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Abstract

This is the first chapter in my studies on the constituents of the Mind, Vision and ultimately of Reality.

This theoretical study ultimately seeks to fuse the attributes of the constituents of Mind, Vision to the reality and attributes of sub-atomic particles as per quantum laws. My philosophical interests are in the ‘constituents of the mind’; questioning what are the elemental properties that constitute the mind of an individual in a specific time-frame?

I have found now throughout the years of my studies that the Constituents of the Mind act, interact and function in certain circumstances as electrons and sub-atomic particles interact with each other. As an example, during interactions of the constituents of the mind, I notice that the latter interaction can create and/or eliminate other constituents of the mind, exactly as quantum laws can create or annihilate particles.[[1]](#footnote-1)

To my surprise, I discovered much of the attributes of the mind are similar if not replicated by the attributes of the electron, as per quantum mechanics.

Motivated by Feynman’s diagrams, this drove me to create novel notations simply to speed up our understanding of these intricate matters.

What I have so far discovered is the following – we speak of the attributes of reality, consciousness, the mind and somehow, we miss one elemental ‘mind dimension’, and that is the dimension of *‘nothingness’*, wherein mind and therefore our entire physicality is rendered extinct during the time when we are not aware nor conscious.

Examples abound, yet they are not seen as relevant; what is the reality and the attributes of our mind when we are thinking? What are the attributes of our mind when we blank out? What are the attributes of our mind when we are dreaming or influenced by drugs? While it is well-known that there are differing realms of the mind, with their differing attributes, we ignore, or we do not study the fact that there may be different realms of existence for both mind and matter. The only reality most people assume exists is the one we live within – the physical three-dimensional, plus time dimension.

And yet, the definitions of reality are in fact numberless, depending entirely on the quality and spatial context of the collective totality of the Observer’s conscious and/or unconscious mind within any specified time-frame. That means there are numberless ‘realities’ in the repose of each conscious or unconscious individual in question.
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1. Basic Themes of This Study
2. I propose that the functional constituents [or at their most basic, fundamental level] and attributes of *Vision and Mind*, are functionally the same.
3. The full array of the *Constituents of the Mind* [CoM] in any given time-frame can be written in one simple mind equation which can only exist within a specific time-frame relative to the individual in question.
4. Concept of the *‘Nothingness’.* The closer we look at any observed entity, the less do we see of said entity. In effect, we see a nothingness, a void. However, once we back away from the observed entity, so then will we once more see the recognisable, relatable, distinctive visualised entity in question. Therefore, the Constituents of Vision [CoV] are composed of a numberless ineffable, unviewable voids or ‘nothingness’.
5. I note that the *mind too is also composed of* *a numberless series of voids or nothingness*. The more we try to think or visualise a thought, concept or image in our mind, the less do we perceive, recognise, and note. Significantly, it is precisely from these numberless voids or nothingness that ultimately evolve into a recognisable, viewable, relatable thought, memory, emotion and/or feeling/s.
6. I propose that when a person is in a *‘blank state of mind’* [meaning, they are thinking, feeling, seeing, sensing nothing] so their mind becomes exactly as the properties of the blank state of mind, that is a state of ‘nothingness’.
7. *Extinction of Mind Equals Extinction of Self*. I propose that when a person fully concentrates on an image and/or a physical entity and has no other distractions, so then, in that time-frame, the observer’s mind will functionally be exactly as the attributes as the physical or mental entity that is being concentrated upon. In other words, and here is the significant point, in such a state of mind, the *entire physicality of the observer in question is rendered extinct*. Or, put another way, in such a specific state of mind, the mind becomes as the entity it is observing. I will propose that Mind can only ‘exist’, and even then, it can *only partially* exist, when there is an *awareness* within the observing mind, a similarity with quantum’s observer collapsing the wave of probabilities and into a more defined area once a measurement takes place. Man, therefore only ‘exists’ interminably and never continuously. Everything depends on what I call the *Awareness Factor*, the greater awareness we have, the higher levels of consciousness and vice-versa.
8. Strikingly, in my studies, I could only note the eerie similarities between the functions, the attributes of the mind and the functions, the attributes of the electron, in the quantum mechanical manner. The properties or laws governing sub-atomic particles, as per *quantum mechanics* are exactly as the laws governing Mind and Vision and ultimately the entirety of one’s Self. In other words, the basic, fundamental attributes of the units or constituents of Mind and Vison are exactly as the fundamental attributes of electrons and sub-atomic particles. Perhaps, this ought not to be so surprising, since, mind, electrons, sub-atomic particles are all the same material *and/or* abstract attributes. There is a *similarity in these functional properties between Mind and Vision* as there is the principle of equivalence between mass and energy, gravity and acceleration.
9. Ultimately the basic constituents of all that exists in the human mind and in the material universe are the same as the Constituents of the Mind I speak of. In other words, I am speaking of the ultimate nature of ‘reality’ in the physical world *and* in the mind of Man.

This paper is entirely theoretical; thought experiments that are empirical and can be done by anyone. I have done is put them forth in a rigorously defined and categorised manner, building on each component –

1. Constituents of the Mind
2. Constituents of Vision
3. Attributes of quantum laws, specifically with sub-atomic particles
4. Realms, dimensions and/or realities experienced with each individual within a specific time-frame

Studies on physics and the studies on the Mind have been converging since the beginnings of Quantum Mechanics, some saying inexorably so, to the comfort or discomfort of some people, be they scholars or laymen.

Indeed, beginning with Boltzmann[[2]](#footnote-2) to Heisenberg, Bohr, metaphysical ‘realms’ or dimensions were already being discussed; for example, probability waves are themselves by definition non-material, or metaphysical. So, too, is the precise nature or attributes of an electron. Quantum concepts such as wave functions, complementarity, superposition and virtual particles are all metaphysical science.

And we understand why ‘standard’ scientists are not enamoured with the studies of the mind – the fundamentally abstract nature/attributes that is studied is not supposedly viewable, quantifiable and therefore cannot be science proper. Period. And yet, baffling it is to me, this rigid ‘thinking’, since all mind, thoughts, dreams, emotions are abstract. Indeed, were we to agree with orthodox theoretical physicists, are we then supposed to simply ‘ignore’ studying our own identity, sense of self, the ‘I’ in each of us and the ineffable qualia each of us senses/feels?

I not only believe the studies of the Mind, the sense of the ‘I’/the Self to be scientific, I also happen to see uncanny commonalities between attributes of the aforementioned subjects and the attributes of sub-atomic particles.
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1. But Don’t Sub-Atomic Particles Have Physical Attributes That Are Beyond the Material?

I propose the mechanical, interactive *relationships* between Mind and Vision enable us to draw certain conclusions relevant to one aspect of what *constitutes the Mind and Vision*, thereby affording a better understanding of what the phenomena of the ‘I’ or the ‘Self’ and Vision are.

In this paper, the following propositions will be put forward:

1. The reality and attributes of Mind and Vision are similar to the attributes and reality of sub-atomic particles. In other words, a fusion between Mind, Vision and quantum physics.
2. I will discuss what are the functional constituents/ingredients/components of an observed entity; specifically, I will ask ‘what is it that we see when we strictly and only focus/stare at the smallest point of an entity in question, ignoring anything and everything else?’ I propose what is ‘seen’ is one key feature in this thesis – and that is a ‘*field of nothingness’.[[3]](#footnote-3)*
3. I propose this ‘nothingness’ possesses an inherently *abstract* quality, that is non-material. By that I mean, the tiniest observed point is necessarily non-spatial, a void, unrecognisable – ultimately, unobservable. Hence, its abstractness.
4. Herein is one primary paradox of vision: the ultimate constituents of vision are made of a numberless units that are abstract, void, unrecognisable – an infinite number of ‘nothingness’.[[4]](#footnote-4)
5. The theme/element of the void or nothingness is one prevalent attribute in our mind and vision. For example, when a person ‘blanks out’, so too his mind becomes entirely a void, a field of nothingness. In other words, mind functionally becomes as the vision in question.
6. Further, if an Observer thinks of an image and on nothing else, I propose to show the mind of said Observer will be functionally as the observed mental image. I shall propose that the Observer’s actual *physicality is eliminated* in the time frame in which he is fully absorbed in imaging/visualising the image he has in his mind.
7. Therefore ‘being’ comes in and out of existence depending entirely on what I call the *Awareness Factor*. In other words, our materiality, physicality switches on and off depending entirely on what the degree of awareness in the mind in question. This is, of course, counter-intuitive, since we think of ourselves as ‘continuously existing’, whereas I propose that we exist discontinuously and intermittently, only insofar as our awareness pulses.
8. I will propose that there are similarities in the functional properties between Mind and Vision since both are constituted from these similar non-spatial ‘units’ of ‘nothingness’.
9. I will propose that the fundamental ‘unit’ of conscious reality of mind and vision are these ‘bits of nothingness’. It is from these bits of nothingness that eventually there evolves a recognisable image we call an observed and identifiable entity, be it thought or actual, material object before us. Similarly, from the quantum foam of ‘nothingness’, from the emptiness within the atom, from the indeterminate/abstract attributes of electrons, so there too ultimately emerges our mind *and* material, physical, observable world.[[5]](#footnote-5)
10. Finally, if correct, we can now understand that there are other *‘dimensions’* in our world and in our daily lives. For I shall propose that in certain specific states and in specific time-frames, there are other realms or dimensions – dimensions whose attributes of physicality, time, vision, are qualitatively and dramatically different from our ‘normal’ day to day world - within which the mind of human beings exist, dimensions beyond our daily three plus one dimensions. In other differing ‘realms or dimensions of existence’ are constantly with each one us, as we switch from dimension to the other in any given time-frame, thus altering our perception of reality.
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1. Analysis of the Vision of a Perceived Object Outside of Our Mind/Body

Why Do I say ‘Image’ With Respect to Vision?

In this part of the study, I will seek to explain how Vision is of critical importance if we wish to understand the nature of Mind. We shall see that it is the *abstractness of Vision [optics]* in itself that is the contributing factor to the overall understanding of what Vision itself is. To begin our study of what I call the *fundamentally* *elusive* quality of Vision, I begin asking a simple question:

When we see an object [say, a cat], what do we actually see?

I propose that what we see is an *abstract image* of the observed entity, say, the cat. These two concepts, the ‘abstract’ and ‘image’ are key elements in this study and, as such, must further be defined.

If I were to ask you, “What do you see?” You will say, “I see a recognisable cat.”

Now, I ask you “Will you please *focus on one specific point on the cat*, and while doing that, I shall specifically ask you *not* to think of anything else except on what I’m asking you to do - in other words, to fully concentrate on the one and only point on the cat, while at the same time clearing your Mind of everything else while you endure that exercise?”

You now concentrate on one specific point on our cat. One specific part/point on her furry body and on nothing else. I remind you, to ignore everything else – you must not be distracted by any other thought, feeling, emotion, memory and you must not be distracted by any attribute surrounding you; you must completely ignore any of your surroundings, the room you’re in, the furniture, the temperature, you must ignore any sounds, scents, temperatures, breezes – everything must be utterly ignored except for the one point your eyeballs and mind are focusing on the cat.

I now ask you, “What do you see?”

You may answer, “I am solely seeing or focusing on the one point of the cat and on nowhere and nothing else.”

What if I now ask you to *define that one point,* and ask you to describe for me that one tiny observed point, or “What is *it* exactly that you see when you only focus on the point on the cat and on nothing else?”

And here is the point – *for as hard as you may try, you cannot define that one point of the cat, you cannot relate to or define or recognise what it is that you are seeing, precisely because you are observing, in essence, nothing that is relatable, meaningful, discernible, recognisable or definable*.

In short, the smallest point of the observed point is unobservable.

So, you try again.

And yet, no matter how hard you focus on that specific point on the cat, you will still *not* be able to recognise, relate to that particular point, *because, in essence you are seeing the nothing, the void*. No matter how much and how hard you focus your Mind on that one point, you cannot relate to or define that image.

In other words, your Vison is seeing precisely what I have been alluding to - the void, ‘the nothing’, I was discussing previously. You are observing a *nothingness*, you are experiencing a vacuum, you are interacting with a void which is the absolute and strict antithesis of the definable and recognisable whole of the image of the cat you were first viewing.[[6]](#footnote-6)

So, can it be said that whenever we strictly and only focus on one point on an observed entity we must necessarily see this nothingness, this void? Yes, and this is our proposition - for whenever we focus on one point on a viewed entity and whenever we do not permit our Mind to be distracted by anything else, we then necessarily can only ‘see’ a nothingness, a void and it is for this reason that I use the term ‘abstract’ in describing the Vision in question.

Let us now elaborate on what is meant by abstract.

In using that term, I mean any perceived entity that is indefinable, indescribable, immeasurable, elusive, hazy, formless, non-spatial, blurry, and - perhaps most importantly for the Mind - *that which in itself cannot be seen or understood or comprehended or recognised or related to in any meaningful way*. This, of course, reminds us the Mind-Body Dualist problem and paradox because on the one hand the observed point on the cat is made of matter [fur, skin] and yet the Observer sees a nothingness, a vacuum that is therefore definitionally an abstraction and the two phenomena are obviously attributively opposites.[[7]](#footnote-7)

In effect, we are claiming that all the intensely focused, perceived objects/entities must be made up these non-spatial ‘nothings’ precisely because it is from these nothings/voids that ultimately, we see the recognisable viewable, relatable whole entity, or the cat, in our case.

Why do I use the term ‘image’?

Visual perceptions of any observed entity are dependent on the following changing factors:

1. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on what *species* the Observer is.
2. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the differing and changing *optical accuracies/deficiencies* of the Observer’s eyeball.
3. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on *the age and health* [or lack thereof] of the observing agent.
4. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and changing *speeds* within which the Observer observes the observed entity.
5. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and changing *distance/s* between Observer and observed entity.
6. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the *temperature* that prevails at the moment of perception.
7. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and changing *angle and height/elevation* from which the Observer observes the observed entity.
8. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and changing *degree of awareness and unawareness* the observing individual has as he/she observes the observed entity.
9. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and/or changing *mood/s* of the observing agent.
10. Therefore, we say ‘image’ because there isn’t a ‘one vision’ of the cat or any observed entity; there are millions of visions or images.

Thus, if we allow a bee[[8]](#footnote-8), an eagle[[9]](#footnote-9), a human and a worm[[10]](#footnote-10) to see our cat, they will each see an immeasurable number of differing Visions, noting that in each instance they are all *unlike* Visions.

Why?

Because, as we just stated, each species will see differently and secondly, each Observing agent will see constantly differing visions, since Vision itself depends entirely on the aforementioned factors mentioned above. Therefore, each individual image is itself constantly changing, contrasting and conflicting at each observed moment and at other times they are similar in their appearance, depending on the factors mentioned above.

Hence, we can say *there is no one, unified, united, single Vision* of the observed cat.

One can say that an Observer only sees changing *Images*– that is, an infinite number of representations or impressions of an observed entity within a specific time-frame, taking into account the specific state of the attributes of the physiological and mental conditions of the Observer in question.

One can therefore say there can be *no unity* in the observed Vision by our one Observer of the one observed entity in question. Therefore, the truth, the reality of the vision of any one specific, individual perceived object has numberless images, some contrasting, others similar.

But why is it, then, generally speaking and on average, when we see our cat, we tend to see the ‘same appearance’ of the cat? That is because our awareness factor is not always high, nor is our level of thought particular in picking up the nuances in the differences of the appearance of the cat. In other words, it is out of simple biological necessity born out of convenience that our mind and vision ignore the differences and so they ‘create’ the same appearance. And this makes sense, otherwise, our mind would get overloaded with too many images and the human brain cannot suffer so much excitation on any one perceived entity.[[11]](#footnote-11)
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1. The ‘Abstract’ - What Do We Mean by ‘Voids’ and ‘Nothingness’ as The Basis of All Observed Entities?

We discussed the concept of ‘image’ as regards vision, we must now turn our attention to the term ‘abstract’ as regards vision too. What do I mean by ‘constituents of the mind’? I mean any mental phenomena at its most discrete, smallest, microscopic in their dimensions.

By ‘abstract’, I mean all realities, sensations, feelings, thoughts which have no defining properties and/or attributes that can be empirically sized, measured, defined and quantified. In other words, Qualia. We are here at once confronted with the historical problem, for how can we discuss and analyse the ‘mind’ which is made of matter while what the mind exudes is in its entirety an Abstract phenomenon? We can discuss, study, quantify and measure functions of every organ in the human body, such as the liver, the heart, lungs, kidneys and so on; but how does one empirically study that which is in its purest essence entirely formless and amorphous, such as that which is precisely of an entirely abstract essence? In other words, that which is abstract by definition evades any scientific, empirical analysis. Hence the historical paradox numbing and sizzling minds since antiquity.

Neuroscience has certainly come a long way here in its multitudes of analyses of brain functions, but we are still woefully unable to empirically measure, describe, quantify and/or illustrate the varying and changing attributes of the innumerable abstract phenomena of our minds such as thoughts, whims, impulses, intuitions, emotions and so on.

Thus, as a simple example, ask yourself, “What exactly is a thought?” For Heaven’s sakes, make it a simple thought! So, you think of happiness and you feel happy. No, wait. That is already a complicated route. So, let us try for an even simpler example. Imagine and visualise a cat. Any cat. Nothing wild, nothing exotic. Just a cartoon-like cat. And now, in your content mind you are visualising this benign-looking cat. So far, so good. But let us now get into the hard aspect of this matter we are speaking of. We said that you are mentally visualising a cat. I will divide my three questions into the three themes we shall be discussing, namely, location, vision and reality.

Here are our questions for the observer of the cat in question –

1. Question I. Location - Where exactly is this cat you are visualising? Is it inside your brain or does it ‘exist’ outside of your brain? If not in and within your brain, so then where exactly does the visualised cat exist? Does the imagined cat exist in our human-worldly realm or not?[[12]](#footnote-12) If not, that answer indicates there must be other realms within the cosmos. Already, if true that is an astonishing claim to be making. Well, what other existential realms are there? What are their properties? [We shall discuss this theme later in much more details, given its relevance to this essay]. Already, we feel one of the prickliness when thinking of this scenario, such, for example, when it comes to linguistics, since the latter field is desperately unequal in being able to describe or define abstractions, which is what this essay is all about. If I feel a pain in my chest, and if a doctor asks me, “Where do you feel the pain?” I can point to the location of the pain I feel in and around my chest. I know, I sense of a generalised location in relation to the pain which is the grave question at hand. But in our case, visualising a cat, can you be certain ‘where’ you see this imaginary cat? Notice that I deliberately employ the term ‘imaginary’ and this is most important, because unlike our friend who genuinely feels chest pains, the main visualising a cat is only ‘imagining’ the cat – in other words, there is no ‘real’ cat in question.
2. Question II. Vision - When you observe a real cat in front of you, you can presumable see the entirety of the cat but in the case of you visualising the cat, are you seeing the entirety of this imaginary cat or not? And if not, are you seeing portions or parts of the cat or what? How accurate is your representation of the cat you see? Does the image of the imagined cat change or not? Anyone imaging a cat in his/her mind will find it difficult imagining the process of visualising the entirety of the cat and certainly not for longer than the space of moments in time.
3. Question III. Reality - And now for the fundamental question. Do you believe the visualised cat is ‘real’, as ‘real’ as when you observed the real cat sitting in front of you? You can say, “It is a ‘real’ cat only insofar as my imagination allows me think it is ‘real’.” Is that your answer? And if so, in what way or ways is/are the cat you observed sitting in front of you qualitatively different in its reality from the cat you visualised?

Let us try another experiment. Look at one specific point on a piece of paper. Try to look at the smallest point on the paper. Do not move your eyes from that point. Do not distract your mind with any of your other senses. What do you see? I contend you see a ‘nothingness’ or a ‘void’. Why? Precisely because at the smallest point of vison, no human can see anything that is identifiable, recognisable, distant or, in short that which has any attributes. Because there is *functionally* nothing the Observer can see or relate to that is recognisable or definable within that observed point. Without any reference, without any contrast, without any differences between and within the context of the observed fields, one cannot see - anything. This is the same situation, as a moving person who cannot measure his/her speed without a frame of reference.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Now we can say the paper may have had shades, creases, contours, differing hues and so on thereby giving it different colours and dimensions and therefore the observer cannot be said to have seen nothing.

But what about the surroundings, the settings, the noises, the smells, the sounds, the ambience, the scenery, the climate, the temperature and the general environment of the Observer - do *they* not create a visual distraction?

Yes, they do, and that is why experimentally, this may be difficult to be done in one’s home. So now let us imagine our Observer floating in a white coloured limitless arena/space or bubble which has a uniform colour, and again, with no contours nor any differing color patterns nor any differing hues, and with no borders, walls or any other thing except for the same-hue of whiteness discussed.

We now ask our Observer friend, “What do you see?”

I propose that he/she will *have to* say, “I see nothing, nothingness, void.” Notice that in this case, we do not need the Observer to focus on any one point precisely because his entire surroundings are of the same monotone unvaried texture and quality.

And, by definition, he sees an *infinite number* *of voids*.[[14]](#footnote-14)

Why?

Because everywhere he focuses on or wherever he looks, he sees the exact same singular void/nothingness and since this specific singularity is physically everywhere, therefore they are infinite in number. We also note that all these viewed/observed voids possess the exact same *non-functional properties* as each other and the latter is the exact strict opposite of any viewed entity that does have functional physical properties.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Let us go back to the observed void [focused observed point] in the observed entity such as the cat – recalling that the cat is in itself nothing more than the sum total or the amalgamation of these very voids themselves.

Why?

Because as we have seen, the structure and properties or the fundamental, inherent constituents of any viewed focused object is the nothing, the void and it is precisely from these nothings/voids that ultimately evolve into a perceivable, recognisable image and one that can be recognised, one that can be visualised in a humanly meaningful sense - as, the cat.

This ‘nothingness’ I describe is key to our study and in the next papers, we shall develop its properties in much greater scope and depth.

Further, perhaps this void we speak of is somewhat akin to the nature of the electron, wherein its properties too are undecided and imprecise because of their inherent uncertain nature, or to be more precise, its properties. Another analogy, and perhaps one far closer to the reality we are specifically speaking of is this – the vast majority of the matter or stuff of any atom is emptiness. Perhaps the nothingness that we ‘see’ when fixated on one specific tiny point of any object is functionally similar to the emptiness of the constituents of the atom.[[16]](#footnote-16)

This then is our *paradox*: whereas we can only measure the location or the momentum of an electron but never both, we find that the constituents of vison *cannot* be defined *at all* and yet, of course, it is precisely from these meaningless, indefinable, un-relatable voids that there eventually emerges the opposite image, which is a recognisable, relatable, meaningful one before our eyes.[[17]](#footnote-17)

But *what* exactly is this nothingness?

When discussing matters or phenomena of the minute, language may fail us for when we focus our eyes upon one viewed focused point we see only vague, meaningless images and since they certainly have no boundaries or limits or borders, it is strictly speaking wrong to speak of ‘points’, but for linguistic purposes one must employ one term or another and I have chosen to rely on that one for the sake of simplicity and argument.

Let’s take a different example. How about if we look at a clear, cloudless sky and do the same thing? Focus on one specific point in the sky and do not move your head or eyes from that point and do not distract your mind with any of your other senses.

What do you see? In this case, assuming as we did, the skies have no differing hues in color, no clouds, no observable delineation/s, nothing except for the same one color, I contend the observer or any other such person will see a point of nothingness, a void. And this phenomenon remains for all colours wherein there are no shades, differing hues, contours and so on. In each of these cases, the observer in question will ‘see’ a nullity’ or nothingness.

Paradoxically, the tiniest point of any observed object, that point of vision relative to the observer in question will have no vision. And that means all our views, sceneries and material world before our eyes are equally made up of these voids, these points where there can be no vision.

Now this shouldn’t surprise too many of us since we still do not know the full ‘reality’, or the full attributes of any of the sub-atomic particles. We can mathematically describer their attributes, such as, for example, spin, but that means nothing to the mind, the senses, the understanding or relatability of any human being. We know gravity’s basic equations. We know electrons are ‘negative’, protons are ‘positively’ charged and so on. An electric charge [be it positive or negative][[18]](#footnote-18) only acts when in an electro-magnetic field and that is when it creates a force. So, what is this ‘charge’? At its most basic level, the elementary charge is the simplest charge carried by a single proton.[[19]](#footnote-19) Its value is *exactly* 1.602176634×10−19 - these are all mathematical truths for now[[20]](#footnote-20), but again, my question repeats itself – how do these facts affect our feeling, sensing, knowing the reality of the difference between the electron and proton? Answer – nothing. And I can go on and on droning about the laws that govern the universe, the biology of plants and animals and the laws that govern all and every chemical action and reaction.

But what does that functionally mean to any human being? Certainly, we can endlessly discuss and still compute for new equations on the laws that govern how the electric charge affects any particle or sub-particle, since they behave differently.

But what does that ‘mean’ for you and I? Nothing. Functionally, we cannot possibly relate to those concepts because they are unrelatable. But, none of us can ‘feel’ [qualia] what this entity or phenomenon of gravity is. And the same goes for all the entities in our world, such as fields, electro-magnetic fields, mass and so on. And again, if I ask you how we humans relate to these statistics, data and facts - the answer is, nothing.

Here we come to one of the pillars of this thesis.

“What do you mean I’m seeing ‘nothing’?” you retort.

Well, yes; if you concentrate and ask yourself this simple question, “What is it exactly that I am seeing? Can I describe it? What is/are its colors? Can I define its dimensions?” You will find the answers are all in the negative. Why? Precisely because you are seeing a ‘nothingness’ and nothingness negates vison. And that is natural – we can only see or recognise an object or any observable, recognisable entity from a certain distance, depending on a person’s visual acuity. But in general, the closer we stare at a specific point, no matter how good your vision is, we shall come to a point where we shall come to see a ‘nothingness.’

The simplest point of any observable ‘reality’ is ‘nothing’ because we cannot perceive it. It’s as simple as that. Wherever we look, whenever we think, wherever we are being, if we concentrate on the tiniest portion, moment, segment or spot of whatever there is before our eyes, we shall functionally experience a ‘nothingness;’, or a de facto blindness.

And yet, here is where my study blooms, and yet when we collate the multitudes of these numberless of ‘nothingness’, ultimately, we, the observing agent will eventually see, will recognise the object before us.

1. Therefore, the essence of all existence, of all reality is composed of nothingness.[[21]](#footnote-21)
2. Obversely, when we distance ourselves from the object in question, we eventually can recognise the object before us.

For now, and in summation, this study –

1. Fuses the reality and the attributes of the constituents of Mind and Vision being in essence functionally the same for the specific observer in question and for the specific time-frame he/she is that exact state or circumstance.
2. Further on, this study will illustrate that the laws governing the attributes of Mind and Vision are similar to the reality and attributes of the quantum laws governing sub-atomic particles.

$$\~$$

1. Abstractions Are the Essence of The Attributes and Constituents of Life

There are in life what I call the imponderables, meaning matters which the human brain cannot understand. Simple examples –

1. Can anyone successfully explain colors to a blind person? No.
2. Can anyone successfully explain taste to someone who has not tasted the object you have in mind? Answer – no.
3. If the universe is finite, what is beyond its final frontier?

Functionally speaking, we humans cannot discern, feel, sense, understand, recognise, spot, verify, define anything that is an attribute in the tiniest point in the [so-called] ‘observed’ point of any entity before us. Why? Precisely because that tiniest point we ‘observe’ has no vision. It’s a blind-spot, if you like to so call it. And these are the abstract attributes of most of the constituents of our minds. What is the difference you feel between hunger and thirst? We cannot say. What’s the difference between the hurt we feel when watching a sad movie and when we feel low?

And this is where and why we come back to the realities, the attributes of the sub-atomic world. Why? They are entirely abstract. Meaning, we cannot functionally relate to them. And we experience the exact same human reaction when we discuss the world of sub-atomic particle physics. Hence the connection and in our next chapters I will discuss how the laws governing sub-atomic particles are not only similar but are equivalent to the laws governing our mind and vision.

Everything I’m discussing here is of course what can be termed as ‘abstract’ or ‘abstractions’ – meaning anything which cannot be recognised, identified, recognised, delineated and so on. We hear of the material and the immaterial worlds. The physical and the metaphysical. In essence, is not every entity existing in our universe composed of atoms and of their sub-atomic particles? Yes, they are. Therefore, how can we steadfastly draw a line between the so-called ‘physical world’ and the metaphysical world when as we can all agree – every entity in the universe is composed of the exact same building blocks? Some may respond by saying, “Ah yes, everything is indeed composed of atoms, but reality is the way these atoms act and interact with each other producing differing physical worlds we sense.”

Now, I agree with that proposition, but it does not change the fundamental fact, that all of truth, mind, vision, reality and all of our perceived experienced are fundamentally based on abstractions, meaning we can only partially recognise, perceive, delineate, their attributes when we stand at a distance from their points of origin. Why do I say ‘partially’? Because as I said, when any observer observes a snoozing cat in front of him, he can only see a percentage of that totality of the cat’s entire physicality.

Why? Because, as we know and we’ve stated, by definition any human can only see so much of the cat.

$$\~$$

1. Analysis of the Vision of a Perceived Object Outside Our Mind

Allow me to discuss this in more detail[[22]](#footnote-22) –

1. The Observer of the snoozing cat can never see the total physicality of the cat. Our brains only allow us to see a generalised image of the cat. In other words, as you watch the cat in the generalised mode of vision, you cannot note and pinpoint attributes of its neck or of its paws. Thus, the observer in question is not seeing the total physicality of the cat.
2. Suppose now our observer focuses on any one point on the cat; say he focuses purely on its eyes. Fine. But now he has lost his vision and therefore definition of the rest of the physicality of the cat.
3. Thus, no matter how our observer looks at the cat, he can never see its total reality.
4. Well now, you may well retort back, “What exactly is this ‘total reality’ of the cat in question? No human can observe the entirety of an observed entity because we do not have anatomical ability to do. To the see the entirety of say, a chair, at the least we must be able to see – say, a chair - from every angle and distance simulatanously, obviously an impossibility.
5. There is another troublesome problem here. At what visual level do you wish to observe the cat? I mean, at what level of visual acuity do you want to see the cat? We can start, as we did, by looking at the cat with our eyes. Now, is that the ‘reality’ of the cat? Of course not. How about if we look at the cat with a [gigantic] microscope? Clearly, we now see an entirely differing entity than the smug cat we were looking with our eyes, right? And now, what if we use an electron microscope and observe this cat? What do we see? We see a different image. And let us go further. Suppose you and I can become minimised by nano-technology to be the size of atoms. Now, being the size of atoms, how will we see this cat? Presumably, we will see bundles and masses of whirring atoms and nothing else. At this point, we no longer recognise the cat because all we’re seeing are the atoms. And, I think by now, you know where I’m going with this thought experiment. At what level or at what visual acuity can we say the cat we are observing is the ‘real’ cat? And the question contains a key clue – what, if anything is ‘real’?

That is why I state all reality’s basic constituents are abstract. For humans, reality is essentially abstract.[[23]](#footnote-23) I mean, its constituents are abstract. Meaning if we look minutely closely at the fundamental components of reality, you see, feel nothing. Nothing as a void. Everything in our lives, experiences and everything in our entire existence is abstract – observe your senses, hearing, sensing, touching, feeling, smelling, seeing, hearing, tasting – when you think about one of them and scrutinize them, such as sound for example, you can never explain them as you yourself feel them. You can describe them in words, songs, poetry, sculpture or in any other manner but you can never portray them as accurately as they themselves affected you.

1. Can you explain to yourself what it is about a sound, any sound that causes a reaction in your mind? No, you cannot.
2. Can you explain to yourself in what way the sound of running water is different to the sound of laughter?
3. Can you understand why a sorrowful song causes you sorrow?

And so on. The answers to all these questions are in the negative. Why?

Because any metaphysical entity or phenomenon can never be described as accurately one could with a physical entity, such as a table, flower or dog.

Metaphysical appearances can only be felt, they can only be experienced by our agency, our reality, our subjective senses - but we can never explain these specific feelings or effects that can sometimes overwhelm us with any concrete, factual, and definitive words such that the latter can impress upon the listener what it is you experienced. The truth is stark – no human can ever express the ‘reality’ of their reality.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Let’s go back to a sad song. You hear it, you feel sad. You now view a sad painting, say one of van Gogh’s final paintings and again you feel sad. Ask yourself the same question, “Why am I feeling sad?” In the case of Vincent’s last paintings, take ‘The Night Café’. Why does it make one feel sad? Well, one can describe in minute details reasons why the image before us represents the sorrows of miserable, lonely, poor people. We can see what is specifically sad painted on the canvas.[[25]](#footnote-25) Going back to the sad song, we can, for example, certainly describe how some specific these sets of notes create sadness in us, but that is precisely where such statements are unrelatable to any person, exactly as we were discussing with some of the physics equations on particles.

Thus, the difficulties in describing in words metaphysical matters, such one’s mood, desire, personality and so on as opposed to discussing physical entities. Nevertheless, it is irrefutable that the tiniest basis, fragments of all vision, of all observed entities are not visual, they cannot in fact be seen and because they can only be experienced based strictly and entirely on the subjectivity of the observer, on the personhood of the observer, so they are abstract.

$$\~$$

1. Analysis of the Vision of a Perceived Object Inside Our Mind

Imagine now you are asked to imagine visualising a cat in your mind.

The same rules apply here. You must not be distracted by anything else – outside your body or within your mind. You must only focus on the image of the cat in your mind. Of course, here it’s a much more difficult proposition because the mind is not so controllable when we close our eyes as when we open our eyes. The fact is trying to visualise a cat *on command* is extremely difficult.[[26]](#footnote-26) Therefore, accuracy and consistency in ‘seeing’ the imagined cat is a perilous endeavour, as opposed to the simpler task of observing a cat snoozing in front of us. Therefore, it would be fair to say visualising of anything in our minds on command has a much greater degree of abstraction than when seeing an object before your eyes.

However, and conversely, how many times do we see ultra-detailed images and/or memories in our minds when we ourselves did not expect it? In these instances, as stated, the visualised images and/or events, memories etc will paradoxically be far more vivid, crystal-clear, visceral in their exquisite details than when we see anything before our eyes. Indeed, it precisely because of these ultra-realistic images and/or events that we see within our minds that causes so much confusion as to wether they exist in reality or not, and this attribute is of course most common when we experience extremely expressive and dramatic dreams.

I propose in that given those precise conditions, the Observer’s mind ‘becomes’ exactly as the image he is seeing. In other words, functionally, existentially, his mind becomes as the attributes of the image, or the cat itself.

It is in that sense I posit the Observer’s actually physical body is rendered *extinct* because the Observer is entirely unaware/unconscious of his body and any of its attributes and functions. Similarly, I posit the mind of the Observer will be whatever the attributes, the appearances of the cat are. In essence, the Observer’s entirely is temporarily annihilated as long as he is fully focusing on the image of the cat in his mind.[[27]](#footnote-27)

$$\~$$

1. Extinction of Self/Consciousness of A Conscious Human

Now if we stare on at the cat and succeed in doing nothing else in our minds, we may reach a moment in time when we can say the Observer is observing naught else but observing the cat in question. In that specific time - that is when he is staring at the cat and visualising and imagining nothing else - we can say the Observer has nothing else on his mind and vision but the cat.

Where then does that leave the rest of his mind or self?

That is exactly the question we need to answer when I was referring to the *‘extinction’ of the Self*. Why? The answer is in the status of his mind -if the observer is observing, thinking, visualising nothing but the cat then it stands to reason the observer has nothing else in his mind but the vision of the cat. Therefore, all his sense of ‘selfhood’, his sense of his ‘I’, his physicality are all rendered null and void because, as we just said, the person in question is doing nothing – repeat, nothing – but seeing the cat.

This concept is difficult for people to accept in its fullest implications because while many can agree that if a person is only focusing on the cat, it would be true to say that functionally speaking he is doing nothing else. But the next step is ignored or misunderstood – it follows that if any human being observes but one entity, phenomena or whatever is being observed during a specific time-frame, then that observer’s mind becomes functionally having no attribute other than seeing the cat, as is the case in our example. Thus, physicality is extinct and more importantly [perhaps] Mind becomes extinct during the time-frame when an observer observes one specific entity, phenomena, etc.

$$\~$$

1. What Happens to the Physicality of Mind and Body when a Person ‘Blanks Out’?

In connection to the previous segment, we must now pose this question, as they are functionally and qualitatively linked.

Let us ask another question now: when we are *not* looking at anything and when we are not thinking or imagining or visualising anything in our Minds – what, in those circumstances, do we then see?

Suppose you are *vacant-minded*, momentarily blanking out and not relating to anything in your outside world and anything in your Mind; when your Mind is completely idle, vacuous, blank, unused, disengaged from everything, void - what in those specific circumstances *exactly* is it that you would then be seeing?[[28]](#footnote-28)

I propose that when we blank out, we would again see the *nothing*, the void, the nothingness - exactly as that which we ‘see’ when we observe a single point on a viewed object. The two images are in fact, functionally, exactly the same.

Let us think about that specific situation: what do you ‘see’ when you blank out?[[29]](#footnote-29)

My answer is that you must necessarily see nothing.

For if you do view something then, by definition, you are not in a blanked-out state of Mind. And when you think of what exactly is the image and the experience of the nothing we experience during the blanked-out state, the answer appears to be that that it is the strict and total negation of any *Vision* and the strict and total negation of any *thought* and of the strict and total negation of any *sensation/s* or *feeling/s*, and that, in turn, is the exact definition of the void or the nothing.[[30]](#footnote-30)

In other words, during a blanked-out state of Mind, there is absolutely and strictly no Mind acting, behaving, interacting and the Mind is simply doing any functioning, sensing, noticing, intuiting, smelling, hearing, touching, thinking, feeling … etc … anything. Therefore, and strictly with that status of the Mind, the latter is functionally acting/being exactly as if it were non-existent.

Thus, the implications are fascinating – for when in that state of mind, and we say the ‘I’, the Self, the ‘me’ becomes *extinct*, we can therefore add that we do live in a linear time-frame, fro moment to moment, from second to second. Rather we exist in specific time-frames only when we are aware and conscious of ourselves, our ‘I’, our bodies and so on. Just as we de facto ‘dead’ when under an anaesthetic, so too, on minds anesthetise themselves on a daily basis whenever it chooses to discard recognition and cognisance of ourselves, our sense of ‘I’ and so on.

$$\~$$

1. There are Differing Mind Realms with Entirely Differing Attributes

What I have so far discovered is the following – we speak of the attributes of reality, consciousness, the mind and somehow, we miss one elemental ‘mind dimension’, and that is the dimension of *‘nothingness’*, wherein mind and therefore our entire physicality is rendered extinct during the time when we are not aware nor conscious.

We speak of the attributes of existence, mind, our lives, reality, consciousness and somehow, we miss one elemental ‘mind dimension’ and that is the dimension of *‘nothingness’*, wherein mind and therefore our entire physicality is rendered extinct during the time when we are not aware nor conscious.

Examples abound, yet they are not seen as relevant; for example, when we see or observe a cat, we may not the attributes of the cat. When we are socialising, we are generally aware that we are doing this ‘socialising’. But what is the reality and the attributes of our mind when we are only thinking, disregarding the rest of our physical and mental surroundings?

What are the attributes of our mind when we are awake and yet when we blank out? What are the attributes of our mind when we are dreaming or influenced by drugs?

While it is well-known that there are clearly differing ‘realms of the mind’ with their differing attributes given our differing states of consciousness, we tend to ignore what exactly do such statements imply or mean?

Generally speaking, most of us accept the most or the supposedly most common ‘reality’ we experience, and that is the one that exists within which we mostly live within – that is, the spatially physical three-dimensional plus the time dimension.

But as we just noted, that is but a fragment of our reality, as per its frequencies. The differing realms of reality are in in effect numberless, depending entirely on the quality, spatial, physical circumstances and the precise context of mind in question that ultimately completes a collective totality of the Observer’s conscious and/or unconscious mind – and all that exists strictly within any specified time-frame. Thus, is easy to understand that there are a numberless amount of effective ‘realities’ in the repose of each conscious or unconscious individual in question.

One simple example. Say you are in one state of a neutral ‘mind realm’ and next you hear an exhilarating song. You are now transposed to a functionally differing mind realm, and I say ‘functionally’ precisely because it has differing mental attributes from the original benign mind realm we started out with.

Now one can dryly ask, “Well, so what?”

Good question. No one denies how different we feel, depending on the stimuli we receive, such as music, alcohol and so on. However, nowhere do we recognise that these differing Mind Realms affect us on a daily basis precisely any event, word, voice stare from somebody can affect a person. But what does it mean to be in a differing ‘Mind Realm’? Are we saying we are not the same person?

Let’s go deeper now. When we are awake and with no stimulants, we can say that we are in a neutral, benign Mind Realm. The latter has its attributes. Now we briefly mentioned this before, but when we are in a ‘blanked out’ state of mind, we know that the properties, attributes of our ‘blanked out’ mind are radically different from our minds when we are not in a blanked state of mind. So, what does that mean? Well, that means we human beings exist in a life with differing ‘Mind Realms’, each with their own differing properties, characteristics and so on. Take time, as an example. Everyone knows that time can be completely subservient to the specific Mind Realm we’re in. Thus, if we have a dreamless night, we may feel time has gone by speedily, especially when compared to watching or listening to a boring event.

Again, you may say, “So what?”

What I am saying is that we human beings do not exist in one Mind Realm. That is the important matter here. We live within a numberless volume of differing Mind Realms, each with their changing and varying, complimenting and contrasting characteristics.

Take dreaming. Where are we when we dream? Our we in our brain? Outside our mind? We all recognise time acts weirdly during dreams. Is that ‘real’, as per actual time or is it just a phantasy of our dream?

I will propose that when dreaming, especially vivid dreams, the human in question exists in an entirely different ‘existence’ from his daily self, and that the former is a realm which we do not for the moment understand one bit. In other words, as so many scientists say, we all live and die as who we are, on this earth. But in my thesis, I propose that this life that we know of, our daily lives, is not of one reality. There are other realities to our minds, our existence, of which we know nothing of. Certainly, we can describe these differing states of mind, but we have no scientific implements or tools to treat these ‘realities’ or more accurately these ‘meta-realities’ in any way. We cannot locate them; in other where exactly are we during these scenes? We don’t know who creates them. We don’t know how or why time acts at times a slurred manner and in other times it acts in speedy manner. In short, we know nothing of our own meta-realities. But we must understand that none of us live in a linear progression of events in spacetime from birth to death, subject to the specific land and circumstance we happen to be in.

Examples abound, yet they are not seen as relevant; what is the reality and the attributes of our mind when we are thinking? What are the attributes of our mind when we blank out? What are the attributes of our mind when we are dreaming or influenced by drugs? While it is well-known that there are differing realms of the mind, with their differing attributes, we ignore, or we do not study the fact that there may be different realms of existence for both mind and matter. The only reality most people assume exists is the one we live within – the physical three-dimensional, plus time dimension.

And yet, the definitions of reality are in fact numberless, depending entirely on the quality and spatial context of the collective totality of the Observer’s conscious and/or unconscious mind within any specified time-frame. That means there are numberless ‘realities’ in the repose of each conscious or unconscious individual in question.

$$\~$$

1. Recap

Thus far we note:

1. **The Theme of the ‘Void/s’ and/or of ‘Nothingness’** - All observed entities are ultimately composed of a numberless series of imperceptible voids. One can imagine pointillism in art as being similar in properties as the elemental constituents of vision are.
2. **All Reality is Abstract** - These ‘voids’ are ‘abstract’ in nature precisely because they cannot be recognised, discerned or any way delineated from other observed entities. Any object the human views is necessarily ***abstract*** because it is composed, it is created from an infinite number of indefinable, unrecognisable, non-figurative, borderless formless, vague, shadowy, intangible, imperceptible and unobservable points or areas and that all of these points or areas do not and can never allow the observing human to perceive them or to relate to them in any meaningful manner as one would when perceiving the greater, recognisable parts.
3. **How Vision Is Recognisable** - It from these infinite number of abstract voids that ultimately a whole image evolves into what is perceivable and recognisable for what it is. Thus, from an infinity of voids arises a meaningful whole Vision.
4. **There is *no unity of Vision* for any observed entity** - Just as there is no one image of, say, a flower or cat or anything observable. When we employ the term an ***Image***, I mean there does not exist a one exact and same image of the observed entity. So, if we observe a cat, we need to note that there is no one image or reality of that same observed cat. In fact, there are an infinite number of images, some look alike while others conflict with others and at the same time each and every one of these images are themselves continually changing. The images of the observed cat are therefore *infinite* as perceived by the Observer and since there is no one viewed picture of the cat there is no unity of the Vision/picture of the cat in question and that phenomenon of Vision, is the same for any observable entity, and hence there is no unity of Vision whatsoever for any observing organism.
5. **Extinction of One’s Physicality/Existence** - When an observing character observes only one entity and has nothing else in his/her mind, then in that specific time-frame we can say their entire sense of physicality, selfhood becomes extinct. Equally when an observing character observes nothing, is a ‘blank state of mind’ and has nothing else in his/her mind, then in that time-frame, so too we can say their ‘I’, their physicality, their existence becomes extinct. Therefore, the entirety of our everyday living is a chaotic, non-linear series of abstractions. Nothing is or can be ‘concrete’. Even that noun – ‘concrete’ – is meaningless insofar as our lives, experiences and our existence goes.

Now we must talk about the difference between what we see outside our Mind and what we see within our Mind.

We start our differentiation in the types of Vision here by dividing them into two types: that which we see/experience/interact with *outside* our Mind we call General Abstract Vision [or gav] and that which we see/feel/visualise/experience *within* our Mind we call Mental Abstract Vision, [or mav].

$$\~$$

1. What is General Abstract Vision [gav] and Mental Abstract Vision [mav]?

General Abstract Vision is defined in the following manners:

1. ‘General’ [‘g’] because it denotes any observed entity that is *not* within our Mind but outside and nothing specific or focused [fop] within that observed entity.
2. ‘Abstract’ [‘a’] because the essence of all that which is perceived is abstract, a matter we have already discussed.
3. ‘Vision’ [‘v’], is that which is being seen/viewed.

Mental Abstract Vision is defined in the following manners:

1. ‘Mental’ [‘m’] because it is what is viewed, imagined, thought of and visualised *within* our Mind only and not what is beyond our Mind.
2. ‘Abstract’ [‘a’] because the essence of all that which is perceived is abstract, a matter we have already discussed; further, this mental Vision is *necessarily more abstract* than the general abstract Vision precisely because it is entirely viewed/observed/experienced within the Mind.
3. Vision, [‘v’], is that which is being seen/viewed.

$$\~$$

1. Observer Observing Entity in His Surroundings, or [gav] and in His Mind [mav] Using Our *Notations*

**In this part I use the notations I created.**

**Perhaps one may object to such an endeavour – if so, ignore the rest of the paper. I can write out my ideas without the notations. It would of course mean so much more verbiage. If, however, you may be comfortable in exploring my Feynman-inspired notations, please do read on.**

When an Observer views an object or an Observed Entity, and if/when that Observed Entity is *not* in his Mind, in other words he/she is viewing anything, entity or phenomena outside his mind, eyes, brain, body, or when it out there existing in the ‘real world’, so to speak, we can then write the following:

$me1. [x\_{r}^{α+}$] {[$gav\_{1}^{0}$]} ]

[‘me’ = mind equation].

The above denotes –

1. There is an Observer $[x \_{r}^{α+}]$ and we are only discussing this individual, and all that is *relative* [r] *to* him
2. This observer is fully aware and conscious [$α^{+}$],
3. Our Observer is seeing the observed entity in question which is a Vision of the general abstract Vision type [gav]. Since the observed object is not in his Mind but outside his Mind, we denote that by using the letter ‘g’ for the general observed object, [e.g. the cat].
4. Therefore $[x\_{r}^{α+}] $is viewing a specific general abstract Vision, [gav], the cat in front of him.
5. What do the numbers denote in $[gav\_{1}^{0}]$? The ‘0’ implies the vision being viewed is a neutral image, it neither a happy image nor is it saddening one. It is neutral. After all, it’s only the Observer’s cat and the latter is doing nothing. The ‘1’ simply denotes the specific image we have in mind, which, again, in this case is the humble cat.

Now imagine our Observer *imagining* a cat in his Mind, in which case we can write the following:

$me2$. [ $x\_{r}^{α+}$] {$mav\_{1}^{0}$]}

Or, the observing person, [x] and only relative to observing person [$x\_{r}$], who is also fully aware and conscious [$α^{+}$], sees the mental Mind image of the cat, or $[mav\_{1}$] The [m] in the [mav] denotes that this perceived image is from the Mind and not from outside his Mind. And the numbers denote the same meanings as with our previous example. The [0] above the [1] are there to express the *emotion* this vision in particular invokes on our Observer, and it is one of neutrality, since it does not evoke any interest or disgust, hence the zero, written symbolically, exactly as an electron is ‘–‘, while the proton is ‘+’.

Finally, we need to factor in one more essential attribute – Time.

We must be accurate, we must include the time-frame, because it is vitally important in understanding that each mind equation, or interaction must be studied within any specified time frame simply because every attribute of Mind can and will change within milliseconds and that’s why we need to know when and/or in what time-frame are we discussing the status of the mind of our observer in question -

$me5. [x\_{r}^{α+}$ {$gav\_{1}^{0}$}$]t^{0-5s}$

Or, the above event occurred between seconds zero to five relative only to $[x\_{r}^{α+}]$.

$$\~$$
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