

PART VIII

1.0 Neurophenomenological Implications

1.1 First-Person Observations, Constructed Boundaries, and Neurophenomenological Constraint

The following first-person reports are presented in ascending order relative to broad periods of my life. They are not offered as isolated proof-claims, but as structured phenomenological observations that can be placed in relation to objective descriptions of memory, sensation, time, attention, bodily regulation, and perceptual construction. Their value in the present paper is that they show continuity between subjective experience and broader structural arguments already developed elsewhere in the manuscript: recurrence, constraint, accumulated memory, temporal scaling, and the constructive role of consciousness in defining what becomes observable.

1.1.1 Early Self-Induced Reenactment of a Drug State

At approximately fourteen years of age, I first tried marijuana. At that time I was a conflicted teenager, on probation, subject to random drug tests, without a job, and therefore unable to afford marijuana even if I wanted it. At the same time, I had just begun martial arts training and was being introduced to meditation through class practice.

Somehow I got the idea that if I focused hard enough on the feeling of being high, then perhaps I could stimulate or reignite that experience from memory, since the experience had already occurred and therefore had to be stored somewhere in my biological and conscious history.

So I meditated on the feeling of being high. The initiating reference was my first experience with marijuana. To my surprise, the meditation appeared to affect me biologically. I felt high. My eyes became red. I got the munchies. I had cotton mouth. I recognize that some people will be skeptical of

this report, and there was no third-person observer present to validate it independently. Still, for me, the event established an important principle: a remembered experiential pattern was capable of re-entering the body as if it were being biologically reactivated rather than merely remembered in an abstract way. [59, 63]

Later in life, when I tried to reenact the same experience, it became more difficult and eventually seemed farther from reach. By the time I reached my forties, I understood one possible reason. Each time I relied on actually smoking marijuana, I was effectively teaching my body that the state depended on the external action of consuming the substance. At the same time, each repeated use created additional layers of experience. Those experiences did not replace the first one; they accumulated upon it.

A useful metaphor here is that of a blank canvas. The first experience is like the first painting. If a new experience occurs, reality does not hand us a brand-new canvas in the way an artist might take a fresh one from a shelf. Memory is not erased. At most it can be suppressed, which is more like priming over an earlier painting. Then another image is painted over what came before. Consciousness evolves in this layered way. As new observations are added, the texture of reality changes. The earlier layer still exists, but it is no longer immediately visible beneath what has been built on top of it.

1.1.2 Conditioning Aversion: Sugar and Visual Desire

Later in my teenage years, while in high school, I consumed a great deal of sugar in the form of soda and candy. At some point I noticed the extent of the habit and felt disgusted by it. I then began pairing the idea of sugar with the feeling of nausea whenever cravings arose. I do not remember exactly how long I repeated this practice, but after enough repetition it became increasingly automatic. When cravings arose, nausea would arise with them, which in turn discouraged consumption. This kept me off soda and candy for roughly two years.

Around the same era, I used a similar process in a relational context. I had a girlfriend who was very beautiful, yet like many people I was still susceptible to attention being pulled toward highly serialized framing in the environment. I could see how this made her uncomfortable and could make a person feel

insufficient. Since the nausea strategy had worked for sugar, I applied it here as well. Again, the body learned an aversive association through repeated intentional focus.

1.1.3 What These Early Cases Suggest

These early cases suggest that consciousness is not merely a passive witness of bodily events. It can become an active participant in shaping which bodily patterns are amplified, inhibited, or made available to experience. Memory is not simply archival. It can act as an initiator. Attention then functions as an amplifier. Repetition stabilizes the process. Over time, the body learns. The result is not a clean replacement of one state by another, but a progressive layering of patterned experience.

This is one reason the canvas metaphor matters. In ordinary life we often speak as if each event is separate. Yet in actual lived experience, present states are textured by prior ones. New experiences are painted over earlier layers rather than emerging from nowhere. The continuity remains even when the surface appearance changes.

1.1.4 Slow Motion, Segmented Time, and Multiple Scales of Observation

Moving forward into my twenties, I used to fish often with a close friend. One day another friend and I met up with him. We had been drinking, among other things, but that is not the focus of the story, even if it may have contributed to the overall state of the moment. The three of us were walking when my fishing friend, carrying a can of beer, tripped over a crack in the cement. My other friend and I were only a couple of steps away. I instinctively reached out to catch him.

What happened next was striking. He seemed to stop in mid-fall, almost as if someone had pressed pause with a remote control. I stopped reaching because it looked like he had caught himself. Then he continued to fall, only to pause again, now stabilized briefly on one knee, with the other leg bent and one hand supporting him on top of the beer can set on the ground. Then he continued again, the can crushed, and he rolled onto his shoulder.

My other friend and I looked at each other in confusion and then at him. When he stood up, he explained that the fall had happened in slow motion in his mind. I laughed, because it had appeared

slow to us as well, and I described the three segments of the fall with the two pauses. This created a rare real-time alignment between first-person and third-person observation. My friend experienced the event from within; my other friend and I experienced it from outside. Yet all three of us reported temporal segmentation and slowing.

That event reminded me of other moments throughout my life in which time seemed to slow during a fall or while an object rolled toward an edge. The first couple of times it happened I was not reactive. Later, once I recognized the experience, I began to respond to it. On one occasion in adulthood, probably in my late twenties or early thirties, I was having a meal with a friend at a restaurant when something began to fall from the table. It entered a kind of slow motion in my perception, and I reached out and caught it. My friend looked at me with amazement and said I had moved really fast. To me, I had reacted quickly, but not impossibly so. To him, however, my movement likely seemed much faster than it felt from the inside.

1.1.5 Relative Scale and the Expansion or Compression of Observed Time

What I eventually realized is that conscious observation itself can seem to change scale. I once used the term “quantum” for this in a loose explanatory sense, drawing on the popular image from Ant-Man: shrink the body and relative movement changes. If an ant were looking at us, we would appear to move differently than we do from our own scale. Likewise, when we look at large cyclical motions in the cosmos, things with vastly greater scale and mass can appear to move very slowly from our position, even though on their own scale they may be moving at a normal pace.

The point is not the comic-book example itself, but the logic of scale. Observation is always position-dependent. What looks fast at one scale may look slow at another. What looks stable at one scale may look highly active at another. This repeated relation between micro and macro helps explain why subjective and objective descriptions can diverge while still referring to one and the same event.

1.1.6 Deliberate Use of Emotional Arousal as a Functional Tool

Another example, different in content but related in structure, concerns emotional arousal. I am a very sensory and emotionally receptive person. In arguments, for many different reasons, I often allowed my

emotions to get the better of me. During my twenties and thirties, however, I learned that I could dwell on a past experience that would get my blood boiling, so to speak, and thereby start adrenaline pumping. The initiating memory would trigger the state. Once the feeling became present, I could set the initiating memory aside and focus on the feeling itself, amplifying it and redirecting that energy into whatever physical task I needed to perform.

Sometimes I used this in distracting environments when I needed intense concentration. In those cases I might even wear the aggression on my face so that others would leave me alone. At other times, particularly when I had my own cabinet installation business and was under time pressure at a customer's home, I would run that same physiological intensity internally while maintaining a neutral tone and an inviting face externally so that the customer would not feel uncomfortable. On some occasions I explained exactly what I was doing biologically and why. No one was offended; some were actually impressed by the method.

1.1.7 Sensory Deprivation, Spatial Construction, and the Ganzfeld Relation

Most recently, I spent two hours in a sensory deprivation float tank in Southern California at Float Lab. I had used pod-style float environments before, but I strongly preferred the larger chamber because the pods repeatedly interrupted relaxation whenever my arm touched the wall. The larger chamber reduced that problem substantially. The point of a sensory deprivation float tank is to dull the senses as much as possible, so repeated tactile interruptions defeat part of the purpose. [60]

For readers unfamiliar with the setup: the water is heavily salted to create buoyancy, warmed to approximately body temperature, and the environment is dark and sound-dampened. Earplugs reduce external noise further. The aim is to minimize sensory contrast—sight, sound, and much of touch—so that ordinary spatial and bodily reference points are weakened. In the larger chamber I could hear little besides an occasional breath or perhaps my heartbeat. At times I drifted into a trance-like state. My body would become so relaxed that an arm or leg might flop in the water unexpectedly, as if the body had entered a deeper neurological mode of release.

After the two-hour float ended, staff signaled the conclusion of the session by gently pounding on the wall. I opened my eyes and made my way toward the chamber door. Everything was still pitch black.

Yet my mind produced a faint outline of the room and the door. I found the door, and the outline of the door was accurate. Curious about the larger outline of the room, I reached upward toward what I perceived as the ceiling line. To my surprise, my hand touched the actual ceiling well before reaching the outline I thought I was seeing.

This indicated that the period of deep relaxation and sensory reduction had affected my spatial awareness. The physical confinement of the room felt much larger than it actually was because there were few external cues available to calibrate bodily position against fixed boundaries. In the darkness my mind still knew that I was in a room and still attempted to generate a workable spatial model so that I could orient myself and leave. It preserved some aspects accurately, such as the location of the door, but exaggerated others, especially the apparent height of the room. The fact that I could stand upright in the chamber may also have contributed to the larger projected sense of vertical space.

This experience directly relates to the Ganzfeld effect. When sensory contrast is reduced enough, the mind does not simply stop producing form. Instead, it begins to generate or stabilize form from within, often using minimal cues, memory, bodily expectation, and residual orientation habits. In my case, what emerged most clearly was not detailed content but outline: the geometry of the room, the line of the ceiling, the location of the door. This is important because it shows how observability can arise through edge, boundary, and structural approximation even when ordinary sensory anchors are severely reduced. [61]

1.2 Integrative Relevance to the Paper

Taken together, these experiences help establish the section's central point: first-person experience is not merely private content added on top of objective reality, but a domain in which the constructive activity of consciousness can be directly studied. The bodily reenactment of an intoxicated state, the learned induction of nausea, the temporal segmentation of falling, the deliberate redirection of emotional arousal, and the spatial distortion produced in sensory deprivation all point toward a common pattern. Memory can initiate state. Attention can amplify it. Repetition can stabilize it. Constraint can reshape what becomes observable. Scale can alter how time and motion are experienced. Boundaries can be generated, softened, or recalibrate depending on available input. [46, 58, 59]

This also helps connect the present section to the larger manuscript. Elsewhere in the paper, I argue that what appears as separation is often a functional distinction within an underlying continuity, and that what appears as definition often emerges through differentiation under constraint. The float tank experience, in particular, provides a lived example of this. In darkness, what became available to awareness first was not the “inside” of the room as a full object, but its outline. In that sense, the experience offers a neurophenomenological analogue to a broader structural relation explored elsewhere in the manuscript: distributed or less-defined potential becomes observable through constraint, and observability often appears first geometrically, at edges, outlines, or facets.

I do not present these relations as literal equations between domains. I am not claiming that a float tank reproduces quantum mechanics, or that subjective experience is identical to crystallography or cosmology. The claim is structural rather than reductive. Across different levels of reality, there appears a recurring relation among continuity, constraint, form, and observability. This section lives near the end of the manuscript because it gathers the conceptual work of earlier sections and shows how those patterns can also be encountered from the inside, in lived experience, as first-person evidence of how reality is constructed, stabilized, and interpreted by an observing system.

In this sense, the phenomenological reports do not stand apart from the paper’s broader claims. They serve as the place where the argument folds back into direct experience: not only how reality may be described from the outside, but how its structuring can be felt, modulated, and observed from within.

A further refinement is necessary here. Although experiential layering can make earlier states more difficult to access, this does not mean they are absolutely lost. Because conscious experience is observer-dependent, accessibility changes according to what the observer continues to reinforce, what is allowed to fade, and how much competing distraction is acknowledged. Practices such as meditation, disciplined attention, and deliberate sensory reduction can function as ways of weakening the dominance of later layers so that earlier configurations of feeling or perception become reachable again.

In this sense, the layers of experience are not sealed compartments. They are more like accumulated surfaces whose texture can be penetrated through sustained focus. The difficulty many people encounter may stem less from impossibility than from how thoroughly they have trained themselves to invest in later habits, later meanings, and socially reinforced versions of reality. The more heavily one

cultivates those later structures, the more distant earlier states can appear. Yet distance is not the same as erasure.

This also helps explain the difference between childhood and adulthood. Children often move fluidly between imagination and enacted experience because fewer constraints have hardened into unquestioned reality. Adults, by contrast, repeatedly invest in what they are taught to treat as the only real world, and this repeated investment changes the texture of conscious life. What appears to be a barrier may therefore be an acquired surface rather than an absolute disconnection.

The closing implication of this section is that consciousness is not merely layered; it is also conditionally permeable. By recognizing ourselves as conscious observers and by becoming more deliberate about what we invest in and cultivate, we can begin to break through accumulated layers and re-access states that once seemed buried beneath them. The movement is not a reversal in the simple sense, but a renewed penetration through texture—more like the persistent force of a wave reaching what lies beneath the surface than a return to an untouched past.

When you can focus like this, you being the initiating factor, internal resonance occurs throughout your system ultimately effecting you biologically.

2.0 Reading Between the Lines: Cross-Domain Pattern Recognition as Method

2.1 The Subcategory Principle

Any investigative focus point of belief connects the rest of existence to that focus point functionally — like a subcategory. The moment you center your inquiry on a discipline, a tradition, or a framework, everything else becomes organized relative to that center. This is not a flaw. It is how observation works. But it means that every structured system of thought — scientific, theological, philosophical — is presenting a focused cross-section of a larger phenomenon, not the phenomenon itself.

2.2 Redefining "Reading Between the Lines"

Our conventional definition of reading between the lines is exposing hidden meanings. But meanings are definitions, and definitions are custom to the point of observation — they are personal, shaped by the observer.

This raises a necessary distinction: **perception** is what we observe for ourselves — the raw intake, the negative of a photograph before development. **Perspective** is what we project onto others — the developed image, the interpretation extended outward. Perception receives. Perspective transmits. They are not the same operation, and confusing them is where conflict begins.

What reading between the lines *actually* is — stripped of subjective overlay — is **exposing a repetitive pattern**. It is finding the underlying function beneath whatever content you are examining. You are not assuming "this has a deeper meaning than what it says." That assumption is a first-person subjective experience, not a structural fact — and that is precisely where people get confused, argue, and cause conflict.

Cross-domain pattern recognition is the method of reading between the lines. What you are doing is exposing a repetitive rhythm based on details that are already given. There is no hidden meaning to decode. There is a recurring structure to recognize. At least, that's my experience of it.

2.3 The Rhythmic Signature Across Domains

I can look into any domain and expose the same rhythmic patterns. They stand out with the numerical definitions of 1, 3, 7, and 13. But that doesn't mean other patterns do not exist.

Throughout my life, I have discussed my understanding of existence with people from vastly different cultures and belief structures. What we consistently found were similarities. They believe their way. I believe mine. But there was always a moment of recognition — of saying, *this is exactly like this* — when speaking about different religions, traditions, or frameworks. These conversations produced a peaceful connection. There was no rejection, no forcing of ideas upon the other. There was a bridge of similarities.

They still believe in their ways. I still believe in mine. But there is no conflict between us — no judgment measuring the difference of our belief systems. Because **measurement of difference is what causes separation and isolation. Looking at similarities is what causes connection.**

I am not claiming one belief structure is more correct than another. I am saying that we can all exist in peace by looking at the similarities between our differences. If we learn to see the similarities, the argument diminishes — if you want it to. At that point, it becomes a choice: either you want to be a destructive person living in isolation, or you want to live peacefully, preserving your individuality and the freedom to believe in whatever you want — as long as you do no harm.

3. The Problem of Naming

The same underlying patterns expressed in this framework are found across religions and across academia.

Therefore, any individual discipline — whether religious or academic — can claim that the archetypal numbers documented here are the signature of whatever source they identify with.

A Christian could say that the rhythmic signature of 1, 3, 7, and 13 is the signature of God or Christ. A Muslim might say it is the signature of Allah. Science might call it the rhythmic signature of consciousness — perhaps not yet, but that is where the evidence leads, and that is what this paper suggests.

But at the end of the day, what you are arguing about is **name**. Because if the same rhythmic signature appears across domains, it is clear that it is the subjective experience placing personal definition upon it — trying to name what that rhythmic signature *is*. But the rhythmic signature itself is the same phenomenon found in all of these disciplines.

The point is not which label is correct. The point is that all of these avenues should be finding agreement on the similarities instead of the differences. If the focus is exclusively on differences in search of a singular truth, that truth will never be reached — because the process becomes relative to entropy. Identity and definition continue thinning out and separating into finer observational categories until they become so neutral, so universal, that there is a conflict of identity. At that point, the system

either accepts or denies. Transcends or collapses. And collapse here means recursiveness — starting the cycle over again.

3.1 The Investigative Limit

If science identifies the fundamental waveform and theology rediscovers the vibration — which is the Word of God — then there still lacks a definition of exactly *what those things are*. Therefore the identity of those vibrations and waveforms must be investigated again. These things have been written about continuously throughout history. In philosophy, metaphysics, mythology, and ancient religious traditions — Egyptian, Greek, and beyond — the numerical progressions are present.

To try to prove God, or to try to prove consciousness, I can comfortably say will never happen in the way that people hope. The reason is that in order to define consciousness — or to find God, which would be the presence of existence that created everything — you must have an outside perspective in order to identify it. But there is no outside perspective. Only inside.

Therefore, the very best approach we have to defining existence is by identifying its repetitive rhythmic patterns — through a process of deconstruction, or what I call **following the breadcrumbs**.

3.2 The Methodological Claim

I do not deny any part of existence. It is unfortunate that we have been taught to choose one thing over the other. But the very action of saying *you must choose one over the other* is a statement that acknowledges the existence of two halves of one whole.

To choose one over the other means you are rejecting the other — treating it as though it means nothing to you. There is still an acknowledgment of its existence, but there is a deflection from it. A deflection from something that exists. You do not want to understand it from the other perspective, to see how it makes sense functionally. Instead, you invest in a third-person aspect — what something *looks like* from the outside — rather than understanding it from the inside, functionally, where the rhythmic patterns are present. And therefore, you will never see how these two things work in tandem.

This is why cross-domain pattern recognition — reading between the lines of existence itself — is not one method among many. It is the only method capable of approaching the whole without fragmenting it into competing claims.

4. The Tandem That Cannot Be Divided

Consider the most fundamental pair of opposites in existence: life and death. You cannot choose one over the other. You *will* experience both, because they work in tandem. Yet entire cultures celebrate death while many others are consumed by fear of it — and that fear is a product of how we define it, not what it is.

Death is inevitable. Everyone knows this. But we do not engage with death as a structural function. We engage with it through the details of its occurrence. Some cultures celebrate death as the completion of a cycle, some do not. We may find ourselves asking, *why did this happen*. We may say, *they were too young, too healthy, it doesn't make sense*. We ask, *why did God do that*, or *why do I keep losing people in my life*. We judge causes as "natural" or "unnatural," as though the label changes the structural outcome.

What goes unrecognized is that after every death — no matter how it is judged — it affects everyone connected to the occurrence in such a way that their lives change. It was a functional component. A stimulus for change. This is not a justification for tragedy. It is not a claim that it is acceptable for a child to die or for someone to be murdered. It is an observation that the function operates regardless of how we categorize or judge the event.

This resonates with expressions found across traditions: "*God has a plan for everyone*" [117] — you simply may not know what that plan is or how it unfolds. "*Ask and thou shall receive*" [118]. "*Be careful what you wish for*" [119]. These are not empty platitudes. They are phenomenological descriptions of how a system that operates in tandem — life and death, expansion and contraction, observer and observed — responds to the focus of the observer.

The refusal to see both halves as functional components of one whole is the same refusal described throughout this framework: measuring difference instead of recognizing similarity. Choosing one side

of the coin and pretending the other does not exist. But the coin does not stop being a coin because you refuse to flip it.