

Essay

From Dogma to Clarity

Alan J. Oliver*

Abstract

Over a number of years, I have written about the Yoga diagram because I was convinced it could explain consciousness based on my Samapatti experiences. This essay relates to what writing about those experiences have finally taught me, and, thus, is my own viewpoint on the Yoga diagram, Samapatti, and my conclusions about consciousness and reality.

Keywords: Memory, singularity, quantum state, retained information, implicate order, measurement problem.

Introduction

In the early 2000's, I spoke with Professor Basil Hiley of my experience with the 'disturbed' cat and asked him how that experience would fit within modern physics. He said the best word to describe it would be entanglement. My lack of a grounding in physics has slowed my understanding of what he really intended to convey, but persistence has yielded its surprising viewpoint.

The diagram below is intended to describe the descent of consciousness into matter. This essay is my own viewpoint on the Yoga diagram, Samapatti, and my conclusions about consciousness and reality. I begin with some definitions of the Sanskrit terminology used in the diagram:

Prakriti: Matter as a potential, inferring there is a universal substrate from which matter evolves.

Mahat: From the spiritual perspective, Mahat is the reflection of Pure Consciousness as the potential to know within matter. From a practical or rational perspective, Mahat is the dispassionate observer operating beyond the sense of Self.

Buddhi: Buddhi is the faculty of discrimination of 'this and not that' within that potential for knowing.

Ahamkara, the ego, the sense of self, I Am, which is impelling both mind and body. **Sattva,** **Tamas** and **Rajas** are the three **Gunas**, states of activity within the Prakriti, with Sattva said to be luminous and expansive, Tamas being dull and solid, and Rajas being the relationship between Tamas and Sattva, impelling them both. The diagram can also represent a state of inactivity when the gunas are in equilibrium. Sattva becomes Mind, while Tamas becomes matter. At the lower part of the diagram are five subtle elements which can be regarded as potentials, and five gross elements which are the precursors of matter coming from the

* Correspondence: Alan J. Oliver, Normanville, South Australia. E-mail: thinkerman1@dodo.com.au

In his book, “Wholeness and the Implicate Order”³, David Bohm talks about information in potential which infolds as quantum potential and unfolds to realise that potential as reality. The Yoga diagram says much the same; the five subtle elements, 14-18, being those potentials. Matter becoming atomic appears at the bottom of the diagram, the five gross elements, 19-23, representing the forces and fields within the quantum state which eventually create matter. The way the whole diagram is described is, from a modern perspective, quite complex and yet, when one considers the fact that it was intuited in a Samadhi state possibly some thousands of years ago and handed down verbally in the context of the original culture, it does bear some resemblance to modern physics.

The first similarity I see is that the whole diagram is a snapshot of the quantum state, down to the point where matter is manifested. The fact that the original purpose of the diagram was to describe the ‘descent’ of consciousness into matter infers the manifestation of matter was a secondary consideration for the people who first envisaged this diagram. My conclusion on that point is that the diagram is intended for two different sectors of that original culture and reflects the views of G Srinivasan in Sankhya Karika⁴. The diagram’s focus on consciousness was intended for a broader audience than its deeper science content because the broader audience had come to accept the providential aspect of nature in a spiritual context.

On the Yoga diagram the first appearance of intelligence is called Mahat, and is said to be the reflection of Purusha, pure consciousness. Mahat has the faculty of discrimination between ‘this and that’; in other words, Mahat is the first point of intelligence one could describe as knowing what it has observed, which makes Mahat the observer. The reason for the reflection is that Purusha aka God is the creator of reality and logically must be existentially apart from its creation. So, this interpretation of the diagram is for communicating its message to the population at large, most likely by a person higher up the scale of importance, such as a spiritual leader. Further down the diagram the aspects of mind come into play, with Ahamkara, ego, giving the observation an individual context; Sattva or mind, while at the same time having a relationship, Rajas, with matter, Tamas.

In the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali¹, the author, Pandit Usharuddh Arya, describes two kinds of memory. The first kind is that in which ‘the process and instrument of apprehension’ is primary in one’s awareness; this awareness is called intelligence. The second kind of memory is that in which the ‘object’ being remembered is primary; this is what most people experience as memory. I realised I have the first kind of memory and understood that part of the answer about consciousness may be found by considering situations which differ markedly from the general view of consciousness. This becomes important when considering Samapatti, which is the ‘coalescence of two minds’; I thought this was a fine example of a different view.

The word, ‘intelligence’, in relation to the process and instrument of apprehension, infers that this kind of memory is present at the level of Mahat. It also infers that the second or more general form of memory is a characteristic of mind. Intelligence enters the mind, Sattva and Tamas, through the activity of Rajas.

This knowledge is said to have been obtained through the Samadhi state of Samapatti. Patanjali tells us that Samapatti is one of the attributes accessed while in that state, and that all of the

information ever known throughout time can be accessed by anyone in that state. To become established in that state one must have the mind under control; in practice this means having the mind empty and open to whatever or whoever one's awareness is focused upon. In Samapatti, the one who is focused is called the seer, while the one focussed upon is called the subject.

In some Hindu schools of philosophy there is an opinion that the universe is cyclic, created in cycles of coming into existence, lasting for some time and then dissolving back into its substrate, Prakriti. The cycle is a function of the Creator, Brahma, the Sustainer, Vishnu and the Dissolver, Shiva. I mentioned the Yoga diagram in the Abstract of this essay and have reasoned that its mention of 'matter becoming atomic' at the end point of the diagram means that I can assume the whole diagram leading to that point must be describing the quantum state which precedes real matter. The diagram itself uses Sanskrit terms which the average person would find difficult to understand, and for that reason I will give a Plain English interpretation in terms of the observation Professor Hiley made when I asked him about an experience I had in Samapatti. He said my experience with the cat was a quantum entanglement. The subject in the example I gave Hiley was a very emotionally disturbed cat. I offer three different examples of Samapatti to point out how different subjects can provide different experiences for comparison.

Example 1

This experience came about when I was asked to help a lady's 'disturbed cat'. She told me the cat had been a stray which she had housed and fed for almost two years; she said the cat was very nervous and obviously disturbed, it couldn't be held for more than two minutes, and had not washed itself in all of its time with her. I sat down and she placed this smelly cat on my lap; I put my hand on its head and it immediately went to sleep.

I began to have chaotic visual images of multiple shards of jagged light, like a number of multiple simultaneous migraine episodes. This was a surprise for me because I am unable to form mental images of anything. The flashing lights continued for about twenty minutes, finally giving way to a garden scene, apparently seen from a cat's perspective. To me the plants seemed to be very large and the colours lacked any green, just shades of brown and yellow. I also felt that the garden was both familiar and comfortable, while at the same time knowing I had never seen this garden before. I realised that what I had seen was the cat's perspective of a garden the cat seemed to know. As soon as I made that observation, the garden scene changed into my own human perspective with the usual colours of a garden. After about twenty minutes in the garden I knew the cat was going to wake up; in a few moments it woke and began to wash itself. The lady was very impressed. I didn't comment because I didn't know what to say at the time.

This example shows two minds being entangled, and the two minds only require to be in living forms, not just human form. The entanglement results in the seer knowing and feeling what the subject knows and feels in that moment. The next example involves a human as the subject.

Example 2

In this second example I had been asked to help a man, Graham, who suffered from Huntington's chorea. Initially I sat near him, and as I relaxed and thought about what I could do, my limbs began to shake a little. I realised this was his shaking; I stayed in my position and after a while I noticed his shaking had stopped, and this remained the case for about forty minutes. We repeated

this Samapatti once a week for about six months, and I had asked him to remember the session and its outcome as something he could practice at home. He had been living in residential care at the time, and with his practice he was able to move into the house of one of his friends. After six months of continued practice of remembering his Samapatti experience at home he became confident enough to secure a part time job, a move which had helped his self-esteem to some extent. Unfortunately, he was killed in a road accident some months later and I wasn't able see just where this case might have gone for Graham.

These examples show what happens when two minds coalesce. It means that the seer can experience the experience of the subject, while the subject experiences the seer's empty mind. Effectively, the subject experiences the neural state of the seer consciously and physically as her/his own neural state during the period of the Samapatti session, a change which is retained as a real memory for the subject; to that extent Samapatti becomes a form of therapy. What the experiences show is that Samapatti can give some relief to someone in pain or any other physical disturbance. It also shows that it can work between two different species. It is my contention that this form of interaction is a form of entanglement Hiley said it was, and as an entanglement it operates in the quantum state through the potentials and information in a medium of waves and particles.

Example 3

My final example concerns my eldest daughter Tracey, who was in a coma in hospital after her body had rejected the heart and lungs transplant she had received five years earlier. At the time I was living in another state and had flown there to see her. Arriving in the hospital room I found her surrounded by her immediate family as well as many friends, which meant I had to wait until there was space for me to sit beside her. When I sat beside the bed and looked at Tracey, her body was making some involuntary movements consistent with the neural activity related to being in a coma. I entered a very intense state of bliss and was able to notice that my bliss had no effect on her involuntary movements. My bliss lasted on and off from that moment, and into the days after her funeral and burial and into the following week.

What I had not noticed before feeling the bliss, was that my memory is not the same as that of people in general. When the bliss finally eased off and came to an end I tried to regain it from memory. What I found was that my memory is only a narrative of the event, a simple thought that 'this is what happened when I sat beside Tracey in hospital'. I hadn't noticed this before, and yet now I as I look back I realise my memory has always been this way. I had never thought about it before because I believed I was just the same as everyone else. As I began to write this essay I realised where this experience seems to be different from my other Samapatti experiences. However, the more I think about it, this isn't really about this experience being different; what is different is now is that I can see I need a more accurate description of Samapatti instead of simply saying Samapatti is a coalescence of two minds. In this case it is about our two minds meeting at the level of Mahat.

Looking back on all three experiences I can make a few observations:

The cat's dream:

- The first point is that my inability to form visual images tells me that what I 'saw' in the cat experience was the cat's dream from the cat's perspective, together with the cat's feeling that the garden was familiar and comfortable.
- The second point is that as soon as I found I was seeing from the cat's perspective, the perspective changed to the garden as I would have seen it myself.
- The third point is that of me knowing the cat would wake up before it did wake up. I did not know the cat would begin to wash itself on waking. It is likely this is what this cat might have done when it woke up at earlier times in its life.

Huntington's chorea:

- In this second experience there was the realisation that my shaking was the subject's condition, not mine, and my shaking stopped for the rest of our time together because I was no longer experiencing from Graham's perspective.

My daughter Tracey in a coma:

- In the third experience with my daughter Tracey, the Bliss started immediately I sat beside her and looked at her; and it remained with me for over a week. At no time did my focus on Tracey stop her involuntary movements, which means this was not Samapatti; it was two selves meeting at the level of Mahat. I use the word selves deliberately because her mind was obviously occupied with the subjective process related to the coma and the involuntary movements involved in that process.

In the first two experiences, when I found I was experiencing the subject's viewpoint it changed back to mine; on the diagram, this discrimination came from the Buddhi aspect of Mahat, which produced my realisation of experiencing from the subject's viewpoint.

Entanglement & Process

My references to Samapatti and to the Buddhi aspect of Mahat in two of them, all show that Samapatti is not confined to the human form of life. First, it is a quantum process which has a conscious as well as a physical effect in any living form. Therefore, the quantum process is what creates life, manifests life, and experiences life. Moreover, the information related to the experience is retained because this quantum process operates in nonlocal space. In my case, what is retained is a dispassionate observation rather than the exact experience itself, and I believe this is significant in terms of understanding consciousness. With these points in mind, I can now examine the process in what I believe are quantum terms as well as recognising a correlation between science and the Yoga diagram.

The first thought I have in relation to the process as a fundamental of creation, is that it exists now, and that it would have existed in the original formation of matter, long before any life appeared on earth. In my view follows that, because consciousness as we experience it through

the brain requires a living form, then consciousness is not the fundamental of the process of creation.

My experience with the cat shows that the conscious awareness provided in living forms is not the exclusive preserve of humankind that the diagram would suggest, and its reason for being is spiritual, political, or it is both. It is obviously educational and a tool for sharing the early scientific knowledge gained in the Samadhi state, knowledge which is quite similar to what we know from science. The language used is a metaphoric way of describing things in the quantum state in everyday terms and contexts, and that has been an impediment to western minds trying to understand its message.

Conscious?

The Sanskrit word, Satchitananda, is generally translated as Existence, Knowing and Bliss. Existence is obviously related to matter, and it can infer the awareness of being alive which we call being conscious, which also relates to knowing. Bliss on the other hand is rarely experienced outside of the Samadhi state. In my case, I have sometimes experienced it during quiet moments alone, obviously there were no distraction or any inputs at the time. What I experienced with Tracey I would describe as an unbroken time of continuous expansion throughout every cell in my body, an almost unbearable visceral pleasure. It is this narrative memory of that experience that gives me an example of how consciousness works. I think it may have been Bohm who introduced me to the idea of a hologram; a structure in which the whole hologram can be reconstructed from any part of the hologram.

In the body we have the sensory system, the subtle elements, the neural system of the brain, and the gross elements. In a normal functioning mammal, the experience of the sensory system 'informs' the neural system and the result is a visceral feeling accompanied by conscious awareness. The manner in which the sensory system informs the neural system is via each system being entangled as parts of a hologram, effectively two entangled holograms. Whatever is in the sensory hologram is also present in the physical hologram. The latter being particles in the synaptic junctions being turned on or off in sync with the waveforms within the sensory hologram. The same can be true of a memory, in which people experience a feeling or a thought, either simultaneously or one following the other.

In Tracey's case, her brain was informed by the body's responses to the organs shutting down in the comatose state. At the same time, I was experiencing Tracey's bliss, while her body/mind activity had no effect on me; it was not the usual Samapatti because Tracey as a mind had no input that I could experience. I am saying that in my view I was experiencing Tracey's state of Mahat which was not at all connected to her body; I was experiencing the process as it was operating for Tracey; there was no consciousness; if there had been I would have experienced it at that time. At Mahat, it would seem that Tracey had made a measurement, a choice to end this life and enter the next one or to simply wait things out; then it was only a matter of waiting for the whole body to shut down, which it did about ten hours later. I believe it was the process which moved to the next step, based on the context of her body's state in that moment.

Creation

If one takes a literal interpretation of the Yoga diagram, Prakriti viewed as a substrate must be a singularity, a point without mass/matter, oscillating as a spherical standing wave, mentioned by Srinivasan in his Sankhya Karika⁵, and by others. The singularity is what one would expect to find at the end point of a cycle of creation and it exists in the state of Akasha, which I understand to be the Sanskrit word for nonlocality. The spiritual view given on the diagram is that Purusha enters Prakriti and from then on, the focus is on the first evolute of matter and the first point of intelligence and conscious knowing called Mahat. This is the first appearance of the wave/particle duality on the diagram. If it is needed, one could say that Purusha experiences reality through Mahat in a Samapatti, with Purusha being the seer and Mahat being the subject.

From my experiences in Samapatti, I believe the information retained in that nonlocal space, Mahat, will be related to the observation of the final point at the end of a cycle, and that observation by Mahat, will initiate the beginning the next cycle of creation. To explain how I think that would happen in terms of the quantum state I move to Hiley's suggestion that Samapatti infers quantum entanglement.

Quantum Mechanics tells us that particle can be in any number of states at the same time, and that a quantum entanglement is the result of a particle decaying into two 'new' particles. If we define a particle by measuring one of those states we find that the measurement has had an effect on its entangled partner, an effect which is independent of their distance apart at the time of taking the measurement. The effect on the other particle is what defines it in terms of its partner and the original particle which decayed. The distance apart and the time of the measurement indicates the particles have become real because the measurement is taken by a real person using a real measuring instrument. This decay of the particle and the subsequent two particles would occupy the last level on the diagram, the boundary between the quantum domain and five fundamental forces of matter.

Wave or particle?

In science, the wave/particle dilemma comes from the discovery that a particle can be described, partly in terms of being a particle and partly in terms of being a wave. My suggestion of a fundamental process of creation involves this question of a duality present in the viewpoint of Mahat as it observes matter becoming atomic. Remembering that the whole diagram is in the nonlocal state, Mahat, and its faculty of discrimination Buddhi, is really observing the whole diagram simultaneously, and while matter becomes atomic at the bottom of the diagram we must be aware of the players at that level. The diagram uses the words, earth, air, fire, water and space; in modern science these words would be related to the fundamental forces of gravity, the strong and weak forces and electromagnetism, while space is Akasha, and therefore space in this context is information in potential related to what Mahat has observed.

What I am suggesting is that space/Akasha is the information, which is part waveform and part particle, together with Mahat as the fundamental spherical standing wave and the relevant harmonics 'at the same time'. This means that the information we have called Mahat, together with the waveforms related to the beginning of the evolution of a particle in this quantum state,

are effectively ‘measured’ in a process which has the means to discriminate between the parts of the process we might call steps and the dancers taking those steps. This means that a physical measurement cannot unpick the simultaneous nature of this portion of the particle’s creation; the best one can obtain are parts of a measurement of a particle and of the wave because the measurement makes some of these ‘parts’ real in spacetime, which is why there can be ‘information retained in space’. In science, this is sometimes attributed to the ‘collapse of the waveform or wavefront’.

In terms of the information observed by the singularity before the decay of the original particle, I would assert it would be the information related to the forces involved in its formation, and when it decayed that information would be observed as the distinct parts of the subsequent particles in the context of a relationship or set. As an entangled set, any measurement on a part of the set would have an effect on the other part. In a quantum entanglement, these wave/particle components will be what Mahat observes as the original particle, p^0 , which decays into p^0_1 and p^0_2 . These can be any pieces of the fundamental forces, ‘earth, air, fire, and water’, which make up a particular particle. We know that a measurement on p^0_1 will have an effect on p^0_2 because it will have been made as a physical measurement by a person whose conscious observation is one observed by Mahat. One might say p^0 can be expressed as being $p^0_1 + p^0_2$ if we assume the fundamental forces could be written that way. We cannot say that exactly because defining either would require a measurement; instead we simply say a measurement on one will influence the other without saying what that effect will be.

This is exactly the same as two people in Samapatti, where the contextual information of each mind is present on the other mind, and when the seer notices that the information she/he has become aware of is the subject’s mind, her/his awareness then reverts back to that of the individual who is the seer. In effect, the seer’s mind has taken a measurement, and the seer here is Mahat. Its effect is to have the subject experience the seer’s mind state. Because the seer’s mind is different to that of the subject, it ‘replaces the subject’s mental and therefore physical hologram which is experienced as a change in the way the subject feels, such as Graham having his shaking stop when he remembers the earlier Samapatti.

The process of creation is the same process used to produce what we call consciousness; but in reality consciousness is the outcome of the process, which means it is not a fundamental. In terms of entanglement, consciousness is the informational context of any individual sentient entity, when she/he/it ‘measures’ a moment in time in terms of his/her/its environment, a measurement which can be real information as experienced directly or information from memory. This information is what Bohm called the Implicate Order², infolding as experience and unfolding as memory, with all this happening simultaneously in Wheeler’s Quantum Foam³.

The relationship I always believed Samapatti to have in respect of gaining an understanding of consciousness, is the quantum entanglement the singularity has with every part of the diagram. What this means is that Mahat is the seer and every step in the process is the subject; in effect, the so-called ‘observation’ by Mahat is in fact the simultaneous informational context and the information itself, infolding or unfolding in any given quantum moment, which is of course a step in the process. The infoldment is what Yoga has called the observation of that moment while the unfoldment is the retained information (memory) recalled by that moment.

If we consider Rajas to be stepping the process between infolding and unfolding, we can use Wheeler's and Feynman's³ description of taking a measurement in an experiment to determine which pathway a particle may select in an experiment set up for that purpose. Feynman called this selection an integral path, while Wheeler renamed the selection as the 'sum over histories'. I have assumed the 'histories' in question are all the possible paths taken within the particle's context. I base this assumption on all particles being entangled in the quantum state, meaning histories will always be plural rather than singular.

Part of the plurality of the histories lies in the word, context. In Bohm and Hiley's book, *The Undivided Universe*⁷, I came across the term, 'hidden variables' which, in an entangled universe can relate to a similar context contributing an unforeseen or unknown 'history' in respect of a decision apparently 'made' by a particle in an experiment, or even in a human decision. In 2005 I read a report in *New Scientist* of Madeleine Ennis's⁸ experiment designed to debunk homeopathy. Ennis said the solution had been diluted to such an extent there was not even one molecule of histamine remaining in the solution. The study, replicated in four different labs, found that the diluted homeopathic solutions 'worked just like histamine'. I believe this retained effect of histamine in the context of a homeopathic solution could be an example of what Bohm and Hiley called a 'hidden variable'.

In respect of retained information in nonlocal space, the Yoga Sutras appear to agree with Quantum Mechanics³ when they say that in Samadhi, as in making a quantum measurement, time can appear to run forwards as well as backwards. This would mean the 'history,' which determines the outcome of a decision regarding which pathway a particle may take in a quantum experiment, may be related to information associated with a different but similar experiment performed at some future time. Considering the similarity of the information inferred within the Yoga diagram and with Quantum Mechanics in this current time, it is entirely plausible that a person in the Samadhi state in the distant past could have acquired access to the modern viewpoint of the scientists of today, information which would be expressed in the cultural viewpoint of that distant past, which explains part of why a western mind has difficulty interpreting an eastern viewpoint.

A quantum anomaly relating directly to Sattva and Tamas is the wave/particle dilemma⁶, in which a particle can appear to be both a wave and a particle at the same time. To me, the two viewpoints, wave and particle, are analogous to the seer having her/his own awareness *and* the subject's awareness in Samapatti; I suggest this viewpoint has been interpreted by the ancient ones as Rajas impelling both viewpoints, when in fact they are being observed simultaneously and discriminated as two distinct entangled subjects by Mahat.

From this last point I believe the process of creation follows the unfolding information as the context for an aggregation of harmonic waveforms to transform the latent energy, as earth, air, fire and water, at the singularity, Akashic space, into matter. It would be a reasonable assumption that every particle of a specific element so created is entangled with every other particle of that specific element at that level of creation, which would account for the apparent consistency of the laws of physics related to that specific element.

When I consider consciousness in the context of being the result of the fundamental process, the role of Ahankara, ego or identity, is the definition afforded by Mahat in the same way that Mahat discriminates between other identities in the entanglement. To that extent, all matter is entangled with the singularity within the particles at the base of all matter, and every particle constituting any living matter is similarly entangled. Therefore, in respect of the appearance of conscious in matter, this process within matter, whether the first appearance of life or in human life, quantum entanglement is the vital component of the sensory and neural systems which provide the awareness we use as the subjective evidence of life. For most people, this means we are the subject rather than the seer in the Samapatti we call existence.

My conclusions at this point

In most of my childhood and subsequent growing up, I have always felt inadequate and could never understand why. I know my older siblings treated me as the weak link in the family and I have lived much of my life within that self-image as an accepted fact. My earliest memory, despite it being in the narrative form, is from around the age of four and it concerns what has now become an enlightening realisation. I remember playing in our back yard alone and had the impression that the leg of a boy just like me had emerged through the corrugated iron fence. Unlike me, this leg wore a shoe and had its sock pushed down around the ankle. I rushed to my mother to tell her what had frightened me; she gave me a whack on the head and told me to stop being so stupid.

I remember some years back reading R. D. Laing's book, *The Divided Self*⁵, in which he says there is often a person within a family who assumes the defects of other family personalities; it is usually the one with the least sense of self. Strangely enough, in the Hindu schools it is said that there is only one self, Mahat/Purusha. It is only now that I have begun to put my story into perspective and will consider this point later in the essay.

The Hindu schools of philosophy have a collective term for the process of creation, Satchitananda; which translates as Existence, Knowing and Bliss. I have deduced Bliss to be at the level of Mahat, and that Mahat is the instant between the last moment of a cycle of creation and the first moment of the next cycle. Srinivasan says something about this instant in his *Sankhya Karika*⁴, and I didn't quite understand most of it when I read it because it seemed too complicated at the time. Now I believe this instant, which Srinivasan says is later than the end of one cycle and earlier than the beginning of the next, is analogous to Schrodinger's cat; neither dead nor alive until measured.

When I recall that earliest memory, I can understand it as a metaphor for what happened during my episode of febrile convulsions a few months before my experience in the back yard and the leg coming through the fence, and there is a similarity to my shared state of bliss with Tracey. I have always thought I probably had a Near-Death Experience during my convulsions, and what I remembered was a metaphor for that experience. I believe Tracey was most likely in that same Near-Death state of bliss when I sat beside her bed in the hospital and focused on her, and this brings me back to consider the state of the singularity in terms of spirit.

For living matter, there is a singular instant between life and death; for me that moment came about because of that episode of convulsions as a child, and for Tracey it was a moment during a point in the hours before her death. I think the everlasting life mentioned in the New Testament is confined to that moment or instant between life and death, a forever moment because it is an experience in the nonlocal state. Satchitananda promises that Ananda moment of total bliss. I can see now why I used “Thinking on the other side of Zero⁹” for the title of the book I wrote in my attempt to explain all of the above in 2005.

I conclude that Mahat/spirit is in nonlocal space, and there is really no interval between death and rebirth, which makes the concept of reincarnating a person or Schrodinger’s cat a simple matter of making a measurement. I find it ironic that in the New Testament we are told by Jesus that ‘one must be born again to have life everlasting’ any yet most in the western world have what appears to be an all-consuming avoidance of the subject of death. In a Near-Death moment the measurement to be made is one of choosing to continue the present life or allowing it to end. It makes heaven a simple decision of enjoying the bliss, and hell is being undecided, or thinking I could have done this or that to avoid death.

My experience of bliss was one of an almost unbearable sense of expansion in every cell of my body, coupled with almost unbearable intense pleasure; an experience some might imagine to be orgasmic but for the fact that it is quite non-sexual. The sense of expansion comes from the singularity, that Near-Death point/Schrodinger state; it combines the point between maximum expansion of the oscillation and an apparent pause before its imminent collapse. One feels that expansion as a mild outward pressure on the skin as well as the pleasure/relief of the pause, possibly another example of two simultaneous states.

In earlier essays, I have mentioned my friend, Emma¹⁰, a woman in the final stages of breast cancer. Emma experienced these Near-death states in our Samapatti sessions in the hospice every night during her final three months, and it is why the staff nurses told me Emma had the ‘most beautiful death’ they had ever witnessed. Some seven years earlier we had started our Samapatti sessions and in the early stages I had written a poem in which I described Emma’s death. Emma was very happy with the poem as it gave her confidence of the outcome and called our sessions as her creative dying course.

How does all of this relate to a religious belief in God?

I can only speak in relation to Christianity: any links a reader may make to Judaism or Islam is their own responsibility. The point on page 9, about the Hindu opinion that there is only one Self, is a good place to start. The Hindu schools of thought also say that reality is an illusion, or words to that effect and that illusion will be addressed as we go as best I can. My starting premise at this point is that Prakriti is the fundamental substrate of the universe, which has collapsed at the end of a cycle to a single point; a singularity.

As a final point of what was the universe, that singularity will retain all of the experience of every point in the former universe *and* all of its former matter which is now energy, effectively we can say it is Bohm’s infolded information and the potential for matter, now as a potential

source of information related to every former experience, including the first oscillation of the spherical standing wave mentioned earlier.

We can also say that retained information in potential contains the combination of the four fundamental forces required to undo the information of the now energy and return it to its former state of matter, particle and field by particle and field. Therefore, the process of creation is part of that information in potential, ‘unfolded’ by the singularity in what would be the reverse of the particle decaying, although in truth it would have been information retained from an earlier iteration of a cycle of creation.

The Yoga diagram infers that Purusha creates life and matter, which is like saying that Purusha is the Brahminic trinity and I will continue on that line of thought, while replacing Purusha with Mahat because it is in a Samapatti with Purusha as the seer and Mahat as the subject. To follow that line with some rudimentary logic I will restate my belief that this singularity is at the level of Mahat on the diagram as well as being across the whole diagram. From this point I will use ‘singularity’ rather than Mahat.

Being the first appearance of intelligence and reason (through the discrimination of Buddhi), this intelligent singularity is entangled with every step in the process, including the information retained regarding every one of those steps to the extent that one might say the singularity ‘knows’ everything because every step exists in the quantum state of nonlocality. One can say that the singularity fulfils the roles of Creator and Knower at this point. The question of Ananda, or Bliss, has already been answered on page 10, and I will leave that for the moment.

Every particle that comes into existence comes via the process of creation and would clearly be entangled with the singularity in every subsequent particle of matter. Therefore, every particle of matter has the intelligence and discrimination referred to above. In my explanation regarding entanglement I used the word, Ahamkara, as the ego or self, and said this applies to every particle in an entanglement. In this explanation I mean ‘self’ is a word which identifies one item from another, whether that is a person or a particle. That ‘self’ is always entangled with the singularity, and in a New Age sense one might say the singularity is the ‘higher self’, while in the Yoga Sutras it is simply called the Self, meaning the singularity. In the Yoga Sutras the individual self is referred to as non-self.

The singularity, on the diagram as Mahat, is also referred to as the observer or knower, which I think is where the concept of God came from when one considers the associated attributes. From the examples of Samapatti, the experience of the subject is the informational content of the seer’s mind, and for the seer, the seer’s experience is the informational content of the subject’s mind. The mind of the subject is the momentary configuration of her/his neural network, and part of the input making that configuration is the subject’s definition of “I AM”, which, in the case of the cat was its own experience of the garden; effectively this is how the cat saw the garden in its dream, as well as how it felt about that scene.

For a human, how we experience the world, our relationships, and how we feel in any given moment, is through the fundamental process of the information at the singularity, which we perceive through our conscious awareness. This process evolved the first form of life and its

awareness of the immediate environment. That awareness would have come from the entangled information of the singularity produced by every interaction as its version of awareness. Fast forward to early humans and there would have been the same degree of awareness, but with a mammalian body and brain through which it was expressed.

Other species use mimicry to pass on learned responses to food, ways of getting food and sharing it; They also teach survival responses. The advent of language gave humans an expanding way to share information, to the point where the alignment of language to words and visual and emotional cues, became so embedded in our communication that it is the predominant information in our mind; conscious thought.

It is hardly surprising that we developed predictive thought based on observation of cause and effect, and in the face of the evidence for believing the environment was in turns both provident and punitive, this 'external manager' was assumed to warrant the respect it evidently had. This led to propitiation and ceremonies for this purpose. There were those who, over time, had learned to meditate and enter Samadhi states and gain deeper knowledge and a more accurate type of prediction; the prophets who became the seers of the Vedas, priests and shamans.

Everything we know, we know it consciously. The fact that any information gained by the seers or prophets was known in a cognitive sense of the word; it is likely that it was conveyed in terms of how they experienced it. Most of the recorded seers and prophets in history were men, and the information gained and 'known' in the Samadhi state could be either visual/clairvoyant or clairaudient, as in seeing a man speaking or hearing a male voice. This would allow the inference of the person having been in contact with God, making that seer or prophet a very important person. I believe most have regarded consciousness as the fundamental manner by which this 'absolute knower' delivered its message from God as the father of humanity. Thus, man created God in man's image and the rest is history.

Returning to the issue of there being only one Self, as distinct from the non-self, I AM, the true Self is the singularity, and therefore every living form is entangled with that Self. The extent of that entanglement extends all the way back to the first appearance of life, because that first life reproduced initially through cell division, and later through sexual reproduction. It is obvious that conception can only be possible when the ovum and the sperm are alive in that moment, which means the line of heredity began with that first life and is the same life right now in each living form. Furthermore, each living form is entangled with us through the same process and the same singularity.

In the Hindu tradition that human Self is Atman, and my thought is that there is only one life. We know from science that individual parts of the body are replaced over a lifetime, and that the body/self we have at the end of life is not the one we are born with. We are living through the same life in the different bodies, and this thought is not necessarily confined to the human form. Other forms aren't as enlightened with mind as we think we are, which is why they all live as part of a whole living system. Our human minds have created our exclusive viewpoint which has not served us or the whole of life providentially. That same human mind can change but it would require a transformational shift in what we think being human can mean rather than what we believe about our place on the tree of life.

My own experiences as I understand them

I have always resisted the thought that I might be psychic because I regarded those people as special. What got me focused on this whole exercise of needing to understand began after my first wife left me. In a quiet moment I heard a voice in my head say my name, It sounded familiar but not a voice I could recognise. This happened a few times over the next three years and then one day the voice said, “We want you to have a relationship”. After that I only heard my name, and only once. Now, in these thirty or more years when I have been asking questions about consciousness and the process, I never hear anything; I only ‘know’ the answer.

In terms Arya’s diagram, this knowing was said to be acognitive; knowing without the mind, while hearing a voice without someone present to physically say my name can be said to be clairaudient. As for clairvoyance, I would say watching the cat’s dream, even the shards of light before the dream of the garden comes into that category. In my view, all three would seem fit into an objective understanding of subjective experiences. I think the bliss state I shared with my daughter Tracey is in a category of its own, and perhaps that is true for the others.

In his Foreword to my book⁹, Bevan Reid said one would need to use i , $\sqrt{-1}$, to describe the way I think, while Metod Saniga⁹ made a similar comment when he said that in topology terms, he would place where I think on one of his charts almost off the scale on the right-hand side of the chart.

I don’t know what a psychologist or a psychiatrist would have to say about my experiences, but surely me hearing a disembodied voice or watching a cat’s dream might elicit the word, schizophrenia. But the Yoga diagram offers a different perspective, with the process provided by the singularity giving a reason why an entangled particle would ‘know’ the effect of a measurement on its partner, and perhaps the process might give a different perspective on schizophrenia. It might be not a split brain but a case of the person being in touch with the perspective of the singularity. What I do know is that this state of knowing and the bliss has nothing to do with taking a substance, not alcohol and certainly not a drug. In those moments of bliss, I am open to any input from my immediate personal environment because the bliss is from the nonlocal state. The input becomes the next ‘quantum measurement’ so to speak, and I am back in the real world immediately.

The dispassionate observer

This term appears in many places in this essay and needs some explanation. My ‘process of creation’ is the default fundamental of reality, both real and potential and must exist across every cycle of the universe. In other words, it is a characteristic of Prakriti, the substrate from which the universe comes into existence and goes out of existence. I have assumed this substrate to be energy which is permanently oscillating as described by Srinivasan in his Sankhya Karika.

There is a relatively universal consensus that the universe as matter preceded life and that the creation of matter would correspond to the Standard Model of Physics, which I have said is described in the Yoga diagram as the final evolutes, albeit from a much earlier perspective. It is

from that earlier perspective that I was able to propose a model of creation at the quantum level and following what I believe to be quantum processes. Those same processes which I believe gave rise to matter also retain and implement the responses of living matter to the immediate environment.

From a human viewpoint, we have assumed these responses of discrimination and differentiation at the quantum level as a process which had observed and made logical deductions through the application of consciousness. I would assert that what changed with the appearance of life was the introduction of a living vehicle for the expression of those quantum outcomes. The expression itself came from the matter of the organism, and because this matter responded at the particle and field level of matter, each form developed what we might call a sense of self. The quantum responses were retained as the particles and fields 'learned' what was supportive and what was not and developed strategies for survival.

One of the first lessons would have been what sustained the organism, and that was a source of energy; the obvious source being any other form of life. Some would be consumed and obviously some were incorporated, with the outcome being a more complex form. Most living forms today have this inherent complexity, which may be why different parts of our bodies have different life spans, and why we have what is effectively a body which is not the one we had at birth.

If we stop and consider the fact that we have all evolved from whatever was the first form of life, and that through cell division and later through sexual reproduction that life is still operating through each of these current individual lives, one could say we are all living the same life in much the same way the component parts of our biome are part of what we assume to be this individual me. The Vedas tell us there is only one self; Mahat on the diagram as well as the singularity as the fundamental process. It is this common everlasting life which is the dispassionate observer, the true self; bearing in mind always that this true self is an artefact of the fundamental process as it expresses through this everlasting life.

In terms of religion Mahat may be understood to represent God, or Purusha in the Hindu philosophies. To put it in what I believe could be a philosophical, even a scientific sense, the dispassionate observer is life itself; the same life which emerged on Earth howsoever a very long time ago. Due to reproduction, it is existentially the same life every form of life on the planet shares, which is asserted in the Vedas in saying 'there is only one self', part of which is prey and part is predator and it has ever been thus.

What I believe this means for religions is that every religion has the same notional Supreme Being. MAN created GOD with the same defect, 'in his image', and through this clever wording, MAN inferred that God is male. This male created defect has pitted mankind against everyone and everything. It has sought to subjugate women, the environment, as well as every other man; the result is the world we have today. Some years back Krishnamurti and Bohm said that the world we have today is the way it is because of how we think. Which means that we cannot think our way out of this problem using the existing way we think; we need to think in an entirely different way.

Every culture has the answer to this problem, and we saw it on display in the recent massacres in Christchurch, Holland and Sri Lanka; it is unconditional love. That word, unconditional, has no place in our present world view; we have all seen Catholic against Protestant, Sunni against Shia, Hebrew against Arab; Hindu against Pakistani, White against Black or Brown; the list is endless, and it has skewed our economies to be focused on military hardware and economic and cyber warfare.

If we return to the quantum domain for just a moment, we might remember that every individual experience is retained to become a 'history' in the sum over histories which determine the next moment; karma in other words. We rarely consider this quantum process and our input into that process which has moulded the world we have. It is human to have existential reservations about how an action might impact on me as an individual; now we must reconsider that self-interest viewpoint based on the evidence before us and ask is it worth remaining on this self-destructive pathway? Our religions are all based on faith, so why not have faith that as an individual, I will make that change and have faith that others will join me in this evolutionary step. After all, we all have the intelligence to do it, so why not support the whole of life?

References

1. The Yoga Sutras of Patanjali by Pandit Usharuddh Arya. Himalayan Institute. 1986.
2. Wholeness and the Implicate Order. David Bohm. Routledge Keegan Paul. UK 1984.
3. Geons, Black Holes and Quantum Foam. John Archibald Wheeler and Kenneth Ford.
4. Sankhya Karika. G. Srinivasan. Online.
5. R.D. Laing. The Divided Self. Pelican Books, London. 1982.
6. Consciousness, Time and Praxis. Meera Chakravorty. New Bharatiya Book Corporation, Delhi, India. 2007.
7. The Undivided Universe. David Bohm and Basil Hiley. Routledge. 1983.
8. New Scientist. March 19, 2005, p33.
9. Thinking on the other side of Zero. Alan J Oliver. Self-published. 2005.
10. Oliver, A. J., On Prespacetime, Consciousness & Samapatti, Prespacetime Journal, 10(1): pp. 109-117