

# Mental Relativity Theory

## Transcribed Notes | Volume One

Melanie Anne Phillips

These are raw, unedited transcriptions of some of the tapes I recorded to document the progress of my work in continuing to expand the Mental Relativity theory of narrative psychology originally developed by myself and my friend and partner, Chris Huntley.

There are many more tapes and many more transcripts – dozens of hours – but as they were recorded and transcribed a quarter of a century ago, they are scattered in many places. So, for the sake of creating a permanent record of them lest they become lost forever, I'll publish each collection as I find them.

Alas, there are misinterpreted words, misplaced punctuation and so on, but I feel it is more important to protect the information than to spend any time at this juncture trying to edit the material. Still, the transcription was a horrible task to give someone and she did a magnificent job under the circumstances back in the day, which is why we have them at all.

Here, then, is this group of transcripts for the record:

### Mental Relativity Notes | August 26, 1994

August 26, 1994. Some thoughts that go down to the variation level of working out personal problems. In our early days of dealing with mental relativity, Chris and I, established a group of four concepts, that later became the first four variations and after that we then changed them completely by name. We'll probably be coming back to these variations, as being the central core for alter ego. So –?– –?– and talk about how they become involved in the emotional side of personal problem solving. These four variations are can, need, want, and should. Originally we believed can was just what you were able to do, later we realized that can meant ability limited by outside concerns. For example, permission other pressures from other people, rather than just saying here is my natural ability, we say we can, outside influences are considered rather than just inside potential. When we look at need, need or everybody thinks we need something that's it, you need it and there is no two ways about it.

Need depends on what your motivations are. For example, you would say, somebody needs air to breath, well if someone is trying to commit suicide by suffocating themselves, the last thing they need is air to breath. It depends on what you need to

do, as to what you need. So even the needing food and water, that's the last thing a person needs if they are trying to go on a hunger strike. For example, when we talk about can, need, want; want we use to think was desire, but in fact want is the lacking form of desire. Want means to lack, and so were as desire says things are great, but here is something that could be even better, want means things are terrible until I get this, I want to be able to enjoy myself. That's why want works very closely with need, and you end up with want need people, that say I need this because I want it and unless I get it I won't be happy. Then you end up with the fourth aspect which is should, and just as want and need go together, can and should go together because can is one of the outside influences and should is the pressure that does the limiting; so you have, can and should, and want and need. Other combinations are there too, like can need people and want should people, each one of these different relationships creates a different kind of pairing. When you end up with can, need and want, should, then you're dealing with dynamic pairs essentially and when you end up with want, need and can, should, then you are dealing with dependent pair relationships and the other combinations of need should can want, that's dealing with companion pair relationships. When someone can do something and somebody else wants to do something, or somebody wants something and someone else can do it, well then you end up with a companion relationship, were they are working in tandem, the by product of each are beneficial to the other. Need and should has the same kind of relationship, those are positive aspects.

Now remember, we talked about when men and women look at the four kinds of pairs; dynamic, companion, dependent, and component. When we look at those four kinds of relationships, men are going to say one is positive and one is negative of each of the pairs. Now that is primarily because they are looking at the logical. rational side. In fact, if women look at the rational side, look at the reasons why, they will also see that one is positive and one is negative. So when you are using a reason to try and measure things, you're going to want to find a way of evaluating the object of your concern, in terms of finding dynamic pairs and evaluating which pair is positive and which is negative. So you can take any quad of items and say if these four things are what is intrinsic to this particular object of our evaluation, then this dynamic pair seems positive that means this one is negative, or if I say this one as negative then this one would be positive if I could get it going, same thing for companion, dependent, or component pairs.

Now if you're looking at it emotionally, which is were women intrinsically would look at evaluating, evaluate in terms of their emotions, or if men get to the point were they look at it rationally and then decide to look at it emotionally, then you are going to see where out of the four kinds of pairs, one of them is going to appear to be completely positive and one of, both pairs will appear to be completely negative, in one of them one will be positive and one will be negative, and in the other one the reverse pattern. Now how do you get reverse pattern, well quite simply everything in this -?- system is based on -?-, and as a result anything that emanates from the -?- position,

is not only considered default position of positive, however just as likely it could be negative but that is not consistent with the culture in which we live. However, regardless of whether it is seen as positive or negative there is a triumvered of pairs that animate through the K position, so that we have one of them comes as the dependent pair, one of them comes as the dynamic pair, one of them comes as the companion pair, all three of them splay out of the K position. Meaning that if you say in one appreciation of a companion pair is positive and the other companion pair, the co-companion pair is negative, then if you say that another quad has the reverse relationship, that means that whatever the one that came out of the K was, of that companion pair, it was positive. For example, then if you go into dynamic pairs and it is a reverse relationship, then the one that comes out of the K will be seen as negative. Now this has to be drawn to be really appreciated, and once you've drawn it then it is quite easy to see. So at this point, in document it would be nice if we could put in four little boxes with quads and I can just sketch in the relationships as I've described them here, with the dynamic, companion, dependent and component pairing.

Now, I'm going to look at this system, we get into the -?- the one that should, and in fact, from the position I'm looking now which is the subjective one, I can line up can, need, want, and should, with the four kinds of pairing. I can say that when I look at dynamic pairs, I'm dealing with can because can comes out of ability minus limitations and the dynamic pairs are dealing with battling heads against somebody else, battling against them. One of the pairs measures, when the two of you come together you loose nothing of yourselves and yet create something greater outside of yourselves, that is synthesis, that's the positive dynamic pair. However, that is limited by the other dynamic pair which represents when the two of you but heads against each other, you eliminate your own potential, until no potential is left. \_\_\_\_\_-?-\_\_\_\_\_is wonderfully positive and wonderfully negative, but when you're trying to consider what you can do, it's the combination of these two forces, one that creates the synthesis outside yourself at no cost and one that is nothing but cost and as you put the two together ultimately it creates this can scenario, what can you do well it is the amount that you can create by pushing against somebody minus the cost you have to pay in lost potential. So there is an equation here for Valentine to start working on, in terms of describing dynamic pair as being can, psychologically \_\_\_\_\_-?-\_\_\_\_\_. If that is the case, then want, where would you find want, in terms of the companion pairs we would find want because you see, in a companion pair I lack something and this companion provides this as a by product, or I do not want something and this companion pair provides it that I don't want. In other words companion pairs operate by having someone along on a particular course that does not directly intersect yours, but when you are near them you are to get positive or negative fall out. If you get the positive fall out, they will provide things that they emanate or that they just don't want, that they leave in a way that are useful to you. If you are in a negative companion relationship, they keep dumping junk on you and you get stuck with it and you don't really want it. So the question of want is, I want or I don't want, that means you are attracted or repelled from this relationship because it gives you positive fall out or negative fall out. In other

words, this is another way of assessing cost and dividends, you look at cost and dividends as being attached to that. I don't know what attached to dynamic pairs out of our story terms, but certainly cost and dividends would be attached to the companion relationship.

Now we go on to the, we've done the can and we've done the want, now lets do the need. Need is when you go to dependent pairs and dependent pairs you need because either is a positive need, where if we are to do something that is outside of ourselves we can join forces to become greater than we are separately. This is different for dynamic relationships that creates synthesis because in synthesis you are directly opposed to the person that you are synthesizing with and from that, it sparks some sideways lateral motion, you but heads and because of that it creates sparks light a positive fire or light a candle as it were. In the negative dynamic relationship, you but heads to create sparks and burn yourself down.

When we go to the dependent relationship, that's more like saying brain and braun, two come together and between them they act as a complimentary relationship and can more than either one could do separately. Then we go to the negative dependent relationship, where each one is nothing without the other, meaning as matter of context always, each one of these are contextually examples that would turn it positive or that would turn it negative. So when we look at the dependent pairs, we're going to say or actually I'd guess you'd have to say, the greatest view of context, the greatest focus of context would be occurring at the dependent relationship even though context effects them all. It is harder to see in dynamic pairs and companion ones, than it is to see in the dependent relationship were it seems more apparent, at least to me. Now this may be culturally bias or a female perspective bias or a personal bias, but it seems that is were context would go in any event. When we require each other or we are nothing, when for the task at hand or for our own happiness, we can not be happy unless the other person is with us, then we find ourselves in a negative dependent relationship, meaning that we are always at risk of becoming nothing because the other person may not always be there, that negative dependent relationship is always dealing with need, we have a negative need. Now the concept of negative need and positive need is one that is pretty foreign to us, our culture, but the positive need is when you say, "Oh look wouldn't it be nice if I went to Yosemite, well I have money for gas and I have a friend who has a car who has no money. I will give this friend who has a car my money for gas, I'll buy the gas, they'll supply the car, the three of us will go off we'll have a good time at Yosemite," and that works.

Now the negative dependent relationship is when two people, or when a person feels they cannot live without the other one. In that case, it is like in a marriage, where I can not get by without you, or it's more of a, it's beyond a symbiotic relationship. A symbiotic relationship is one in which two friends help each other, but when you actually combine the two, so that without one the other can't exist. Much like I guess where people breathe out carbon dioxide and trees breathe out oxygen with out

both of them co-existing, than neither one can exist, they are required to both to be providing something to the other one, for the other one to continue or for the other one to be whole. In other words, some source of carbon dioxide needs to come out for trees to live, some source of oxygen needs to be out there for people to live. And if you look at it as an open system, where there is unlimited oxygen and unlimited carbon dioxide, then certainly that isn't a problem and that is the way society traditionally looked at it, but when you begin to look at the close environment of the earth's atmosphere, when you have people who many of them able to do things like destroy the plankton, or missurface the ocean with oil slicks, and chop down the rain forest, all of a sudden there is enough of an impact, that the relationship between people and plants, and this in terms of the oxygen – carbon dioxide relationship, becomes a dependent one. and that I think is what is happening in ecology, that they are missing the point, they are trying to say that this has always existed, we've always been dependent, we've always been interdependent in that sense co-dependent , that's not really true. There were plenty and plenty of plants that ultimately we were dependent on them, but it never went the other way around were they dependent on us, they had enough carbon dioxide in the initial atmosphere of the young planet to be able to grow. The plants could do just fine but there was no oxygen, when they provided oxygen that was what was needed in order for human kind to come to exist. However, once human kind comes time to exist because of the continued evolution of the plant, they say that seeds ——?—, kind of like that concept of plants arranging ——?—— and the reason for this, is that they eventually would have used up all of the free carbon dioxide and been in a —?— atmosphere of pure oxygen and they could not have existed. However, human kind came through so in a sense by creating the oxygen they —?— a new species, an animal species that could then create the other resource and that was essentially the dependent relationship. So they went from being completely independent until the resources ran out, to be co-dependent, and once they were co-dependent that means they could not exist without us and in truth because we were created out of that kind of made already closed system. Initially there was an abundant, over abundance of oxygen of us to breathe that as we began to expand ourselves just like the trees and the plants expanded, we began to use up that limited supply on the earth. At that point we need to reach an equilibrium between the two of us because anymore loss of plants begins to loose the oxygen we need to breath, we don't want to tear down anymore plant life, we actually want to encourage and add a little more carbon dioxide to the system by our breathing, have them add a little more oxygen, we need to start the balance between the two. So that is why the negative dependent relationship is, and so negative dependent relationship describe need of one sort or another. If we want to so something —?— OK, than we will go on and we will say this is what I, how I can make a deal with somebody. Say I'll give you this, if you give me that and together we can both get what we want. Sometimes it's the same thing we both want and sometimes it's different things, that is the nature of business. The negative dependent relationship is to say I cannot survive without what you have, so if you have something and it is just a simple one sided negative dependent relationship than somebody can charge any price

they want because it doesn't matter if they sell it or not, they don't need the money. Therefore, they're not in that position where they have to sell it and you have to buy it and you strike a deal. –?– in terms of business, in terms of a dependent relationship, that is where shysters and hustlers work, that is where they put their effort in, is to find people whose needs are so negatively dependent that they must pay any price for what you want, or they must sell at whatever price they are willing to pay because they need whatever money they can get. That is the nature of taking advantage of someone but for the moment let's talk about a relationship where just it is equal on both sides, and both need what the other has or they will die. A simple –?– in –?– and that is called a win-win scenario. Another win-win scenario is when you have a positive dependent relationship in which each contributes part of what is there needed on the outside to create something greater, like brain and brawn, that is now dealing in the area as we said of need.

We come to the final kind of pairing, which is the pairing correspondent to should, the concept of should. Now what is should? Should has the tendency to make us feel these –?– judgments, is where our conscious gets us. Basically, if we do not follow through on this particular path we will pay for it later or we will pay for it in other ways that are not directly related to not following that path, if we follow a path we are not suppose to, it will create something that will come back to haunt us. The reason we can look at this is because when we look at the component relationship there are either four individuals in a quad that are not related to each other, or there is an umbrella over them that defines them as a group. When we get to male thinking, male thinking can go so far as to perceive that as being the elemental nature of things in the field in which they exist. In other words, when a left minded science, K-based science comes down and looks into the universe as deeply as it can, it says these distinct particles that make it up that have no relationship directly between each other and an overall field that connects across them, connects them, and that field then, that magical field defines them as somehow being related. So that when something happens to one, it correspondingly happens to another or perhaps the inverse happens to another. In other words, if you push this one positively, the other will move negatively. While in fact, that is how all of the pair relationships are created. When you push on a dynamic pair, the question is when you push one up does the other one go down, like a teeter-totter or a saw-saw. Or does it work so that if one goes up the other one goes up, like two sides of a platform for a window washer, when one goes up the other one goes up, when one goes down the other one goes down. Both work like when one goes up the other one could go up or down, it doesn't matter, like two elevators side by side. All of those are the three kinds of relationships, the dynamic pair of relationship is when one goes up the other one goes down. The companion pair relationship is when one goes up the other one goes up, or when it goes down the other one goes down. And the dependent relationship is, gosh I can't even figure that one out, so the analogy that I have of the elevators, seems more like the component relationship of the independently views. So there seems to be some missing areas there in the analogy, meaning that

who ever is looking at this and reading it, can now supply those hopefully and use the elevator concept of when one goes up and down it doesn't effect anything else, that's the independent relationship of the component. But when you have the fact that they are all for moving people up and down, that's kind of like the field, meaning that if one is going up because people at the top floor have determined that they need an elevator, then it is the people that are waiting at the bottom floor that are seeing that elevator go up that will perhaps call the other one up or down depending on it's position, which would not have happened had the first one not gone up or down, because if the first one had come down then the people at bottom would wait for it. And so that kind of relationship I guess is describing the component relationship, then we end up with dependent relationship and I haven't go an analogy for that one. So use those analogies as marked and we'll all of us try to come up with a class project with the interns, an analogy for the dependent relationship, positive and negative. In any event, we –?– the component relationship and that is should because as we see, when an individual event happens as in the elevator example, what that means is that there is no direct impact from one elevator on the other. When you use one elevator it does not force the other one to go up or down directly, in fact it's the calling of the people that are using the elevator that effect what happens on one and in response to what happens in the other. The people the become the field, they become the over view and when we look at our model, if we are looking at elements for example a being four little elevators, then if we look at the variations that's on top of them, that becomes the field that connects them all. So when we're dealing with should, which is if we do this thing, will it have an holistic impact that is positive or will it have a holistic impact that is negative. That is the question that we are asking ourselves, are we going to have to pay a price later? Or are we going to be able to say that it reflects back upon us from a field ultimately as being a positive thing? So we are either going to do well or not do well, but because it is impossible for us to accurately predict what it is going to be like in terms of response, we can only go by our experiences, our knowledge of the interconnections of things, the interconnectedness, which is not the some thing as field. That's like saying, well ever time in the past at ten o'clock in the morning, whenever we saw this elevator go up this other one always came down because perhaps the night before the elevators were put in a resting position and in the morning certain conventions are going in and out, or people going to business or something and as a result of the patterns of the flow of people and business, you can anticipate that, that kind of impact you see, you don't know why it happens, but you just know that at this time you always see this. When this, also that, the two always occur together. Then if one of the businesses goes out of the building it can upset the whole scheme, it can throw one event that you have anticipated out of –?– or throw all of them out of –?–or anything in-between.

That's why it is always risky to deny something because we think it might have a negative impact, or risky to something because we think we can have a positive or get out of a negative impact, or we won't be impacted by it. That comes down to the phrase that I have written before that says, never count on inertia, never depend on

change, meaning don't ever put all of your, hang all of your, I guess what it really means is, don't ever become negatively dependent upon inertia or change because if you become negatively dependent on inertia or change, then if you assume things will always be the way they were, and you —?— on that, the rug can be pulled out from under your feet, when something completely unexpectedly happens out in left field, forces beyond your consideration which appear to be chaotic, they are only chaotic because you have not considered them. When you have the change don't hang everything on the fact that things are going to change just because you see all the signs pointing to change, but every time you've seen these signs before change didn't happen because there may be some extenuating circumstances that put a —?— on the whole thing and change —?—. So that's an interesting concept that has now occurred, I've taken the concept of a dependent relationship and applied it to a component relationship. In other words, I've formed one of the initial steps of processing, which is to compare two kinds of pairs and from that has come essentially a proverbial phrase. I think we'll probably find if we take a penny saved is a penny earned, and such things as that we'll find that all of these proverbs, probably re simply one kind of pairing applied to another kind of pairing. Now this is important for Valentine and the work that he is doing, is that the pairing that we create by virtue of applying one pair to another, the relationship created has an impact that creates the synthesis. So in a sense, we're saying by using a dependent pair and applying it to a component set of pairs, we end up creating a dynamic pair or a companion pair but not both. In other words, we're going to stand on one of those and evaluate the others, we might be standing here on a, lets see we apply the dynamic pair of never count on inertia, never depend on change, we apply the dependent pair relationship that we have here to the component, now what do we get, we get a dynamic pair relationship out of that. So that means we are standing on a companion pair to view it and that is the way some of these equations are going to work conceptually on the —?— side, is that when we stand on one view point, one kind of pair, one kind of evaluation, to take another evaluation pull it against a third evaluation and synthesis a four evaluation, and that's the way the system works subjectively. Objectively, we always say, that what you do is we look at this —?—, we look down like the game of twister with these big dots and we see four dots that describe a —?— and we say here's dot one, two, three, four, initially somebody is standing on dot one, they have one view of two, three, and four. Then they jump to dot two and when they do, they now will get no more view of dot number two —?—, they just have one view because now standing on it. But then they see dot number one, where they were standing for the first time so there is a single view of that. When they see a single view of that, then they are seeing a double view of dot three and four because they've seen that from one and also seen it from two and as a result they've created a parallax between their view of two and their view of four, each one has a parallax on it, so they get kind of a three dimensional triangulation. In a sense, that is saying first we look at in from space then we look at it from time, and as we jump from space to time then we end up seeing the views of these two things and we create a good knowledge of dot two, a good knowledge of dot four but we only have one view of

one, and a good knowledge of three and a good knowledge of dot four because each had two views, we only have one view of one and one view of two because we were standing on each on alternately and only had one opportunity to view. Because of this, we then synthesis by blending those two views together and say let's compare our one view of one to our one view of two and we will end up with looking at three things, we'll look at four each with a double view then we'll look at the synthesis of the single view of one and the single view of two. This is how we blend things together to make something like  $E = MC^2$  (squared), were it is really energy equals mass times the speed of light, constant squared, the speed of light constant is really space times time. Because our minds our setup that we jump between space and time and are thinking, the spatial sense and the temporal sense as a result of influence –?– or –?–, that the level of the ganglia that creates then a back and forth movement between space ant time were we jump from one to the other to evaluate mass and energy. And as such we blend space and time together, into something we call space time continuum, who are not really tied together except by virtue of our own observation, that's why we see things sometimes as particles and sometimes as waves is that for different context, we will be looking from space or looking from time at viewing what we are doing. We can never look from them both at the same moment and depending on whether we are looking at something that is unchanging and we view it from space and from time, then we see it as a particle. If during the time we've left between the two perspectives the sensory input has altered, then we see it as being two different things and when we get a difference between the two we see it as a wave. So things that remain consistent during the scope of our observation, –?– the cycle of our observation appear to be particles and those things that are inconsistent during the cycle of our observation appear to be waves. All that is generated, there are no particles, there are no waves they're only when we jump between space and time, the conclusion we come to through synthesizing the single view of space, the single view of time and seeing if things have changed or not, that determines whether it stays at a particle or wave.

So all of these interconnected concepts are really beginning to gel in terms of the equations that we can draw by applying one pair to another, that objected view as we look down gives us a great understanding but there is also subjective view which is what we want more for alter ego. Subjective view of jumping around and taking a look at things, when we jump around and take a look at things we simply see a three dimensional world, we don't see that we are missing a part of a four dimensional world. We see three dimensions and one of them is going to be a continuum, like space time continuum, when we're looking outside. When we are looking inside, we create a different kind of appreciation internally, in so far as, as we write these equations and applying one kind of pairing to another kind of pairing, we don't consider the one we are standing on at all. In other words, from an internal perspective a more valid analogy would be to say, that we stand on one of the four points and see the other three, we don't see ourselves as jumping around. This is the old relativistic argument, that whether you are sitting on the train or whether you are standing at the station watching the train go by, it's –?– observers –?–. If you are looking at something from the outside,

you can see the person jumping back and fourth, you can see them moving from place to place and arriving to a conclusion. They themselves appear to be standing still because from the inside all they see is that they are looking at three different things and they don't realize that they are standing on another one, but even if they do, they only see themselves as standing on this, this is what I am evaluating by. In other words, of the four character considerations with motivations, methodology, purposes, and evaluations, you can only see three of them at one time, only three of them will be visible at one time, only three of them will be visible and the fourth one will not be visible. You can only consider three at a time, if you try to think about your motivation, methodology, and purpose, you can grasp that but trying to think about your evaluations at the same time, you can't because you're using your evaluations to consider those. When you're looking at how you evaluate things and the methodology that you use and your purposes and your questioning those, you're questioning those from the stand point of your motivation, how motivated am I in terms of, to evaluate, how motivated am I to use this method, how motivated am I to achieve that purpose, you don't see the motivations at the same time, they are what you are using as your standard of measurement. So evaluation itself is not the only standard of measurement, that's the standard by which you see how the other three work together but when you see how you feel about it, then anyone of the points is what you are evaluating from and you can even evaluate your evaluations. You can have your evaluations evaluated from three different perspectives, from purpose, from motivation, and from methodology, each of those will be looking at evaluation as a part of the set, only when you are standing on your evaluation do you not see them. So this creates two different patterns that can be seen within a quad, one of the patterns is the splayed out vision that we talked about before, where you take K for example and have a dynamic pair that goes from upper left to lower right, a companion pair that goes from upper left to upper right, and a dependent pair that goes from upper left to lower left, those three kinds of pairs splay out and that's an open system. Then you have the view from the inside, when you are standing at one place looking at looking at three things, you stand on K and as you stand on K you look over and see the dynamic pair that goes from the upper right to the lower left, the dependent pair that goes from the upper right to the lower right and the companion pair that goes from the lower left to the lower right, now the difference is when you look at it from that way, there is no common emanating point, it creates a triangle and because it creates a triangle, there isn't one single place from which all three things come out. Each one of those corners that we are dealing with has two vectors that come out of it, when we are dealing with the view of K splaying out in three directions that is the objective view from the outside view of looking at things, looking at things externally and when we do we see them splaying out. That splaying out position, that goes out one direction, out the other direction and out in another direction, that creates the essential pattern of where men are coming from, that leads to induction and it leads deduction because it either draws it all into a point in deduction or takes a point and it arranges it in all possible directions which is induction. However, when you're dealing from the female perspective that's the intrinsic

one, when you're looking at it from the inside subjectively and you see a triangle, a closed system, a wholism in which there isn't any particular point that is more important than any other, it's the way the whole shebang hangs together. That view is the emotional view and the rational view, logical view is the splayed out view. The relationship between the two is a relationship between space and time, the spatial view is the one dealing with the K, the temporal view is the one dealing with the triangle. The splayed, the spatial, and the triangle and the temporal, and as a result of it the spatial view forms a --?-- linearity, the linearity that is created by male thinking is to take the subjective view of seeing all these things connected to a point and then find the best way to get from one point to another. If you go from the K over to the A and then back to the K and then over to the P and then back to the K and then over to the D, you have to make six trips totally because you're going up three lines in both directions, and that forms a form of linearity always touching back to the same basic point. Another type of logic that men use, which is the third of the fourth steps that they can get, is to take one short cut, the short cut they can take is to go from K over to A and since they've already seen K they assume it hasn't changed, so they go from K to A and then go from A down to P and then over to D, which forms a linearity, and that linear form of logic which is different than induction or deduction then touching all those points assuming that K has not changed since you left. The danger of course is, that if something has happened to K than you are not going to see it happen while you make this journey, but since men are dealing with them spatially, they deal with looking at things in the particle nature and therefore it is there assumption from that bias that K will not change during the duration from your jumping from point, to point, to point, that is why they believe linear logical is true, that only holds true depending on the duration it takes to make that journey and the longer it takes to get around that circle, the more dangers they run into because the more opportunity for chaos to strike and K to change.

I've done the male model for moving around and creating a linear logic out of a splayed view. However, I haven't worked out the one for the female model yet, which is not surprising because that's my own operating system and as a result of it, I cannot see it clearly because that's exactly where I live. So perhaps another job for Valentine, is to take the concepts that have been developed in terms of the logic, or the representation, or the analogy of how male problem solving works and turn around and apply that to the triangular shaped appreciation of the female perspective from the internal view. because again that is going to be something that is highly important to the alter ego program, that is understanding how that view develops from the just as the male view develops into the linear logical display position. Where do we go from starting at a holistic triangular view from the female position, how do we turn that into something? What is it that we turn it into? That ruins the risk of inaccuracy, again it's too close to home, so I can't see it.

Anyway that's it for today, at least for now, and well I'll play out some more later.

A little later the same day, a few minutes later. There is a concept that when you get married, you become one, the couple is no longer a couple they are one. What that is looking at is the dependency, and essentially saying, that no longer are you independent, you are now co-dependent and as a result of becoming co-dependent you have become one. Neither one exists without the other, each exists in the other. The problem with that is that if one of them leaves or the other one dies, the one that is remaining is now nothing. In other words, you've given up the opportunity to be a unique individual, self-sustaining individual because now you have said that I am now dependent on this person to define my existence. And if the relationship breaks then the person left can no longer define themselves as anything, they have become nothing. So they have given up their oneness for a greater oneness of which they are only a part, now that greater oneness falls apart they are left being nothing because they are not self-sustaining in and of themselves. This particular understanding has got to be pretty good if you can apply it to broken relationships and the alter ego program.

And speaking of relationships there is the concept of when you are trying to meet somebody new, as I am going through right now, do you do something like sign up on a computer bulletin board? Or go off to a place where singles gather and try and meet somebody? In that case, what you're really looking for, forget the dynamic relationship that is out of the question because you're not looking for butting heads with anybody. In fact, what you're looking for is a dependent relationship because your going to a place where you are trying to find someone who is needy, essentially either they need you to accomplish something else, like women might go to great expectations to look for a doctor or a lawyer so that they would have secure future. Men might go to that same place looking for someone to provide them with emotional meaning in their lives. And so each one is trying to provide some sense of the other, but in a dependent relationship were they are hoping it's not a work relationship. A work relationship would be were you are hiring somebody from a newspaper ad and saying anybody wants to come to work for us, should come to work for us and come out and apply, and if this person has appropriate skills that we can use we'll hire them, but it has nothing to do with whether that person is going to be emotionally compatible with the company, that is usually ignored. One of the things that I always do when I'm hiring is, I first look at the emotional compatibility and if that matches, I would rather have someone trained in the skills and start with the emotional capacity, then have somebody that already has the skills but can not change there emotions. Because in our society, emotions the way you feel about things are very hard to change predictably because of our cultural biases. However, getting back to the dating scene, if you go into a bar, if go to a computer bulletin board, if you go to a singles group, if you go to a dating service, your actually primarily looking for someone to become dependent with, either emotionally dependent or logistically dependent and the logistic side is business oriented, or like with women trying to feather their nest and for men in general are looking for the emotional support or it's the personal level. Those kinds of things then presuppose that if these two people come together and they depend on each other, they will grown to love each other in time, by finding common interest, developing new common interest,

discovering new things that they both like to do, things in which when one does one thing there is –?– to fall on to the other, so they will become companions over time. But first they find love, well that's what they said in Shannon –?–, it's a war movie with Jimmy Stuart, as he said when a young man came to ask for his daughter's hand, "when I married her mother I didn't love her, I liked her but I didn't love her. However one morning after twenty years, I woke up and realized I loved her." Now that's just the reverse of the way we've gotten in our society, where we say let's love somebody first, love is so all important that we want to love them, then we will learn to be similar. Which is what's actually alluding to the incredible divorce rate that we have and the break up of couples, and the fact that marriage is no longer really an institution. It's not so much that society it's self has changed, in terms of what it's demands are upon us, but our societal perspective has changed to say that love is so fulfilling that it should be the initial bases for getting involved with someone and then find out if you have any compatibility. Well obviously compatibility's that existed before a marriage, more than likely came from some intrinsic in the people that were involved, so if you have certain interest of your own before you get into a relationship they probably won't go away because you quote unquote "all consuming". In fact they will begin to grate on the other person, if you don't like to go to bed at the same time, if you don't like to listen to the same music, if you don't enjoy the same comedians, if you don't like to keep the house at a similar degree of cleanliness, all those things will grate because there is no compatibility but by God you found love, and yet after awhile, love is not enough. And then you end up with incredible pain because you have to disassociate yourself from what in a long time goes from being a positive dependent relationship, where you create something were you both work together and have a working relationship within your home to a relationship in which you really care about the other person and because you define yourself in terms of them and without them you can't understand who you are, and then you have to break that or suffer the fact that you are really incompatible at the companion level. A much better way to go about that is to first approach the compatibility and say let me become involved in the Sierra Club and an outdoorsy person, then meet somebody else who is outdoorsy, let me become involved in doing charitable work because I'm into charity and I'll meet somebody else who has that kind of heart. So you look for areas in which you are companions, positive companions relationships and then you go and try to form a dependency that is a positive one. If that is the nature, you can be true to yourself by still enjoying your interest and also finding that you are interested in what the other person is interested in, and from that you begin to grow together until you merger interests into one overall interest because as a matter of degree. As we talk about the stories concerned and we see the difference between concern and goal is, when you talk about goal everybody that is their focus, this is the goal everybody concerned with the goal is saying that this is the most important thing out of all of their concerns; but when you are talking about the concern you are saying that this is something that we all share in common. When you are looking at a relationship in terms of companion pairs, you are going to want to say is this something that is paramount to both of us, or is this something that I have an

interest in that's a minor interest but there's is highly focused on that and that is not a problem unless their focus becomes so all consuming, in other words, they are so single purpose oriented that their interest takes over their entire life and they have no other interest. Then unless you show that interest as being the primary one that you are interested in, you run into trouble and that is the nature of saying that the positive dependent relationship is when you are actually sharing the exact same interest as being the primary focus of your lives as couples who come together, who are a preaching team husband and wife, or they are both archeologist or something, they focus themselves on a positive dependent relationship with a single interest. On the other hand, unless the degree of concern is nearly equal and one becomes all consuming in that concern then the other person feels all left out, like when the sea captain goes off to sea, the football widow and so on. A wife may be mildly interested in football compared to her husband who is infatic about it, of course the reverse could be true but not as often in this culture. Still under those conditions it is the degree of interest, not the fact that there is an interest. The negative companion relationships are when there is a differing interest, where what is positive to one person is actually negative to the other one in terms of companion relationships. Now the real question arises is it negative because they actually are repelled by it, or the other kind of negativity where it's that I don't like your interest because even though I like that, I don't like that much of it and it takes away attention and resources from where I would like them spent. If you look at these four different ways of dealing with, first the positive and negative dependent relationships or the companion relationships, in terms of when somebody is focused verses when somebody has something in a more compatible level, when you both share a focus verses when one has a focus and the other does not and whether that is seen as positive or negative depending on whether there is positive or negative fall out because there is a negative interest or a positive interest. Couples never hang together if somebody's interest becomes all consuming, all focused in a particular object and the other person finds that to be a negative, in other words, they are repelled by the same thing. You don't have anything to talk about, you don't have anything to communicate because what interest one person is absolutely bores to tears the other person. If the other person shares a minor interest in it, then that minor interest tends to save things for awhile and the more the interest levels match not just what you're interested in but how interested you are in it, when those things match then you have great compatibility. And so these test that are just asking about are you interested in this, that, and the other, that's not good, when they start saying how important to you is this that's better. But the real question for getting together should be, do not try to go out and randomly form a dependent relationship, instead form a companion relationship that is a positive relationship in which your interest are of similar intensities, in similar areas and then you will find a lot to talk about and to do together and to enjoy each other company. Because when you are motivated through your own energy to go out and get a new book on the subject, the other person is thrilled because as soon as you're finished with it they'll want to read it. If you're motivated to decide to buy a new piece of equipment around the house, like a new

television set or something, and the other person is really into watching television on good quality equipment, then they will benefit by virtue of something you've been wanting to do. Their motivations do look for you to provide you with pleasure that you didn't have to go out and get, and your motivations drive you to do things that you enjoy doing or you enjoy enough or are motivated enough to go out and do that will then bring benefit to the other person, so rather than saying let me see what do they like, they like this I will go out and make an effort to get this thing that they like that I don't particularly like. If you are cooking a meal that you could both enjoy eating it a lot, you would make it for yourself, if they weren't enjoying it because you were enjoying it and yet you make that meal for the two of you because they enjoy it as well, there is much more fulfillment there for you because you put the effort into it and you would put it in just for yourself and then when there is also their –?– there it even adds to the pleasure of enjoying the meal and making it, and for them they get a meal made that they like to enjoy, that they get to enjoy and they don't have to put that effort in to do it. Another thing that happens is when somebody enjoys something and not enough to put in the motivation to go out and do it themselves, that if the person that they are married with enjoys it enough for them to put the effort into and do it then the other person gets to partake without having to actually put in the effort. And so since there is no catalyst there to help them overcome the entropy of not wanting to do it because the costs are too great for them compared to the benefits, but they really like the benefits. Then in that case, then the other person perhaps finds that the costs are pleasurable and aren't costs at all and are dividends, then that person enjoys the dividends of doing the item, gets it accomplished and once it's accomplished the other person shares the benefits without having to pay the cost. This kind of relationship is a very good one. But when you get into a should relationships in terms of components you begin thinking about the fact that, well if I do this thing that has cost associated to me by paying that price, it's worth it because even though I wouldn't pay that price to get this item because it's not of big enough interest to me to warrant those costs. The pleasure that the other person has at getting it, will be such that it will make me happier to see them happy, and therefore I will quote unquote "sacrifice" and put in these costs that are really not called for just on the basis of my own interest. That sort of thing once and awhile will not really be detrimental but the more of it one does the more one finds themselves paying cost to make somebody else happy, and then you get into some very serious situations under which a relationship, if you find yourself co-dependent and that you require them for identifying yourself you can't break out of it even though you are now trapped into a routine of adding more and more cost to your life or sustaining cost. And if you try to limit those costs and say I'm not going to do this anymore, the other person comes to expect it as part of their dependency upon you and as such they feel that you are taking something away from them by no longer continuing to pay a cost to make them happy.

So all of these intertwining relationships are going on, this only accounts for the relationships in our discussion today that were both people are looking at the relationship as being a companion relationship, or a dynamic relationship, or a dependent relationship. But it is quite clear that one person could see the relationship

as a positive dynamic, while the other person sees it as a negative, and so that you actually have one person viewing it as a positive aspect of their life and the other person sees it as negative. That is when you get people who are hangers on, they come to you because they not in dynamic pairs but in companion pairs because they like the fall out that you are creating, but they create negative fall out for you and so the impact of one person on the other is not the same in the reverse. On person creates a positive fall out for the second person, the second person creates negative fall out for the first, and as a result you end up with a relationships that cant exist but somebody is hounded by somebody else. Then there's even the more complex kind of relationship, where one sees it as companion and one sees it as dependent. For example, the big brother trying to take his girl out on a date and the little brother that wants to tag along. The little brother sees them as companions and the big brother sees the little brother as being dependent. And as a result of that the concept of get a life comes from that, without me you are nothing, get a life of your own, I don't want to provide that rule for you. The other person says I have a life, it's just I like being near you, okay they're seeing it as companion. Well if you actually look at the quad and you map a dependent relationship, and you map a companion relationship, no matter which way you map it, you create two sides of the square. And the one thing that will connect that is the vector that goes from one open end to the other open end and creates the triangle, or that completes the pattern by going form the same nexus point and splaying out, either way you create a dynamic. The dynamic that you create out of that is going to be positive or negative and essentially you have a relationship that has it's internal logistics between the people, described by the vector that connects the two rays that they say the relationship. If they both see the relationship as a positive companion one, then the relationship that exists between them is a positive companion relationship. If they both see it as a negative companion, then the vector that connects the two goes along the exactly same line and its a negative companion relationship. However, if you see it as different kinds of relationships, where as one sees it as dependent and one sees it as companion, then you end up creating a dynamic relationship between the two of them which could be positive or negative. If you have one see it as a positive dependent relationship and one as a positive companion relationship, you end up with a positive dynamic relationship. If you have a negative companion relationship coupled with a negative dependent relationship that turns into a positive dynamic relationship. That is why two wrongs can make a right in a sense, the relationship between the people can be positive, even though each one sees it as negative. Similarly if you have one see it as positive and one see it as negative it does not matter which is which, the result will be negative. This can easily be plotted on a trigametric function just looking at which quadrants are seen as positive or negative. And when we talk about the relationship between relationship, the analogy that the dynamic and companion and dependent pairs all represent the trigametric functions what there being, sine, cosine, tangent, cotangent, secant and cosecant. And that would be that sine, cosine would be the dynamic pair, positive and negative one direction and the other direction and tangent, cotangent would be companion pair relationship; and the dependent would be

the secant, cosecant and we have this other one that we need two new trigonometric functions to create quadranticity to describe where something is holistically connected in that field versus relativistically connected versus completely independent as a definable unit. Those functions also have quadrants in which they appear to be positive or negative and those relationships of positive or negative quadrants actually are going to be what determine the kind of relationship created between positive or negative just as if you have in the first quadrant in trigonometry, the sign is going to be positive and in the second quadrant it is going to be negative, so you end up with changing the polarity of the signal depending on the quadrant in which it is found. So these kind of vector relationships or matrix can be directly translated to trigonometry partly by function and partly by the polarity of the sign in the quadrant in which they occur. So with that thought for now, for Valentine to consider as well is, how to describe, how to translate the relationships that we see or in at least the first three, the dynamic, dependent and companion? And talk about the relationships that are created by vectors, so that if one sees it as a positive and the other sees it as a negative, it is always going to be as a negative relationship, but if they both see it as a negative or if both see it as positive, it is going to be a positive relationship. Which shows why two people that are constantly bickering at each other's back, bickering at each other and stabbing each other in the back all the time can stay together for twenty years arguing, is because they both see a relationship as negative which creates a positive relationship between them, from an objective standpoint, fills in that last leg of the connecting vector from the first two that are created as their independent appraisals.

One last thought that has occurred to me, before I can let this go and get on with my day. The thought is that we should not forget that we've been looking at relationships here as if they were fixed quantities. In other words, that someone sees it this way, someone else sees it as that way and between them they create this particular kind of relationship. That is actually looking at a frozen moment in time and saying in any given moment you can say, if somebody sees it as positive or negative which of course we have a matter of degree and that degree may depend on how wide spread the evaluation is. For example, it may be that there are five, or ten, or twenty major areas in a relationship that are of concern to somebody at a given moment, how many of them are on the positive side and how strongly? How many are on the negative side and how strongly? When they group them all together and look at the relationship, then they say is this positive or negative and that would be where you would judge them at that moment. And if you have two positive appraisals, it would be positive; two negative appraisals it would be negative in a relationship and so on. However, when you look at it rather than being particulate, you look at it at the wave form, you can see that these evaluations in the relationship change over time and they change in a couple of different ways. One of them is that they change from going from positive to negative in terms of polarity, as someone becomes more attentive, perhaps someone had obligations of the job that were beyond their ability to walk away from, they have to spend a lot of time there, those are over they come home, they spend more time there, it turns out positive because they do more positive things when they are there. When

they are away they do fewer positive things, and so the negative things that they do that are consistent take the reign and it goes negative. Therefore, someone's appraisal of the relationship can –?– between the positive and the negative over time and that can either be a repeating pattern or not a repeating pattern. That can be something appears completely chaotic because it is outside the scope of predictability, or it can be something that has to do with seasonal changes, it can be something to do with a sporting event, it could be something to do with pay periods, with PMS. A lot of the things of that nature can cause these wave forms, some of them regular, some of them irregular and new ones can be added, new instances can be added and taken away at all times. However, that's even looking at it in terms of what kind of relationship you would see it as. Are you evaluating it in terms of being a companion relationship or a dynamic relationship, as saying this is what you define it as. In fact, the wave form way would be to look at them as drifting from one kind of relationship to another, this couple between them has a dependent relationship, now it's edging over and finally it moves out of there and into a dynamic relationship. So things could be moving between positive and negative at the same time that there a moving from being identifying as being primarily one kind of relationship, to primarily another kind, acting as kind of a subcarrier and signal imposed upon it, depending on which is the longer wave and which is the shorter. And as you create these, the differences instead of just like the subcarriers it's like moving ninety degrees to it because one of the evaluations is, is it going positive and negative, up and down, and the other one is, is it am or PM, by moving from one kind of relationship to another. In fact, from the holistic relativistic sense all of these relationships exist among all people at all times. So if you take any two people at each one is going to be evaluating in terms of how compatible are in companionships, how dependent am I upon this person, is that positive or negative, how often are we butting heads over things, does that have a good result, does something good come out of it or do we only tear each other down? They are going to be making these evaluations, they ultimately going to evaluate the final one, saying am I really in a relationship with this person or do we have no relationship at all. Those will be the considerations, how often those considerations occur is looking at it particularly, looking at it in wave form is how often those considerations reach a cycle at which they rise to conscious consideration. These evaluations should be made throughout the levels of the mind at all times, but they only peak into our consciousness when there is enough to drive them up there. So depending on the number of evaluations that may have a positive or negative value to them at any given moments. It creates these complex patterns of waves in which the combined syntheses of several wave forms can lead to a negative appraisal, when one is looking at things from a particular point of view at a particular time and a moment later it can be made completely positive. I found out myself, when I has somebody that I absolutely hated that I was working with about three years ago, who was an absolute jerk and then at one time someone called on the phone. This guy never did favors for anybody and always wanted to get something, just did something for the guy because he liked him and out of the goodness of his heart he wanted to help him. And for that one brief moment suddenly I loved this guy and I

thought he was the most wonderful person in the world, until he opened his mouth again and went right back to the old system. So that you can have these big binary changes that can occur because something can effect so many of these wave forms because they share a common impact, or are commonly impacted by a single event or process that it occurs, that it can turn them all around and make them all show positive or all show negative for a moment. And unless that is sustained however then it will continue in the pattern that it was at and even if it is sustained you're talking about bringing a bunch of waves that have cycles up to a peak at which two people who would normally never give each other the time of day, end up making love for a moment. There was an episode of MASH in which that happened where Hulahan and Hawkeye were trapped out in this place under enemy fire and they made love that night, and then as soon as they were rescued from that context then everything went back down to it's usual sparing. But there was still something left, the residual because the wave forms between them had been slightly altered by the relationship and even though they still were not compatible at least they had a better understanding of where each others hearts was and little more respect came out of it. These are the kinds of things that happens when you have these complex wave forms undulating, peaking for but a moment and then the bottom falls out and slowly erodes, falls out all at once depending on how quickly it goes compared to the baseline of your measurement. That's going to determine whether it seems to be a binary switch, flipping from one thing to another or whether it seems to be a gradual erosion or build up in intensity.

A couple of quick proverbs for alter ego.

Before you can be one with another, you must be one with yourself. Or if you get it really confusing, before one can be one with another, one must become one with oneself,

that's attributed to Melanie Phillips.

Then there's I'm waiting for someone to have it, attributed to Melanie Phillips.

And attributed to my son Keith, I've got to find something to take my mind off these distractions.

## Mental Relativity Notes | August 27, 1994

It's Saturday, August 27, 1994 and I have a couple of ways of expressing the different kinds of pair relationships. First of all the dynamic pair relationship is the win-loose relationship. The dependent pair relationship is the win-win or loose-loose relationship.

I haven't figure the other two out yet, but I do lines of dialogue that express each kind of pair. When you have a dynamic pair, you're basically saying, "Lines for an action picture be, you're going down." For the dependent pair the line might be "I'm taking you with me or if we win we both win." The line for the companion pair relationship would be, "--?-- a little of that my way or get out of my way." The line for the component relationships would be, "One for all and all for one or Every man for himself."

Note that might be handy for all of us to try to contribute some well know lines of dialogue to these different kinds of paired relationship because that might be kind of like putting the appreciations into context. That would put the relationships into context and perhaps putting that kind of technical, textual support into the build of characters --?--, but also give a better field to the authors for the kinds of relationships they're looking at. We should remember that when ever we are dealing with these relationships they are objective relationships and because of that we are not going to have any sense at all about how the characters feel about the relationship. We're only going to see what the relationship is between them, so when characters are dealing with their objective role there effectively neither one is going to actually see that relationship. The relationship is just going to exist as seen from the outside. Whenever we evaluate how two people are relating, they have their own feelings about the relationship but whenever we see the relationship that is created between them that is what we are seeing objectively. When we talked earlier in this tape about how one might see it as dependent, one might see the relationship as companion and as a result of those two we end up with a dynamic relationship that exist objectively between the two. That's the relationship that we are looking at in the build characters window. When we're looking at one seeing companion and one seeing dependent, those are actually subjective views of the relationship and in fact are going to I believe deal with the subjective nature of the characters.

So as we begin to build these characters, the subjective characters, which is another area of investigation that we haven't talked about yet, theoretically for future reference for Dramatica is to build the subjective character archetypes (?) and then ultimately to build the subjective set of characteristics, will be able to see those kinds of relationship. Now that might be as it would develop these emotional characteristics for the --?-- template, I'm still not sure at this point if the --?-- view is going to actually be the main characters super class appreciation or the subjective story appreciation. If it is the subjective story appreciations then it is going to tell us a lot about how to build archetypal subjective characters and build complex subjective characters and also gets a lot of information about how to put together those subjective views. However, I feel that that's not really the case, I think we will get to that until develop the splayed representation from the K-base and the triangular representation from the K-base and have those two of there to determine the objective and subjective appreciations of the given quad. Now, another --?-- problem might be to take the splayed and triangular appreciations and use those as a template on the objective character --?-. And to say when it is seen objectively like this, subjectively this is what it would be seen as, but

when it subjectively seen like this, objectively this is what it would be seen like. And in that case we could then g--?-- more information out of the objective character set, in kind of a --?-- fashion. By seeing when you have this proactive and reactive character, if the relationship between them is a positive dynamic pair that means one of them is going to be a companion, one is going to be a dependent and it also means that either one will be positive and one will be negative but we don't know which one. Perhaps other dynamics that we haven't yet determined can choose one, certainly if we chose one as seeing the relationship as positive we could then determine if the other one as negative. This would then require an interactive build characters window, in which selections can also be made as to which relationships are really positive or which would be negative, which would then predetermine which other ones would be positive and which other ones would be negative and eventually just like the story engine after you picked a certain number it would probably force other decisions to be made. For example, when we look at the view of each quad we are going to say that as an overall in the quad all of the objective relationships would appear positive or perhaps all of the subjective, I don't know yet, meaning that when we are dealing with the inner single quad if we said that there is a negative dynamic relationship that would require that there be a companion in the dependent and one of them would be negative and one would be positive. However, when we look at the relationship as a whole between the subjective and the objective, we can then say that one of the quads is a set of characteristics would appear to have all positive relationships, one would have all negative relationships, one would have relationships in which half are positive and half negative, and the other one would reverse the positions in which the positive and negative relationships occur. Meaning that we would then be able to predicted using the kind of a character engine as suppose to story engine and talk about selecting which relationships are important to us to make positive or negative, objectively or subjectively and as a result of that to then be able to determine which other ones are positive or negative after we've answered enough questions about enough of the relationships.

Further note one relationships, the dependent pair relationships are where you see sacrifice whether it be positive or negative, in terms of someone sacrificing themselves in baseball in order to get their player advance on base or whether it is sacrificing something that one truly needs for the benefit of someone else. Sacrifice will be occurring in dependent relationships and only in dependent relationships. Where as sharing is going to occur in companion relationships, although that sharing may not always be a good thing, sometimes when you share something the other person wants well obviously that is good. However, often one person wants to share something that the other person doesn't want. A good point in case for some dialogue copy of context is my son many, many years ago about 8 or 9 years ago had a rock and he decided to give it to his sister and said "Here Mindy, here's a rock." and she said "Thank you, but I don't want a rock." Well that is the nature of a negative companion relationship, in terms of dialogue, is that he was sharing something that she did not want to have to posses.

## Mental Relativity Notes | Recorded August 28, 1994

Sunday morning, August 28th about six in the morning .

I was thinking today about the concept where --?-- says "At first a mountain is a mountain and a river is a river, then a mountain is not a mountain and a river is not a river, then a mountain is a mountain and a river is a river." Meaning that essentially first you see something as a mountain for the initiate, then as you begin to take your first glimpse into sand you do not see it as a mountain anymore and then when you enlightened you come full circle and see it as a mountain again. However, you see from a different perspective that's what is left unspoken and then as talking socially, trying to get you to see the dynamic of the internal, by creating a paradox in the external, where a paradox does not normally exist, it is a matter of where you put the paradox. In fact, what's happening is that when you look at something from one perspective you would have to have a perspective change to also change the way something looked. So for example, you would say in alter ego version of --?-- that you see it as a mountain from here, then you move to here and it no longer looks like a mountain, then you move to this third position and it looks like a mountain again. So for positions one and three it looks like a mountain, from positions two and presentably four it doesn't. That of nature, the cycle that is the nature of the wave as opposed to the nature of the particle. When you are looking at something and you see the perspectives and you see the points of view and you see the object you are looking at. Then you can take note of the perspectives and that is the essential female characteristic is to look at the perspective not look at the point of view or at the object, the perspective and the change in perspective so that you see both what that distortion is. It is the distortion seen through male point of view that is created between where you are looking and what you are looking at. That --?-- seems to be only partially true for a complete description of what is being observed, instead that is the essential concept. As a result of looking at these points of view and changing, it has led me to a thought of how something that exist never will quite come out of existence once it had existed. For example, I had a company called --?-- that did video duplication and with that company I stopped having an put it out of business about two years ago. I still get occasional calls on the phone number for people looking for video duplication, this is because there are still ads out there or the name listed some place. In fact I by having a business by sending out advertisements, they spread out in kind of a ripple effect and created a holistic impact that turns around and brings back the influence to recreate the original to some extent it is never quite recreating it completely. So when you have something into existence and you stop, go at the center and say it no longer exists, stop the process that keeps it alive. The fall out from what created it goes off outside of itself, like ripples in the pond - ----- and ripple back. And as they ripple back they reconstitute something of the original but it is always going to be never quite as strong as the original. It can get close

to making it happen again, like Woodstock reoccurring or bringing back a group together that was popular that are singers or having a company that you still get calls for and advertisements for but it is not almost to the same level of the surrounding environment that existed when the business existed that never quite reached that degree, that will never quite bring it back to life unless the instigating factor is reinstated. The same thing happens under the former name that I used, I still get mail today under that former name. How do you get rid of that mail? How do you stop it from coming? Well what you do is, you start approaching it one by one, every time an item comes in that you get mail you don't want or mail under a name you don't want, you send to them and say please correct your mailing list the name is now this instead of that. Now that will not handle the holistic effect of all these ripples coming back but eventually it may drive it down to a point that it so approaches the background noise level of what would have happened before the thing existed. For example, if for the video --?-- is getting mail and

tape ended

Mental Relativity Notes | Recorded on November 29, 1994

It's November 29, 1994 just about noon, a little past noon. The plot for today, dealing with duration of an event or duration of an activity, as a principle female means of measurement. When you look at how long something takes to be accomplished or how long it lasts, everyone is aware of these. It seems to be intrinsic in the nature of women in terms of duration which is why time locks don't have much of a meaning to the female perspective in terms of empathy. Because it's not a certain fixed objective sense of time, but how long it seems, that is important and when you deal with an option lock because you are limited in your options the longer the problem last, the more duration it has, the more it irritates.

Much as if you just take your finger nail and start scratching away at your skin at one point, the longer you do it the more irritated it will become. Or if you stay out in the sun and get a sunburn, the longer you're there, the worse the burn will be and eventually gets irritating to the point that you can't stand it anymore and that is when you reach a leap of faith in an option lock story. So although you feel things in terms of time in an option lock, that they've lasted longer, longer, and longer and you have to go quicker and quicker to get them over with. In a time lock story that's meant a lot of meaning for the female point of view because it just meant this is a fixed amount of time and that's when it is going to be over and it doesn't matter how long it feels.

Well the concept is subjective time verses object time, subjective reality verses objective reality, has certainly been discussed much throughout history. However, in

terms of Dramatica dealing with subjective time, looking at a day and saying you want a day that is a pleasant day to last longer, you want a day that is a miserable day to go by more quickly, you don't want your life to fly by.

Well lets look at the concept of having a certain amount of subjective time in your life. You only have a certain amount of subjective time and if you make it go by more quickly you use it up and that will mean things will go quickly later as well. How is this possible, well it has to do with duration. When you are doing activities in a day and getting them done, do you rush through them or do you leisurely go through those activities during the course of the day? Suppose it is a day off, I found today, when I am going in late to the office and working around the house, that at first I was rushing to get some presents wrapped for the kids and I would rush out to the garage and pick the presents and then rush back in with them and then hurry over and get the wrapping paper and quickly wrap them and get them together. Not only did I do a less then sterling job of neatness but in addition it seemed the morning just flew by. However when I stopped at lunch time and I'd made a TV dinner. I sat down and savored the dinner, enjoyed it, didn't rush through, just went through in a leisurely fashion. I looked at the clock and it seemed look the clock was hardly moving at all.

The key is speed in relationship to duration, and acceleration in relationship to duration. When it seems like things are getting more and more hectic until you can't stand it, there is an acceleration in speed. Because there is an acceleration going on then it shortens the duration and it makes time feel like it's going faster and faster, either for good things or bad things. However, if you have a steady speed of doing things with a zero acceleration, then things seem to be going at roughly the same rate whatever it is. "What happens" (unable to make out) you have an inertia then to your speed because you have no acceleration and when you have speed with no acceleration you have an inertia. And subjectively that means zero acceleration means things will not seem that they're going any faster or slower. But whatever the time is that you have available to you, it will seem to be a consistent rate of passage.

If you seem to have a deceleration, where you are starting out hectic and going slower, slower, slower and slower until you are leisurely languishing, barely moving, time will then seem like it is going slower, and slower, and slower as well, then it takes longer and longer for things to happen. So taking a speed at which your life seems to be interesting on one side because the opposite of that is boredom if you go to slow, but at the same time but it seems like it is traveling at the enjoyable speed of spending your life at the subjective time, so you that don't seem like you're racing through it.

Those two are kind of diametrically opposed, when you have something that interests you, it seems as if, that means that time will go faster and when you have something that is boring time will go slower. Well this is only if you're using on of the kinds of pair relationships, probably a dependent pair relationship. However, if you get into a companion pair relationship between your interest and the passage of time, you can find that by rather than looking at the number of experiences you want to have, look

into the details of what you're doing. Then you can get all wrapped up in something and go through it leisurely at a leisurely speed and see more and more detail into it, rather than moving linearly through the steps. That will keep your interest at the same time that it makes time appear to pass very slowly.

We have a tendency in this culture, that as we, even if we shift away from saying let's get this done, and that done, and that done and being totally linear and trying to do them as quickly as we can. Even if we stop and deal with something in a detail or option lock fashion and look at it and say, "How much resolution can I see in this, how much can I learn about it." A pet subject that you like to study about, a hobby that you really like to get into the details of. When you are looking at something of that nature, we still have the tendency to try and go through the levels of resolution as quickly as we can, pushing the limits right to the edge of not being able to absorb those details, just enough to see them then moving on. It is how we site see, whipping along from one destination to another, traveling from here to there and never seen the scenery go by. Whenever we shut our minds to either the details to go through steps or we just take snap photographs of the way things are as we pass through levels of details without waiting to see the patterns that emerge and how things change in terms of the process in any given level of resolution. Now, we find ourselves speeding through our lives and time goes very, very quickly. However, instead of doing that we examine our surroundings. Look at it in terms of a materialistic society, we want more and more things but we hardly ever use the things we have. In the last few months, I have been trying to have fewer and fewer things, I have been giving a lot of stuff away, in addition I've been putting stuff away in the shed where it is not in my direct observation. I find that I have more books than I can read in ten years, sitting on my shelf unread. I have videos that I have only seen once and I have no idea of when I would see them again because there is so many of them. So I am beginning to view them and if I view them and they are not all that interesting, I am erasing them or giving the tape away to somebody else to erase.

By doing this I am beginning to go though those levels of resolution, not to get more things but to get more details out of the things I already have. And in doing that I move my way down through the levels. However, I am not trying to do it quickly. When I use to try and paint the house, for example, I would try to do it all in a weekend, down to the last dotting of an "i" or crossing of the last "t". So far it has taken me five weeks to do the painting of the house and it will probably take a total of two months before it is finished. However, by taking my time and going through the details, and making sure there aren't any smudges and that I get into all the cracks. The job is not only a better job when it is over, but it's been a more enjoyable job because I am not just trying to slap things on and not being satisfied until it is over, but I'm enjoying the process of doing the painting. So there is the reward of seeing a good job behind me, as I finished section by section. Then at the same time there is the pleasure of working on it, which makes time seem to go very slowly while I am painting the house. I am not pushing it, I'm not trying to go as fast as I can. I am letting it all be an option lock at every level.

This change in attitude for me is going to be, I think, a valuable function we can provide with alter ego, in terms of trying to get ones life to slow down. For example, in taking on a tape recorder here, normally I speak a mile a minute and I have learned that in my classes that I have been giving in Dramatica. When I got the point where I was just reaching the max and speaking as quickly as I could and not pausing for audience response, no one was understanding anything, so I was doing a very terrible job of educating and at the same time I was getting all frantic, worked up into a tissy and feeling like the time just wizzed by and there wasn't enough time to say everything that had to be said. However, in the last month or so, I have been slowing down my presentation both on my microcassette recordings and also in class, so that I am putting pauses in, giving time for consideration. We all know in humor, that if you tell a joke and you don't wait for the audience to laugh, you're stepping on their laughter and they won't hear the next joke and they will feel like they've been rushed through and didn't have time to enjoy the joke you've already laid on them.

The key is to give time for consideration, time to enjoy something to the fullest. How do you diet? Not by cutting down the amount of food that you eat, that will happen naturally if you consider the food that you're eating enjoy it, savor it, take a bite, don't just wulf it down. If you slow down your speed to the point that you are able to enjoy all the aspects of something, with in the current level of resolution that you are dealing with. Everything you can be aware of in terms of it's new awesome sedulity, then at that point you would have gotten the most out of that experience and the most out of that moment and time would go very slowly for you and yet your life will feel full. It will not feel boring, you will find you will accomplished more, with better detailed work, better precision. People will find you more organized, you will find yourself more organized. Things will not surprise you as much because you are taking care of the detail work, so you are aware of the little nuances and currants and eddies, that can have an impact on what you are trying to accomplish, you see things coming ahead of time and can anticipate better, you can savor the memory of it better because you have more cross connecting touch points in the holographic memory as you fill it with more details each of which will then be associated with memory as a whole and can recall it again. Your entire life, the fabric of your life becomes much richer, when you just slow down, but if you only slow down and don't go into looking into the details and just go slowly, you will feel constrained, held back, frustrated, nervous, anxious, and chopping at the bed and bored. But when you slow down don't slow down arbitrarily allow that to happen by it's self, so that you examine the details more and more slowly, with in the limits of practicality, of course, and when you have examined the details down to the level that is as far as you can see, without loosing site of where you started, that carries you to the full depth of mind, full size of mind or range of mind that you can have.

If you keep track of what you are trying to accomplish and then go down to the levels of details to the fullest level which is as far as you can go and still hold the top level. You won't be able to go the fourth, you will only be able to see the fourth and when you do that your experiences will be as rich as they can be and time will go as

slowly as it can and you will not be spending the time, the subjective time of your life more quickly, wasting it all at once in a lot of frenzy and then having nothing but a deficit later. So that your subjective time has to be spread out over many, many more years, meaning that it will pull them all together and make them go much faster. That's the way to have a more enjoyable, more pleasing pace of life in any endeavor, both work and both at home.

Another thought occurs to me, it is about twenty-five minutes after twelve. Just as we have resolution in dealing with spatial appreciations, there must be a resolution we deal with in temporal considerations. In other words, when we use the example of taking a piece of twine and spiraling it and then going through the spiral, of the spiral and the spiral of the spiral, of the spiral and then trying to carry it to the fourth level and we can't see anything beyond that, as long as we are still trying to look at the first one. Well the same thing must happen with time, in terms of space, when looking at the details we can see with in factual level. When we deal with fractuals, factual relationships, we are dealing with magnitudes of time, in other words, circuits of the spiral. When you make a trip around the first spiral, and then you make a trip around the second spiral, and then you make a trip around the third spiral, you can see the wave forms undulating like signals that are riding on a carrier wave, with the longest wave form appearing to be the carrier and the shorter wave forms or shorter cycles appear to be the information that is modulated on it, and you can see three of those, but if you try to go to the fourth, you loose the signal or the data or the information riding on the carriers and subcarriers, that is the smallest level of temporal resolution.

The way this works is that we are talking in each case about getting down to the level of the thoton, that when you look at the thoton, that is the thing that creates the first spiral, whether you see it as spatial or temporal. For it to process, takes a certain amount of time, that amount of time becomes the calibration by which time passage is initially measured. Sometimes it speeds up, sometimes it slows down, but you can never see that speed up or slow down within yourself because that is the foundation against which all other change is measured. So instead you look at the external senses, to sense how time is passing and then you measure whether supposedly objective passages of time, like a clock moving around, against senses of time to see whether you're moving faster or slower than it. And between these measurements you can tell whether you are accelerating or decelerating, but there is a resolution there at the thoton level and you'll never be able to see anything smaller, in terms of time passage than that. The particulate nature of time, is an interesting concept, just like you would look at light and say you see the particle and wave nature of light in the external universe, it is really one thing that generates the particle and wave nature. The thoton within the mind generates a particulate and a wave nature of time, in other words, you can see particles of time because that is the smallest resolution you can see of time passing and that smallest resolution appears to be a unit of time, which is a particle, a spatial view of time as it were.

When you look out across a valley from a mountain top, there comes a point, ed.. two hundred feet, five hundred feet, a thousand feet, away from you were anything farther than that doesn't have any depth to it, created by depth perception. You can still see that things appear to get smaller, you can see that more and more material gets put into the air in front of you and is hazier and hazier, which gives a sense of depth, but if those things weren't present, if you didn't have size differential and you took two items and you gave them to a subject and you said "look at these, and put one a thousand feet away, and put one five thousand feet away", by there binocular vision alone, they could not tell that there is an difference in distance between the two. Why is this? It's because you get to a point were binocular vision is judging the parallax against the background, between two items. The two eyes are converging and saying there is parallaxing between them because we have to bend the eyes a certain distance. Now, the eyes also have a resolution to them because of the rods and the cones, color resolution is a little less then black and white resolution but there is a limit to resolution. Just like the television screen has a certain resolution, the eye can only discern so much detail before the detail occurs smaller then the diameter of the rod can not be perceived. When you apply this to binocular vision, then someone looking at something in the distance, that the parallax shift between the two eye views is less then the diameter of a rod say, then you will not notice any parallax shift different between the two objects because it is lost in the resolution then the eye itself. Now notice how that has flipped an entire factual level, but it still has an influence. We are talking about seeing parallax between two things and yet there is a limit line beyond which we can not see a parallax difference between two objects of different distances, anything past say a thousand feet. What puts that limit on it? Nothing to do with binocular vision, the eye balls can still feel themselves moving with greater resolution than that and can feel the angle that is created between them, but the resolution of the eye itself is such that it can't see that there is a different angle needed between the two of them. It can't see the difference in parallax, it's invisible and because it's invisible it puts a limit on how far our binocular vision works.

Now apply this to time, we look at time passing and as I mentioned early, if we keep track of what it is we are trying to achieve or what it is we are trying to experience at one level, and we allow ourselves to go farther and farther away from ourselves, looking greater and greater detail in the work we are doing, eventually if we go down through three levels and approach the fourth we'll be as far as we can in terms of seeing into those details, which will then apparently stretch time to the limit. All of the cycles of time measurement we have of which there are four simultaneous ones, that we can be aware of at one point, all four of those will be filled with the activity at hand and as soon as you fill each of those buffers, temporal buffers. Starting with the particulate nature of time, which is down at level one, at the level of thoton and carry it all the way up to the wave nature of time at the highest level, by the time you have finished all of that, you have fully saturated your time sense. Because you can carry no more breath of resolution then that at one time and just like with binocular vision, when you can not discern the difference because it lies outside the scope of your level of resolution. You

can't tell if time is passing any slower or any faster for an object beyond that level. Look at a tree try to watch a tree grow, just by watching it, then try to look at a mountain and see a mountain rise or be eroded away, just by watching. In fact, the growth and fall of a tree, occurs much, much quicker by magnitude, then the rise and fall of a mountain and yet we can perceive no difference in them just by observation alone. There is no temporal sense in the difference between the tree and the mountain and so temporally they are classed together because they are beyond the resolution of our observation, by our baseline. The way our mind works there is a range in which the photon can move faster or slower in terms of its processing, which is controlled primarily by the biochemistry and as it does this time appears to speed up and slow down in our daily lives, things seem more hectic or more laid back. Good things and bad things, it doesn't matter, can seem like they are going faster or slower and we can get bored. The cure for boredom is not to find something else to do, the cure for boredom is to find something else to do with what you are already doing, to look deeper into it, to look for more meaning, in the same thing you are involved in. That is how you survive in a prison camp or in solitary confinement, is to start counting the cracks on the walls. Then from counting the cracks on the walls, if you understand them fully, then you move your way into looking at the differences in each crack in terms of its shape and its depth and if that's not enough then you start looking into the particles of dirt lodged into the crack and so on. Eventually, you reach a point in which a life sentence would not be long enough for you to exhaust the level of detail, but your mind has still been functioning and has not frozen up.

All of these concepts, of course, tie in together with ----?---- mental relativity theory, but the real work that we can accomplish, the real understanding that we can bring, is not in this revolutionary view of space that we have been touting with our structure and our dynamics, which merely describe the forces that work and what they are applied to, but to go to the other levels of time where we are describing the processes that manipulate the dynamics in relationship to structure and how they change the rate in which they do this. When you change the rate at which these processes are manipulated in relationship to the structure, the diameter manipulated in relationship to the structure by processes, and the duration of the processes changes they slip in and out of sync, so that processes that were completed before another one began, now may be completed after the other one begins, or even after the other one is completed.

In other words, the sequence by which other things occur will change by virtue of the duration of the processes altering. That temporal aspect is where the real understanding, the real breakthrough is coming through with mental relativity. One way to describe it, is to look at waves and say where to glimpse the wave. If you look at a wave as in emotion because it is definitely the emotional side, the biochemical side of experience that we are talking about here. Which is what we're working with, with Dramatica right now with a new front end that we're creating using the genre appreciation's of comedy drama information and entertainment, in relationship to the

classes of the university, such as mine in psychology. By creating that as a touch point with the emotion that has logical impact on the story engine.

Similarly when we talk about depressions, you're looking at the down side of each wave, of each emotional wave and you connect them together because you viewing is moving in a cycle and you have to look at something for a certain amount of time and then to consider it you have to stop observing, and consider it. There is a blanking period, just like a television picture that stands out of frame, and then there is the blanking interval while the electron gun moves back to the top and transmits nothing until it gets back to the top of the screen and begins to scan all over. The relationship between how much duration, is contained in the blanking interval and how much is contained in the information interval, that ratio can alter. If you are watching the wave form completely, you can not consider it but you can monitor it, so that you watch the wave for go up and down, and as you do then after you've seen it go up and down a few times, you've seen a cycle and then you consider that cycle. When you are watching the cycle of the wave form, you are taking the analytic view because you're seeing from the outside rather than experiencing it go up and down. When you monitor only a portion of a cycle then consider that portion, go back and monitor another portion and come back again, if you spend a lot of time considering and a small time monitoring, then you are dealing with a purely emotional view, or as close as you can get, remember each one has a limit line, and then you deal with that emotional view to the max, then you are going to be experiencing the rise and fall of your considerations based on the sampling you've taken of the wave form as it is unfolding.

Now, if in a depression, all you do is sample and you are in sinc with your consideration cycle is in sinc with your emotional appraisal of things, so that you're always looking at the down side of wave, then you look at the down side of the wave and you go back and sample it again and you look at down side of the wave and again, and appears to be from your consideration there is a line extending down, down, down, down, down, and down and that's all, it's just a straight line going down, so all you're looking at is the straight part of the wave that is continually moves down ward, you never see the up swing, you never see the peak, you never see the trough, you just see down, down, down, or you just see the trough. -----?----- where it just stays at this low level and optimist would see nothing but the peaks. The would gate their sampling rate, so that like a -----?----- pattern, their internal considerations would phase in with their rating of how they feel. In other words, without looking outside ourselves when we are dealing with this emotional appraisal, we are looking inside ourselves to see what our sense of self is at any given moment and depending on how we align ourselves phase wise with our consciousness verses perhaps our subconsciousness. The two waves come together, and depending on when we sample it, we'll see it either rising, falling or remaining steady at a level above zero or steady at a level below zero, which accounts for all the basic states that are described spatially existing in psychological effective attributes. The cognitive is dealing when you're looking more towards observing full cycles of more, so if you observe, I say more than a fourth of a cycle, then

you are dealing with the cognitive processes and when you are observing less than one fourth of the cycle or effectively less than  $P/2$  on a wave, then you are dealing with the emotional aspect, that's the touch point when you're looking at in terms of waves.

In any event, gating that is what you need to do to change your emotional state because no matter what state you're in, or how depressed or elevated, no matter what kind of condition you're in, why do some people deal with tragedy so well? Why do others deal so poorly, even with lives that appear to be going so well? It's because how they phase their consciousness in looking at their emotional state, in relationship to the cycles of the emotional state and sometimes you don't even have to change your sampling rate, all you have to do is just shift the phase a little bit. When you shift the phase, you can either do it consciously through practice or you can do it biochemically through prozac or lithium. You can either change the cycle, shift it inside or change it outside and as we know cycles that are going on have amplitude, and they have frequency, and they have how high the whole wave is on the scale, like if it's a one volt peak to peak whether that is from five to six volts, or whether it's from three to four volts, depends on how high the wave is and of course you can move the phasing there also along the x-axis, so that it can go in and out of phase. Right now, we're just talking about phasing, the others have impact to be sure, but it's real simple wave dynamics and by looking at there being four areas of the mind, each of which use these wave patterns. From the temporal perspective we can see how our memories can appear to positive and negative, how we can shut out the bad and see only the good, we can see how our emotional state, and our subconscious can appear to be positive or negative, our appraisal of things, how our preconsciousness can be in sync with our consciousness or out of sync as we look throughout ourselves.

Of course, from this perspective then the one thing we aren't considering is the spatial nature of it, and the spatial nature is, if you look at it something long enough, a certain way and don't see the other part of it, when you're looking internally, that other part of it will eventually cease to exist. Just like bad memories will fade until you do not recall them at all and can never get them because they are really, literally gone. In other words, we begin to create the spatial nature of the structure, when we talk about gravitational pull and that's the relationship between gravity and time, that as time brings things in and out of phase, it's ultimately going to change the gravitational relationship between through which time flows and that gravitational relationship is going to change the essence of the mass that is observed. Here we look at mass and energy, and space and time, it would be my hunch that there is no such thing as space. There's really mass, energy, gravity, and time, and gravity is what people perceive as space, that is doesn't really exist externally at all, but again only exist internally. The gravity that we see outside, is only our appraisal of the relationship between our rate of observation and the mass and the energy that exists outside, creates what we perceive as gravity and we will look at gravity having its effect, then we have room left over to perceive things as time, when we hold on constant we can measure the other. But internally, certainly that's the case, is that even though for awhile memories will persist,

and you have to change to see the good that is in the bad, or the silver lining in the cloud, you have to change the phasing that you are dealing with between your consideration and the actual nature of the memories, so that you're only looking at the good parts of the memory. That as things bring these memories forward, you have adjusted your phasing, so that you only look at them when the positive memories are surfacing and you are considering those positive memories while the bad ones surface, but you never see the bad ones because you are not considering them. Until eventually, that has caused the bad ones to fade, through lack of reuse, and eventually they go away.

The one aspect in memory, of course, that this does not apply to, is when you create the equivalent to a black hole. which is a prejudice or some kind of emotional pit or abyss within yourself, that has internal mechanisms for taking any energy that comes into it and turning into it a self-sustaining memory, that you can not get rid of, that has to be dealt with in a different way. It no longer is something that can be seen as being a phasing away form, it's turned itself in on itself and become a complete particle. Which is exactly what happens in terms of a black hole, which is why you begin to see all the strange time effects in viewing a black hole and the strange things going on with light because this black hole is outside the realm of normal physics, just as a mental black hole is outside the realm of looking at wave forms. It exists almost outside the universe, as it were the mental universe, and even though it has an impact nothing gets out of it and can no longer be dealt with as a wave form, it must be dealt with as a particle. Similarly, I would say that you could not deal with a black hole, anymore as a particle once it has folded in on itself. Particularly you have to deal with it in terms of a wave, and therefore rather than seeing it as occupying space, you have to look at a black hole as occupying time. In other words, see it as a duration and a wave pattern, rather than seeing it as a location and a mass.

## Mental Relativity Notes | Recorded December 1, 1994

It's Thursday, December 1st, 1994, just a quick note, for some time I've realized that I work better when I don't have a purpose. If I have a purpose, I throw myself into things and lose track of the things that are really important to me, which are all along the way, relationships, time for myself, just stopping to smell the roses, that gets lost I turn into a workaholic. So I decided to give up purposes, and as I did, I found that I got more and more accomplished. In fact I became more and more efficient at getting things done, but there is no particular direction to it. So in all, my subconscious seemed to guide me, so that the things that were important to me, like getting my house painted, or my living room redecorated, or spending more time with friends, just sort of happened by itself and yet it was still kind of aimless.

So it occurred to me this morning that even within the realm of the English language, which by the very fact that it is a language and turns things into discrete

packets of words, is a male bias or spatial bias view. When you have a spatial bias built in you look at time, and therefore perhaps the concept of purpose as a concept had been drilled into my head as being a temporal thing, that this is what you want to achieve and here are the steps you go through to achieve it. and as long as I put myself on steps, that's why I loose track of the real meaning of life for myself. So I wondered if there was a female equivalent of a definition for purpose, that you could use within the language to at least get closer to the essential concept of what a female purpose ought to be. Perhaps in this case if I came up with the word, I would understand better what it was I meant and clarify it because of my left minded spatial bias training. So the word scope occurred to me, we've been using it a lot in class, but scope as purpose instead of purpose as some end you are trying to achieve. What scope are you dealing with? In other words, we were talking about resolution earlier and trying to go into depth of detail, so that duration would seem longer and more enjoyable in your endeavors. Well the idea was to go into as much depth as you could without loosing site of what was the top level you were concerned, your area of concern. That area of concern is your scope, for example, if I have at the top level, I'm interested in creating an organization that will hire people to do charitable work. Well something like that could allow me to go into great depth about using the Internet to have these people communicate and creating a series of coffee houses where people who contribute to this effort could gather and talk about such things. Well that is starting to move down a level away from the original concept, from the scope of my concept, and the deeper and deeper we would get eventually, I would loose site of my concept, which is loosing site of my purpose. That's what happens when you let your subconscious take over completely, is that there is no fixed scope, it's a floating scope and because of that you end up getting things accomplished but there is no particular overall direction to it. It has a tendency to give you an overall improvement in the areas that are least satisfying to you, in a very nebula sense.

However, if you want to set direction in your life, as opposed to just having a general overall nebulas improvement, that would require then selecting a scope. Now certainly, the overall improvement nebulous, is the unjustified view from the female perspective, but as we talked about in our basics class, just because you start from one side doesn't mean you want to completely go straight up and down from that perspective, go through all four levels of the mind, preconscious, subconscious memory and consciousness, and stack them all up on the same level because you end up with air-headed women and ice cold calculating men. The idea is to meet in the middle, which means you have to go into at least a couple levels of justification, no more than three though because the fourth level of justification is were you can't see what it is you did to yourself. So you need to go through a couple levels of justification, just to be a balanced person and a little bit autonomous and self-sufficient. So there for moving from the concept of just the overall, making your better without any particular purpose, which is completely unjustified, selecting a scope which chooses a direction there for you in which you wish to move, that would take you into second and possibly third level

justification, which is a more balanced perspective for getting through what you want to get through and accomplishing what you want to accomplish.

## Mental Relativity Notes | Recorded December 28, 1994

It's the 28th of December, 1994, about four-thirty in the afternoon, catching up on just a couple of quick comments, some things that might be appropriate for alter ego.

First of all, Mindy today when I asked her to come back in fifteen minutes, when she said she was going to go out and ride her bike because I needed her to do some chores. So she came back to the door, looked at the clock, watched the second hand for a minute and said let me see how fast time is going, so I know when to come back. That concept of stretching time is very interesting and even she is using it.

Another comment she had the other day, we were talking about the food chain and I made some comment about the food chain and about two different concepts that they were very far separated, and she made the comment, that I think is a great, great quote, she said they are so far apart in the food chain maybe they'll swim together. And indeed looking at how many spirals you go around, in terms of mental relativity, if you get outside of the scope of the four levels, one can not see the other of anything of importance. Therefore, two things far enough in the food chain can indeed swim together.

Also I think I mentioned once before, that Keith had a comment when he was bothered by a lot of things that were getting in his way, he came up with the comment, I've got to find something that will get my mind off of all of these distractions. I think that again this is something good for alter ego.

And another phrase, this one I came up with for alter ego is, I'm waiting for someone to happen.

## Mental Relativity Notes | Recorded on December 29, 1994

Thursday, December 29th, at about five minutes to nine. For relationships between men and women.

Women would be cheating themselves if they committed to saying that they will love somebody forever because their emotions fall all over the place. While as for men, they would be cheating if they said I will take care of you forever because their way of going about dealing with problems, dealing with inequities, is all over the place, that is what they need to keep fluid. Women have to keep their emotions fluid and men have to keep their methodology fluid. So that creates interesting social commitment that

people have to make. Men who are going to be roaming all over doing all kinds of things, whether as a sea captain or as a police officer, whatever their profession is, whatever they do, they'll have the tendency to try a lot of things, unless they become fully justified. As a result of that, that part they don't try to keep in check socially, but the part that is a commitment to love -- tape goes blank ---- a thin promise by a woman because she can't really keep it because her emotions are going to change and that would be a huge justification for a woman to say I love you, forever. However, she can say I will always take care of you, forever. Now you see it sounds like pretty much the same sort of thing, except there is different reasoning behind it. For men, the one --- tape goes blank again --

## Mental Relativity Notes | Recorded February 3, 1995

It's 11:30 am on Friday, February 3rd 1995.

First a thought - A living culture should have values, not impose values.

Now a thought on getting back into the unified field concepts which will have great practical application in dealing with the emotional issues of stories and of psychology.

As an exercise try to match the four kinds of relationships, dynamic, companions, dependent, and component, in a one to one correspondence with the four points of view I, you, we, and they.

In fact, mass and energy seem to be the external components of our universe, and space and time are internal creations, and that seems true for both men and women.

As a result, men and women will see dynamic relationships as "you," and will see component relationships as "they," so the "you" and the "they" perspectives would be consistent for male and female.

However, because men have their space-sense, they give preference to an external view of things or looking outward and time sense is a view of looking inward.

When it comes to the other two the companion and dependent pairs, those will be reversed between of men and women as to how they place the perspective of which one is "I" and which one is "we."

Now for men, "we" is put in the companion pairs because the companion pairs, buddy type stuff, male bonding, a guy thing, that is where they see "we." And they see "I," as independent and they look as to who they have to depend on, they gear their perspective of who I am by how independent I am versus how dependent I am.

Whereas for women it is exactly the reverse, women will look at the I perspective in terms of companion pairs. Who am I friends with? I define myself by who I am around, that's where groupies come from.

Whereas the dependent pair relationship is where they look to as "we." By being in dependent relationships, women have a sense that they have to rely on each other and because of that there is a certain security or a joining that comes together causing us to be "we" and that could be "we" plural - remember not just "we" meaning you and I, but it could be all of you plural, whenever you feel part of a group for women that would be the dependent relationship.

So this again it is a preference that we would see in those two pair relationships not just between men and women but also of course impacted by the other levels of the mind since this is a pre-conscious leaning of the subconscious. Memory and conscious would also have impact as to whether it would be in line the way it was described for men and women or it would be actually the reverse in many individuals.

So in general, however: statistically this holds true because society tends to be, as a male society, built in a male image, and as such it tends to bi-polarize the male and female aspects.

It will see what the preconscious basis is and then exert pressures to force each side of the equation to either a neutral corner, pretty much straight up and down, their minds lined up in that one level. That is what women's intuition has been - the attempt to say "no" to that male-minded hierarchy for women. That's one place we are, yes, but we also have a whole range.

Whereas men find that threatening because it blurs the distinction between the roles, but naturally this would be the case because in terms of empathy and sympathy men are going to find a huge difference between the way of problem solving spatially or holistically because it is either external or internal.

Whereas external and internal has no big difference for women. It is the idea of whether it is temporal or spatial thinking and that is why from this particular perspective women would want to have a full range across the tendencies, whereas men would try to in society have things bipolarized so that the lines become more distinct because they are based on sex. Which is an external appreciation, which is where they have to have their binaries.

Women have their binaries too, again, but their binaries is going to be in terms of time and space. And that would be the division in which women would like to see things separated. Not by gender, not by sex, but by the linear people verses the holistic people. And in fact, that is how women would divide their groups naturally when left alone.

If you have a group of women only, without the influence of men, they will clearly divide into the temporal and the spatial thinkers. Whereas if you have a group of men and

women together, they will divide things between men and women because men control the outside infrastructure.

When men and women are together, women will not be able to divide into groups that have the male and female temporal thinkers on one side, and the male and female spatial thinkers on the other. They don't get a chance to bipolarize because they are not allowed to group together men and women on the bases of anything until it is first separated into men and women. And then women are only allowed that opportunity to separate their own group of women into the spatial and temporal thinkers.

This is how you will see the pairings that go on and groupings that go on at a party or at a convention wherever there are a number of people working together. Unless there is something in the structure that forces men and women to be together, other than that you will find that the men will go over to one side and the women will go over to the other side, and then the women will sub-divide into two groups but the men will not. And so you end up with three perspectives because the male external one currently is taking precedence in the social organization.

However if the constraints or the requirements of the social interaction demand that men and women be grouped together without a dividing line between the two of them, as uncomfortable as this is for most men, you will find that the larger group will sub-divide itself into two categories of the spatial thinkers and temporal thinkers.

The complex interactions of the social levels caused by this are nothing more than *fritical* echoes of repeating *fritical* patterns of things going on in the individual mind. And so the same technology that can be used to describe what's happening in the internal mind, the same theoretical algorithms can be applied to social relationships -- all you have to do is just upgrade the scope of what you are applying it to and the algorithms will work equally well for complex social interactions.

\*\*\*\*\*

Okay, here's another note, this is a quick one for organization of the [Dramatica] department.. We have so much written already on so many topics, we really have to start putting this together in all kinds of publications.

As I speak right now, we are only a week, ten days away from having to complete the Dramatica manual which is occupying all our time. But just by way of setting a direction for myself, I suppose recording it here and putting it into hard copy later as we transcribe this.

We are generating interesting useful perspectives on all of this all the time. Occasionally, a new concept such as matching up the dynamic pair relationships or the pair relationships with the points of view will come up that haven't been thought of before but often they are just new ways of saying the same thing being developed.

Now that doesn't mean that any way is better than any other way that all depends on the audience that we are trying to reach with our understanding of what we found. We will need many ways to present it and so we can't just write the book on Mental Relativity or the book on personal problem solving. We have to write any number of books on those things so that we can have material out there that will speak to various groups that have their own particular biases in which the imagery that we use, the encoding that we're using is such that it will be attractive or speak clearly to a wide variety of groups because again it is the symbols that we're using, the encoding, that is going to prevent our message from getting through or make it accessible.

So the multiplicity of effort in that area is not unwarranted, the main thing is we have to set up a system at the office, a normal process where by constantly we are regenerating or generating new works, new modes of expression simply using the text that has already been written recombined in different ways.

It is not so much an easy program because right now we have so much text that unless someone wanted to be an expert in what's going on they would not find time, in an entire lifetime, to read everything that we've already written about all aspects of this theory.

That's why it's our job as a department to devote full-time ourselves to going through that material and constantly gleaning and culling what we can from it and reassembling it in new packages that make it available to wider segment of the population for the temporal and the spatial thinkers.

## Mental Relativity Notes | Recorded February 11, 1995

Saturday morning, February 11, 1995

I just woke up with a thought for dealing with the wave forms and the variables of the Dramatica dynamic structural relationship. When we are picking domain, concern, range, and problem we have looked at this as being the equivalent of taking a wave form and saying, one of those choices fills in a value to the variable that determines a wave forms amplitude, another one it's frequency, another one it's phasing from left to right, and another one it's overall vertical positioning,

The entire wave form is elevated or lowered, so that instead of being peak to peak from plus one volt to minus one volt, for example, it might be the same size wave but be peak to peak, plus two volts to zero or plus three to plus one. In other words, there is a two volt range peak to peak, but you can put that at any height lower or above.

That was the only way that we've been looking at it in the past, looking at it structurally as just choosing concern, domain, range, and problem, which one we chose assigned a value to each of those variables and positioned the dynamic wave form on the model.

Now in thinking of it in terms of dynamics, as with most of these things, two of them will be the same from a dynamic stand point. But there will be a quad of variables that are filled in, of which, the other two are variables that are completely different ions.

That is what makes the dynamic and structural terms appear to intersect, is that they share two items out of a quad and each have two separate. That is also what makes them appear to come together at a ninety degree angle, so that they can intersect on two points of a square, on two corners of a square. And the other two corners, as it were, would form two planes that intersected at a ninety degree angle.

Then we look at the dynamics, the things that we do share is, I guess you could put this together in any combination of ways, you got to share at least two and this is what begins to create the dynamic model, is how many combinations you can create that share two.

Because the structural model is always going to be the four that we mentioned, and the dynamic model now will build itself by all of the permutations. An example would be, the dynamic model might share that there is a particular amplitude to the wave and there is a particular frequency to the wave. But then it might have a frequency modulation on amplitude modulation which could be a cyclic repeating thing, where you have a wave on top of a wave. So that you can actually watch over time an amplitude change but in a repeating sense, so that it gets higher and lower, higher and lower, as an amplitude. In other words, it becomes then kind of like an adjective, or a I guess an adverb in that case it would modify the flow of the wave form.

Another way to look at it would be to, rather than just say there is amplitude and frequency modulation along with an amplitude and a frequency, would be to say that there is an amplitude and a frequency and then there is an increase or decrease in linear fashion of the amplitude or the frequency. So that you can watch it changing without being repeating, moving it in a completely different direction.

Another way to look at it would be in terms of the wave itself becoming more and less distinct. In other words almost like putting it out of focus, into focus, and out of focus and into focus or having the force disburse itself and then re-congeal itself so that over the body of the wave you look more at it like a three dimensional scatter chart, that basically shows the wave becoming less dense and more dense, more focused and more diffused. So that overall, its power caused by its amplitude and frequency would remain the same and yet its impact or influence the scope of how much area it touches would actually become a factor. So then instead of just looking at the wave as being descriptive of some function which is a very linear, structural way of looking at things, we would be looking at it as actually a wave traveling through medium and when it travels through the medium,

if it is only a single point traveling through, then it is not having a certain dispersal. If you look at a wave as traveling through a medium as in gravity, everything will be affected to some degree just because of the influence say of the weak forces that hold

the molecules of one to another in terms of affinity. So that you move through the medium, things farther away will have less of an influence from a wave traveling through it, things closer to the wave will be more influenced, and if you look at that kind of impact, it forms the notion of a wave that is more or less diffused as it is traveling through a medium.

And in doing so, it gives you a clear idea of the effect on biochemistry of the patterns that happen in biochemistry in terms of the brain. The interference patterns that we create, or that actually create our self awareness, are a combination between the linear patterns that you can see moving through the neurology, where it is there or it is not, and you can detect wave forms in brain waves, by something being there or being not.

But when you are looking at the brain waves that are actually biochemical waves, then you are going to be looking at the ones that are more or less diffused and are having their frequency more or less constant. That kind of an impact then creates an unusual interference pattern because instead of putting two waves together to create an interference pattern that are both linear, you are putting a diffuse wave in conjunction with a focused linear wave, and when the two come together all bets are off.

That is what creates the meaning of chaos because it is virtually impossible to predict both what the momentum will be and also what the new position will be because the wave form can have a number of factual levels. In fact, there are an infinite number of factual levels from which to appreciate this new interference pattern and each fractal dimension. As you appreciate it, would be a different place at which you could perceive a wave. If you could see a wave, you've got a fractal dimension. There are areas in-between where you can perceive no wave and so the context in which waves can be perceived in the interference pattern between the diffuse and linear wave. Those areas in-between are chaos and those areas where we perceive the waves are order.

Again this is at the heart of unified field theory in these kinds of appreciations, depending on the level in which you perceive them, fractal levels can go on infinitely.

Changes in those patterns are what always is going on fractally because whenever you see a pattern that remains constant, while it remains constant that can be fractal and described by nonlinear equations. Whenever you see a pattern that is undulating or changing you can perceive that there is something at work, either above or below it, that is altering it.

(end of side A of tape)

Continuing... This is at the heart of unified field theory concept because it deals with the relationships between orders and chaos, and it says that whatever you perceive in the relationship between the diffuse pattern of waves, the biochemistry, and the focused linear pattern of waves in the brain, in the neurology, that the relationship between the two creates an interference pattern. If the interference pattern is constant, you perceive that as order and the less constant it is the less orderly that things appear.

In fact, the relationship is that fractal is where it is constant and where it is not constant that is where you end up in the domain of *frictal*. [*Frictal* is a term we coined to describe the temporal pattern created by the interaction of order and chaos, being a contraction of friction and fraction, as opposed to *fractal* – the spatial pattern created by the interaction of order and chaos I being a contraction of fracture and fraction].

Frictals tell you that there is another force at work, either a greater or larger fractal magnitude of where you are looking that is having an influence but an uneven influence because it is another wave passing through the system.

When waves pass through the system, that can not be linear because a linear wave passing through the system will cause constancy which would contribute to the order of view that we have. But when we have a larger or smaller magnitude wave of diffuse nature passing through the system, then its influence is not going to be constant and that is going to be a frictal force that we appreciate.

The result of the frictal and fractal working together is relativistic versus the non-linear appreciations that is what ultimately creates alternating layers of order and chaos, with order being what we perceive the constancy and chaos where we perceive the inconstancy because unpredictable, because we are not monitoring above or below at those levels of magnitude and therefore have no way of knowing what the next move will be.

The value of this way of looking at the theory is that it takes concepts such as synchronicity and relativity, which seem to have a relationship outside of linearity and approaches them and arrives at them completely through understanding of linear processes just by adding the extra concept of diffusion.

And that is the same concept that you would look at in terms of saying “does something exist or does something not exist,” well it's more of a question of how firmly does it exist.

Now that's something you look at in reality, you say how firmly does this tape exist? Well the tape will exist absolutely, I mean there is no question in our minds but that is only if you look at it spatially. You can say right now here is the table and it exists, and only if you look at it at this level you are appreciating it.

But just as in chaos theory, they say the coast of England is infinitely long because if you try to measure it as you get with smaller and smaller instruments of measure you begin to go around boulders and then you begin to go around grains of sand. By the time you measured you've added one circumference after another a portion of it as you go around all of these irregularities in the coast, and the length of the coast begins to become larger at an exponential rate, you would end up with an infinite coast to England.

Well similarly when you look at table and you say well is the tablecloth part of the table? Well no it's not, OK. Now on this particular table I'm looking at there is some adhesive tape that I put a rip on as part of the surface, well is that part of the table?

Well no it's not. Now the fact that there is a rip, there is a few molecules missing of that table, does that make it less of a table? No, because we will define it then by it's function, it holds things. all right one of the legs is weak on this particular table, and if I touch the wrong way it falls over and things spill, does that make it not a table? Well it makes it not a table at the moment it is spilling, well when exactly is that moment when it is spilling?

And then you start to get into the temporal sense, you see, you know at what exact moment of time did it cease to be a table and you run into all kinds of problems like that logistically, unless you are looking at things in terms of their fractal nature.

When you look at things in terms of fractal nature there never is any absolute existence or non-existence everything is in a constant state of flux. It is just that some things have long term flux and some things have a short term flux, as a result of this things appear more or less constant to us within the level at which we appreciate them. But when we look at larger and smaller magnitudes we can see that things are actually always in a constant state of change.

That leads back to the concept that is essential to the unified field theory, that when dealing with things that appear to have synchronicity they only have an apparent synchronicity because of the fact that the influences that we are watching are beyond the scope that we can perceive. And there are moments when the diffusion is undulating and at two points at the undulation of the diffusion there are two focal points in this undulation.

Our concept of life, as an observer, does not allow us to have two focal points, when we look at something we see it from only one focal point or so we think. We look at the world and say this is where we are, this is where everything else is in reference to us that is the subjective view. And in so doing we then look at everything as being converging on us at one particular point.

But if we have two focal points where we say this is what it looks like to me and also this is what it looks like to me, it happens all the time but our minds are constructed so as not to appreciate it.

When you are working out two views where you say, well I want to go here, but I don't really want to go there. Or when you are saying, well it makes sense logistically that it would be a good career move to go there, but I really don't like that particular meeting or those particular people and I don't want to go.

You have a logical point of view and you have an emotional point of view and you are actually sensing the parallax between the two. If there is a wide ranging difference it causes more deliberation, if there is a small difference then it causes less deliberation. If one is stronger than the other than it causes less deliberation, if they are both as equally balanced as possible if cause the most deliberation.

When you reach the point where you get absolute deliberation, you do not move, you do not act, you form an endless loop because nothing is changing. It's constant and yet even though it is constant the two are completely balanced in magnitude and in differential.

Each makes the same amount of sense, each has the strongest feeling attached to it, so you end up trapped in a loop. This is one reason why there is a bias built into the mind of being a temporal or spatial mind to prevent people from going into brain lock all the time, which is a bad survival trait. It's another reason that things would evolve in this way, is any entity that was of two minds would quickly cease to live long enough to procreate.

In any event, it is the observer looking through two eyes that creates a parallax that gives us all of our depth perception. And as a result of that two focal points are what is happening in synchronicity is that things exist spatially in two areas and in-between they do not exist as firmly. So we move from focus to diffusion and when they become diffuse enough we cannot see the smoke in the room until it reaches a certain point where we can perceive it as a haze, if it gets beyond a haze we can see it as a fog.

Eventually you solidify a fog enough and you've got an ice cube, something solid, something tangible. You go out into space and it is not absolutely vacant, it's not a complete vacuum, but what concept does vacuum have anymore when you have to go one light year between the particles.

If you are in-between the particles, is there a vacuum in-between the particles? Well you really can't say there is because from a spatial sense, as long as there is any content in something it is not an absolute vacuum and yet if you are in-between those two particles there is an absolute vacuum.

Well you have to look at it in two ways, there is a vacuum in terms of the fact that you are not feel any physical effects from the two particles. So you can say that their molecular energy is not being imparted to you, they're kinetic energy and therefore you are in an absolute vacuum.

Yet at the same time each will have a gravitational field and that will effect your gravity, so through an indirect means the kinetic energy of your molecules is being altered by the changing positions relative to one another of these two particles that you stand in-between with a light year on either side.

That is how the brain works, is that some functions of the brain, the ones that happen in the neurology are occurring when particles collide with one another when they actually impart kinetic energy through direct contact, (quote end quote) " direct contact".

In fact when you then look at the chemistry of the brain, it is kinetic energy being imparted through gravitational means. This kind of relationship between the two is the nature of all these interference patterns, that what we hold to be reality is a combination between both.

Now when you have items that are getting closer together, what happens to the gravity? Well naturally the gravity between them seems to be stronger when they are closer, as if which is the strangest part of it, as if gravity was egocentric. As if gravity was something that determined its influence by perceiving its place in the universe, rather than just having a place in the universe.

You look at a particle and from the particle's point of view, if there was such a thing, gravity would seem to be linear, its gravity would seem to be linear, the gravity it has. It would look outside itself, and say "well the sum total of the force I have one foot away from me, is equal to the summed total of the force that I have two feet away from me, which is equal to the summed total of the force that I have four feet away from me and so on."

So that you end up looking at these increasing as the square of the distance and the force, of course, is cubed. But as you begin to look at this you realize that, just as the entire universe shrinks all around you from a point of view, the farther away it gets, your influence appears to shrink also, and that is what makes it appear to be a constant.

That is the real key, is that the two seem to me coinciding. So that when you look at some force that is in the distance, the farther away it is, the force gets smaller from your point of view, that you are exerting, and at the same time the universe itself shrinks.

Trees become smaller in the distance, stars are little tiny things, and when this happens it appears that your force is shrinking at the same rate away from you, as things are shrinking at the same rate away from you. Therefore, your power appears to be consistent throughout the universe from an internal stand point and certainly that is the point of view a particle would have exerting gravity in the universe.

However when you look at another particle, when you look at a second force generator in the universe, then at that point it seems as if when it gets closer to you its force gets stronger.

In a sense, you can turn around and see you're occupying more of its field of vision and therefore the particle exerts more force upon you. But as the particles come together, the gravity increases and as that gravity increases from one perspective, remember we are dealing with subjective and objective here, as the gravity increases from one perspective then it suddenly becomes the stronger of the two forces and the kinetic energy becomes the weaker.

Now that is a very interesting thing, which one is more important? How long does it take for gravity to change its position relative to the kinetic energy? If you have two particles that are traveling near the speed of light and they collide, then what is actually going on?

You have to look at combined momentum to understand this, consider that light travels at the speed of light, light travels at the speed of light. Now we look at the speed of light as a limit that we cannot get by, that we can approach but never achieve. And yet light

travels at the speed of light. So something is not only approaching, something it is at the speed of light. Light cannot travel at anything but the speed of light, it's trapped in that limit line.

Now what if you take two flashlights and shine them at each another, and the two photons are coming at each other at a combined momentum of twice the speed of light. What occurs then? Because from either standpoint each particle could not see the other coming faster because it cannot perceive anything beyond the speed of light.

And so if the particle is coming towards it there is no way it could affect it in a direct physical sense, so that it would have energy imparted that would transmit to it before the other photon arrived because nothing can travel faster than the speed of light.

Now if you have these two photons coming towards each other, you can look at their combined speed and you can say that they are actually converging at faster than the speed of light, at twice the speed of light, in fact. Well that is at an objective of standpoint. From a subjective stand point you cannot see anything traveling faster than the speed of light because it couldn't get to you any faster and therefore you could not see it coming and that is the nature of the chaos in a temporal sense.

Chaos, in a temporal sense, is something that is coming at you faster than you can perceive it, faster than the size of mind, faster than the speed of mind.

When something comes faster than the size of mind, faster than the speed of mind, it is a chaotic event but it is actually something that is quite ordered. It's just that the overall combined speed between what is coming to you and you coming to it, creates something that is unappreciable from a subjective perspective.

But if you look at it from an objective perspective quite clearly there are things that one can perceive that are happening at faster than the speed of light or faster than the speed of thought or larger than the size of mind or bigger than the universe, there are levels beyond that are going to have this kind of impact.

And it all has to do with that fractal and frictal nature of combining the linear wave patterns with the diffused wave patterns and creating an interference pattern that either has a constancy or has inconstancy, were it is constant we look at it in our time sense and our space sense or in our gravity sense, in our physical connective sense.

We put the two together and were we see constancy, we describe it as order; were we see inconstancy, we describe it as chaos. If you step back into an objective perspective out of the point of view, the single point of view concept, then you can clearly see that there is a wave form even in that, and that the wave form undulates between order and chaos, with order and chaos being one-hundred and eighty degrees out of phase.

So the strong and the weak forces of the universe are connected in this concept, strong and weak forces of the mind, the observers connected to the observation and again, once the math is worked out, these essential concepts describe the unified field theory,

which can be seen as both open and closed as a system, both as being infinite and as being infinitesimal.

It's all a matter of perspective, and science, as it is built now, cannot allow for a unified field theory because the one thing that must not change in an observation are the conditions under which the observation was made. In other words, you cannot perceive the beginning of an experiment any differently than you perceive the end of an experiment or you have changed your standard of measurement, which is not allowed and that invalidates the experiment.

That is why in trigonometry, you can only have functions that can be plotted horizontally, but if you try to plot a vertical inverse function it's limited to one cycle because anything beyond that would require changing your perspective to perceive it.

Everyone knows the waves doesn't stop in that direction and waves can go in both, but we just can't allow ourselves to look at them because it violates the standard of not changing ones perspective, cause there is only that one cycles worth of overlap between the function and the inverse function that we can perceive from the same perspective.

That is the nature that has come out to be 3.14 on and on, as opposed to being an even three. A truly objective perspective will see it in fact as four. So in order to appreciate a unified field theory it requires that the perspective change, it requires that the observer be considered, it requires that you shift were you are looking at things from in order to see all the things that you can look at.

So that is the crucial aspect of it, as long as you only adopt only a single fixed perspective or a single standard of measurement, you can only see part of the universe, you will see as much as you can see at one time.

If you allow yourself to shift your perspective, then you are changing your perspective and between those two perspectives you will be able to see all of the universe. But the one thing that you won't see by doing that is to realize that you can't be in two perspective simultaneously and therefore you have to take time to get from one perspective to the other perspective, going from one to the other.

The nature of what you are observing changes under your feet and therefore you will not see all of the universe shifting perspective, you will only see the largest amount of perspective you can see, keeping space as a constant, changing your perspective over time.

So when you say let's freeze time, that is the male perspective and that is what goes into traditional science. When you're saying lets freeze space, that is the perspective intrinsic to women and that is also why women are not statistically doing as well in science or math, is not because they don't have the capacity to perceive as much of the universe as the men do. But because the standards of measurement in the science

community is established on male perspectives in which time is frozen and space is looked at in terms of the arrangement of things.

If we were to create alternate tools for women to use, which could allow for multiple points of view to get a more holistic sense of looking around an issue rather than looking at an issue, then women would excel equally to men in terms of science and math. But it would be a different language of science and math and in fact that language would be as inaccurate to men, as men's language of science and math is not meaningful to women.

In talking to my son just a moment ago, he was bringing to my attention one thing I said, "What about when you have a black hole? And you have light that is going into a black hole and it reaches the event horizon and light actually freezes because it has slowed down towards the observer. Well, of course, discounting what we just said about the observer and the fact that the light slows down according to the observer, meaning that light never actually slows down, that light actually continues right on into the black hole at the speed of light because it defines zone speed from a subjective stand point, suppose for a moment that we did assume that light did stop from the scientific perspective and was no longer preceding towards the black hole. Of course that is when it would vanish because if light stops it will give off no light, it can't decrease itself, it will freeze it's momentum but that is only the momentum that is going directly into the black hole. In fact, from the stand point of the unified field theory such as this one we are describing here, is that when you approach the black hole, light will be slowing down it's forward momentum so it will be increasing in it's sideways momentum. Well rather in a momentum of being diffuse more or less diffuse, because what is sideways in space?

Well it is something becoming more or less diffuse so that angular momentum that goes of to the side that is going to increase and is going to become a wave form that's kind of a polarity type thing, so that the wave of light that is going toward the black hole slows down and begins to come to the point where it becomes absolutely frozen.

In relationship to that, the light is going to become more or less diffuse as it undulates from side to side, going from a focused point in it's angular momentum to a maximum point in it's angular momentum.

Well what actually happens is as you reach a point coming towards the black hole when light actually would theoretically freeze and have no more forward momentum, that what's happening is the wave form that is described as sideways undulation from side to side has become more stiff, more vertical, the peaks would become higher, the frequencies would become greater. And you end up with a point at which the wave form is violated because if the light actually comes to a point where it stops going forward, then the side ways momentum has to be maximum and that means that it has to be maximum there is no time to turn the curve on a wave form and if you were to plot

what was happening as a function you would see it would violate all functional rules because it would become plotted along the horizontal axis a series of vertical lines.

In other words, light would, say, travel from the center point to the right as far as it goes and then once it travels from the center point to the right it would immediately be traveling back to the left and there would be no point at which it was at rest, there would be no slowing down it would simply travel to the right and immediately turn tail and travel to the left.

This odd phenomenon is what happens outside of black holes that makes them appear to just appear because all of the energy that has been seen coming back towards us is not going off in the side ways direction.

Sideways again, looking at it as a linear event, would perceive it at a series of vertical lines, and these vertical lines along the horizontal axis would be spaced equally so that they would represent a complete cycle. And each one would be the path way that light would take go from the farthest left point to the farthest right point, and then immediately it would be going from the farthest right to the farthest left.

The problem is that it takes it's time to go from one side to the other, which is represented by lengths of the vertical line along the horizontal axis but once it has taken that time to go from one place to the other, then it immediately is going the other direction and time that it has taken has passed, which is represented by the horizontal gap between the vertical lines.

This would normally describe a wave form, how do we get the vertical lines? We get the vertical lines because it is simultaneously all along it's full diffusion range from left to right, as it were, I mean from on the vertical lines from the top to the bottom from side to side in it's movement and it simultaneously exists and then it ceases to exist for the interval period as time passes and then it exists again.

So in a sense that would be plotting it so that you could see that it was, it existed in sideways time, I guess is the best way to describe it. Where time has become space, space has become time, the two of them have inverted, they've exchanged positions and so it exists within a moment of time, ... how to describe?

Let me walk through the model one more time and see if I can find a way to describe what's going on in the model. The light approaches the black hole, it's reaching the point where it freezes, as it reaches the point where it freezes, the momentum that it has so that it can continue to travel at the speed of light goes side ways to the black hole, because there is absolutely no force preventing it from moving in that direction, you might think of it as an orbit, if you would. So if the light going forward towards the black hole is slowing down, the light going side ways that polarity is going to in a sense orbit the black hole.

Now because it orbits the black hole, the only place we are going to be able to perceive the light as an observer, is when it comes around in it's orbit back to the point that is

directly between us and the black hole. So we are only going to see it for that infinitely small moment, that tiny moment at which it exactly lines up between us and what we are observing. When that happens all of its other momentum has gone side ways but the nature of the light has changed, because if we are plotting the forward momentum of the light is such that it no longer exists, light has stopped its forward momentum. If this is the case then light itself is only visible to us because it will appear to have forward momentum when it crosses that point, its own point in its orbit of going around this black hole.

If you plot that from the perspective of light's forward momentum then it would appear as if light had its speed that it had before of the speed of light, but only for a moment.

This would create a vertical line that would be represented over the amplitude of the speed which would be the light and this vertical line would be placed on the horizontal axis with time going off along the horizontal axis toward the right as we continue our graph.

As things go along the horizontal axis towards the right, light is actually making another side ways revolution orbit around the black hole finally comes back to the point in front of us and instantly we see that it has an instant immediate momentary speed of the speed of light. And we plot that by its amplitude speed along the vertical axis, as a vertical line equal to the speed of light and that is evenly spaced to the right of the original observations.

These observations would continue so that each time that we saw the light, we would see it for a brief moment, kind of like a pulse type thing, we would see it for a brief moment where it would show up at full intensity and then it would be shut off instantly.

In other words there is no undulation in it, it's not that we could perceive at all any wave form in it because in fact the light we are looking at is not truly anymore forward moving light but sideways moving light.

It has gone from something heading directly on, to something heading in an orbit, why would it do that? One would hypothetically look at a particle of light, at a photon of light going towards the black hole that would be hitting dead center, directly from the position of the observer. And if it did go directly from the position of the observer into the black hole then at that point we could say that (end of tape)

Okay, we are continuing now on Saturday morning, February 11, 1995, and we're talking about if there was a situation with a black hole where the observer was actually able to see the light moving directly from them, directly into the black hole, dead on.

Then as they perceive this, one would assume that it would just appear to blink out and we could say that if light could go directly into the black hole, dead center, then light would not go into an orbit because there is nothing to pull it in any given direction into an orbit, no regularity.

So there would be a theoretical point at which light could hit dead on, perfectly perpendicular to the force of the gravity of the black hole, in all measurable directions and it would not go into to orbit because there would be nothing to make it go one way or another.

Well in fact as we know the Coriolis effect on Earth, there is always some kind of chaotic event that will choose one thing over another. There is a tendency to go one particular way but if you reach the equator, it is still going to go down the drain in one direction or another, but which direction it goes is going to be a chaotic event because the Coriolis effect will be an equal pull.

But you never see the water just sit there and not go around the drain and it never just goes down straight, that doesn't happen, that just doesn't happen, no time does that ever occur. The reason for that is, the observer, if you are looking at light the only way that the observer could see the light going dead on away from them, would be if the observer were in line with the light itself so they were watching it dead on, go away from them, into the black hole.

And if they are watching it dead on then they are not going to see anything because if the light hits them in an absolutely straight perspective completely straight, then at that point you are not going to see any light at all, so that observation could not occur.

That is the interesting thing about the universe, is that you can come up with all these hypothetical situations in which the paradox would exist, but the nature of the universe is such a way that as members of it, as citizens of the universe, we are constructed in such a way that we can not observe the paradox and so we believe the paradox doesn't exist because we cannot see it, or we believe it exists even though we can't see it.

It makes little difference because we're never going to be able to directly observe it and if we can't directly observe it or even directly observe it's impact, because of that we have no way of having it effect us or us effect it in an observable fashion.

If you are looking for the mind of God that is probably the place to find it.

So anyway, that one instance where it would hit dead on is something could imagine but something that we could never observe and we can also never observe it's impact or influence upon us. And so, there is no way we could even measure it through circumstantial factors, anything short of that direct hit is going to lead to some kind of an orbit.

And that orbit, because light will maintain it's speed, is once it's forward momentum freezes, then it's angular momentum will be maximum but the observer will only be able to note when it exactly crosses their path. That there is a momentary flash of light visible at exactly one-hundred eighty-six thousand - whatever the speed is depending on the medium it's moving through - that it will show up just for that instant at it's full force without any fading in or fading out, it will be there one moment and not be there

the next and that is the nature of it's journey turning the forward momentum into orbital or angular momentum.

## Mental Relativity Notes | Recorded February 13, 1995

It's Monday morning, February 13, 1995.

I had a dream last night and when I woke up I knew a lot more about the pair relationships, dynamic, companion, dependent, and component.

For a long time, we have known that men and women perceive them differently in terms of positive and negative. Men will see each kind of relationship as having a positive one and a negative one and they are completely bipolar, so that you end up with a positive dynamic relationship and a negative dynamic relationship in a quad; each of those is represented in a diagonal.

For example, companion relationships, dependent and component each one will appear to be positive or negative. However in the first three pairs dynamic, companion, and dependent, from a male stand point, each one of those relationships can very clearly be described as to which one is positive and which one is negative by nature.

But when you get to the component relationship at the end, that one - all bets are off. That is the one that has to be the flexible one, that's the one in their blind spot where they can't see which one is positive and which one is negative because it changes by context.

The component relationship is where you're either seeing all as one group like a family or a team, or whether you are seen as an individual, and trying to determine what's best for the individual verses what is best for the team is the component relationship. That is why it is difficult to determine what is positive or negative, by saying it is always better to be an individual or always better to be one of the team, you really can't look at it that way.

However, women don't appreciate pair relationships at all like men do, women appreciate them completely differently. For a long time, we felt that women saw the relationships; one theory that we had was that women would see the relationships, one of them the same way as men, with one being positive and one being negative. Then they would see another one exactly the opposite of men. Then another one they would, the other two remaining ones, they would be like the reverse of men because they would see one of them all positive and one of them all negative.

So basically, we would see one, like the dynamic pair for example, I don't know which pair would be which cause we haven't calculated out that far, but the dynamic pairs would be see as positive and negative to both men and women.

Then, the companion pair relationship, what men see as positive, women would see as negative and vice versa.

Then in the dependent pair relationships women would see that as perhaps all positive and the component pair relationship as all negative. Well actually I think that is the way women appear to men, remember we're dealing with four things here; how men see themselves, how men see women, how women see themselves, and how women see men.

In terms of the relationships we've lined out so far, all of that is consistent male bias, where it is how men see themselves. And when we have women appear in the model, it is always from the perspective of how men see women. How women see women, is not at all represented in anything we do in Dramatica, as of this point. We know it is out there and we are trying to document it but since there are all kinds of tools out there for understanding how men see men, and how men see women, but nothing has ever been devised, very little for how women see men, and hardly anything at all for how women see women.

Those examples are just not there, the tools are just not there, so we have to construct a whole framework of understanding before we can even explore the theory. Well, the first aspect of this framework came to me last night, after this dream I had and it occurred to me that in looking at the companion and dependent pairs, women see those as favorable relationships, when you have a favorable relationship because those are the ones that they can control, those are the ones that are stretchy, they are the ones that are sliding scale.

In other words, rather than seeing as two pairs you see two separate areas, the positive ones and the negative ones, you see it as a single relationship, women blend that together - what men would see as a positive and negative companion, and then they -- ?-- separately, in a separate group the positive and negative dependent relationship, so that women are constantly looking at a range and saying well it is a love hate relationship.

Well that doesn't mean that it's got love in it and hate in it, it means that it cycles or oscillates between love and hate, between good and bad. And the relationships are not judged as being positive and negative, they are being judged as favorable or unfavorable kinds of relationships and then the nature of whether they are more positive or more negative, is what you have to get a feel for.

This causes women to get into relationship in which they are abused but not want to leave them because they see the relationship as this sliding scale that it's much better to be in an overall negative relationship as a dependent one or overall relationship as a companion one, then it is to be dealing at all with dynamic relationships or component relationships.

Now this is the natural tendency of women. Assertiveness training tries to bring women to the point where they can do the dynamic relationship and argue with somebody, and stand up for their rights, and go head to head against them.

This is what happens when women become masculinized in assertiveness training and the other opportunity is to leave, which is what ultimately women need to do in battered relationships, to get out and leave through the component.

The dynamic relationship is really not the women's way, that is really not what is going on in their heart. A woman who is constantly in a dynamic relationship with people if she works and functions and has relationships in terms of dynamic relationships, has missed the boat. That is the exclusive male domain, is that kind of direct conflict. It is not appropriate to one's fulfillment, you can do it if you want, it doesn't mean any woman can't do that, it just means that I guarantee that any woman who is living her life in dynamic relationships, is a woman who's not going to be fulfilled no matter what she says. That is a pretty bold statement, but that is what the theory predicts. And I believe in the theory because it hasn't let me down so far.

Now in terms of the component relationships that is the place that women have sort of a major blind spot; the option that you can step out of it, the option that you can stop being a family, the option that you can stop being in a relationship with a guy. We use it all the time, we do it all the time because we are not looking there, we step on people in those areas, we form little cliques and little groups, we reject men who feel like they aren't part of our circle, we do it all the time with the flick of the finger because we never even aware we're doing it.

It's not that we are intentionally locking into that, it's just that, that intrinsically is not an area that we consider. We step on the flowers as we pass by without realizing that they are under feet, in that area.

Now the interesting thing about that is because we see two kinds of relationships as being favorable or attractive relationships; and two as being repulsive relationships, not in an "oooh grody" sense but in a "no we are pushed away from those" even if we find ourselves drifting towards them on our own, we're pushed away from them which are the dynamic and the component.

Those are areas we don't wish to tamper in, that are not comfortable for us. Completely unlike men, who basically have the range of all three of them but they don't look into the component generally at all. For women, women have the range of two of them as being favorable, the dynamic as being unfavorable and the component being a shared area of not looking, which is also unfavorable. So men don't think in terms of what are favorable and unfavorable relationships, they look at each relationship as having the opportunity as being unfavorable or unfavorable depending upon whether it is positive or negative. Women never look at the positive or negative nature of a relationship they look at the kind of relationship and try to gravitate towards those that are more favorable, which are the companion and the dependent.

Now in looking at that, you will notice that the relationship that guys have with women and the relationship that women have with guys are quite different, because we are using different standards of measurement. And where as a guy may say, " Oh, well she depends on me, I am the bread winner, therefore I am in a positive relationship because I have someone dependent upon me."

For a man to be dependent upon someone else is not a comfortable thing. For there to be a unity of opposites, that is a dependent relationship where men realize the value of working together - Brain and brawn, for example - a partnership, learn that they will watch each other's back, and together they can accomplish something and so in that nature there is a mutual need that is going on.

But in a dependent relationship for women, women are not looking at it as a mutual need, women are looking at it as providing something that is of assistance and in return they get something that they desire. It is more of a transactional relationship, which essentially is the difference in the way men and women view prostitution, is that women see it as a transaction and men see it as this is something that someone will do to fulfill their needs for money.

It's different - the concept of fulfilling one's needs for money as supposed to as the concept of it being a transaction because then a transaction is two people involved in something in which two people provide something the other wants.

In a need kind of situation is where I, you are fulfilling what I want for a price. The aspect of what the price does for the other person is really not considered, it's just a requirement rather than a balanced trade off.

That is why it is usually a win / lose situation when dealing with men, is women try to go for the win-win in negotiations.

Beyond this you end up with the companion relationships being quite different for men and women as well. Men are looking at it as saying, what are the cost of having this relationship verses the benefits that I get, the positive things verses the negative things and women are just saying, oh we're close to each other.

That is what leads to the grouping mentality, is just to be close to the action, just to be close to somebody, just to be near it. Is quite different than looking at as being part of the family or just being an independent unit.

Men might have trouble blending those two things in the companion and the component. If they were to look at women, when they see women they say oh they are trying to be part of the group.

No, they are not trying to be part of the group, they are trying to be close to the center, so that there is more fall out, more positive fall out. And this is what also leads women, when they are dealing with companion pair relationships, to look at things in terms of the warmth of an atmosphere. To look at things in terms of being around friends who

do interesting things, that's a very positive attractive kind of relationship for women and even being around friends who do negative things because then in effect you are participating without being a participant. You are not dealing with the companion relationship, yes this is how you are yourself, you're part of the group, you're responsible for things, from the female perspective. Instead, you can say I can be there and enjoy all this negative, evil, terrible stuff that is going on without really being the one who is doing it, just because I happen to be in an area where I can pick up that signal and resonate with it.

Well, that's quite different then it is for men, men are dealing with it more in terms of logistics. But this again is an interesting situation. I said that women were looking at relationships as being favorable kinds of relationships whether or not they were positive or negative overall. Women of course are going to be looking at the relationship as being favorable, they are going to take a momentary value and say it's favorable and right now it is also positive. But then if it is negative, they'll say it is a favorable relationship but it's negative and they will feel that just have to get through things until they get better again, sensing intuitively the cyclic nature of relationships.

What they do not see in their blind spot, is that these relationships may be overall to the point that the bad far out weighs the good, and yet women are always looking at there being an up swing, that it is always going to be better because the relationship itself is favorable, so how can it ever turn out to be negative?

Well, favorable and negative are two different things. A favorable relationship just means, the kind in which you are comfortable with the relationship nature, but it doesn't mean that the relationship itself, this particular relationship, is a positive one of that kind.

This is an important thing for both men and women to remember is, just because there is a relationship that is positive for men, does not mean that it is a favorable relationship, that is where they get into trouble. And for women, just because the relationship is favorable doesn't necessarily mean it is positive, this is where women get into trouble. Interesting thing about that, is that the same kind of thing that's going on in terms of looking at the relationships as being favorable because men don't consider the favorable, and women don't consider the positive or negative.

Look again at how men or women pick out cars and things. It's funny that men are always complaining that women are the one's who go off and do things frivolously, and yet then they have women coming out and picking out cars because they've got the right number of doors for the family and good trunk space. And guys are out there picking out cars because they're fast and sleek and all kinds of things that aren't, what's the word, practical.

Women are more practical, but how can men be more analytical and logistic and women be more practical? Because the relationship of practicality to logic, is the same as the relationship of favorable to positive and negative.

When men are dealing with being logical, logical has nothing to do with practicality. See practicality is looking at things holistically, it's saying what will cover most of the needs for all of the different things that are going on, it's very non-linear. Whereas men are dealing with logistics, they're dealing with, if this is a particular need this is what I need to get there, these are the steps I have to take, these are the resources I'm going to have to have. But that is a linear approach, a straight line approach and for men it is appropriate.

For women the practical approach is more appropriate, to say how can I cover as many bases as possible so that the overall situation is as positive as possible or as favorable as possible. And men will be looking, plotting the path way that they have between where they are and what they need for their goal, trying to come up with a path way that is as positive as possible. So a positive path way would be the most efficient path way, whereas a favorable situation would be the one that creates the least problems, fulfills the most needs even if they are not tied into a specific purpose even if they have no relationship to what's going on, immediately in the for front.

This is why men and women in business get into arguments all the time, is because of that nature that men are looking for, here is what we are trying to accomplish and here is the fastest way to go to it and once we've set ourselves a goal than we are saying that this takes priority over everything else. In other words, not only does this take priority but everything else is shut out of the picture.

Once you define the scope of your goal and --?-- you can define a goal as being a pleasant environment or a pleasant working environment but once you've defined a goal, anything that falls outside the scope of that goal id no longer considered.

Men throw themselves, then into creating the most efficient path to get to that goal and arrive at it. That kind of approach is very satisfying to them, but it's not very fulfilling to women.

Women are not concerned with just having one particular thing you've achieved going through life in a linear pattern, one foot in front of another, one step after another, that is not what has fulfillment and meaning for women, but it does for men. But when you have women in life, looking towards what will make them happy, they want to create a holistic environment, where everything within the range of their perception is balanced as positively as possible or as favorable as possible. And so, women are constantly fine tuning things, moving furniture, trying on new clothes, joining new social organizations, watching new programs on television, exploring these areas. Whereas men will usually find a new direction they like to go, one particular hobby, one particular approach, one particular activity and they will go with it a long time, until it stops doing it's job for them and then they will select something else.

Women are usually apt to bounce around a lot of different things and balance them off. When they become single-minded that's when they find that they are not being as

fulfilled as they would like to be, because all the other things they are not considering are slowly detuning through the effects of chaos.

Of course, they might not detune, in which case we end up with women being very fortunate because they are lucky, they're simply lucky. They go off and follow a single-minded purpose and everything else around their life just gets in order by itself, that's great. That's like having a house you don't have to dust, but the point is, when most of us focus on one thing and leave the infrastructure to itself it begins to crumble around us.

In the end, if we had any kind of order in our life, that order will react with chaos to form an equilibrium between --?-- and --?--, and we'll end up with something that is neither good or bad, neither favorable or unfavorable rather neutral. So then we have to put all our eggs in one basket and follow this linear path that means nothing as women in terms of fulfillment and when we are all said and done we accomplish our goal, and we're left with what neutrality. It's as if we got no reward because we've worked all our lives and gotten back to zero, of course for some people getting back to zero can be an improvement.

Anyway all these things notwithstanding we are able to look briefly at the difference between those relationships. We talked about heterosexuals looking at homosexual relationships. Relationships that are of a homosexual nature are different for men and women. The relationship between lesbians is different than the relationship between gays.

It's going to be a very hard thing for men to try and understand because men are going to be looking at the relationships in terms of maybe being in a companion relationship with somebody, or maybe in a dependent relationship with somebody and if it's a positive one or a negative one.

But women are going to be gravitating towards a certain kind of relationship and in fact, when women get into relationships with men or with women as being straight women or gay women, lesbians, than the relationship shifts between the dependent and companion. It's the type of favorable relationship that is the difference, in that kind of sexuality.

It's very, very interesting, you have women who are just good friends, have no sexual interest in other women between them, they give themselves hugs, they hold each other tight and have feelings for each other, and those feelings are feelings of proximity, feelings of being close to someone else, that's the companion relationship that is doing that. The companion relationship has a closeness, and there's really when you have a lesbian relationship that is based on love, it's a companion relationship. It's where the women have become so close to each other that they share everything, that is a positive lesbian relationship, if you would look at it completely positive.

But if you have a lesbian relationship that is a dependent relationship, that is negative lesbian relationship, where each one is dealing from the female perspective in terms of their needs. And because they are dealing in terms of their needs, then you end up with each other not being able to trust each other one, constantly checking your security, constantly being insecure, constantly wondering what the other person is up to, where you are trying to divide up territory, where you are trying to separate yourselves one from the other, and so that would be a negative lesbian relationship.

You see when women are dealing with other women, in a straight sense, they are dealing with companion relationships and when they are dealing with men they are dealing with a dependent relationship, they are not companions with men. But because companion and dependent are both favorable relationships, women can empathize with either men or women, because men will fall into the dependent category in all of relationships and women will fall into the companion relationship in all relationships that are of a favorable nature.

But see if you flip, where you put men and women, and you start putting men into a companion relationship, that is a very negative relationship for women. And so if you have a heterosexual relationship that falls into the companion relationship area that is not really very favorable for women to put it that way. You see the interesting thing about it is that these relationships for women, depend on whether it's men or women in terms of what is favorable and what is not favorable. And it turns out that the favorable relationships, the most favored relationship for men is the dependent pairs for a women, and the most favorable relationship with a women is a companion pair. And that is why you end up with having a relationship between women either as friends or intimately as a lesbian relationship. Or with men, the concept of having a male friend it just doesn't quite work out well, there has to be a dependency in there some where, in order for it to be a favorable relationship.

Now a lot of women have men as friends and the men come to them and ask for advice, they talk to them about this and that, that is the relationship that women have with their male children is a dependent one and the dependency turns around.

And that's the problem that a lot of mothers have is, their children grow up, is that it starts out with the man being dependent upon the women so there is a love hate relationship between the child and the mother when they are younger. And at that point though the mother is there, is always providing positive if she is a good mother, and therefore the young man grows to love his mother, because even though he doesn't want to be dependent from the get go his reliance on her is not violated, is never violated, or is seldom violated and therefore he comes to trust her.

But when it turns around the other way, then here is a dependent relationship that he has with her, and in having that relationship with her then, now she is dependent upon him. And in being dependent upon him, she just becomes a drain, and he has this

terrible conflict psychologically with in himself because, he loves her because when he was dependent upon her, she never violated that.

He now feels an obligation to her because she is dependent upon him, but she is not providing anything to him anymore, she is merely a drain. That is the kind of relationship with a man that he would sever immediately, but he can't sever it with his mother because of an obligation and love turns to obligation.

The best thing a mother could do is set up her own little nest egg, so that when she is older, she is in the position where she can take care of herself. But she doesn't want to move into a position where she seems completely independent because the component relationship will bite her son on the ears, and when that happens he will feel that she no longer needs him at all and if she no longer needs him, then he has no function or purpose with her because he certainly doesn't want to have to need her, which is the only other kind of relationship he can have with her.

So generally the dependent relationship is the one where men will always place women, and men will always strive for the companion relationship with men, but dependent and companion are the types of things that (end of side A)

OK, I only have a few minutes here, I was losing track of what I was saying at the end of that because I got interrupted by running cats through the living room, it disturbed my train of thought. It is time I have to get ready for work anyway, it's nine o'clock, I've got to get in and get some stuff done. But anyway just to put a --?-- on that thought, clearly the relationships that men and women have with their same sex or the other sex, in a intimate and non-intimate sense can be catalogue in a way, as long as we change the meaning of the terms we are looking at. So we have to look at terms of practicality verses logic, because logic has no meaning, linear logic has no meaning to women, practicality does.

Linear logic is something that, yes we can do but if we do it, it brings us no fulfillment, which is very important to us, although it would bring us satisfaction but satisfaction is not important to us, but that is important to men. So the differences between how we break down, what relationships are attractive or not, well men don't even use the concept of what relationships are attractive they look at all relationships at which are positive and which are negative within each kind of relationship and categorize them according to which kind.

Women basically categorize them according to kind for determining what is favorable relationship, regardless of whether it is positive or negative. This kind of differential is going to lead, what does lead to all that confusion between the sexes because we are not looking at the same things at all, from the same perspective.

When we look at our inner selves, when we try to find out what is really going on inside the first thing we do, is we perceive relationships differently and then we measure them

differently on top of it. Meaning that what we are looking at, and where we are looking from, both of those things are at odds.

This is the area in which the paradox exists, this is the area in which men and women are one-hundred and eighty degrees opposed, even though in the process of creating these evaluations of relationships, they are really only ninety degrees out of phase at any given point. But since they're ninety degrees out of phase on how they look at relationship, and ninety degrees out of phase in how they measure relationships or where they are looking from, it comes to an entire one-hundred and eighty degrees out of phase in terms of relationships in general.

It's a combination of the two ninety degrees movements out of phase and they don't cancel out, that's the thing of it they don't cancel out. It always works around the clock in the direction to go one-hundred and eighty degrees out of phase. If they could cancel out, that would be a wonderful thing and we can find in real life these kinds of relationships and they cancel out through training, but if you train yourself to get to the point where you undo or adopt the opposite --?-- for half the equation, wither how you look at the relationships, the way you evaluate relationships, the way you see them being, or the way you evaluate them, if you move one of those one-hundred and eighty degrees out of phase, then you could cancel out the way men are looking at it and be more in tune with them, which is what happens to a lot of business women but you're never going to find fulfillment because you're putting yourself out of phase with yourself.

So the real key is to be true to yourself, and find something that accommodates both. Much as you would look at a photon of light and say it has a particle and a wave nature, so it doesn't matter whether you look at it as a particle or a wave, you might not be able to do some things when you look at it as a wave that you could do when you look at it as particle and vice versa. But if you only have need for looking at it, or desire for looking at it as a wave than that is fine for you. But if somebody else wants to look at it as a particle they can do that and it works fine for them. So it doesn't matter that it has a dual nature, if you're using only half of that nature, then it only appears to have one nature to you. And as long as you're dealing with the same object, it's equally useful to both parties.

Same thing for men and women in relationships, whether they are same sex or opposite sex. Is that you have to come up with something that is both positive for men and favorable for women. In other words, if you had a relationship with a man, you would want to look for a dependent relationship, where he would look at it and say, is it a positive or negative dependent relationship? And if he sees the relationship as a positive dependent relationship, than in that case he is able to get more with you than he would get without you, but not in the sense of just saying it adds a little bit. Saying that he has to supply you with his resources, and in supplying you with his resources then because of what you contribute, he ends up getting more than if he had used those resources for himself alone. So that is where you end up with, with buying flowers and candy, after all tomorrow is Valentines Day. That is the concept behind it, is by putting

in something that is of X amount of value to him, he gets something much more in value even if it is intangible. He should recognize that there is much more of value coming for the amount spent, it's got to be a situation where he is feeling that his needs are being fulfilled, that he is coming out a winner.

I had a teacher once in economics. She talked about the concept of economic profit. One of the most intelligent ladies I've ever met in my life. She had been all over the world, she written a number of books, she was incredible. And she taught about economic profit, she said if you go to a, she used this example because she was trained in the male mystique, she said if you go to a football game, it's a hot summer day, you're thirsty, you'd gladly pay a dollar for a lemonade. So a vender comes by and sells it to you for fifty cents, you've made fifty cents economic profit because that is the money you didn't spend that you would have in order to get that satisfaction. That's how you come out a head of the game.

She said if you have five dollars? How do you spend your five dollars? Do you buy five used paperback books, or buy one new paperback book? Do you go to a movie with it? Do you rent a videotape? What do you do? When you have five dollars, how you spend it should be determined on bases of economic profit. Meaning, do you get how the difference between how much pleasure it gives you and how much you're willing to spend for it? Meaning, it's not always this is the thing that will bring me the most pleasure at the moment, but sometimes it's saying that this is the thing that will bring me the most pleasure for the buck. Because it may turn out that with five dollars you're able to get something that would normally cost a huge amount but is only five dollars and that huge amount that it would cost that you would be willing to pay if you had the money, is something that you don't have to pay now because it's on sale.

This is where the whole sale mentality comes from, especially with women, is that when something is marked down in terms of saying well it's normal price is X and it's now selling for this. Well even if it is something that will not bring you as much pleasure, as spending the money on something else immediately, you want to get this because it is a fleeting opportunity to make that kind of economic profit.

That is when you're diluting yourself and misusing it because you're doing something that you didn't have a preestablished need for now, but you anticipate a need for later or something that actually doesn't give you the greatest amount of pleasure because it is something that gives you the greatest amount of economic profit. So those two concepts of what will make me happiest and what will make me feel like I have the biggest bargain, are two different concepts.

Men want the biggest bargain all the time, in terms of relationships. Women want the biggest bargain all the time, in terms of material things. Men want the things that make them happiest immediately, in material things. Women want the things that make them happiest immediately, in relationships, so in the end there seems to be an opposite in there.

But the whole nature in all of this is the different ways we look at relationships. So if we come up with a dependent relationship between men and women, and we have it as a positive dependent relationship, then that is the one in which both the man and the women will be satisfied with the relationship and fulfilled, because the women will find that she can rely on the man and he will take care of her needs and the man will look at that relationship and say that in it the women is supplying something that is of great value to him, greater than the value of the money that he is spending, the emotional money that he is spending on her.

And therefore he comes out with a tremendous whopping profit out of the deal just by being in an association with her, in a relationship with her. Whereas if you are looking for, as a women, a lesbian relationship, you're going to want to get into a companion relationship because in a companion, you will both be looking at that as a favorable relationship. And if you can make it a positive companion relationship, then two of you could make that work.

But if you put yourself into a dependent relationship, then that is not going to work as a true lesbian relationship. Now if you put yourself into a dependent relationship that is positive, well then you end up in a relationship that is essentially a male-female relationship between two women, which is not going to be fulfilling, it may be satisfying but it won't be fulfilling.

So women who put themselves into relationships as lesbians that have a dependent relationship, have one of the parties depending upon the other one to fill their needs. And when that one fills their needs, the one who is doing the need feeling has to perceive the relationship as being one that brings them more out of life, then they would have had by using those resources else where, that is what makes it worth will. If that is not happening, then it appears negative to one side, and positive to the other side.

I'll close in a moment here by saying, this has led into the concept of positive and negative, not by looking at the relationship between of two people, but by looking at how each one sees the relationship because relationships can be seen as positive or negative from either side.

Relationships can be seen as favorable or unfavorable from either side, and depending on whether you are dealing with relationships between women or relationships between men is going to create a very complex algorithm of finding out if they are seen as favorable from one side and negative from one side, favorable from one side and unfavorable from the other side, unfavorable from one side and positive or negative from the other side, or unfavorable from one side and favorable from the other side, so all of these combinations create the wealth and variety of relationships.

Keep in mind that many of us, most of us have relationships that don't just focus on one particular kind. That, in other words, when we get closer to people, we are not just operating at one level of relationship, we are actually beginning to stretch into other areas. So we begin in one of them, perhaps dynamic are arguing and fighting all the

time, and maybe that turns into companionship and then dependency and then into a component where you become the same thing.

The journey that we take through these dynamics is one in which we expand our context of relationships and so very often, we'll find that certain aspects of our relationships are positive and certain aspects are negative, or certain are favorable and unfavorable depending upon the area that we are talking about. Which is ultimately why men might have a workshop out in the garage and women would have the kitchen as their domain. It's a place in which they can turn the tables on other kinds of relationship issues that are less favorable or more negative to be able to define the scope in which contexts carrying a given beyond this instead of just talking about all these four different kinds of relationships that can be rated differently and create the complexity between men and women, women and women, and men and men. T

Then you end up with the notion that each one of those relationships can be functional or dysfunctional in a different context. So that when you are talking about relationships outside the house, verses relationships inside of the house, verses relationships when you're dealing with economic matters, verses relationships that you're dealing with when planning for vacation, verses relationships in raising the kids; each thing that is identified by the parties in the relationship as a context that is separate can create a completely different kind of pair relationship that is involved in that area and it can also change it's favorable and unfavorable, and positive-negative nature.

Then, of course, you run into the relationships where each one is defining context differently, and that is where most disagreements come from. That's when you are dealing with apples and oranges, where it is context itself that you see things as different, what is included what is not included in this part of the relationship, in this scope of our discussion here.

So you add all that together and end up with the different ways men and women see relationships, in terms of being favorable primarily and then seeing what is positive and negative, and seeing that as spot judgments for women. Or in terms of seeing the relationship as being positive or negative one across the board, and then seeing what's favorable or not, out of the most favorable relationships which is a more flexible thing for men. And then determining whether it's a relationship between a man and a women, and then determining whether both are seeing the relationship in the same light. So that one is seeing favorable, the other is seeing positive, for example, or one is seeing unfavorable and the other is seeing negative. Or if they don't match up exactly and you end up with one seeing it one way and the other seeing it another, even from their different points of view, then you deal with the terms of context as to what context these relationships are taking place in? What scope that you have them in? If they are already --?-- on the scope, and seeing how all those views of the relationship change it?

Then you look at in terms of having different views of the context, so that is how things change. And finally you end up with the most complex issue of all, which is, how

context changes over time, so that nature of the relationships changes over time. What is seen as favorable and unfavorable, will change for men. What is seen as positive and negative, will change for women, over time. The context in which we place things, will change overtime, sometimes in a repeating way were it comes full circle, sometimes in a non-repeating way where it goes off on a tangent. That's how relationships sometimes grow together, and sometimes grow apart. Anyway all of this is material that can easily be put into algorithms. I think most of them have been described here and from those algorithms, we can create an entire new dynamic engine, that can be used for Alter-Ego and also for Dramatica.

The terms that we put on these dynamics, once we understand the mechanism of how they all go together are going to be the terms like: greed, and love, and lust, and hate, and happiness, and sadness; and all of these things are the terms that are going to be hung on this particular model. But I think, in looking at this dynamic model that's building with all of these pieces to it, this flexible, fluid dynamic model which deals with things in a frictal sense, that is the other side of Dramatica. It is the emotional side of story telling, it is the heart side or the heart of Alter-Ego.

The structural elements currently in Dramatica would be perfect for business oriented decisions because that is what you would be looking at, is the logistics and it is a logistics based system. But in terms of dynamic model, it is not going to be based on logistics, or in terms of practicality women would also look at that structure in terms of practicality.

But in terms of this dynamic model that we are creating right now, it would be seen as what is favorable, what is emotional aside of the argument to see what is positive or a negative emotional context. And also what is favorable, as opposed to, I guess favorable and satisfying. Fulfilling and satisfying is what you get over here on this side, and on the other side of the structural model, you get practical and logistic.

So in any event, I guess it is about time for me to go take my shower because I'm going to be late for work. But it is important to have documented this and this tape particularly is going to be the heart of future development in a practical sense.