

Reality Is Not What It Appears To Be

You see yourself in the world, while I see the world in myself. To you, you get born and die, while to me, the world appears and disappears. It is your imagination that misleads you. There is a deep contradiction in your attitude which you do not see.

-Nisargadatta Maharaj

One of the strangest aspects of reality, which is almost universally ignored by all the people who want to talk about the nature of reality, has to do with the nature of perception. It's often stated that *perception is reality*, but what exactly does this mean? In any scientific discussion about the nature of reality, all the scientific talk is about what is being perceived, and almost never about what is perceiving whatever is being perceived. If we really want to talk about what is perceiving the perceivable aspects of reality, we have to talk about the nature of perceiving consciousness, but to quote Ludwig Wittgenstein: *Of that which we cannot speak, we must remain silent*. The scientific approach is to remain silent about the nature of perceiving consciousness because science really has nothing to say about it. The scientific community almost universally ignores the nature of perceiving consciousness because it is impossible to talk about it in a scientific way.

All the scientific discussion is about what is being perceived and not about what is perceiving those perceivable things. The fact of the matter is there is no scientific way to discuss what is perceiving the perceivable things because the nature of perceiving consciousness is not itself a perceivable thing. Only the perceivable things can be scientifically discussed. That's why almost all scientists refuse to talk about the nature of perceiving consciousness. They want to sweep the problem under the rug and ignore it because they really have nothing to say about it.

Even worse than the scientists who refuse to talk about the nature of perceiving consciousness are those pseudo-scientists who call themselves neuroscientists who want to confuse you about the nature of your own consciousness. These false messengers of science want to tell you that your consciousness is only an illusion or that the problem of consciousness is so complex that we'll have to wait for a science of complexity to develop before we can really understand it. If they can't confuse you with their consciousness as an illusion argument, they'll try to confuse you with their complexity of consciousness argument. Even though you know at your very core and with absolute certainty that you are conscious and aware as you perceive things, these false messengers of pseudoscience either want to tell you that your consciousness is all an illusion or that it's so complex in nature that you can never understand it. The logical contradiction in their argument, which is what makes their argument a big lie, is that even an illusion has to be perceived, and even the most highly organized and complex things have to be perceived. What perceives them? What exactly is perceiving the illusion or perceiving the complexity of things?

Why do these pseudo-scientists want to tell you this big lie? The answer is, they want to tell you this lie because at some level they know that they really have nothing to say about the nature of perceiving consciousness, and rather than admit their own failing and inability to give a scientific

explanation for the nature of perceiving consciousness, they'd rather lie to you and tell you that it's all an illusion or it's too complex to understand. They've forced themselves into telling you this big lie in order to save face so that they can continue to appear to be brilliant scientists even though they know in their heart of hearts that they're lying to you. It's basically a big con job, and they've become nothing more than con-artists. Their deception reflects their unwillingness to acknowledge the simple fact that there is a higher level of reality that is beyond the reality of the physical world of things that we perceive. That higher level of reality is the nature of perceiving consciousness. Perceiving consciousness is what perceives everything in the physical world, but the true nature of perceiving consciousness is not really a part of that physical world.

Both the illusion argument and the complexity argument about consciousness are really only smoke-screens that are meant to confuse you about the true nature of your own consciousness, which if you look into it for yourself, you will discover has no confusion. At your very core, you know with absolute certainty that you are conscious and aware as you perceive things in the world, but if you look deeply into that center of consciousness, you will discover that this center is not really a part of the world that you perceive in the sense of being something in the world. That center of consciousness is at the very center of the world you perceive, which can only be described as a focal point of consciousness at the central point of view of the world you perceive.

If these pseudo-scientists were really honest, which probably will never happen due to they're unwillingness to admit their own failings and limitations, they would acknowledge that there is no scientific solution to the hard problem of consciousness. Science can only give a scientific description of the nature or the behavior of the things that appear in the physical world that consciousness perceives. That scientific description is inherently a mathematical description. Only the perceivable things that appear in the physical world that consciousness perceives can be reduced to a mathematical description. Unlike the perceivable things that can be reduced to a mathematical description, the true nature of perceiving consciousness can never be reduced to a mathematical description. There is no scientific solution for the hard problem of consciousness.

This state of affairs is really not that hard to understand. The best analogy is the operation of a computer. The operation of a computer is governed by computational rules, which are inherently mathematical. Whatever images appear on the computer screen, which is the output device of the computer, is a result of that computation, and so those images have a mathematical description. The images projected from the computer screen are all reducible to bits of information encoded on the computer screen, and those projected images are animated as energy flows through the computer. Both the encoding information in a binary code of 1's and 0's and the flow of energy through the computer have a mathematical description. The problem in terms of understanding the nature of perceiving consciousness is that the observer of the computer screen is always outside the computer. The consciousness of the observer that perceives the projected images is always outside the computer, and so the consciousness of the observer cannot be reduced to the way information is encoded in the computer or to the way energy flows through the computer. Those images are projected from the computer screen to the point of view of the observer outside

the computer screen. Unlike the projected images, which do have a mathematical description in terms of how information is processed inside the computer, the perceiving consciousness of the observer does not have a mathematical description in terms of how information is processed inside the computer. A computer screen cannot perceive itself. The observer is always outside.

If we extend this computer analogy to the entire physical world and imagine that everything that we can perceive in the physical world or that can appear in the physical world is like an animated image projected from a computer screen to our own point of view, then we have to conclude that the true nature of our perceiving consciousness is not really a part of the physical world. As observers of the physical world, we do not really exist inside the physical world. The true nature of perceiving consciousness does not really exist in the physical world of things that it perceives.

In the sense of the holographic principle of modern theoretical physics, that physical world of things is defined on a holographic screen, and the observer of that physical world is always outside that holographic screen. This is also the logic that underlies the Godel incompleteness theorems. The consciousness that knows about the consistency of mathematics cannot be mathematically explained. The upshot is the perceiving consciousness of the observer can never be explained in terms of our mathematically based sciences in the same way all the things that appear in the holographic world the observer perceives can be scientifically explained.

It's worth delving into the Godel incompleteness theorems at a deeper level and understanding what they tell us about the relationship between computation and consciousness. The second incompleteness theorem proves that a logically consistent mathematical system, like arithmetic, can never prove its own logical consistency. The proof of consistency is always outside the mathematical system. The way the incompleteness theorems prove this is by showing that if such a proof of consistency was possible within the mathematical system, that would imply a paradox of self-reference, which would make the proof logically inconsistent. If that mathematical system is programmed on a computer, then the consciousness that knows about the logical consistency of that computation must be outside the computer, which is to say that consciousness is not computational in nature. The consciousness that knows about the consistency of mathematics cannot be mathematically explained without creating a logically inconsistent paradox of self-reference. That paradox of self-reference is the nature of a computer screen observing itself or an image projected from a computer screen observing itself. The only way we can eliminate this paradox of self-reference is if the consciousness that observes the computer screen and observes the images projected from the computer screen is outside the computer and outside the computer screen. Since all science is based on mathematics, if we want to preserve logical consistency, we have to conclude that consciousness cannot be scientifically explained.

The problem is we're talking about two different levels of reality. There's the level of reality of whatever appears in the world we perceive, which is like a computer-generated virtual reality, and there's the level of reality of what we really are, which is the consciousness that perceives that world. Mathematics and theoretical physics only apply at the level of the world we perceive,

which isn't really real, and not at the level of our consciousness, which is real. In the words of the Bhagavad-Gita: *The unreal has no being; the real never ceases to be.*

At this point in the argument, most people will have a violent reaction against this argument, but it's important to realize that this reaction is an emotional reaction, and is not based upon logic or reason. Emotional reactions are inherently illogical and irrational. Emotional reactions are always self-defensive, but if the nature of the self that is being defended is not really real, then emotional reactions are only defending an illusion of what you really are. If you want to move beyond that illusion of what you really are, you have to overcome that emotional reaction, and the only way you can do that is to abandon your emotions and appeal to logic and reason. Those of you who are unable to abandon your emotions and consider this argument in a dispassionate and logically reasoned way are best advised to stop reading this book right now, since if you continue reading, it will only increase your annoyance and displeasure and make you angrier. Those of you who can abandon your emotions and consider this argument as a dispassionate observer, based only on the reasoned logic of the argument, are invited to continue reading.

This computer analogy is not really that far-fetched in terms of what modern physics is telling us about the nature of reality. Is it really possible that physical reality or the entire physical world that we perceive is no more real than the animated images of a computer-generated virtual reality projected from a computer screen to our own point of view? The answer turns out to be a yes. Recent developments in theoretical physics have confirmed this idea with the discovery of the holographic principle of quantum gravity. Before we can discuss the holographic principle, it's necessary to make a short digression and to review the history of the observer in theoretical physics. In some sense, understanding the true nature of the observer is the natural result of unifying the relativistic observer with the quantum observer. That unification of the relativistic observer with the quantum observer was how the holographic principle was discovered.

This strange state of affairs about all the scientific confusion about the nature of consciousness is very weird since the most fundamental science we have, which is the mathematically grounded science of theoretical physics, by necessity is forced to talk about perceivable reality from the perspective of an observer of physical reality. Theoretical physicists don't worry about defining what the observer actually is in scientific terms except to recognize that the observer is observing some aspect of physical reality from the perspective of a particular point of view. In theoretical physics, an observer is nothing more than a point of view, which can be understood as a focal point of perceiving consciousness. In relativity theory, an observer is always at the central point of view of its own coordinate system, which is called a frame of reference. All the observer's observations in that coordinate system are made relative to the observations of other observers in other coordinate systems, which can move relative to each other. When coordinate systems move relative to each other, the observations of different observers are different, which is the whole basis for relativity theory. The observations of different observers appear to be different from those different points of view when the coordinate systems move relative to each other. With

constant velocity motion, these different observations include phenomena like time dilation. With accelerated motion, these different observations include the phenomena of gravity.

The important point to be clear about is that these different observations all occur from different points of view when those points of view move relative to each other. With constant velocity motion we get the effect of time dilation. With accelerated motion we get the effect of gravity. Each observer observes different effects of time dilation and gravity from its own point of view depending on its relative state of motion. Relative means relative to the motion of other observers. The observer itself can only be understood as a point of view that moves relative to other points of view. The observer can only be understood in scientific terms as a focal point of perceiving consciousness, which basically tells us nothing about the true nature of the observer.

The situation only becomes murkier and more confusing when we consider quantum theory. Like relativity theory, quantum theory is also forced to talk about perceivable reality from the perspective of an observer, although this important point is again often ignored and swept under the rug. The only thing that quantum theory can ever calculate is a quantum state of potentiality. This quantum state is the nature of the quantum wave-function. This quantum state is not the nature of the perceivable reality that we perceive. The quantum state is a superposition of all the possible observable states of the perceivable reality that we perceive. Every time we make an observation of perceivable reality, we have to reduce the quantum state to a specific observable state, which is called the collapse of the wave-function or a quantum state reduction.

This strange state of affairs cannot be overemphasized. The quantum state is not a description of perceivable reality. The quantum state is a superposition of all possible observable states of perceivable reality. Every possible observation of perceivable reality is a choice that must be made before that observation can occur. The quantum state is a sum over all possible choices. When I come to a fork in the road, I have a choice to make about which way to travel if I want to continue moving forward. I can turn right or left. If I turn right, I observe one possible version of perceivable reality. If I turn left, I observe another possible version of perceivable reality, which is different from the other possible version. Whichever path I take is a choice. Different choices I make result in different versions of the perceivable reality I observe from my own point of view. The perceivable reality I observe depends on the choices I make as I follow my own path.

In the language of quantum theory, the quantum state is a sum over all possible paths. Each path results in a different version of perceivable reality from the point of view of the observer that follows that path. The quantum state of potentiality is only a sum over all possible paths, which is a superposition of all possible observable states of perceivable reality. Once a choice is made and a particular path is chosen, that's the version of perceivable reality the observer will observe from its own point of view as it follows its own path.

Most theoretical physicists want to ignore this problem and treat the quantum state as though it were the same as perceivable reality, but that is a mistaken view of things. The quantum state is a

sum over all possible observable states of perceivable reality, which is not the same as the perceivable reality perceived from the point of view of any particular observer. The perceivable reality perceived from the point of view of any particular observer is always a reduction of the quantum state that occurs as choices are made and the observer follows its own path.

The big mistake that theoretical physicists make is to assume that there is a God's eye view of perceivable reality that can see all the possible paths all at once. When theoretical physicists falsely equate the quantum state of potentiality with perceivable reality, they're assuming that this God's eye view of things can see all the possible paths all at once. That's a mistaken assumption. There is no such thing as a God's eye view of all possible paths. The nature of perceivable reality is that it has to be perceived by an observer, and the observer is only a point of view. This point of view must follow one of the possible paths as the observer perceives one of the possible versions of perceivable reality. The observer always perceives its own possible version of perceivable reality from its own point of view as it follows its own possible path. An important aspect of perceivable reality is that the observer's observation of its own possible version of perceivable reality always occurs in a subject-object relation. The observer is the subject, and whatever the observer observes in its own possible version of perceivable reality is its object.

The reason it's important to understand this state of affairs is because it tells us that there really is no such thing as an objective perceivable reality of the physical world out there that's independent of the observations of an observer. The physical world that we perceive is not an objective reality, but only a perceivable reality defined in a subject-object relation. Every observer observes its own version of perceivable reality from its own point of view in a subject-object relation as the observer follows its own path. There is no possible way to take the observer out of what we call perceivable reality. Perceivable reality is not an objective reality that can be defined independent of an observer's observations, but can only be defined in a subject-object relation of perception.

Relativity theory and quantum theory are both telling us that perceivable reality is always defined in a subject-object relation. The subject is the observer and the object is whatever the observer observes in its own perceivable reality. The relation between the perceiving subject and its perceivable object is perception. The observer can only be understood as the perceiving consciousness that arises at a point of view, which is a focal point of perceiving consciousness.

We really don't need relativity theory or quantum theory to tell us that perceivable reality is always defined in a subject-object relation. The perceivable reality any observer observes is always defined from the point of view of that particular observer. Other observers will observe a different version of perceivable reality from their own point of view. In the language of quantum theory, whichever version of perceivable reality any observer observes from its own point of view depends on which path it follows and what choices it makes when it comes to a fork in the road. There is no such thing as an objective perceivable reality out there that is independent of

the observations of an observer. Every observer observes its own version of perceivable reality from its own point of view, which may or may not agree with what other observers observe.

This important point cannot be overemphasized. There is no such thing as an objective physical reality of the world out there that is the same for all observers. Every observer observes its own perceivable reality in a subject-object relation, and what one observer observes may not be the same as what another observer observes. It all depends on their own point of view, how they're moving relative to other points of view, and which path they follow. This is exactly what relativity theory and quantum theory are telling us. It also is the only possible logical conclusion we can draw by analyzing the nature of perception. Perception is only defined in a subject-object relation, and the subject can only be understood as the perceiving consciousness that arises at a point of view, which is the nature of the observer. Unfortunately, neither theory can really tell us anything about the true nature of the observer, which is the nature of perceiving consciousness.

Relativity theory and quantum theory are both telling us the same thing about the nature of perception, which is that perception always occurs in a subject-object relation, and that the subject can only be understood as the perceiving consciousness that arises at a point of view, which really tells us nothing about the true nature of the observer. Relativity theory and quantum theory do have something to tell us about the nature of the perceivable objects that the observer observes, which is where we have to focus our attention if we want to take this argument further.

The conventional way that both relativity theory and quantum theory are understood is called the point particle formulation of physics. In this formation, we always have to assume some sort of fixed background space-time geometry within which point particles can be localized and through which point particles can move. The most sophisticated version of this point particle formulation of physics is called quantum field theory. A quantum field is like the quantum wave-function of conventional quantum theory, which specifies the quantum probability that a point particle can be localized at some space-time position in this fixed background space-time geometry or follow some path through this fixed background space-time geometry. The quantum field specifies the quantum probability that the point particle can be measured at some point in space and at some moment of time in the fixed background space-time geometry. The quantum field also specifies the quantum probability for measuring other measurable properties of the point particle, like its spin state. In quantum field theory, all the measurable properties of a point particle are specified by its quantum wave-function, which essentially is the quantum field. These measurable properties always exhibit a wave-particle duality, and so it's more appropriate to speak of the particle as a quantum particle rather than a point particle. A good example of a quantum particle is the photon, which has both point particle-like properties and wave-like properties. The quantum field that underlies the behavior of the photon is the electromagnetic field.

A problem arises when we try to unify the force of gravity with the other fundamental forces, like the electromagnetic force. In relativity theory, the force of gravity is understood to arise from the dynamical curvature of space-time geometry, which is described by Einstein's field

equations for the space-time metric. If we treat the space-time metric, which is the nature of the gravitational field, like any other quantum field, this would imply a quantum particle called the graviton that propagates through a space-time geometry just like the photon propagates through a space-time geometry. The problem is, to quantize the behavior of the photon in the sense of a quantum field theory, we have to assume that the photon propagates through a fixed background space-time geometry. If we treat the graviton in the same way that we treat the photon, as a quantum particle that propagates through a fixed background space-time geometry, we are then contradicting the very idea of gravity as the dynamical curvature of space-time geometry.

There simply is no logically consistent way to understand gravity as a quantum field theory since all quantum field theories assume that a quantum particle propagates through a fixed background space-time geometry, which contradicts the very idea of gravity as the dynamical curvature of space-time geometry. If we want to include gravity, there is something inherently wrong with the point particle formulation of physics formulated with quantum field theory. This formulation is not consistent with the nature of gravity. Gravity cannot be understood as a quantum field theory.

The only known possible resolution of this problem, which is the only known way to resolve the contradiction, was discovered about twenty-five years ago in the mid to late 1990's. This solution is called the holographic principle of quantum gravity. With the holographic principle, we essentially have to abandon the point particle formulation of physics. Quantum field theory is not a fundamental formulation of physics. Neither gravity nor any of the other fundamental forces, like electromagnetism and the nuclear forces, can be understood as a quantum field theory, at least not at a fundamental level. At best, all quantum field theories are only effective field theories that only have a limited range of validity, and are not really anything fundamental.

With the holographic principle, the fundamental nature of physical reality is no longer taken to be point particles that are localized within and move through some space-time geometry. Even space-time geometry is no longer taken to be fundamental. The holographic principle tells us that the only two fundamental aspects of physical reality are information and energy. What appears to be a point particle that's localized within and moves through some space-time geometry can be reduced to information and energy. Even that space-time geometry can be reduced to information and energy. The holographic principle reduces everything that can be perceived in a space-time geometry, including the nature of that space-time geometry, to information and energy.

The way the holographic principle accomplishes this trick is to begin with the accelerated motion of an observer, which in relativity theory is called an observer in an accelerated frame of reference. The observer is simply the perceiving consciousness at the central point of view of a coordinate system that can move relative to other coordinate systems or other observers. If the observer undergoes accelerated motion, relativity theory tells us that the observer's observations of things in space will be limited by an event horizon. The observer's event horizon is as far out in space as the observer can see things in space due to the limitation of the speed of light, which is a constant for all observers and gives a limitation on the rate with which information can be

transferred through three dimensional space. Nothing is observable to the observer beyond its event horizon due to the constancy of the speed of light that places a limitation on observation.

Once the observer has an event horizon, a holographic screen can be constructed from that horizon. The observer's holographic screen is constructed from the observer's event horizon when that horizon encodes quantized bits of information, which are called qubits. Each qubit of information is like a spin $\frac{1}{2}$ variable in quantum theory that can only point up or down and thereby encodes information in a binary code of 1's and 0's like a switch that is either on or off. The observer's event horizon encodes information like a computer screen, with one qubit of information encoded per pixel on the screen, which is called a holographic screen.

The fact that the observer's holographic screen arises as an event horizon in its own accelerated frame of reference is again telling us that there is no such thing as a God's eye view of perceivable reality. There are always aspects of perceivable reality that the observer cannot observe because the observer cannot observe anything beyond the boundary of its own event horizon. There is no God's eye view of things that can see things on both sides of an event horizon. The observer's point of view is always located at the central point of view of its own holographic world, and observations within that world are always limited by the boundary of its own event horizon. The observer's horizon acts as a holographic screen that encodes all the qubits for information for all those observations. Everything observable in the observer's own holographic world is reducible to qubits of information encoded on its own holographic screen.

The holographic principle tells us that everything the observer can observe in its own holographic world can be reduced to qubits of information encoded on its own holographic screen, which arises as an event horizon in its own accelerated frame of reference. Everything observable in that holographic world is reducible to information and energy. Even the space-time geometry of that world is reducible to information and energy. Information is encoded on the observer's holographic screen and energy is inherent in the accelerated motion of the observer's accelerated frame of reference. The observer itself can only be understood as the perceiving consciousness present at the central point of view of its own accelerated reference frame, which is the perceiving consciousness present at the central point of view of its own holographic world.

The perceiving subject in the subject-object relation of perception that defines the subject's own perceivable reality is the perceiving consciousness of the observer at the central point of view of its own holographic world. All the perceivable objects in that perceivable reality can be reduced to qubits of information encoded on the observer's holographic screen and the energy inherent in its own accelerated frame of reference, which tells us those objects are forms of information animated in the flow of energy. In no way is this description different from that of an observer that plays a computer-generated virtual reality game on a computer screen. Everything the observer observes in that computer-generated virtual reality is like an image projected from the computer screen to the observer's point of view and animated in the flow of energy. All the

projected and animated images of that virtual reality can be reduced to bits of information encoded on the computer screen and the energy that flows through the computer.

The holographic principle also explains how many observers can share a consensual reality. Each observer observes events in its own world from the central point of view of that world as those events are defined in terms of how information is encoded on its own holographic screen, but when those screens overlap in the sense of a Venn diagram, they can share information.

If the perceivable reality we perceive is no more real than a computer-generated virtual reality, then what is reality? To answer this question, we have to ask: where does the perceiving consciousness of the observer come from? What is the source of perceiving consciousness?

By simple logical analysis, a computer-generated virtual reality cannot be the source of the consciousness that perceives that reality. Everything perceivable in that computer-generated virtual reality is like an image projected from a computer screen to the point of view of an observer and animated in the flow of energy through the computer. Everything perceivable in the virtual reality is reducible to information and energy, but the perceiving consciousness of the observer cannot itself be reduced to the information encoded in the computer or to the energy that flows through the computer. The observer of the computer screen is always outside the computer. Everything the observer can observe in the virtual reality can be reduced to information and energy defined inside the computer, but the perceiving consciousness of the observer cannot be defined in terms of the information and energy defined inside the computer, which is another way of saying that perceiving consciousness is not itself a perceivable thing.

This means perceiving consciousness does not have a personal origin. The animated form of a person that appears in that virtual reality is no more real than a projected image, like the form of an avatar that appears in a computer-generated virtual reality game or the animated image of the central character of a movie projected from a movie screen to the point of view of an observer in the movie audience. The consciousness that perceives that image cannot arise from the image.

If the projected and animated image of a person that appears in the virtual reality is not the origin of the consciousness that perceives that image, what is the source of perceiving consciousness? If perceiving consciousness does not have a personal origin, then where does it come from?

The only possible answer is perceiving consciousness has an impersonal origin. This impersonal source of perceiving consciousness is the nature of nonduality. The concept of nonduality simply says that there is an ultimate reality out there that is the source of perceiving consciousness, and that this ultimate reality is beyond the computer-generated virtual reality of the holographic world that we perceive. This ultimate reality is also the source of all the information and energy that constructs a holographic world. This ultimate reality constructs the quantum computer that gives rise to the appearance of the computer-generated virtual reality of a holographic world. Simultaneously with the construction of that holographic world, this ultimate reality is also the

source of the perceiving consciousness of the observer that perceives that holographic world from the central point of view of that world. This ultimate reality is called the void.

The first thing to be clear about is that the void is not a part of the universe. The universe is characterized by a space-time geometry, but the void is not a space-time geometry. In a very real sense, the universe arises within the void. The void is like the vacuum state of quantum field theory, but to fully appreciate the nature of the void, we have to go beyond the concept of quantum field theory to a unified theory of quantum gravity. In the last twenty-five years such a unification has become possible thanks to the holographic principle of quantum gravity. The void is what creates a holographic world, including its space-time geometry. That creation occurs on a holographic screen that arises as an event horizon in an observer's accelerated reference frame. Both the observer's holographic screen and the observer itself as the perceiving consciousness that arises at the central point of view of that holographic world arise within the void.

The void is the motionless background of all motion. In physics, this idea has been called the ether, which is also another word used for the void. The accelerated motion of an observer in its accelerated frame of reference is always relative to the motionless void. The void is also like an empty space of potentiality that has the potential to create geometry. That creation of geometry is how a holographic world is created, both in terms of the creation of energy that places an observer in an accelerated frame of reference, which gives rise to the observer's event horizon, and the encoding of information on that event horizon that turns the horizon into a holographic screen. This creation of geometry is how a quantum computer is created that gives rise to the observer's holographic world as a computer-generated virtual reality.

Simultaneous with the creation of the observer's holographic world, the perceiving consciousness of the observer also arises at the central point of view of that world. In some sense, the undivided or undifferentiated consciousness of the void is focalizing itself into a focal point of perceiving consciousness at the center of that world, which is the perceiving consciousness of the observer.

The important point to realize in terms of the concept of nonduality is that the ultimate reality of the void is beyond the Self. The perceiving consciousness of the observer is the nature of the Self that perceives things in a subject-object relation, which essentially defines self and other. The concept of nonduality tells us that the ultimate reality of the void, which is the source of the perceiving consciousness of the observer, is beyond the Self. In the ultimate reality of the void there is no self and other because there is no subject-object relation of perception. All is One. The subject-object relation of perception is only operative at the dualistic level of a perceivable world. In the ultimate reality of the void, there is nothing perceivable and nothing is perceived. The absolute nothingness of the void is the ultimate reality that is beyond the Self.

Another important point to realize about the concept of nonduality is that the ultimate reality of the void is unlimited, undivided and unchanging. All change implies the flow of energy, which can only arise with the accelerated motion of an observer as that observer enters into an

accelerated frame of reference. As soon as the perceiving consciousness of an observer arises, we're at the level of duality as that observer observes things in its own holographic world. That holographic world is always limited by an event horizon that limits the observer's observation of things in space and acts as its holographic screen. The observer is the nature of the Self that perceives things in that world in a subject-object relation of self and other. None of these aspects of a dualistic holographic world apply to the ultimate reality of the void that is beyond the Self.

In the sense of being pure undifferentiated consciousness, the void can also be understood as Pure Being. This pure being is unlimited, undivided and unchanging in nature. As the motionless background of all motion, this pure being is timeless in nature. All our concepts of change, separation, and limitation only apply at the level of a holographic world that we perceive. That holographic world appears to come into existence as we perceive it, and disappears from existence when we stop perceiving it. Even our own individual perceiving consciousness as the perceiver of that world comes into existence as we perceive it, and must return to undivided existence when we stop perceiving it. The only thing that has timeless existence, which paradoxically is not really a thing, is the true nature of what we really are, which is the void.

In pure being consciousness arises.

In consciousness the world appears and disappears.

Consciousness is on contact, a reflection against a surface, a state of duality. The center is a point of void and the witness a point of pure awareness; they know themselves to be as nothing.

But the void is full to the brim.

It is the eternal potential as consciousness is the eternal actual.

-Nisargadatta Maharaj

Appearances are Deceiving



Do not try to bend the spoon. That is impossible. Only try to realize the truth.

What truth?

There is no spoon.

Then you'll see that it is not the spoon that bends, but only yourself.