Stand n Point 20161121

It's November 21st, 2016. It's about 1:23 in the afternoon, give or take, and I have a few minutes. I'm waiting on an update on the system I'm working on, so I thought it might be a good time to take a few notes. I've been just kind of tossing around a sports metaphor. I'm working on the scripting for the first presentation I'm going to produce, which is to stand and point, and some of what I was mulling over was possibly using a sports metaphor. At this point, so much of it is just about packaging, and with that realization, with that challenge, I started thinking about the best ways that I could represent the material in such a way that the widest possible range of individuals would be able to relate to it. Based on some current events, some events that have taken place quite recently, I realized that approaching it as a game... I'd always talked about, in my early notes, I had referred to a treasure map of sorts, and I had referred to unclaimed inheritance and lost treasures, but as I developed my concept map, I ended up identifying two basic natures that are in play, and I guess I'm referring to these as my archetypes, archetypical characters. One was identified as the avatar nature, and the other was identified as the troll nature. So, going back to my early notes, I had referred to the worldwide reality game, who, what, when, where, how, and why, and as part of that breakdown, again, I had referred to the unclaimed inheritance and lost treasures, and therefore, the ontological map of the human condition was, in some respects, a treasure map, and in some respects, we're engaged in a treasure hunt. So, I guess the verses is attempting to fill our lives up versus living a full life. That's one of the this or that's. Another thing that struck me was, you know, all this, in any of this, I had identified that it's all about conversion. That's part of the goal or outcome that the gameplay incorporates, that in order to really have an impact, it's about converting, about conversion, and I guess, you know, in the simplest terms, conversion from one tribe to another tribe, from one team to another team. Of course, there's many other factors that play into that, but what it came down to was, you know, I started to realize that this has a tie back to early research when I was introduced to the theory of, well, to game theory, and Nash, I can't think of his name right now, but I had read some information about the way that he spoke about the participants in the game, and so going back to the stand and point presentation, you know, I was thinking, well, I could take the approach in that first presentation that I'm pointing, I'm going to take a stand and point to what I suspect is the nature of the game, and what's at stake. So, at the individual level,

of course, you know, this goes back to the unclaimed inheritance and lost treasures. For the individual, okay, so unclaimed inheritance is singular, lost treasures is plural, and the reason I approached it that way was because unclaimed inheritance is a state of human affairs. It's what I call a playground for the children, but that can only be manifested, that can only become actualized through consensus, through mass action that results in mass effect. So, it's not something that any unique or any person, individual, can stake a claim to by themself, or even a small group. It has to be something in the end that the majority, if not the vast majority, let's say the super majority, would understand the value of, and through that consensus, that power of agreement, they could bring it about, they could manifest it or actualize it. So, leaving that off to the side as something not readily available to the individual, that leaves work play, that's the lost treasures. So, what I identified there was, you know, again, attempting to fill our lives up versus living a full life. You know, if we find, if we can browse our options and find an activity, a discipline, a career, however we would tag that to, with a token to name it, my goal was for myself to find an activity that I looked forward to doing. That I would be engaging in every day. I would wake up like a child with the anticipation of another day's play. And I know that's possible, and I don't think that's too much to ask for as an individual in the human condition. So, it's not so easily, it's not so easy to come by. Sometimes it's not even easy, so much easy to identify. But I think once an individual has lived that life, has tasted it, it's really difficult to settle for less. So, I guess in the stand and point, my introduction is to my view of what I suspect to be true. And in order to package it, I'm packaging my perspectives, my perspective to share, my perspectives to share our story to tell. In the form of a game. And so, I want to identify the basic participant, or participants, and or how they're grouped, how they're associated, or how they're connected. And I also want to identify what's at stake. What's the prize? What's the potential prize, or what's the potential cost? What can be lost? And so, the potential prize is, as I've said, the ontological map of the human condition can be thought of as a treasure map. There's these treasures. Unclaimed inheritance, that's a playground for the children, and lost treasures, which is work play. So, that's at the individual level. That's the very first level. And in my analogy of can't see the forest for the trees, that would be in the midst of the first level of the ontological map of the human condition, which is human beings are in competition for survival. They're in competition for resources and opportunity. And so, too close to the trees, can't see the forest for the trees, you're so, it's what I call, it's like being in the trenches. You have so much, you're in

such competition that it's really difficult to stand back and begin to get a glimpse of the big picture. In fact, this is right in line with Maslow's hierarchy, where when you're in the survivalist mode, we're basically at base, and we have little time, little focus, little energy to devote to higher levels of self-actualization and self-expression. You know, to command performances and peak experiences. We're just trying to make it moment to moment, hour to hour, day to day. So, that's the first level of approach. This is what's at stake, and this is what's to be gained, and this is what's to be lost. What's at stake is living a full life for the individual, and what can be lost is, I guess, kind of goes in line with living a life of quiet desperation, which, of course, can result in many external deeds. That are a detriment to others and to ourselves. What's to be gained is living a life of excitement, of work play, of finding that activity where we can contribute and finding joy and fulfillment in it, and looking forward to another day's work as a child looks forward to another day's play. So then, one step back from that is what I identified as sort of at that boundary between the dense woods and the open field where we can look back on the forest. It's that very first glimpse of stepping away from being in the trenches, can't see the forest for the trees, where now we're sort of on that boundary. And so this is what I'm referring to as, you know, what do I mean by enlightenment? What do I mean by an expanded consciousness, an awakening awareness? This is where we first get that glimpse of a bigger picture than we can see when we're in the trenches in the dense forest amongst the thickness of the trees. We have limited view, peripheral and ahead and above. You know, we can only see what's right there, but if we step back to the boundary, then we start to see a little bit more of the big picture. And so what's at stake here, and this is the first step back, it's still an ontological view of the human condition, but it has to do with the bigger picture of conflict of forces. So the first level is human conflict. You know, it's conflict of resources, of opportunities. It's the conflict for personal, individual survival. Of course, that's not really enough for the human spirit. We wish to thrive, but that's living at base. Now, this next step back is conflict of forces, and what that conflict of forces, my perspective on that is it's sustainability versus extinction. In other words, what's at stake at this level is the age of man. Will the age of man continue or will the age of man come to an end? And lead to our extinction. And with that said, where this places us is in a chain of custody. We're stewards of this system. We're stewards of the inherent system and we're stewards of the human condition. And it's up to us how, you know, in this chain of custody, which parts of that inherent human, the human condition that we're born into, how much of that

is bridged forward in time to generations that come after us. And that's where I get the term, the bridge function. All human possibility converges at the individual and all human probability emerges from a point that is the individual. So we determine what gets bridged forward, what gets diminished or discarded, what gets introduced, what becomes part of the human condition in our lifetime and then passed forward through the chain of custody into the future. So what's at stake? The age of man. What's at stake is sustainability of the age of man and the human species or the extinction of the human species. And what's our role? What's our role is that it's our watch. You know, we're a chain of custody. This is a chain of custody and this is our watch. And we determine what is bridged forward, what has continuity. We determine what is diminished or discarded. And we determine what's introduced and what is passed as our legacy to the future. So, and then of course the final step back, you know, those to me are ontological, the nature and relations of being. But this last step back is what I term either the metaphysical or teleological view and that is the level of expanded consciousness of awakening awareness that leads to an expanded consciousness and full enlightenment. So, I believe the only thing, the only, the essence of existence is pure consciousness. And so this is a vessel that consciousness has created in order to embody itself. To me the universe is almost like a mirror. It's like I existed but I knew nothing of myself. I knew everything but nothing. But in that instant I realized that consciousness realized that it could create. And so this is its chance. This is one chance for it to manifest in physical form. So the purpose, the teleological purpose is materialized creative consciousness. And that's what each and every individual represents the potential of. However, with that said, at this last step away and seeing the immensity of the big picture, consciousness does not begin or end with the age of man, with mankind. Whether mankind exists and is sustained into the future or mankind as a species becomes extinct. This is just a chance for consciousness to become manifest in material form. I'm not saying it's, it could be the only one currently, the only game in town, it could be the only game running or it might be one of many games running. So anyway, that's sort of where I was thinking about introducing as making the run into with stand and point, to take a stand and to point. And then of course the second presentation is going to be two steps back. So this little summary has been a combination of the stand and point, you know, stand and point. And then further expanding on that awareness of the game by the three levels of awakening awareness and expanded consciousness, you know, therefore loosely referred to as enlightenment. So anyway, that's sort of how I was looking at the

sports metaphor, the game theory approach. I haven't expanded on that any more than I in my basic notes, but I'm kind of thinking that might be the way to go. You know, I have to focus on the packaging now, and I think that might be an easy package for people to unwrap and wrap their minds around. Two competing teams, that's kind of where I'm leading to with that, teams or tribes, going back to the avatar nature and the troll nature. And I think they're evenly matched, and therefore, you know, of course when the game is, when the participants are evenly matched, the game is, the gameplay is very engaging because it's going to be a close game. A lot of talent on both sides, and it's a contest of which approach is going to prevail, which approach is going to win the day, so to speak. And, you know, I think the way that we get there is different, and I think possibly even the outcome is different. I don't know. It's kind of hard for me to relate thoroughly to both, to the positions of both teams in the fundamentalism that the teams have seemed to practice. It seems to be pretty extreme, very little compromise, very little agreement on basics. You know, I even said it earlier, they, you know, it seems like the participants on each side spend so much time trying not to be wrong that they don't use critical thinking to, and employ it to, determine what's right. And so the game continues, and it can be very destructive and very detrimental to everyone around, you know, everyone that's participating in the game, either passively or actively. So anyway, I think that's enough for now. It kind of gets down to basics. Signing off.