind blows.

The leaves fall upon me.

It feels as a caress.

The leaves fall like war upon humanity.

It is life and death.

It is nothing, a caress that makes feeling in me.

Though Tao is stoic, I feel.

If I learn to feel with tree, then war and peace will be like the leaves falling around me.

When I am ready for death I will feel with tree.

In the meantime, a dip now and then is tonic.

Thank you, tree.

Heal me.

Thank you, tree.

11/7/2003

Put aside the unimportant and find what remains is unimportant.

Important/unimportant is without meaning.

In the matter of understanding the wordless put aside continuums (and negations).

There is only declaration (of existence).

 It is a matter of honoring my ancestors that I wish to hear the words of Lao Tsu.

By taking on serenity my vanity is balanced so that I can begin in the middle.

 Tree, you are my ancestor.

At first question to answer to question, then question to question, until finally question without answer.

This is wonder.

 Being wordless I live in the middle.

I live in wonder.

Tao begins (and ends) at the center.

11/8/2003

When I live in passing, I live in Karma.

When I live in the moment, I live in Grace.

In Tao there are both.

 In Tao space my ancestors can mix with the moment.

They can be here and now,

in and out, come and go, with/without.

 Listening to my ancestors help me to wonder.

11/9/2003

When chicken soup is the answer, hocus-pocus is not.

I live in wonder now.

When I transcend moments, I live in passing and separation ends.

Life and death are the same in Tao space.

Death is the negation of life, a point of view.

Negation has functional value.

It shows the center to those who have lost it.

11/10/2003

 “From emptiness comes existence comes reality”

 or

 “From emptiness comes reality “

 or

 “The uncountable clustering of nothing is real. “

4/24/2004

Self-importance is in being less than everything and therefore vain.

Serenity is to be without vanity.

 9/1/2004

 Legends are made of beauty.

Accuracy is not important to the heart.

Hope is the faith that a possibility exists.

A nice thing about love is that you can give all your love repeatedly.

Majesty fulfills desire.

 Is Majesty mistaken or true?

The feeling, the impression of grandeur, stands with the consideration of truth.

Majesty is feeling that can be mistaken.

Majesty influences people to believe.

         Is Majesty mistaken or true?

Belonging is love.

Understanding is abundance.

Argument is luxury.

The desire to be part is ever satisfied.

A consensus has holes.

 A harmless old man begged not for money but for consideration.

 I kept my importance.

 I went to my tree to pray and broke a stick.

 I did not consider what I was doing until the stick was broken.

I saw its importance.

Stop, think, consider.

The purpose of government is to establish order.

Good government establishes a path of opportunity for anyone to gain his or her freedom.

By accepting authority, you allow authority to affirm.

Consider the burden.

Get help, transform, hope, believe, reconstruct,

and live as you wish to be.

Repeatedly.

9/19/2005

Meditation is unbounded consideration.

The words from without are more difficult to understand than the thoughts from within.

 A book is a one-sided conversation with a bigot

 and an efficient way to gain knowledge.

Read as you would handle dynamite,

thoughtfully and carefully!

Books use majesty yet have none.

9/29/2005

Without words there is only majesty.

 9/30/2005

 It is easy to be humble before beggars and kings.

 Humility before the arrogant is another matter.

 Humility before arrogance results in consideration.

 Given consideration the arrogant are frequently right.

 This is the reason for humility.

 6/30/2006

I am ready for everything but unprepared for nothing.

7/8/2006

To resolve religious difference let us put aside the founders of religions.

Let us look at the creations proposed by these people instead.

early June 2007

 Consideration is a process of judging the truth and validity of words.

Yet the most accurate words are meaningless without feelings.

June 24, 2007

Though I wish for desire and fame it would likely curse me

 for what I have without fame and without desire is the need of God.

August 17, 2007

Prayer is best served by a God who receives all burdens and responsibilities.

Prayer, however, does not require the existence of God.

   6/25/2008

    If you trust you need no explanation.

    God and gravity are both real.

 Neither have mass.

    Every idea lies between nothing and everything.

Manifestation is an idea processed into a reality.

    Reconstruction begins with the universe and ends with me.

 Live at the beginning of the end.

4/6/09

    A prayer that takes me out of myself.

You are the tree.

You are the root.

You are the earth.

You are the beasts.

You are the people.

You are the corn.

You are the sky.

You are the sun.

You are the stars.

You are the universe.

You are the void.

You are the essence.

11/11/09

The infinite All composes the one Essence...  or not.

May 10, 2010

    Within the bounds of reality lie common facts (such as the sun will rise tomorrow) and beliefs (such as God has mass).

Outside the bounds of reality lies what is.  Here, all can be doubted.  While mass is real, force is the best metaphor for what is.

May 15, 2010

    My feelings are a spiritual judgment of my senses. I have feelings about everything.

    When I hugged my tree, I felt a range of spiritual sensual judgment.

Is it possible my feelings are a window to an inclusive spirituality?

May 31, 2010

    Doubt is an essential part of consideration.

June 2010

    What misconception requires repression to recognize self as inherently existent?

July 2010

    Recognition, ego, grandeur, majesty.  To never be free of these may be heaven or hell.

  It is the promise of organized religion.

August 2010

    An atheist calls his theology “god” and edits it.

  An agnostic does not consider any meaning of God.

  A theist believes there is a God.

A deist calls his theology "God ".

September 2010

    When I was young, I wished only for unbounded consideration.

 Today's wish comes from yesterday's wish.

 I wish my behavior to be ethical, my attitudes to be moral and my considerations to be disciplined only by

unconditional love.

 After all, we are all in the same barrel.

October 2010

    Knowledge is a strange thing when it cannot be trusted.

  Trust is a strange thing when it is without knowledge.

Faith is the default necessary to begin.

April 12, 2012

    There are no good reasons to read.

 There are no good reasons not to read.

There are many reasons.

    If you wish to know now what others know, read.

    If you wish to know now how others do, read.

    If you wish to know now what others have done, read.

    What's the rush!

  Just think and you will slowly and pleasantly find your place and yourself.

  Reading a little will help.

April 28, 2012

    If you don't recognize chance, you are never afraid.

If you are never afraid you are insane.

July 20, 2012

    The flaw in empiricism is that it lacks a control group.

thought

**The Grandeur of my Insignificance**

 I am everything.  That is what I choose and that is grand. However, I am the teeniest spec of everything.

 My reality is bounded by the walls of the room (Out of sight, out of reality).  I am aware only of my integration of all the gravitations that are changing within very small boundaries. If you don’t change at the same speed of time as me, you are not part of my reality.  Not only that, but the change between us must be different by the time it takes time to get from you to me. That excludes all but the most infinitesimal.

 The only other stuff there is, is my consciousness.  That only includes what I have recorded.  If you walk out of the room, you walk out of my reality but remain in my consciousness.  If a particle zooms through the room and I record it through some strange means it becomes part of my consciousness.  If it changes too fast for me, I never know of it.

**Is majesty mistaken or true?**

Is the strength of what I feel a just cause for what I believe?

 I visited **tree** today.Without words there is only majesty.

 With the sun bright on my face and with my eyes closed I saw red with sparkles.  No words, I felt warm majesty.

 The sun went behind a cloud, and I saw blue with snowflakes.  No words, I felt cool majesty.

 As I came back to words, I asked tree to speak.  I could not believe tree’s first words and have forgotten them.  There was a second reference to “the green pages of the Bible”.  I have no words to find meaning in any of this.  I know I felt majesty.

 “In the beginning there was the Word”.  Green is the color of the beginning.  It is the color of creation at the time of creation.

 “In the beginning there was the Word”.

 Before words, the Word was the word given as covenant as in “I give you my word”. Then in that time before words there was the bond between me as every person and God as everything.  The relationship, the belonging, the bond, that is exactly Love.

 “In the beginning there was love”.

 From love each child creates reality by the process as described in “the tools to peacemaking conversation, basic definition”. The child chooses units.  This is where words come from. This is how consciousness integrates that what is (the essence) into reality.

 The process we call “creation” is the same process as done by a child but credited to the manifestation of everything.  Then to understand how “God” created “the universe” understand how the child chooses his units.  That is understand the axiom of choice and the theory of unity as used by each child as he learns to speak.

 All things (the All) come from the love of God (the Essence).  Things are nonexistent.  Love, the covenant between the All and the Essence, the Word before words, exists.

 Rather than green pages of the Bible being the Christian Bible it is the relationship, the covenant, love.  It is love.

 The forgotten words of the tree come back.  The forgotten words of the tree were “the Bible”.  Not just the Christian Bible but every bible's covenant.  All bibles as one message.  That one message is love.

 Since in the beginning we belonged, it is easiest to begin by belonging.  This is also the beginning.

1/11/2006

 I visited tree today. I was able to empty my mind and feel.  Then word descriptions of my feelings entered me. The parameters for understanding the common usage word, “love “, seem to be, grace (from the Essence) and karma (from the All). The independent variables of the parameters seem to be how we choose our belonging and our chosen groups.

 The words were manifestations of my feelings.  They shaped where and how I felt. The process was judgment.

 Before leaving I hugged and kissed tree. Being of empty mind, I felt majesty. Then I manifested the feeling by calling it love.

Is majesty mistaken or true?

**We**

**postulating an order to the strength of influence.**

  We have looked at the parameters that shape everyone’s beliefs.  Now we must put order to understanding how we influence each other.

  Most people believe that some of their tenets are universal.  Conflicting tenets (the messages) do not kill each other. People (the messengers) kill each other.

 Whether political, ethical, or religious, dogmatic demands to influence other groups (individuals) cause turmoil.  The level of influence is a parameter of the amount of turmoil generated by one group (individual) acting against another.

 It should be noted that turmoil is as often the precursor of understanding as it is the precursor of violence.

Conceal, expose, attract, promote, threaten, force, violate. These are the levels of an individual’s influence upon others.

To conceal your life.

The completely concealed person has no influence on others and is uninfluenced by other people.  Such a person is said to be cloistered.

 A cloistered monk who vows to be silent and live in isolation is the extreme of concealment.  More normally, people who do not answer questions or state their positions conceal themselves. When you answer questions, you leave concealment and enter exposure.

To expose your life.

You let people see how you live.  You answer questions with the purpose of being understood.

    When you initiate talk, you leave exposure and enter attraction.

 To attract others.

 You do or say some things with the purpose of gathering others to you.  You not only answer questions, but you also ask questions.  You state your beliefs without solicitation.  You try to make friends.

 When you talk with the purpose of convincing others to believe as you believe you leave attraction and enter promotion.

To promote your choices.

You give rewards for alliances.  Whether it is candy or a bonus for a job well done, it shapes the behavior of another person.  Praise is often effective.  Praise backed by candy, or a bonus is even more effective.

You advertise your beliefs.  You speak of the advantages and rewards of your beliefs.  You speak of the disadvantages of opposing beliefs.

When you talk with the purpose of making others afraid not to join your view, then you leave promotion and enter threat.

To threaten others.

To speak of the fear of punishment is to threaten others.  Penal law is a threat.  Contracts with penalty clauses are a threat.  Holy books that promise damnation for nonconformity are a threat.  To demand conformity on the job is a threat.  To speak of awful consequences is a threat.

When the talk ends and the process to deliver conformity or punishment begins, then you leave threat and enter force.

To force others.

Punishment induces discipline in the child (teaching" boundaries of behavior”).  This "disciplining" is how other people (society) shape everyone’s discipline.

To sue or prosecute is to force.  To fire from a job is to force. To restrict or confine is to force.  To physically abuse is to force. To rape is to force.

    When force fails and failure is unacceptable, then you leave force and enter violation.

To violate others.

You kill the messenger.  You kill another human being.  You make war.

**Responses**

Sometimes I choose my level of influence and sometimes society chooses for me. Sometimes we choose our level of influence and sometimes the society chooses for me.

 When a decision is a response in concealment it is usually a free choice from an epiphany or from grace. It is private and beautiful.

When a decision is a response to exposure or attraction, then we call it a free choice.  Although we generally don’t notice, it is pleasantly influenced by others.

 When a decision is a response to promotion or threat, then we call it a hard choice. We recognize the influence of others.

 When a decision is a response to force or threat placed upon an individual or group, then it is a decision to obey authority. It usually takes time to accept. It is of the beast.

 There is no response to violation. You are dead.

Examples

 A free choice of a cloistered monk forsaking the unwanted temptation of worldly distraction for the sake of enlightenment is beautiful.  A free choice of a Muslim woman forsaking her influence for the sake of her husband’s is beautiful.

Reality is seldom so pure.  The level of influence is usually a matter of the balance between beauty and the beast; a balance between freedom and obedience; a balance between civil liberties and general welfare.

When we cloister our children, we place a social discipline upon them.  It is not of their choosing.  It is a temporary measure legally ended by their adulthood.  Parents allege that it is for their children’s good.  The legality of it in the United States is a matter of law.

 When a man cloisters his wife, he places a social discipline upon her.  He alleges that it is for society’s good. The legality of it in Saudi Arabia is a matter of law.

 Both examples of cloistering are generally bounded by threat for the law seldom intervenes.

A man robs a store in the United States.  After due process he is put into jail. The force of the state cloisters him.

In Afghanistan a woman purposefully exposing her face would be killed.  So would a robber.  The state, being poor, has no time or money to spend on any process and solves the problem efficiently by killing.  Killing is a violation by the state.

 In the United States a serial killer after due process would be killed.  Killing is a violation by the state.  If the serial killer had been in Britain, he would be cloistered in jail instead.

 Different cultures and different governments establish different levels of influence.  The process due is probably established by the level of affluence within the culture for, with enough to go around, we all want to protect our civil liberties.  The right to influence other countries is determined by the balance between the beast (if you have the power, you have the right) and beauty (morality).

Morality gone amok is dangerous.  View the crusades.  I would suggest that a humble morality would be more akin to peace on earth.  Let’s talk, not fight.

**Tolerate the message, a player parameter.**

 Every message comes with a messenger.  Each "truth" comes with the perspective of human judgment.  Tolerate ideas and accept people.

Sometimes it is possible to extend the benefit of doubt. For example, let us consider a non-affirmed declaration.  It expresses a judgment of the truth.

This judgment is based on the messenger's witness, each witness of his or her own life.  If the messenger recognizes the possibility of a different conclusion based on a different experience, then frequently he can extend the benefit of doubt.  Contradiction to what you know with doubt is easy to tolerate.

To tolerate another's absolute truth is more difficult.  However, sometimes some basic agreement can be found.

For example, consider the affirmed declaration, “The Tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao”.  By being nameless the meaning of the eternal Tao is exchanged by basic definition.  By recognizing the inadequacy of words, we can transcend our individual witness and agree that what you mean when you say "God" and I mean when I say "Tao" might be common.  Though our individual witness is different we recognize a common attraction of "goodness".  We recognize that we might share some common feelings.  By understanding that we have common agreeable feelings, differences in detail can be tolerated.

 To tolerate another's contradictory absolute truth is even more difficult.  For example. consider "a leap of faith".  The leap puts reason aside in favor of a belief of pragmatic purpose.

The person from the church of science says, "You cannot put reason aside".  You might ask where the person from the church of science acquired his belief in reason other than that he finds it pragmatically useful.  As an example, you might ask the reason to conclude that time is linear and independent other than that it is a pragmatically useful assumption.

 When another player exposes an absolute belief that contradicts one of your absolute beliefs, you must establish agreement in principle; that is "I believe A and you believe not A".  Then you must bear the burden of giving weight to the opposing belief.

The result of toleration is understanding rather than agreement. This is what it means to tolerate ideas.

**Accept the messenger, a player parameter.**

"Judge not that ye not be judged".  Though this serves pragmatic purpose it is not enough to play the game of peacemaking conversation. Rather, let grace be your motivation not to judge other people rather than the pragmatic purpose of not being judged.  This is what acceptance is.

 To accept people without reason (starting from nothing) is to be gracious.  To do this you must trust that the player believes what he says is true.  This is the way to accept other people.

When you bear the burden of giving weight to an opposing belief, then you accept the player who has that belief as equal.  You respect his beliefs.  This is what acceptance is.

**Solutions**

**The Muslim solution, isolation**

 If you find you cannot bear the burden of giving weight to an opposing absolute belief, then the Muslim solution is for you.

 It says in the Quran, the believers, “unbelievers, I do not serve what you worship, nor do you serve what I worship.  I shall never serve what you worship, nor will you ever serve what I worship.  You have your own religion, and I have mine.”   This ends any conflict before it begins by keeping the parties isolated.

I am not a purest.  I don't know anyone who is.  We choose which beliefs to cloister and which to share.  If there is a purest whose every declaration is an affirmation, the second church is not for him.  Yet the Muslim solution is.

The Muslim solution creates no peace.  On the other hand, it creates no war. It ceases working when the isolation is violated.

We live in a densely populated highly communicating world. Isolation is nearly impossible to maintain.

**An alternate solution, conversation.**

 I once believed in argument for the sake of truth.  Now I believe in conversation between accepting tolerant people of different groups (churches, nations, races, et al) for the sake of understanding.

Argument has use within a fixed tenet of a specific group because it frequently arrives at a common truth within the tenet of the church.  Even arguments between churches, though seldom establishing broad common belief, can establish some common rationales and rationalizations.  It has some use in understanding.

Conversation has the advantage over argument because its purpose is understanding. Comparing our tenets can lead us to finding how our individual beliefs are the same and how they are different.  We can reduce our fear of each other by discovering and sharing our similarities.  This leads to accepting people whose judgments are different.  Right and wrong reduces to a matter of individual judgment rather than absolute judgment.

**Peacemaking conversation**

Mahatma Gandhi gave the world nonviolent demonstration. People died.

 He mentored Martin Luther king junior who gave Americans peaceful protest. People died.

 The purpose of peacemaking conversation is fulfilled by a lessening of violation and the indiscriminate use of force. It is not peaceful. Less people die.

**attitudes**

I will know that I am obliged to speak as well as listen. “Whatever” is always the wrong answer.

The solution is not to agree with me, but rather to listen, consider and speak. Dialogue is not lacking in our present society. Consideration is lacking.

It would be destructive if those who disagree responded with “whatever”.  It would be destructive if those who disagree responded with “you are completely wrong and I’m not listening to hogwash”. I’m looking for the loyal opposition who might start by saying “I am not sure, but I believe I have a better idea “.

Peacemaking conversation must be open conversation.

Speak the truth as you guess it and listen as it is guessed. Declare what you know without judgment while affirming nothing.

Talk of the message and never the messenger.  That is, accept people and tolerate their ideas.

Play fair.  It is fair to call a killing a killing.  To call a killing a murder or a necessity is a judgment.

Attempt to consider all that you can.  Never claim universal absolute truth.   Be dedicated to finding common ground.

Be considerate of both beliefs and feelings. For the sake of peace on earth I will bear some burden and share my views with others who may have different views. I will consider the views proposed that are outside my discipline. Such conversation is not always peaceful, yet its purpose is to make peace.

**How much to speak and when to stop**

When peacemaking conversation takes place between two people with separate views, use good manners. That’s what manners are for.

For the sake of peace on earth I will bear some burden and share my views with others who may have different views.  I will consider the views proposed that are outside my discipline.   Such conversation is not always peaceful, yet its purpose is to make peace.

 Sacred cows, those judgments we have made sacred, abound!  When I find your sacred cow if (and only if) it is necessary for understanding will I speak my contrasting conclusion once.  There will be no need to repeat it or enforce it with argument.

A sacred cow. Consider my belief that abortion is a good thing.  I do not wish to condone the opposing view by my silence.  I will state my opposition without reasons.  If my loved ones need to express their reasons opposing abortion I will listen and try to understand.  I will expect them to listen to mine and try to understand in exchange.  However, telling one time is sufficient.  There is always hypocrisy.  Ego aside, Love of people is more important than love of ideas.

 Remember the purpose is to understand the other person’s view rather than promote yours, so listen, consider, and expose your view. Sometimes strong opposing opinions make good friendships. Such friendships build bridges.

**A third alternative, hypocrisy.**

A lie is an untruth. A liar tells a known lie with the purpose of deception. Bob tells a child that God created people.  Joe tells the same child that people evolved from monkeys.   Assuming that creation and evolution are mutually exclusive and important, they both believe the other knew he was lying. Namely, their belief is an absolute truth that everyone knows. Here is where we need hypocrisy.

 Hypocrisy is necessary when isolation has been put aside and conversation has taken place and the integrity of the messenger rather than the message has become the issue.

There is always a messenger, and that messenger may be a loved one.  With hypocrisy, you get to keep the loved one.

As previously stated, by accepting people you must trust that the player believes what he says is true.  When you cannot do this; that is, when you believe that another person is telling a lie, then settle for hypocrisy.

 It helps to recognize the possibility that your beliefs may be so ingrained that you are telling lies.  By recognizing that you may be lying to yourself you can recognize that the alleged hypocrite may be lying to himself.  This levels the playing field.

When you cannot extend the benefit of doubt, that is when you cannot exclude yourself from being the hypocrite, you must carry the burden of your intolerance.  That is not to act on it.

The value of hypocrisy is that it delays action.  By tolerating the hypocrisy, both players can reduce their level of influence below threat.  This avoids threat, force, and violation.

 This gives us the time to become tolerant.  Maybe hypocrisy gives us the time to reduce our own fear.

 It is easier to reduce your level of influence when not afraid.  At a reduced level of influence the need of fear is reduced and, hypocrisy aside, through conversation differences can be transcended and similarities can be discovered.

Event/thought

I needed to understand everything.

**Everything/me**

Through the grandeur of my significance

to the grandeur of my insignificance,

I wonder.

To wonder is to produce more questions than answers.

**What am I?**

If existence is not of flesh and bone, then what is a human being?

It is consciousness.

 We have five senses that record changes in the environment over a span of time. For example, if we introduce perfume into air, we smell the perfume until our sense of smell becomes accustomed to it. Then we smell it no longer.

 To discover reality, that is what perfume is, we must sense the change in our environment and decide what happened to our environment. We do this by asking what the cause of the change is, that is observing the look of the perfume, the opening of the perfume bottle, the feel of the perfume and the sound of the perfume splashing out.  These changes are also in our environment.  We then conclude that perfume was introduced into the air by putting all these observations of changes into the same category and associating all of them with the reality of opening a perfume bottle.  By integration of our sensual experiences, we create reality.

 Mathematically each person takes the changes in their environment over a span of time and integrates it to discover what they call reality.   We have no knowledge of reality other than what we have produced by integration of sensual experience.
 Let us call r reality, t time, and f the reality function.  Then r =f (t). ("Time" is used here as a classical reference to induce understanding. Its nature will be corrected later.)  Our observations then are the first derivative of reality with respect to time, dr/dt.  This is exactly what we sense.

 Now from calculus we must note that there are an infinite number of functions that have the same first derivative.  Therefore, if we make our sensual observation, we establish one value for a first derivative.  If we then integrate this observation, we discover an infinite number of possibilities that could have happened to the environment.  However, if we make many observations over the same span of time, then we would have many first derivatives.  When we integrate a series of first derivatives, we greatly reduce the possibilities of reality.

 A person creates reality by integration of these derivatives. As he performs integration, he as easily creates realities that did not occur as those that did by selecting any function which has the set of first derivatives he has observed.  By this process, he creates a reality that he never observed; he imagines things.

**Is the model consistent with scientific witness?**

 Let us consider the brain as a mass of cells that can hold an electrical charge by being polarized.  Let us consider that these cells are electrically connected to each other in some specific way, the way of connection carried by DNA, and that a number of these cells are connected to sensory nerve endings.

 We know that to induce a current we must change the position of iron relative to a conductor.  Also, we know that if the position of iron does not change relative to the conductor, then no current is induced.  Let us assume that when nerve endings are subject to change, they induce a current to the brain that polarizes a brain cell or a set of brain cells.

 Every integration and differentiation are a linear transform and therefore can be stored by a matrix; any matrix can be stored binarily.  Therefore, these differentials could be stored as an arrangement of cells that can be charged and discharged.

 Putting this electrical and mathematical theory together leads us to observe that a change in environment induces an electric current which charges a cell in the brain. If we call this charge a differential, then the brain stores sensual experience as a mass of differentials. This process of storing differentials is called differentiation.

 In summary of our notation, the process of observing differences in nerve endings is differentiation, and the process of combining these differences to predict what is being implied about our environment is called integration.  The more differentials you have, the more reality you can produce, whether it is real or imaginary.

 Let us return to a man who has been stimulated until every nerve ending storage cell is polarized and then proceed to stimulate him one more time. Mathematically and electrically, he would induce a polarization in an adjoining cell.  This polarization would be storage of the change in differentials rather than in environment. Again, the man would build up a store of differentials.  These are called second derivatives, changes in derivatives.

 Now if we integrate these second derivatives, we again have an infinite number of possible first derivatives corresponding to each second derivative.  If we consider the brain as an integrating mechanism, it is likely that while integrating second derivatives a first derivative is found or produced which did not induce this second derivative.  When this happens thought is created, for he not only creates a reality that never occurred, he knows it did not occur.

 There are third, fourth, and more derivatives in calculus.  The depth to which man can integrate is unknown, but if we consider a brain to be a structure of cells that can only integrate and differentiate, people could be described as an animal with a brain more organized to higher level differentiation than other animals.

 There may be physical significance to each level of differentiation.  For example, attitudes may be third derivatives, or maybe sixth derivatives.  With the calculus model of personality, it may be discoverable and useful. At least a lot of old people could have fun talking about learning models, heredity via DNA and behavior.

 Please do not try to put your hand through a brick quite yet. Give reality its due. Mass is real. It just doesn’t have an absolute existence.

 Now here comes the first stretch of your mind. I am going to ask that you imagine that the masses are not there but rather the spaces between them are there. Further the spaces are not spaces but “how the masses are held together” (they are relationships). The nearest thing I can use to describe how masses are held together, is Newton’s universal law of gravitation. These “gravitations” (also called “how masses are held together”) are as countable as masses.

 Now reach deeper into your mind. For every mass there are as many gravitations as there are other masses. Each mass is the result of its gravitations. The gravitations came first.

 Now back to reality. We say air is odorless. Consider the example of introducing perfume into the air. We notice it is there until we become used to it. Then we do not notice it anymore. We only sense change in our environment.

 Hold very still when you sleep and when you first wake up you cannot tell where your hands lie. You must move them. We only sense change in our environment.

 We move through space at breakneck speed and do not sense it. Yet when the car breaks, we feel that. We only sense change in our environment.

 Now back to your mind. Of all the spaces where you could go some are occupied and some are not. Yet they are all influenced by gravitations. I allege that where the gravitations are constant there are no masses and where gravitations are changing there are masses. I admit that this allegation is the result of the need to make sense of the universe. It does, however, appear to be consistent with the rest of our sensory experiences.

 Then mass is the result of changing gravitation rather than gravitation being the result of mass and distance.

 Here comes the model. Rather than beginning with mass (the things or the thoughts) I begin with gravitations (relationships). I have neglected to call gravitations force because in Newtonian physics it is a dependent variable. No longer. Now I am going to use the word, “gravitations”, and specify it as the independent variable.

 Gravitations are the parameter. We do not sense gravitations. We sense the change in gravitations. We call the integration of the changes in gravitations over time at a moment, energy, and the integration of the changes in gravitations over distance from a point, mass.

 I reiterate here for the sake of the physicist. Not mass but gravitations are used as the basic independent variable. This contrasts with Newtonian physics.

 When we “touch” a mass our lifetime empirical record calls it real. However scientific study seems to conclude that mass is mostly space and the particles in that space are mostly space. I ask you to continue the process and note that the limit of the process implies there is no mass. That is there is no such thing as “thing” even though we touch it.

**What is the nature** **of everything and what is reality?**

 Mass exists now. The only evidence that mass exists outside each moment is from inside each moment.

 Reality is the conclusion of what our senses tell us. We conclude that there is mass and energy as a result of our basic experience. This is reality. It is not the nature of everything, yet it is our only source of understanding.

 Remember from “the rules of peacemaking conversation” that you learned the meaning of to be, basically. I am going to ask that you stretch your mind and put aside your basic understanding of existence (“to be”). Discount that understanding as only a convenience of understanding because as a model it cannot explain the universe let alone everything.

 Now all our senses work as we move forward in time at the speed of light (the speed of light, which is the standard for measuring distance, is the speed of time). At the same time as we are moving forward in time at the speed of light distance is expanding from every point at the speed of light. Hence time and distance are always changing, in our case moving forward. It would also explain how little particles appear or disappear traveling near the speed of light (the proof is that computers work). It would also explain how black holes seem to distort time.

 We are not aware of those gravitations that do not change over distance. Hence, we are unaware of the resulting masses. This is consistent with quantum theory, all that material with half turn numbers (in Star Trek referred to as anti-matter).

 It appears then that what we call reality (mass and energy) is more accurately our integration of the change in everything. Everything is composed of gravitations (akin to spirit). We move along our fate, a timeline in everything. We are aware of very little and only that which changes in time and distance.

 We call mass and distance real when in fact they are manifestations of the changes in everything.

**In the language of calculus**

 The only difference between gravitations and Newtonian force is that the gravitations are the parameter rather than dependent on mass and time. To use the concept of calculus and its history consider that force is the parameter. Force is the independent variable of everything. Now we can use classical notation.

 First a review using classical physics notation.

  Time and distance depend on force. Mass and energy depend on time and distance. We do not sense force. We sense the change in force. Our reality is described as dF. dF is the partial derivative of F with respect to distance plus the partial derivative of F with respect to time.

 Wherever force is constant in everything there is no change in force and therefore dF is zero. However, mass can be explained as the integral of all changing forces relative to one location. Mass only appears constant in our fate because we cannot escape our fate to make a measurement.

 Our reality is determined by integrating (a proper subset of) everything. All the non-zero differentials integrated about a location manifest as mass at that location and mass at all other locations. All the non-zero differentials integrated about a time give us energy.

 All the differentials which are zero are not sensed; that is the integration of nothing is nothing.

  At the center of black holes, the ratio between the speed of time and the speed of distance is 0 while at the farthest distance the ratio is uncountably large (and there is always farther out). Let us treat this ratio as a dimension.

 Repeat the process of dimension creation with each new concept.  Is everything bounded by dimensions? If there are infinite dimensions “space” has no meaning.

 If not in time and space, where do the singularities exist? We must change our concept from an array of points in space to, nothing somewhere. It is “that what is”. To get some basic understanding consider the basically understood term “void”.

 “Void” is defined by absence, emptiness, without time and space. “Void” is the absence of everything. This sure does not tell you what it is. That is the problem with basic understanding.

 Everything, “that what is”, is an infinitely dimensional array of singularities in a void.

**How am I related to everything?**

 Does my foot have a separate consciousness? If it does, I am no more aware of it than the consciousness of the tree.

 Since the integration of matter is force, the integration of reality is timeless, massless, distant-less “what (the union of that what is and that which isn’t)”.  This would make what, rather than mass the constant of what is.  This explanation would be consistent with quantum mechanics by including other realities.

 This would make “that what is” ethereal. It would be consistent with timeless all-powerful all present existence.  This would be consistent with most of the world's concept of the union of God and everything.

 Our fate, our reality, is the integration of “that what is” along a time curve. Our universe is the integration of our fate at one instant.

 Nothing and everything are mathematical reciprocals. One is the product of nothing and everything. One is “that what is”.   No matter how you model it, the model is the invention called life. If you take nothing and put it together forever, you end up with everything.

 There is magic called clustering in the universe. It puts nothing together forever. There is, was and will always be the uncountable clustering that is the one thing, the everything.

 To classically order the universe clusters were called real and gravitations were called nonexistent.  In this way respectively we specified them as mass and force.  We randomly selected mass to be called real. If we had selected the other way around, we would have found quantum mechanics earlier. We would call relationships real and objects unreal.

 The universe is one.  To understand it we order it as a turbulent maze of relatively uniform space.  We add time.  This gives us a subset called fate.  We select a cross section of fate and call it a universe.

 If we were to compare the calculus model of consciousness with the calculus model of everything the models have the same structure. The independent variable of our consciousness is change, which is difference over time. Just like when there is no difference in force over distance, we sense no mass. Where there is no difference in sensation over time, we sense no consciousness. At the first derivative level we integrate changes in gravitations and record these as differentials. We say we are conscious of mass (remember that the integration of all gravitations about a point is mass). Therefore, the model of consciousness overlaps the model of everything at the first derivative level, that is our consciousness senses changes in the environment and changes in the environment compose reality.

 Once again, I ask you to stretch your mind and go through the process you went through with reality.  First view your consciousness in a two-dimensional format of matrix.  By making observations value is placed in the columns and rows yielding a three-dimensional model, such that the columns and rows are restricted to our consciousness. In the model of everything the restriction was the bounds of our fate.

 Like our individual fate is less than fate, so our individual consciousness is less than consciousness.

 That would mean within the restriction of myself I am a microcosm of fate and fate is a macrocosm of me. Further, I suspect that the multi-dimensional model of everything, that is an array of singularities in the void, is the most accurate model of consciousness (though not the most useful).  That would mean that consciousness is a microcosm and macrocosm of everything, and everything is a microcosm and macrocosm of consciousness. Consciousness, like everything, is a singularity composed of singularities both without and within the void.

Fragments

**Back to buddha**

Thanksgiving 2013

    Give thanks!

    May charity overcome greed.

    May compassion overcome anger.

    May humility overcome righteousness.

November 24, 2013

    The bellows of life brings truth.

 Breathe!

December 27, 2013

    Life is a relative disturbance.

    Life is the relevant disruption.

January 12, 2014

    Be! That is the lesson.

    To save the world be yourself.

January 13, 2014

    Have admiration for the ways of others.

    It is of respect.

January 19, 2014

    Thought is an example of what comes from within.

January 24, 2014

    I choose to be here now.

January 28, 2014

    Live in thanksgiving.

March 16, 2014

    In need you fill my emptiness.

    Without need I am joyously empty.

March 30, 2014

    My thoughts are free.

    My mind is empty.

    Joyous perseverance into emptiness.

April 7, 2014

    Emptiness filled and gone.

    Emptiness fulfilled and here.

    Looked upon and unseen.

April 12, 2014

    Death is life within continuing emptiness.

April 28, 2014

    The problem of being fodder,

    Concern for my image blocks me from emptiness.

May 4, 2014

    Pride is a personal greed.

June 8, 2014

    Much, much, much,

    Buddha is abundance,

    fulfilling my need for need.

June 16, 2014

    Being here is arrogant.

    Being everywhere is being without identity.

    Life is between arrogance and insignificance.

June 22, 2014

    Thoughts, words, deeds; these are of the path.

    Emptiness to enlightenment to fulfillment.

July 6, 2014

    Emptying there is no me and only everything.

    The Buddha is empty and fulfilled.

July 22, 1014

    Enlightenment is filled emptiness.

July 27, 2014

    Some days I have no bliss but there is never a day that enlightenment has no bliss in it.

    Emptiness and therefore enlightenment, is without judgment.

    Love is of the essence; common and touching.

August 3, 2014

    The altruist path uses the body and mind and is concerned with others.

  I need myself and others in order to live the altruist path.

 I need attachment.

August 24, 2014

    I was concerned with murderous wars.  Buddha answered,

    Death is the path of life.  The all dies, the essence lives.

September 6, 2014

    Do not judge anger and it will pass through.  Only judgment gives it root.

    After wonder is amazement.

September 14, 2014

    The right thing is not easily determined.

September 21, 2014

Thanksgiving is love making.

Thanksgiving is candy for the soul.

October 5, 2014

    Nothing matters.

Take comfort.

    Everything matters.

 Love all.

October 11, 2014

    I dislike some answers.

October 19, 2014

    I will never be a sage.

I am political.

Event

war became depressing so I read quantum mechanics and got back to writing.

Thought

**Everything**

 Synopsis; By accepting that mass only exists in the present, that the "speed" of light is the "speed" of time, where "speed” is the ratio of measurements in a non-Mobius dimension, and by treating "force" as an independent variable, then space has a mobius dimension, time has an imaginary dimension, and Newtonian physics and quantum mechanics are consistent.

 In one (spatial) dimension

 \_\_ \_\_ \_\_

 AB+BC=AC

 In the union of one (spatial) dimension and the Mobius dimension

 \_\_ \_\_ \_\_

 AB+BC=AC v 0

My son says more words help, so there are footnotes.

The theory

 " That what is" (footnote 1) is without dimension. It has no location, no instant, and no mass. It is, by simile, like energy (The "wowo" everywhere stuff suspected but unverified). Something happens.

 "It which is" evolves. "It which is"(footnote 2) is a super position of eigenstates in a space at a time with mobius dimension. It is without mass. Something happens again.

 "It which is" becomes "those which are"(footnote 3). We have mass and energy in what we call the present.

 From the present we integrate and differentiate the future and the past (those which were and those which will be) (footnote 4).

 What happens quantum mechanics refers to as measurement. I refer to it as integration (footnote 5).

 By manipulating Newton's universal law of gravitation in solving (more accurately dimensionally manipulating) for time as dependent upon "gravitions" (force), I discovered that changes in an instant (time) can be positive, negative, or imaginary. They depend on the integration of gravitations (the sum of the partial derivatives relative to each dimension) of all dimensions about an instant (Footnote 6).

 It also turns the dimension "time" from 2 subset dimensions into 3 (positive, negative, and imaginary). Along with "consecutive measurement gives consistent result", this turns wiggles with a twist into wigglies with spin.

 By the same manner distance is dependent upon gravitations where distance is the difference in locations.

 Treating force as an independent variable results in the sum of all the gravitations (in each dimension as the moment/location is approached) most often is zero. The value of each partial differential does not depend on either distance or time because gravitations are the independent variable. Only when the sum of the partials is nonzero do we have Fermions (mass at a moment/location).

 tunneling.

 We measure a "specific" with no potential or kinetic energy. It has conical nodes without measurement. The mass has no space. Therefore, it has no measurable mass. You say it has energy because "it" has spin. We claim to witness the impossible. Spin is not interacting with other massless spin. For consistency, quantum mechanics concludes the existence of imaginary time. Our conclusions are consistent.

Rather, the sum of gravitations, being independent variables about a location, is energy. This is consistent with Newtonian physics. However, if force is the source of energy (the integration of the forces {an independent variable} about a location) and space is Mobius, then tunneling is an understandable short trip.

Electricity and magnetism.

The effect two sides of the Mobius space have on each other. When the energy drop is exponential electricity causes magnetism. When not, we get tunneling.

Bosons and Fermions.

Fermians have mass. Bosons are massless, in an eigenstate. Both have energy from the sum of the gravitations about them. Bosons, like waves are pliable. They can stack. Without mass Bosons lack the kinetic energy to take a short way in Mobius space. Like with electricity and magnetism after a 1/2 trip it's charge "changes". It doesn't change. Like tunneling, it is at a different point and moment. It takes two trips to return.

Einstein's paradox.

 Fermians have kinetic energy so the spin, like electricity and magnetism, is reversed. There is an instantaneous path for Fermians (because they have kinetic energy) so there is no time delay.

 An easy way to prove me wrong. The new telescope: are there any Fermians or are they all bosons that we receive as past record?

In other words.

 There are "gravitations", relationships between intersections. Gravitations are waves everywhere. Like the wowo stuff, wigglies, and gravitations have "energy". In my book " what is one" is a metaphor for gravitations.

 Gravitations (which evolved from "that what is" to " those which were") exist in the past but, by being integrated, exist in the present. From this source the present has mass. Measured wigglies have mass. After integration or measurement in both cases we get mass from “energy". Energy appears to be the identical component of the past and the present. There may or may not be a fixed energy to each specific which I will be calling everything.

 There is probably an infinite amount of everythings, yet they are not separate. Singularities may be subsets and supersets of everything. In Mobius space in an imaginary time without fermions both can coexist.

 Time, location, and mass are dependent. You cannot note all three. The past becomes an infinitely dimensional energy. This is the same as having no dimension. It has no borders. Hence no discernible wave.

 This is consistent with the idea that there is nothing and everything and we invent (or the Middle is invented) with mathematics (starting with fractions to create something between zero and one. We quantize.). Or maybe it's the other way around; mathematics is quantized from which we count everything.

One more time.

 There is "that what is". The uncountable clustering of nothing is everything. There is no mass or time or space; the wowo stuff.

 It changes into " it which is" a super position. It's all Bosons and no Fermians. It is without mass.

 The sum of all the "gravitations" relative to a location establishes mass in the present. It is quantified. Where the integral is zero, we are unaware. It remains "that what is", wowo stuff. Where it is not zero, we sense mass. The present requantifies itself (I would say quickly, but there is no quickly).

 So "it which is" changes into "those which are" with Fermians in a Mobius geometry. The process continues creating almost the same eigenstate repeatedly, each "flaw" a fermian. The independent variable, "force" has led to the dependent variables, "location, instant and mass" in a dimensional Mobius geometry.

The geometry of everything.

Infinitely dimensional? We live in a finitely dimensional (those which are) reality. There are possibly more dimensions. For example, the relationship between width and height is another dimension. All dimensions are dimensionally related to all other dimensions dimensionally.

 Looking again into the process of creating time to increase understanding, we used the term “wigglies" at first. A more accurate and simpler description of a specific is a partial derivative of the specific to each dimension. Then the process becomes the integration of those partial derivatives about the specific. This creates "those which are" from "that which is".

 In most cases the sum of all those partial derivatives is zero. And there is not a lot of stuffs. In a few cases, like in the crystal lattice of metal, there are specifics, I.E. a mass at a location at a moment.

 Surely as there are also superconductors, there are also moments without mass or location. This moves us forward in time.

 Time drives the process to quickly repeat just like the measuring process applied to super position creates the same eigenstate.

 This creates " those which are". We never sense directly " that what is". However, through thought experiment and direct experiment we structure the story called " those which were".

Footnote 1

 That what is. Empty. Everything is without mass, location, or instant.

 "That what is" is the precursor. It is one thing, everything. It is as if it is always in the present even though, being without time, there is no present. It is the wowo stuff.

 It is dimensionless. It is akin to a singularity, but since it has no location, it is the only singularity. It is both the macrocosm and a microcosm of everything. Though nonexistent to us, it is everything. For lack of understanding we say it has, for lack of a better word, "energy". The only evidence of its existence is the present.

 Using simile, "that what is" is God without a deist.

 Using a Christian god; not the father or son, just the holy ghost, omnipresent without omnipotence.

 Tuning the definition. Omnipresence requires being everywhere at every moment. "That what is" is without place or moment. It is the precursor.

 Using simile again, "that what is" is like God who was there before the creation.

"The uncountable clustering of nothing is everything."

Footnote 2

 It what is. Singular. There is time and space in a dimensioned geometry. Being singular, there is the sum of all gravitations (force like).

 In genesis God creates a moment and location (time and space) before mass. Newtonian physics and quantum mechanics consider time and space independent variables. They deal with the "nothing" first. I deal with the "uncountable clustering" first. "clustering" is the sum of all forces.

 " It which is" is a dimensional space. It is a super position within a Mobius lattice in the present. It's all Bosons and no Fermions. To integrate we sum the limits of all clusterings approaching a moment/location. (The measure of each clustering as the measure of each space collapses, is zero, because it is empty.)

Footnote 3

 Those which are. Plural. The superposition measured (or I prefer integrated) creating masses, locations, and moments.

 " It which is" by magic yields " those which are". At any "instant/location", when the limit of the sum of the partial differentials relative to the “instant/location" as the “instant/location" is approached from all dimensions(including Mobius) is not zero you have mass. We call it the present. It has eigenstates, super positions, and masses.

Footnote 4

 Those which were. The differentiation (of it what is) at a negative time (imaginary) creating a superposition within a geometry. This is the nature of the past.

 The magic I call integration. You call it measurement. Once it starts (or if it has always been) it repeats into almost the same eigenstate. Now there are Bosons and Fermians. There are also lattice flaws like metals giving off photons.

 We observe our past from the present we have created from our past created from " that what is".

 What is the independent variable. Mass is dependent on location and time. Location and time are dependent on gravitations.

Footnote 5

 Through measurement or differentiation, we "create"(simile) our past. There is no "speed" (of light or mass). Rather it is the difference between moments. Because "force" is the independent variable it would be more accurate to talk of the speed of mass.

 An interesting thought: measurement, differentiation, and integration are all human mathematical processes. If everything is united, then is thought itself a wowo process? Does everything collectively invent mass?

 How does mass learn? By instantaneous communication like green slime. The Mobius dimension in space is the answer. There are two paths between two points, the instantaneous path and the betweeness path.

 Gravitations have an advantage over wiggles in that they are independent from everything. That is everything is dependent on them.

 A beautiful question. Does the integration that created mass put mass in tomorrow forever or does the more consistent idea that differentiation that made the present from the imaginary past removes mass from (the real) tomorrow. Does creation go in all directions?

 The wowo stuff is abundant. It's everywhere and nowhere. "The uncomfortable clustering of nothing is everything." It makes gravitations the most practical independent variable to understand the universe and the photon.

footnote 6

Understanding dimensions.

 " That what is" has no measurement or location. You could call it null or the empty set, but that implies location. It's simpler than that. It is without dimension.

 Dimensions are tools to aid understanding through measurement. Reality is simple, clear, and obvious. We complicate the obvious by trying to measure. We use Einstein’s axiom of choice to invent a format for measuring.

 For now, I will say the Mobius dimension is a dimension of space because by using the theory of unity it looks useful as a spatial boundary. We say space has four dimensions because we can say.

 By expanding the number of partial Mobius dimensions (subsets of time and mass) we might explain how green slime knows where to grow and how a savant has a selective skill. I'll settle for four spatial dimensions for now because it resolves Newtonian physics and quantum mechanics.

Nothing above is alleged to be the truth,

The point is not what we wonder but that we wonder.

Event

I needed to understand everything the way other people understood God.

**What**

 Denotivly God and what are the same thing. They are both all present and all-powerful. Let us take three views of creation. Hawkings’ says there was nothing and then there was something. Something from nothing. It has three parameters (three independent variables), space, time and mass. God says there was God and seven days later there was something. It has three parameters (three independent variables), space, time, and mass. I say what. It has one parameter (one independent variable), by simile like energy upon which space, time and mass are dependent (as partial derivatives). Like Magellan before he went around the world, I only have hearsay.

 I believe all knowledge is circular. If you wish to understand a set of knowledge you can do so by understanding one point of the circle.

 God can be understood by human beings through empathy and the connotation that God by simile even if not human is human like. He/she/it created the universe which moves forward in time through interactions within the creation.

 Hawkings' can be understood by understanding the science of the interaction of the independent variables resulting in their creation of dependent variables such as energy. It is hearsay backed by many experiments within the given parameters.

 I can be understood from the connotation that what is (each instant with dependent variables of mass, time, mobius, and space) is created from what, a timeless, spaceless, massless with a single independent variable like energy. With empathy it can be thought of as dimensionless. If you need a reason, that it theoretically resolves the conflict between Newtonian physics and quantum mechanics and an abundance of hearsay about dark space, emptiness, electricity, and magnetism, Et Al.

Event

I had enough of foolish isolated depression and began mixing with people again.

Fragments

**Back to tree and me 2015**

March 24, 2015

    Everything is coincidental for it is part of the whole occurrence.

The cause of each is grace, karma or grace and karma.

April 2015

I do not know what comes next in my life except tomorrow.

May 2015

    God is not fair to humanity, rather God is fair to everything.

God is everything.

There is balance in everything.

June 23, 2015

Metaphor and hyperbole be damned!

Truth above all,

yet it cannot be found when metaphor and hyperbole can.

June 19, 2015

Accept your powerlessness over everything, but do not exclude action.

Write what you were, what you are and what you wish to become.

Make apologies and do actions to correct your past where possible.

Each day consider your behavior and attitudes.

Relax and think.

thoughts

**What is one?**

An alternate statement of the axiom of choice and the theory of unity

 Let fragments reopen my thoughts through empathy. Sometimes there are no words to establish common ground. Yet empathy allows it. After much to do about nothing I come to the same conclusion as Lao Tsu that I paraphrase, “the Tao is the Essence and the All”.

One is the uncountable clustering of nothing,

the essence.

One is our bounded simplification of everything,

the all.

 There are moments in wordless meditation when I sense essence.  However, as a practical matter, essence is useless for by being everything it cannot be manipulated.

 There are moments in wordless meditation when I sense all. However, as a practical matter, the pieces being nothing are without meaning.

 Two items are uncountable, everything and nothing, one and zero. We seem to need some ones we can count.

 How do we bound everything? We pick and choose. We chop up everything into pieces that have meaning and that we can count. By naming the pieces we have something to count.  We give words to the wordless and then count the words.

**God/god/everything/what**

God is the synthesis of the righteousness of man.

god is the flakes of the best of us all.

I wish my life to be a prayer to everything.

 I am part of everything and part with everything. I once thought it was true.  I now believe I chose it. Therefore, there is the consciousness of which my consciousness is part.

 I want to pray.  I choose an understandable bounded simplification of everything. I select everything in my taste and call it God.  Now I have a useful functioning mediator through whom I can pray.  I like to pray.

 **All paths within everything lead to god.**

 Intolerance requires the denial of doubt.  For myself I have beliefs that keep me sober.  I go to my church, alcoholics anonymous, to enforce the denial of doubt.  It seems that the denial of doubt requires maintenance.

 However, I realize that it is important to maintain some doubt for it is in my taste to “do unto others as I would have others do unto me”.  By accepting other people, I give everyone the right to decide everything for themselves. As to their ideas I will be tolerant.  I will give them the benefit of my doubt. I may be wrong about everything.

 If your need requires an absolute denial of doubt, I ask that you wonder.  If you cannot give other religions the benefit of your doubt, consider tolerating the beauty of all the religious myths and legends of the world.  They all at least seek God.

Event It was my intent to present a solution to unnecessary killing of each other. Instead, I have gained a deeper understanding of systemic belief, a better understanding of my personal prejudice, and how I am part of the system. There is no blame.

Thoughts

**The rules of peacemaking conversation within a secondary tribe.**

**The mathematics of the game of peacemaking conversation.**

Principle

By refusing to talk with people with whom we disagree we give up the chance to understand them.

Principled Axiom

If we engage in peacemaking conversation, then we will increase our understanding of each other thereby reducing our fear of each other’s tribes.

An algorithm for peacemaking conversation

1. Any player proposes a new well specified principle. It can be a rework of a previous well specified principle.

2. Everyone accepts or rejects the principle.

3. If everyone accepts,

 A. Insert (as an authority) "We believe that" ... onto the principle.

 B. Go to 1.

4. If some players accept,

 A. Insert (as an authority) the names of those players.

 B. Go to 1.

5. If none of the other players accept,

 A. Insert (as an authority) the name of the player.

 B. Go to 1.

Principle

A player can change his mind.

Axiom

 If a player changes his mind and anyone finds it necessary, then go to the beginning and redo everything.

Criteria for a player

A player accepts all the other players as equals. Hence there is no "you are wrong, and I am right". There is no attacking a player.

A player tolerates all the other players’ beliefs (principles) either by extending the benefit of doubt beyond reason or bearing the burden of disbelief.

The player’s purpose in playing is to reduce inhumanity by understanding each other's beliefs.

From time to time the player talks. Transparency is favored.

The player gives as much consideration as he can to the principles of others.

Criteria for well specified principle

The principle has the form of a principle, principled axiom or principled algorithm. It includes its authority.

The terms of the principle are specified basically (common understanding), by secondary definition or by criteria.

Principled Axiom

If the need to convert others to your church or your politics is always more important to you than the exchange of understanding, then you are never a player.

Axiom (the rule)

When you temporarily do not fit the criteria for a player, don’t speak.

The rules of order make it possible to disagree with understanding. The "rule"(When you temporarily do not fit the criteria of a player then keep silent) avoids the abuse of anger.

 A tenet of the game is, “I may be wrong about everything”. This negates the absolute truth and removes egos. The reality is we will try to understand and find some agreement within some bounds of reason. Our discipline, our boundaries are to understand "the reasonably prudent person" and " beyond a reasonable doubt".

Fragments

**Unitarian universalist 2016**

The cup contains half its capacity.

Investigate the cup.

Rational thoughts lead to rational conclusions.

Logical thoughts lead to valid conclusions.

Free thoughts lead to miraculous conclusions.

Each truth depends on where you start.

The doubt is in the cup.

I am what I am more-or-less.

Life is between arrogance and insignificance.

I am old.

After wonder is amazement.

They sure beat wisdom.

Thanksgiving is lovemaking.

It is candy for the soul.

Yesterday's memories,

today's considerations,

tomorrow's hope.

I have the rest of my life.

Happiness is limited by a lifetime.

Fulfillment might last longer.

Wonder; to feel simple unencumbered curiosity.

Beauty is the word given to the sudden emergence of yes.

It finds me.

Natural sex drive is nurtured by orgasm, egotism, and love.

 Love without orgasm and egotism is friendship.

Thanks for both.

December 2017

Give me enough grace to accept people,

enough serenity to tolerate ideas,

enough will to speak,

 and enough humility to know I might be wrong.

Sometimes it is necessary to speak once so as not to condone with silence.

Let temperance, compassion, and love guide the necessity to speak.

Some things are unimportant.

To remember that I may be wrong about everything is always important.

Temper justice with charity.

Listen and consider.

You might be right.

You might be wrong.

Give and forgive.

January 2018

In dealing with other people give me enough hope to find,

enough grace to accept people's rights,

enough serenity to tolerate their beliefs,

enough respect to consider their ideas,

enough will to speak my mind, and

enough humility to know I may be wrong about everything.

Then love will transcend hope and understanding will trump victory.

March 21, 2018

We are animals attempting to become civilized.

The purpose of civilization is to establish a peaceful distribution of sex.

 May 5,2018

Everyone sees from their own shadow and the truth becomes a matter of opinion.

September 8,2018

Comfort, serenity, and emptiness comes in its own time,

and I have the rest of my life.

 June 14,2019

The purpose of life is living.

The meaning of life is what it is.

Thought

**Tribes**

Any group of people who agree on the truth of some stories and/or reasons, their tenets.

**Tribal order**

 There is systemic order. The system of behavior develops day by day through repetition. The group has habits. These habits maintain order. Small groups, for example families, need little else.

 Systemic order is nearly invisible but always there. It is so invisible that we don't associate it with our egos or our dignity.

 Human beings talk. Talk, specifically exposure and promotion, is where peaceful change (specifically without threat, force, or violation) in the tribe's system can happen.

 The human tribe talks. It's comfortable to agree with your mate, your family, your church, your political party, your country, and maybe even humanity. Some beliefs become common in the group.

 People belong to more than one group. They learn to speak within the common beliefs of the group they are attending. The expression is “wearing different hats”. Groups and grouping become stronger.

 Our modern society is flooded with an abundance of thinking devices that conclude much (TV fiction, TV news, social media, cell phone quips, et al). Rather than thinking; we listen to those we like, gather with people we like, and exchange like views. Disagreeable people are sometimes shunned and at least diminished. This tends to cull them from the group most often from their own choosing. “Can’t complain” replaces criticism. People migrate to their chosen groups.

**Hearsay**

**Hearsay is what you heard or read. Stories. Its truth is undetermined.**

 Galileo said the earth was round. He had a story. The catholic church said the earth was flat. They had a story. There was only hearsay evidence until Magellan circum-navigated the earth. He and his crew had a personal experience. Once they told others their story it became hearsay.

 During "the age of curiosity", you learned the word “mother” before you had words. You had your own connotation of the word based on your experiencing your mother. When you learned to talk “the body from which you were born” is seldom what you meant when you said mother. You exchanged a connotation of mother in story form. You exchanged hearsay.

 I once measured the distance an object fell in the first, second, and third second and computed the acceleration of the object. I observed the acceleration of gravity. Although most of what I used to understand was hearsay (from books and teachers), what I measured was not hearsay. When I tell what I observed, I tell a story. I tell hearsay.

**Affirmations**

 Affirmations from the group leaders strengthen beliefs without affecting the truth. An affirmation told repeatedly within a tribe becomes a tenet. The more it is told the more it is believed. Whether it is true or false does not matter. It becomes part of the system. It becomes the common tribal truth.

**Reasonable doubt**

Reasonable doubt is the mean between belief and truth. It's the second-best way of deciding things that need deciding. It is the line between decisions.

Conotivly the golden mean is the name given to describe the position between opposing equally likely positions. It’s probably called golden because it is a place of least destruction. Denotivly, it has two precise mathematical meanings which I am ignoring.

**Doubt**

The memory of an experience is a recollection. The more times it is recalled, the stronger but less precise the recollection. With each recollection there is more connotation. It is a major contributor to word formation during "the age of curiosity". It is a major contributor to tenet formation.

Each person has a connotative understanding of each tenet as unique as each snowflake is unique. But they denote their understanding with words as common as snowflakes melt to water.

We all have stories. We tend to believe our own stories. Each recollection changes with changing memory affected by desire to see ourselves connotatively pleasant, our egos. The water becomes more important than the snowflakes. The rationale grows in strength and use by copying and counting. The strength grows through trust of the leaders’ words and their belief in their affirmations.

**Reason**

I taught high school geometry in a private school. According to Piaget, at that age mental maturation opens the possibility of reason. Reason is to understand how a cause and its effect are related. I chose to teach reason (called the Manhattan project) rather than the public-school copy technique (called SMSG). In addition, I taught a semester of reason (called creative mathematics) followed by a semester of logic which terminated in a logical debate.

Very little is based on reason. To be reasonable you must begin with a personal foundation other than hearsay. I wish to think, listen, talk, consider, and reconsider not based on loyalty to my group’s tenets, or its personnel, or its leadership, but on the ability of my mind. This is not easy!

Each person uses the tools that work best for them. For most it is easier to count affirmations than to reason.

Other times in conversation, when your ego overcomes your will for peacemaking, then you go with your desire to win rather than your desire to understand. If it is in your taste, put your ego aside and attempt to understand.

If you have reasons which you doubt, then you have reasonable doubt of the conclusion. If you have reasons which are connected to the conclusion, then you have reasonable doubt. If your reasons are from personal experience rather than hearsay, then your belief is beyond a reasonable doubt. It does not make it true. It is merely pragmatic.

**Your personal understanding**

I have shown how you get your language, how to create order with language, understanding the meaning of each other’s language, how people learn their beliefs, an understanding of feelings, how groups work together, how people influence each other, the structure of society, and the available levels of cooperation.

I have explained language as a mathematics, the use of mathematics to create linguistic order, the use of linguistic order to communicate understanding, the use of mapping to communicate feelings, and how people acquire their beliefs.

I have described how society is influenced by each individual, how each individual influences society, how society maintains order, the structure of society, group dynamics, and the individual's prerogatives to maintain peace.

I have attempted throughout to teach how to create a thought from nothing using the axiom of choice and the theory of unity.

I believe the sun will rise tomorrow because I saw it rise yesterday, hearsay says it will rise tomorrow, and hearsay says deduction works. It is my best guess.

**The Best guess of your beliefs**

 The foundation of your best guess is some experience, and mostly hearsay. The tools of your best guess are counting and reasoning. Ultimately your best guess is still founded on your instincts of whom and what you can trust. Compared to knowing, it’s not very satisfying, but it gives a foundation for peacemaking conversation.

 I believe it is a better way of dealing with each other than threat, force, and killing.

It recognizes each person’s humanness by conceding the presence of doubt. This replaces acceptance of opposing ideas with tolerance of opposing ideas.

 Good manners are still best for small groups. The rules of peacemaking conversation, although tedious, helps when the group gets large.

Fragments

**Back to Tree and me 2019**

September 22, 2019

Chaos is beautiful, but being human, I handle less.

January 8, 2020

For the sake of pride, I need to feel helpful.

For the sake of humility, I need to feel helped.

For the practice of love, I attempt to transcend both.

January 10, 2020

"That which is" is an infinitely dimensional array of nothing.

May 9, 2020

The foundation of willingness is desire.

I want to live.

May 20, 2020

If you keep score, you like.

If you don't keep score, you love.

May 21, 2020

Some miracles of life take a lifetime.

Some just a moment.

May 22, 2020

Reducing pride changes granger to majesty.

Both are rewarding for they fill time.

June 1, 2020

What is the question?

What, is the question.

July 4, 2020

Capitalism creates abundance.

Communism distributes it.

Socialism makes them work well together.

September 28, 2020

Not being a purest makes me a hypocrite.

Let the first purest cast the first stone.

**I have gone full circle.**

You have all the tools to understand and judge. Whether you call it God's will, the right thing, what law demands, the reasonable conclusion, truth, etal; your belief reduces to your best guess.

June 20, 2023

Pete Howe and I concluded “nothing really matters” when we were 15 years old. I did not understand that nothing and everything were different and the same until Taoism. I did not understand they were empty until Buddhism. I do not understand they were dimensionless until quantum mechanics. I did not understand “that what is” until now. Matter is unreal. What is the question is the answer.

 I have gone full circle in a Mobius space, one time in a lifetime, the other in the moment between “nothing really matters” and “what is the question”.

I knew we were perfect without perfection, but I did not understand how green slime knows without a brain, savants do without knowing, and art impacts without words. So I made up a story from hearsay about mobius space. I don’t even know if it’s true. But now I understand that we are human beings no better or worse than green slime, perfect without perfection.

Bobby would say, “use more words and explain”. Lao Tzu would explain “there are no words”. There are metaphors; I am using this metaphor to explain Mobius space.

**Event** I believe the conversation is best framed by peacemaking conversation.

**The secondary tribe**

The secondary tribe is never primary. It is a supplement. Because the players are from different tribes It has no bureaucracy of its own. It is an inclusive tribe always including as many tribes as possible. The players play a game of peacemaking conversation. It is hoped that peacemaking conversation leads to understanding, leads to love and peace between tribes. It’s hard to hate a loved one merely because he disagrees with you.

When the game succeeds people talk about important things without loss of face by conceding truth to belief so that they can talk as equals.

When the group is over 7 tribalism will overtake purpose. Stay small.

\_

**My prejudice**

 In a dictatorship, a perfect leader serves all the people. The problem is the leader is a human being, perfect without perfection. In democracy, a perfect leader serves all the people. The problem is the leader is selected by a minority of human beings, perfect without perfection.

 Most governments are republics. It's a middle ground. United States and China are both republics because they "elect” their leaders, a subset of the population.

 Economically, capitalism builds prosperity. Communism distributes prosperity. In socialism they work together. Most governments are socialist. It's a middle ground. United States and China are both socialist republics both denying what they aren’t rather than accepting what they are.

The golden mean between dictatorship and democracy seems to be a Republic. The golden mean between capitalism and communism seems to be socialism.

The golden mean is not between war and peace. It is between exposure / promotion and threat/force/violate. It is between social safety and civil liberties. It is between the right of power and the right of need. People will still kill people. Let’s have less of it.

Tribes can learn from people. Tribes must learn to treat other tribes the way friends treat other friends.

**My proposals**

I have proven my methods will fail,

I entered with hope, doomed to try.

I have the rest of my life.

**I propose peacemaking philosophy in secondary tribes**

 because I believe that tribalism is so out of control that people are killing without reason because we have not mastered: What is the reasonably prudent person? What isbeyond a reasonable doubt? Or simply, what is reasonable? Reason starts with each of us. Reason is most useful when it is most inclusive. We need reason both within our tribes and between our tribes. We are all in the human tribe.

 Starts saving the world. Have a dinner party.

**I propose peacemaking conversation in secondary tribes**

because my nation approves killing Russians. I have never met a Russian. I want back the right to determine who my countrymen kill.

The problem is the killing has already started. The beast is out of control.

**I propose people meet in dendocky groups**

 because people with tribal manifestos and machine guns are killing people. It happens in American schools. It happens in other countries.

People expressed themselves within the boundaries of the dendocky group. We used a map, but it could be spatial, numerical, art, or anything else. We dealt within the area in which “there were no words to describe it”.

**I propose that we brainstorm in secondary tribes**

because we need plans and hypotheticals such as; an alternative to the United Nations, a restructured United Nations, a common world language, an independent international organization like the Internet with a slander system that actually works, new ideas. Some, some other, a mixture, or all might help.

**I propose we create the golden mean in secondary tribes.**

 Start with a blank page. It starts with Einstein's " axiom of choice". (You can put anything together in any way.) We started by putting words on a page.

The goal is human compromise between the powerful and the hungry. The golden mean has enough exposure and promotion to minimize threat, force, and violation.

 Judge. The theory of unity tells us to place boundaries on meanings and make them useful. The axiom of choice says you can always change anything.

fragments

**Why not what**

Capitalism produces wealth.

Communism distributes wealth.

Socialism makes capitalism and communism work together.

Sometimes being smart is stupid.

2023

A book is fun to read.

Choose your hearsay.

Jan.2024

Not only am I part with and part of everything,

I am part with and part of a conspiracy of human beings.

I have hope.

Is it a gift of majesty?

February 19, 2024

When the bullets fly my time will be gone

until

The blood of the dead settles.

Then

the time of peacemaking conversation will be back.

In an abundant society

If you have the power, you have the right

and

If you have the need, you have the right

as long as

the Lion leaves his leftovers for the hungry

and the squirrel does not hoard.

February 24, 2024

A book is one man’s affirmation of his truth.

We’re all bigots.

March 1, 2024

Mass and time move at the same speed.

That’s why mass is always in the present.

Light (Energy) has wiggles.

It’s everywhere.

More accurately, it’s everytime.

The eigenstate.

The union of all eigenstates is What.

**Postscript**

To be continued until I die.

We all have stories.

Some of them are true.

We tend to believe our own stories.

Every book is the author’s hearsay.

Find your own.

Don’t copy mine.