

--THIS IS ONLY A DRAFT--THIS IS ONLY A DRAFT--

Aristo Tacoma

ART OF THINKING

Vol. I

The Study of Pure Esthetics

THIS IS A DRAFT OF THE TWO FIRST CHAPTERS OF THIS BOOK

AS PR SEPTEMBER 2017

This is volume one of a five-volume book series.

Published in the Avenuege Library,

by Yoga4d von Reusch Gamemakers, Oslo, Norway

First printing: nnnn

nnn pages

ISBN nnnnnnnnnnnn

Chapter 1

There is no purpose higher than to be aligned to the flow of cosmos itself. For cosmos is intelligent. It takes immense stupidity not to see it, but human thought is sometimes mesmerizing itself into believing that its shoddy little theories about the world far surpasses the world itself. So human thought, intelligent though it can be, may think it is very worthy to resist cosmos. And when many people do this together, they may think it somehow becomes "truer". But, in this case, if the wave is going in the wrong direction, there is no progress in going with it. When the waves blow wrongly, the rock in the water is making progress by being immovable. Meditation is to be as the rock: and from that silent that of being, to act in a new way afterwards, the way of cosmos.

Cosmos means higher order, lofty order. This is not only found in the universe as a whole, but in the golden purity and symmetry of the face of the happy, healthy little girl. So if you wish to study the universe as a whole, you should study esthetics, too--find out about beauty, what it does to you, and why.

These insights may sound simple--and in a certain sense they are, indeed, simple--when expressed in just a few well-chosen, perhaps poetic words. But to live them --that is to say, to be a human being in this complex world and manage to connect, to bridge as it were, the order of all life as a whole with every little as if trivial thing done, is extremely complex and not a thousand thick books do justice to the enormity of the quest, if we were to follow it through to every detail. In seeking to gather these insights into five volumes, we must balance between getting, on the one hand, too general and poetic, and, on the other, too dragged into concrete practical questions. A book only dedicated to doing things practically will lose touch with the higher order. A book dedicated to the pure sense of meditation may be delightful, but on its own it doesn't contribute much to meeting the intricacies of human living.

A word of caution when it comes to applying your sense of what is "common sense" and where to draw the lines between "normal" and "peculiar" behaviour, and in your judgement of whether what we can call the "enlightened" way to live is an easy one or not: circumstances may affect you more than what is obvious. When many people share a hysteria, for instance, the hysteria may be hard to detect. So, for instance, in a society where perhaps such phenomena as "overpopulation" exists--few resources, many compete and

rather hard for them, and luxuries hard to get at, things consistently expensive compared to the quantity of money easily acquired--and so on--meditation may be easily seen as a peculiarity and an extreme and something only for rather introvert people who have "lost touch with the world". But the objective world, in the immediate social sense of the concept, is then too full of pressures that the human mind can easily act rationally. For it is of course irrationality to tag the meditative life as "peculiar". It is "peculiar" only in the sense that it doesn't immediately help a person to get bread, when things have gotten so after all ridiculous as to make such a thing as food one of the topmost concerns of most people.

And in a society in which all important luxuries are available more or less for free, and nobody is hungry, and everybody has a house and an opportunity to select between several reasonably well-paid jobs,--will it not be easy, then, to regard the requirement of "living by intuition" as an unnecessary strict one? When all important goods come as if on their own, without striving? Will one, in such good conditions--which we must indeed all hope for as the stable, realized condition of humanity before too long--sufficiently respect the quality of teaching inherent in the desparateness of not knowing whether one has any place except the hard streets to sleep on, and not any food but what one can pick up here and there, let alone any bath or

shower possibility? The toughness of living conditions may tell a person that integrity and listening to the heart is more important than survival: that greatness of spirit is more important than petty craving for one's own immediate welfare. By such greatness of spirit, intuition may come, the intuition to indeed also take care of oneself in extreme circumstances. This is not to glorify conditions of poverty, but those to whom poverty is but a faint idea, and who live in resplendent luxury, do at least yourself the favour of, by literature and imagination, to find out how you would react to such challenges. Then embrace the luxury and bless the society that gives you it, but do not scoff at the teachings of poverty.

When you have done something nearly right, and then watch, pay attention, but in a flowing, dancing way, there will be an impulse from deep within as it were, to get it fully right. In super-model theory, we call this "PMW", or: The Principle of a tendency of Movement towards Wholeness. So by getting near full harmony, you are helped to get full harmony. Just as a room nearly in order is easy to get fully in order--also easy in terms of motivation--so is being near a state of some form of perfection something that makes extra perfection easy. However, it may be a perfection that is different from that which self-centered individuals have declared to be the "most perfect". It may be an order with a touch of the arrhythmic, the free, the

wild, the dancing movement, and not the sterile order of pompeous thought. In all this exploration of the whole, at times intensely happy, meditative life, then, we must not merely study means but also ends, and be willing to revise our ideas of the ideals, our concepts of ends and goals, and learn more and ever-more. It feels simple, when it is right, and thought about right, but you'll find that most of the things we explore evade the easy formula. So also when I refer to "PMW" in super-model theory: it is a convenient set of words, and what it refers to is actual, at least I think so, but then again it is no cut'n'dried formula, but a living, flowing movement, with a deep rationality that goes beyond mere thinking and also includes feeling, not just inside you but also between you and, ultimately, all other people.

In this exploration, you may also find that what you have since as early as you can remember regard as 'necessities' aren't quite the necessities they seem to be. Since beauty is also an asset, it is hard to dig deep into the subject of beauty, or more deeply, esthetics (or aesthetics) in a way that is profoundly unprejudiced. There may be certain "games" inside your more or less aware thought, aiming at presenting yourself as maximally beautiful to yourself--or maybe even to ditch the importance of the beauty concept in an attempt to revolt against the emphasis that society tends to put on beauty. All these things you must struggle

against, and you will struggle against them, when you are sincere in your wish of an innermost exploration of a more meditative, more whole and more sane and happy life.

In such explorations, it is easy to look to others, and you will find attractive individuals who laugh in an attractive way and smile in an attractive way and who seem very self-assured when they say that they themselves are about as enlightened as can be. They will shower you with advice that may seem rather wise if you ask them questions --especially if you, at some stage in the process, do them the favor of showering them with some money in return, directly or indirectly. Please, if I can be so direct, see through it sooner rather than later: eat a pill so as to get immune against being overtaken by quasi-priests and ridiculous gurus; don't waste your days, where you could do serious study and balanced living in society to be some kind of sect-candidate or worse. These people may have read every book--those who wish to ensnare you--but they will have dots of insincerity that are quite strong for they have made a business or a social life dependent on their spiritual radiance. They cannot afford--literally, perhaps--to doubt themselves all the way through. So only "safe" insights are available in and through their scheme. So prefer businesses that don't sell you spirituality and prefer people who you join not because they have the key to God but because you find them delightful to be with for

whatever more social reason. And then, not making a guru-order out of it, spend time with exploration in quietude: you can do it with others, but they should be equally aggressive as you are against anyone holding their sweaty hands around the enterprise.

The very little child may see such things quickly: she looks at the face, at the hair, at the gestures, and she listens to the ways the person is speaking and laughing, and by a sort of instinct which is both animal and beyond, she just knows when someone is a bogey. But after puberty anxieties may come and pressures to become somebody rather than nobody and so one may close one's mind to such instinctual perceptions. But, please, don't close your mind to such instinctual perceptions. See a phoney person as a phoney one. That's rule number one to make spiritual progress in this life, not just in next life.

Chapter 2

Introduction to chapter 2

I would have liked that all our study of what we can call 'pure esthetics' could happen on the poetic note, entirely consistently, but, alas, it is not so. We shall have to do something as trivial as to engage in the occasional argument against some mainstream thoughts, even though to some this argument is already known. We must do this since because, indeed, it follows that the majority doesn't know it. This concerns such as consciousness and feeling, the question of mind, matter and beyond, and the nature of the body and the limitations of what we have so far seen of postulates coming from the majority of those who, as career, have chosen to be professional biologists of some kind or another. This is, for them, a touchy area, since they may feel that they are defending a form of unpopular "last strand of rationality" in a world beset upon beating down logic and rationality in favour of fairy-tale bibles. Their positions are in the extreme, not because the evidence justifies these extremes, but because they feel emotionally forced to use big language to defend

against the big language of literal believers in the various socalled "holy" scriptures. Whether their strategy works or not is not our concern. The result, however, is clear: neither side has much truth to them.

In addition, in the study of pure esthetics, we need to leave natural language on occasion, to look at numbers, both in abstraction and inside the peculiar formulations we may choose to employ when programming machines, which in turn cast light on numbers and abstract orders--at least when done reflectively. Without some of the hard core of thinking about order also by formal language use, our study could easily become too soft and we don't want to mislead any honorable student into this loftiest of all themes, more or less, towards thinking that sharp logic has no place for the student of beauty. In contrast, beauty is, in a way, the source of all real good logic.

As a third point why not all such study can be told in a poetic and nice tone, as it were, there is the need to look into the nature of human communication also around the affairs of beauty, and how this can have a complexity that is apt to mislead those who do not see through it, and see through also the games people sometimes play, in which that which is said isn't quite intended that way. These things matters because we are, as human beings doing work, and interesting in beauty, affecting each other all the time in various ways, and communication is, at its best, giving us hints as to how well we do our private

studies into all sorts of questions. But when is this communication reliable, and when is it the opposite of reliable, and rather something that should be seen through for what it is? This, too, is an area that requires a more sober form of talking, not necessarily musical or poetical but necessary as foundation to lay the ground for the more musical things we do in life, I would say.

There may be still more reasons why the poetic style of language isn't enough to guide is all the way in this study but these should suffice, I should think.

In this chapter, then, we will look into, and not for the last time in this book series with its five volumes dedicated to the Art of Thinking, three themes: First, about the physical foundations of feeling and mind; second some hints about how one can begin to think about beauty while one also thinks about abstract orders; and third, what we can call 'games of the self'.

2A. PHYSICAL FOUNDATION OF FEELING AND MIND

In the theory of physics, the way I personally summarize it all, at a highly general level, and in what I call "super-model theory", the universe is not a machine and nothing inside this universe is ONLY a machine. We may take bits of matter from Nature and put together to do certain tasks like washing dishes or calculating our business budgets, but these bits of matter work only as a machine for a while, and after that while they change and refuse to continue to function as a machine. Since humans have had such an immense series of successes in making machines it isn't strange at all that there's an almost equal immense series of books purporting to show that mostly all "is" a machine--your body, your mind, the whole universe. But if you feel that this approach is wrong, and spirituality usually has that as a strating-point, then you will be told that, for instance, God made your body and your mind is essentially a divine and immortal soul and while that seems to be a pleasing alternative theory, it seems a little abstract to most. As a result, we have got what can be seen as 'political camps'. On the one hand, we have those who cling to machine (and coincidence) oriented theories about life and its origin, and who, quite often, refuse even to use the word 'theory' about their viewpoint--it is simply fact, reality, truth (cfr

those, for instance, who won't speak of Theory of Evolution but only "Evolution", just as in physics, the phrase "Theory of Relativity" for some became just, "Relativity"). And on the other hand, we have those who expose faiths of various sorts, and a majority does this in a way that is equally devoid of refinement.

Eventually, after decades of hard polemics between groups in the various societies, East and West, North and South, it became, of course, a matter of career not to even hint of faint belief in the validity of the opposing camp or camps. Those who have had time to think over what science, according to the most idealistic theories of science ought to be, know that one of the first principles is to stay attuned to the multiplicity of perspectives and the willingness to engage in dialogue and regard any set of data as something that can be interpreted by numerable theories. Without caution and openness rationality declines, and professional scientists become much like priests although the language and methods differ from the conventional, openly spiritual priests. The word "secterian" also comes to mind--and the word "cult". Science as cult is not science.

The few people who have avoided being taken in by any of these camps and who also have pursued grand philosophical questions with passion, have come up with many worthwhile theories of the physical foundations of consciousness and feeling and intuition and all sorts of things like that.

With my particular interest in physics, and the complete summary that I did through my super-model theory, I find myself at ease with thinking about these things through certain vocabularies and certain ideas that may or may not resonate with some of the works of the people who have sought alternatives to the literalist camps. To save time, I will not here (also because I have done that fairly well elsewhere) fill up with references to these, but simply state what I think is realistic, and use more or less my own language for this--as concerns the physical reality of such as feelings. And I will do this quickly, but with the intent that what is perhaps not so clearly put here at first, will become more and more clear as you work through all the five volumes.

Let me say, strongly, first though, that while I think what I next say is right, there is but thin flimmers of evidence for these views in mainstream science. I daresay that a millenium of active hunting for such evidence by people of a totally different mind-set than those found in these societies around us at present would be necessary to bring forth the type of hard measurement results that count as evidence in the toughest approaches to science.

Let's begin, then. Your mind is composed of several levels. One of these levels is the brain and its body, or the other way around--the body and its brain; but some would say that we should include heart and genitals and so on and not just speak of 'body'. The body includes the

brain, at any rate,--they are entwined in a myriad ways, and in many cases you can read much of the state of your brain by attending to all aspects of the rest of the body. You can also sense something of the total sum of all your insights relative to all your priorities by listening to --or attending to--the sense of harmonious heat, or lack thereof, around your navel region or above.

Thinking, then, involves these several levels, sometimes more of them, and sometimes fewer of them; sometimes in parallel, and at other times somewhat divided. And thinking goes, of course, always together with feeling, and this means that you are feeling on several levels simultaneously. Some of these levels may appear to your "day-consciousness" rather quiet and silent, like hints or whispers or intimations. But seen on their own--and dreams may be indication of this--they are not at all just hints or whispers seen by themselves. In a way, then, your brain involves an activity that is letting itself be informed by activity on a more subtle level than the brain.

What is this more subtle level? It is not usual matter, so normal material measurement isn't going to give much insight into it unless it is understood that it is a very indirect way of getting at it. This more subtle level is real without being made of typical matter-and-energy-as-we-know-it. And in super-model theory it is called, then, a 'super-model'. Matter is one form of super-model, or, more precisely, a whole category or grup or class of them,

but there are many other forms of super-models as well.

Your brain, and indeed your whole body, is a structure of matter, a structure of a certain type of super-models. But your consciousness has deeper structures, woven by super-models of a different kind. In order for your brain and your day-consciousness to relate to these subtler levels you need what we may call a 'pure mind', and this state of consciousness is associated with meditation and the direct, somewhat stunning experience of beauty, when it comes to you as a pleasant, overwhelming sensation and surprise, that at once brings a new wholeness to your sense of life, yourself and the world.

To simplify this language, we can speak of "q-fields". The phrase is inspired, of course, by the word "quantum", and the way we can use the phrase "q-field" is as a convenient, snappy synonym for "super-models". But usually we can speak of q-fields when we in particular refer to just those super-models that are not quite manifest or not manifest at all--but typically in contact with your manifest brain. The word "manifest" roughly means, "what can be touched". It is typically used in contrast to the word "subtle", which in roots refers to what is "finely woven".

When you think hard about something, you set up a q-field. But when you don't try to think hard about something, but relax, a q-field may present itself. So this is a two-way communication--put very crudely indeed--

and as metaphor only--repeat, as metaphor only--the brain is a transmitter/receiver of the waves of q-fields. But this is a metaphor because radio waves are super-models of which matter is composed, put very simply. Your brain is a transmitter and a receiver of stuff more subtle than radio waves, more subtle than energy and matter in the normal manifest sense.

Usually, the q-fields you radiate may easily not amount to much. Sometimes, however, a group of people may create a sort of swirling set of q-fields, especially if not too many people are involved, and these q-fields can intensify enough that they can move together with some degree of coordination that seems to be, and which, in accordance with my understanding of physics through super-model theory, may well be somewhat telepathic.

Q-fields may also roam into the processes that are about to unfold, and relay information back. A person who often experiences this in a credible way may be said to be somewhat of a 'precog'--a word used also in science fiction for people who are engaging in 'precognition'--ie, the reading of the future, or the likely future. Such is fairly to imagine possible once we have accepted the basic tenets of super-model theory.

The pathway from this to suggesting that souls and spirits and such can be considered real enough--as particular q-fields--is a short one. This doesn't mean that any literalist interpretation of classical religions

have got it right. I am merely saying that, first of all, it's a logical possibility, and not one that breaks with the principle of rationality and logic and weighing evidence. Secondly, I am saying that personally I think it is fruitful and indeed also fitting with reality to concede reality to some sort of soul and some sort of spirit. My intuition is that something, which more or less may match something of what in English is called "soul", may be in a sense "nearest" your brain/body, in terms of q-fields, but that there is more to your subtle natures than this. And this more is yet more subtle and may have a more lofty and also hard-to-get-at and more spiritual function, and the word "spirit" is another one of those used in classical religious literature which can have some such meaning as may more or less match reality here.

Beyond the levels of souls and spirit there is logically room for very many more levels and, in a way, "dimensions" --including beings reminiscent of that which in classical religious literature is called "angels", and including also a source-being such as "God". This source-being may be a set of q-fields but also the being beyond even the most subtle q-field, somehow conjuring up the whole structure of it all as easily, perhaps, as we may close our eyes during a rest and conjure up a sense of some sort of very familiar landscape or area or set of people.

Indeed, my intuitions, as I have indicated earlier in this volume and elsewhere, are supporting the notion of a

personal God, and concede also that this God has something Zevs-like to him, and is more a "him" than a "her"; and that there are myriad, and many more than there are humans, angel-like beings which I intuit can very well be called "muses". My intuition doesn't support the notion of more gods than one, but give the muses capabilities and beauty infinitely beyond mere manifest humans.

Further my intuitions is that manifest reality is set up through intense but lovely work by all these supreme beings. The supreme beings--Zeus, or God, and his muses--have, of course, as many machines of whatever type they like at their service, and it would seem only natural that they have an excess of available computers, made not by manifest matter but by what we can call subtle matter.

These computers are greatly important not only in erecting the stability of the manifest universe, or, more precisely, universes or "multiverse"--for I sense that there are other universes in parallel, though all united by the efforts of the same set of core supreme beings--but they are also involved in projections as to likely outcomes, which are then meditated upon by the supreme beings. The results of these meditations are fed back into the computers and so suitable changes in the otherwise more machine-like flow of the universe are introduced.

For instance, the myriad instances of apparent evidences of a gradual evolution of life through much of what mainstream scientists could call "experiments of Nature",

I regard as one of the particular features of matter as these supreme beings have created it. Put more strongly, it is there in order to confuse, in order to make the materialistic argument strong enough that the type of wildness that humans attain to when they feel that they are their own masters, in a way, becomes a factor in society to be reckoned with. This creates, in turn, a much more interesting type of environment and a more creatively diverse type of people than the types of societies associated with dogmatic creationist religions, in which the only authority is the Man with the Book who repeats, ad infinitum, that God and his beings made this universe and that's all the population in the universe need to know and think about. The teaching, in other words, of the type of arrogance that could lead to more interesting results for these supreme beings, could only attain strength if there were much ground to doubt the existence of these supreme beings. In their supremacy, it was of course extremely easy for them to shape matter so that it has in it the appearance of billions of years of gradual change and that life structures have involved, one by one, in a sort of crazy set of chance-permutations, rather than by a design in which the supreme beings wished to see, as it were, shadows of themselves reflected upon manifest matter.

So all this I consider likely and realistic but it is so "far out" compared to any mainstream you'd care to listen

to in the present societies you have around, that you will do well in not shouting this thesis around but keep it rather to yourself unless it is called for in a truly positive open-minded spiritual dialogue with other people. I say, however, that your intuition will be much strengthened--that is, your capacity to pick up facts, whether from the future or far away in the present, beyond mere reasoning or guesswork--will be much strengthened if you have some such theory like the one just sketched of the overall physical foundations of consciousness and feeling.

2B. BEGINNINGS OF PURE ESTHETICS

What the world is composed of naturally strives to realize some sort of sublime spiral, which may be pointed to by a drawing of a spiral but which perhaps more strongly pointed to by something that in a way incorporates the spiral indirectly. In super-model theory, the chief principle of change is called the PMW, or Principle of a tendency of Movement towards Wholeness, and it is an axiom that this is not a machine-like principle--ie, it is beyond the computer, at least in its essence. Therefore, also, the word 'tendency' is inside the full sentence, to which PMW refer. The idea of a spiral is that of beginning with the full embracing of what we have at hand, in front of us, and continuing effortlessly to some sort of infinity, within it and above it. The play, or dance, of similarities and contrasts in ever-greater refinement, suggests the word 'wholeness', or what in German is called a 'Gestalt'. The artistic touch, as we may put it, of this principle suggests that in the shaping of forms of life, there's a natural tendency for what we may, indeed, call beautiful or esthetical forms to arise. In the study of what we call 'pure esthetics', we are concerned with beauty in its essence more than what particular form it may take in this or that context. This essence invites a

sense of the the infinite, the beyond-materialistic, and a meditation on the vastness of cosmos.

It is, in other words, a postulate of this author that cosmos, the totality of existence, isn't in any way a 'neutral' structure, but rather pulsating with an intent to realize this natural tendency of wholeness; and it is part of this intent that this infinite unfolding happens on the premise of meaningful diversity for a uniform wholeness isn't as naturally whole, not as naturally a suggestive pointer to the spiralling towards infinity, as a wholeness that is experienced as constrained and compromised to fit a narrow definition of it.

In considering these thoughts, you may find yourself wondering how a cosmos at all can have such subtle considerations as those just given--ie, when is a wholeness 'too uniform' to be a wholeness, and, on the other hand, when is a wholeness 'too diverse' to be a wholeness? Surely these types of considerations are more human and cultural--for they belong to the artistic sentiment of the human mind and the flow of consciousness. But, in considering this, let us bear in mind that the human mind exists inside cosmos and does so without having been constructed by any person around us--in other words, somehow cosmos gives rise to the flow of consciousness, and whatever principles are involved in it so doing, it may be that human consciousness in its flow, when at its best, is a sort of ripple in an ocean of very subtle

considerations and deep sentiments indeed--that it is, as I believe Plato could have said, some sort of shadow of a sort of light that is beyond the light that is in front of our eyes.

A cosmos, indeed, that comes from the supremely consciousness activity of a Zeus-like God and his muses is clearly bursting with subtle insights from the starting-point, and with such a worldview, the mystery is perhaps not as much where the human mind in its greatness comes from, but why it is not even greater than it often is (which leads us to the third part of this chapter, the games people play).

To explore the idea of spiral as one of the key concepts in the pursuit of pure esthetics, let us consider the idea of the golden ratio--spontaneously or consciously invoked, quite often, by the greatest of artists and photographers, and probably naturally at play in every kind of beauty perception in between humans and in the human perception of waves and nature. The golden ratio is, just as with the spiral, stronger when hinted at in the dance of forms rather than when stated too obviously. We can, with computer programs in G15 PMN, study some numbers in this context.

For instance, when we add the two last numbers of a series that is expanded, for, say, up to ten or fifteen numbers, with just this sum--and the sum then added to the sum before it, we get numbers of this sort:

1 2 3 5 8 13 21

Here, we started with '1' and '2', but the same effect arises by starting with '1' and '1'. Consider how, after 3, we get to 5; and that after 5, we get a jump to the even number 8. And so the proportion, which we can explore on a calculator program, of, for instance, 800 divided on 5, or 1300 divided on 8, or 2100 divided on 13--where you add more zeroes for more precision--tend to approach approach 161, and, a little higher up, and with one more digit, about 1618. This means that when you cut a square into a rectangle so that one side is about 5 and the other side is about 8--a proportion of, with decimals, not far from 1.618--you have a structure that when looked at in a certain way, can be mentally cut up as is indefinitely in smaller and smaller rectangles of just the same proportion --something you can do manually a couple of time by a clean, precise cut away of a perfect square off the long side of the rectangle. Try it! Take a square away from a rectangle of proportion 8:5 and you have a new rectangle, again with the proportion 8:5. It so happens that our eyes perform this, whether we like it or not, automatically as it were. It just happens. The spiral, then, is in some almost magical way hinted at by the perfectly static shape of the 8:5 square. And so it isn't perhaps surprising that there is something tantalizing about such proportion when encountered in the perception of a face, a body, a dance, in seeing waves, or, carried to the level of tones, in

music, in a voice, and so on to whatever domain we can perceive in.

The similarities and contrasts involved in the golden ratio--as this has aptly been called for a long time in the English language--can be studied also on their own, in what we can call a 'branch' of the study of the golden ratio, where similarities of shapes, and contrasts of shapes that are similar, play upon each other in such as a photograph, and all the more so when it is conveying an overall sense of beauty and natural order. Waves as seen out on the water on a beach, or, on a windy day, poolside, can be seen to be 'fractal' in this way: that big waves like so much like the small waves that if we didn't have cues from the landscape with which to compare them, it would be hard to tell whether a wave is big or small, and, indeed, whether we are very near tiny waves or very far away from gigantic waves. Rocky places have similar features; clouds have similar features; and every painter more or less spontaneously wishes to roam in the fractal when great art is coming forth.

This is called 'fractal' because, after the dawn of the era of computers, it was explored first in the contexts of certain formulae and the initial patterns found were given specific names and the new field in mathematics called 'fractal geometry'. But it soon carried over into normal daily-life English and became a concept of a far more general and more artistic caliber, and the way we use it,

as said, is to denote as it were a field or a branch within a more general study of the golden ratio. We set the study of the golden ratio higher because it points to infinity--not only by means of smaller and smaller forms within a form that exhibits such a ratio, but also by means of larger and larger forms,--and a key feature is similarity of form across scale; and, in an artistic pursuit, we do not demand exact similarity. And the fact that fractal forms in Nature very often aren't exact--just as no two clouds beside one another are totally similar--makes these phenomena naturally seen under one heading.

The study of pure esthetics has, then, beginnings in a natural sense of the universe as not just pervaded by some kind of beauty, but also in a way shaped according to a tendency of natural inclination towards it, and takes on concrete forms as we look into beauty also as explored through the orders of whole numbers and computer programs; and in all this pursuit, we find that artistic talents are not only welcome but a great contribution to our meditations, and, in turn, can be strengthened by our meditations. This is then, a study that in some way is one of the chief foundations in the even grander pursuit of the Art of Thinking, which is the collective title of all these five volumes, of which this is the first volume, dedicated, as you know, to esthetics.

2C. GAMES OF THE SELF, AND THE OTHER, BETTER KIND OF GAMES

The next couple of paragraphs are chiefly for those who already have studied this theme in the light of a classic from the 1960s. If you are new to the theme, you can just briefly browse through the next paragraphs and read more seriously when the games of the self and such are being discussed on their own, without reference to that book.

Though my treatment of games is at some points very different from Eric Berne's, there is little doubt that most people could benefit from a study of his classic book "Games People Play" (USA, 1964). One of the differences is that I, unlike Berne, do not have the therapy situation as starting-point; and, so, to me, the word "game" isn't automatically meaning anything in need of therapy. Rather, what Berne calls "good games"--and to which he dedicates finely little attention--is that which I would like to call just "game". When the games involves something of the kind of serious and deliberate misleading of other people, such as occupies Berne's attention most of the time, I would call it "games of the self" or "a game of the self".

In addition, I do not automatically prescribe the role of the "parent" into the games of the self and would prefer that this concept isn't invoked automatically when complex games of the self should be described. Rather, I

would suggest the use of the word "nanny", because it is more general and it sums up fairly neatly the type of attitudes that Berne wishes to summarize and which are invoked in some of the games (of the self).

There are several more points of difference, but for those who are fortunate enough to have time to study his book, I would also call attention to what I take to be his somewhat perhaps too-rapid tendency to interpret a certain type of behaviour along his scheme of games in a definite way, when the behaviour might be an expression of much more complex motivations and indeed also many layers of games, not all of them bad. I will return to this point in my own description of games in what follows, without presuming that Berne's work on the subject matter has been studied. But there is little doubt that there is intimations of greatness in his book, and exciting perspectives--such as the role of the 'child' versus the 'adult' and what he calls 'parent' but we can call 'nanny' as, as it were, subject characters in also healthy communication and play including sexuality. This is daring stuff for a 1960s America and he is drawing on insights worked out by Freud many decades earlier, work which on just such points perhaps have been little understood in our mainstream cultures, now, much later.

Now the word 'self'--it has many uses, from the common usage of it to refer to such as one's own person without

implying any judgement at all, to lofty uses, when for instance C.G. Jung refers to "the self" as something higher and more sublime than Freud's "ego" and, indeed, more like what we earlier in this book have called "soul" or even "spirit", and all the way to the judgemental use of the word in such normal English words as "selfishness", in which the opposite, unselfishness, is taken to mean generosity, altruism, dedication to a noble cause, and more such wise and virtuous things. As I use the word "ego", it is to me rather synonymous with "self" in this sense of being overly self-centered,--and when I call on the expression "games of the self", we might as well say "games of the ego" but somehow "self" seems to fit the expression more. After all, "self" is a more quiet word, as it were, than "ego", and so the attention, upon hearing the expression "games of the self", naturally goes to the first word in it, namely "games".

My use of the word "self" in this way here doesn't mean that I think it is necessarily a bad idea to use it to mean something far more noble and wise along the lines of such as Jung (or as in such as Hinduism) in a different context.

So what are the games of the self? They are a certain type of games--in most games, there is a sense of one or more people pretending something. If you play a game by yourself in your leisure, such as an innocent shooting

game at the PC, you are in a way pretending that you really are shooting and that you are somehow getting some burdensome real elements away that way. This creates a certain excitement, a certain hypnosis also, that makes the emotions come along and all in all it can be a great relief--rather as some forms of shadow boxing can--from whatever was on the mind in terms of slightly frustrating impulses to begin with.

In many games, as part of this pretence, usually, there is also the necessity to be seeming to aim at something while in fact aiming at something else. In an elementary form, this may be found even in the simplest computer shooting games, in which a lingering near some objects on the screen may activate the 'counter-fire' from these objects while you are really intending to rush over to some other objects entirely and 'get them', as if 'by surprise'. Such lack of advertisement of own intentions is a well-known feature of certain card-games between humans; while there are also games in which a concealment of intentions matters not at all.

Games typically have some kind of score--even if it is only the digital either/or of winning or not over one other agent, whether real or imaginary; but then there can be several such digital games in succession and so a score can accumulate--let's say, 5 to 1. And the score numbers somehow--strangely enough, we might say, consider that many people regard numbers as purely abstract things when

asked--convey themselves rather directly to our emotions. (This depends, though, on the shape of these numbers and that they make direct sense and are not numbers composed of so many digits that they can hardly be pronounced or compared with each other.)

Games of many kinds--both the games of the self, and games which are more, shall we say, innocent,--may very naturally tie in to money, for instance as connected to the score--and then again, the money is expressed in terms of numbers that easily come to mean something, in some cases enormously much, in emotional terms. But that games are naturally interesting for every human being virtually from birth is clear: indeed there is plenty of child-research that indicates just this. Games can be exciting even if the outcome is fairly abstract, such as a score number, and this excitement is part of the playfulness of growing up and learning (a point my friend Francis Frode Steen has emphasized very clearly).

Games, then, in general, is part of the movement that is inherent in life, mind, consciousness, and indeed this sense of movement may be philosophically considered to be a sort of ground of consciousness (a point made very clear by my friend Henrik B. Tschudi over many conversations).

Can we somehow make an abstract, formal scheme and say, "this is what a game is--this is what any game is"? Is there a formula for the construction or analysis of games in the final sense? I doubt it. There is no formula for

beauty. There is also no formula that can replace the game concept, that can take away the need for an intuitive discussion of games. Games, indeed, are part of the perceptive processes of mind, being, soul, spirit. Kids typically laugh hundreds of times each day,--they see hints of games everywhere. You can tell a kid that two plus two is five and, with luck, evoke great laughter. But next day that is no longer a game, it's a worn-out joke; so the mind grows on games and gets also beyond certain definite games; while other types of games may be of a nature that makes them have a more perennial or 'eternal' appeal.

The games of the self are the types of games that involves a sense of deliberately misguiding communication and false premises to achieve something which for a person or a set of persons isn't deserved, but which gratifies this person or these persons. I used the phrase "a sense of" before I said "deliberately misguiding communication" because it is my understanding that in a vast number of important cases, people slip into doing it without there being much conscious thinking about it. In particular, this happens when several people, typically a small group of less than ten, does it together. This can set up a tremendous q-field (to use the term introduced a little earlier in this chapter), so that people are as if rather spontaneously doing 'the right thing' to mislead some others in ways suitable to extract some benefit to is pleasing to their egos. It is a feature of all games, as

we have already said, that these engages the emotions, and it is also a feature of most games of the self that the emotions are in them, and playing along in various ways-- which in turn can act to further confuse the situation, also for those playing the games of the self most intensely.

For instance, the person may, after playing a game of the self a little bit--a game that may have had a past going back months or much longer, and which is imagined to go on perhaps for at least a similar stretch of time--feel so filled by emotions that fit the false premises of the communication processes so well that there can be a reflection that this is, after all, not false. In other words, games of the self involves thoughts and words and gestures that, however dishonest they are in their source within the psyche of the individual, lead to emotions that certainly are very real indeed, and that may seem to give some "reality" or "fact" credibility to the whole activity pattern of the person, when the person is playing the game of the self.

Put more simply, a game of the self involves a set of actions, thoughts and emotions flowing almost as a whole through the person, or through the persons, so as to get a certain satisfaction even though this is destructive to others and ultimately, in some way--at least morally--to themselves.

As if this isn't complex enough, games can have several

levels: they can be as complex as thought itself. And once we give examples, we are tying the games to the present cultures and the present contexts and we are no longer speaking about games, and games of the self, in the most timeless sense.

For instance, real games, in which the premises surrounding the communication processes are honest enough, --even if it is understood that within the action of the game there may be pretence and such--may take place as it were "on top" of games of the self, partly in order to confuse the people who may suspect that they are exposed to games of the self.

But who can say what is deserved and what is undeserved in this world? You see, that is a question that at once calls on worldview: an atheist probably would say that "anything goes if you can get away with it"--and the "getting away" simply refers to the understanding that other people have, or haven't, of what you are doing. But a world made by some kind of intelligent design by highly perceptive and feeling and intending and thinking supreme beings surely has some kind of coordinates for what is deserved and what is not. In tune with the latter worldview, that of a Zeus-like god and his many muses, I have coined (I think) the word "goyon"--roughly inspired by a combination of the word "good" and the word of the female tantric organ, "yoni". Goyon, then, is that which you can and in a sense should accumulate, in a positive sense, by

good and meaningful actions. That makes you reap something positive, e.g. by synchronicities, the coincidences that may for you have deep meaning and that can come along, in this case, with real benefits.

Suppose, then, one or more people collude in a game of self to rob you of something you deserve, according to your goyon: in this worldview, we can surmise that this will reduce their goyon sufficiently that they don't get any real benefit from it after all, while, if you relate to the challenge wisely, and the way Socrates said--"it's better to suffer injustice than to do injustice"--you will yourself perhaps get twice as much benefits when all comes to all, and when time permits. But this must also then be a teaching that tells you to be careful about these games of self, and name them for what they are when you find yourself perhaps coerced by circumstances beginning to play them against someone.

The analysis of a game into an interplay between "the adult in you"--who more comments than judges, and "the child in you"--who is impulsive, creative, but also sometimes craving for nanny-support and comforting words, and the "nanny in you"--who may direct or condemn or, in a parental or teacher-like way, approve of another, is part of the story, part of the thinking we can do about games. And in this light, the statement, "let us speak between ourselves as adults speak to one another"--and similar such statements--may help to clarify the thoughts of all

people present, including those who may perhaps without conscious plan slip into playing the games of the self. Yet, we should remember that such rules of thumb do not apply always, and that just as we can say, spiritually, that "the ego"--as a kind of virus on the otherwise perfect human mind--re-invents itself and become more cunning even as the rest of the mind becomes better at beating it,--so also are games constantly and deeply re-invented in the human psyche, and that includes the games of the self. It is a common expression but the need for infinite further analysis--and synthesis--is clearly there; without there being any final analysis, synthesis, or scheme or formula for it.

In the hope, though that we can be as it were "warriors against the ego"--including our own, innermost, "secret" games of the self,--I think that regular contact with the language of games, and not in the least the language of the games of the self--that is to say, with words that are meant to clarify what really goes on in these processes--will help towards a meaningful personal growth.