

## Singularity Field Effect 20191210

It's December 10th, 2019. It's about 9:15 in the morning. Once again that's December 10th, 2019 about 9:15 in the morning. So I went on a walk last night and I was kind of thinking about, oh, well, I think where I want to start is I was contemplating some quick notes that I had made earlier in the day. Actually it was that morning, yesterday morning, about field effect. And I actually pulled that note out. I had put it a couple places, but one was on an index card. Field effect, until something becomes excited by the field, example given magnetic lines of force, there may be no evidence or awareness that the field exists. So I was thinking about this in context of some notes I had been listening to earlier yesterday, actually before I took that note, about the singularity and how it's, you know, I've heard it approached and described, not described, analogies drawn by others who explore this part of our existence. And in my notes I had said that, you know, this is something that we really need to have tolerance and understanding of each other in our exploration of this because we are, after all, as I've said in the past, attempting to wrap our finite mind around the infinite. And so it's, you know, that's quite a task to undertake. But the direction that my train of thought had taken and the track that I was running on, so to speak, was I was kind of exploring the parallel between the field effect and the way that I had imagined or attempted to probe the existence of what I am terming the singularity. And I had talked about it like being a carrier that's modulated. And I remember seeing somewhere that there was, you know, and the only thing I can really relate this to off the top of my head is states. So you have the rest state and then you have the state of excitation. And so I was kind of thinking about the rest state in some respects as being the state prior to the Big Bang Theory, the metaphysical Big Bang, or the event. I guess you would call that an event horizon. And so I imagined the state as a state of being. And I think that's the, it's hard, I grappled with this a little bit when I first ran across this concept of being, of it's not what an entity does, it's what an entity is. And in that rest state, in that state of being, at rest, there is no action. And in this case, as was covered in some of the presentations that I compared my approach to, there is no thing. It's a null set, it's an empty set, it's non-material. So at the instant that consciousness became aware, because it was in a pure state, a pure potential, it became infinitely aware in an instant. And in its pure potential, in its state of pure potential, it realized in that awakened awareness that it could create. And there was, because it was in a pure state, there was nothing

between, there were no impediments. Nothing that stood between its pure potential and the act of creation. And that is what we term the Big Bang in our understanding of how the physical world came into existence. So I was just kind of thinking about, like I said, that was the rail I was riding, the rails, I should say, of sort of trying to understand the parallel between field effect and viewing this conscious potential as a carrier, as a singularity. And the way that I see that singularity is that state of being. And I think that's what I think that's what the Laws of Form, G. Spencer Brown, was talking about, that he talked about he talked about how a world comes into being when, I think of a space, but when some, when there is division, draw a distinction. And so that, so according to this approach, that first distinction was a state of distinction of states. So it was the state of being and then a severance or a boundary, I should say, and that talks about, that approach is boundary conditions, a boundary of becoming. And that is that creative expression, materialized creative expression. And again, that went, you know, beginning as the singularity, which of course at the human level, you know, it transitions to a state of multiplicity. But it was all about, the teleological purpose was about materialized creative consciousness. And this is where, during the walk, I was kind of thinking about, well, that's really where the bridge function comes in, because it's basically a bridge. It's a created bridge It's a created bridge between that rest state of being and being in a state of singularity, a bridge to becoming, and in this case, becoming in a state of multiplicity. And that multiplicity represents expression of the singularity. And I think the ultimate purpose is embodiment within creation of that creative consciousness. So, then I was thinking about field effect. And I remember reading that, what's, what, and this is from layman's terms, I was kind of fascinated by by the discoveries of physicists, where they really can't detect or measure a field, the force of a field. Well, the field, even the presence of a field, much less the force of it, unless that field is impacting, influencing, or exciting some thing. And then, by them measuring, by them observing and measuring the things that the field influences, then they start to discover characteristics. Well, first they discover the presence of a field, and then they begin to understand or discover the characteristics of the field. And that is, you know, that's kind of, to me, is kind of fascinating, because it's, it kind of goes back to the whole concept of states of, of consciousness. If we thought, so if for a moment I approach or moment I approach or investigate or explore consciousness from the perspective of being a field, if I follow that observable, if I follow that observable track of discovery, then basically there's no way for an entity to be aware of the field until some thing is influenced, impacted, or excited by

the field. And so, that made me think of spiritual events, where someone is somehow impacted by some event in their realm of experience, and I guess for simplicity's sake, they experience a moment of inspiration. So again, you know, so this is one of the difficulties of approaching the infinite with the finite mind. And this is why it spills over into things like religion so quickly. How do you approach, from a physical frame of reference, how do you approach a non-physical influence? And again, this is, you know, one of the gentlemen that I listened to some, a presentation that he offered. It was pretty fascinating to me, because he was what others in his field, which was particle physics, called a promising doctoral candidate. He showed promise. And so he, but I think he kind of surprised and or disappointed some of his colleagues, because once he earned his doctorate, he kind of went, explored a somewhat different path in metaphysics, and kind of followed that path. And I think that's the real struggle for those inquiring minds, those who engage a quest strictly on the physical level. And he even said this in his lecture, that what if that quest leads to no thing? What if that quest leads to something that is non-material? Very difficult for a physicist to take that final step, because of the very nature of their chosen discipline. And I think therein lies the challenge for the, for an individual who is on a quest of discovery. I think that kind of goes back to the mu concept, about sometimes the answer lies outside the frame of the question that's been asked. So you have to unask that question, because the question frames the answer. You have to ask, yeah, you have to perhaps ask a question that lies outside of your domain, outside of your comfort zone. And I think some people, it's difficult for them to take that final leap into that, which this gentleman was willing to do that. But to his colleagues, he's like a lost sheep. So anyway, and then the final thing I wanted to real quick cover was, it was about working in the craft and working on the craft. And I sort of thought about, well, the master with his hand on the tiller of the world, change the course of thought, you change the course of events. At what level does someone have a desire to engage? And that was, I've not answered that for myself at this point, at this juncture in my practice. I suspect there's been levels that I've experienced, that I've engaged in and experienced in the past. And so I was kind of considering now and coming soon in the near future, if I have the opportunity or the opportunity presents itself, if I either create the opportunity or it presents itself, at what level am I going to be willing to engage? I talk about acting as a guide. So I'm kind of trying to understand what that really entails, what, you know, it's privilege and responsibility. You know, yes, you know, the privilege, but how much of the responsibility am I willing, am I

willing to accept and engage? And, you know, and how much should I be if I'm going to be true to my chosen discipline, to my practice, to the Master's craft? So like I said, this has a lot to do with just fathoming the depth and scope, the range and scope of the bridge function. It's, you know, there's a lot of new horizons that have opened up to me, new connections or, you know, insights. I'm just trying to fathom all this. Well, that's enough for now. Signing off.