Addendum to *Are You Thinking what I Am Thinking*.

Introduction to addendum

The reason for this addendum to *Are You Thinking What I Am Thinking* is that it was an 'official' document submitted for review as part of my doctoral thesis. Any addition had to be clearly visible and separate because any alterations to the original would be a lie. The addenda came about as a result of further research and revisions/additions to the conclusions. It was not that there were errors in the original research but rather that all genuine research is a work in progress. Each step is hopefully a little less wrong than the step before, and the next step will be a little less wrong again.

Having identified and explored time and space as the basis for human thinking I wanted to know why? What was so special about time and space that it controlled human thinking? Also there seemed to be more than just 'different use of time and space' to the problem of understanding. Several years and many thousands of words later I settled on an alternative conclusion that has now become this addendum.

Addendum

The first question arising from *Are You Thinking What I Am Thinking* (AYTWIAT) was 'why is intuitive time and space the thinking methodology of human thinking?' Before there could be any resolution to the question why different groups use different mixes of time and space time and space, as used by humans, needed to be understood. There seemed to be a connection here with consciousness because to think a person had to be conscious. Thinking is about making choices. Those choices may be physical choices or intellectual choices but without them there nothing to think about. To have choices there has to be consciousness of those choices, and so consciousness and thinking seemed to be intertwined.

This led back to Hegel's three levels of consciousness and the nature of consciousness itself. The relevant part of Hegel begins:

> 107. In this pointing out, we therefore see only a movement and the following course of the movement. (1) I point out the Now, and it is asserted to be the true. However, I point to it as something that has been and thus sublate the first truth, and (2) I assert the Now as the second truth, that it has been, that it is sublated. (3) However, what has been is not; I sublate that second truth, that it has been, or, its having-been-sublated, (4) and, in doing that, I negate the negation of the Now and so turn back to the first assertion, namely, that Now is. The Now and the pointing out of the Now are therefore composed in such a way that neither the Now nor the pointing out of the now are what is immediately simple. Rather, they are a movement which has various moments in it; this is posited, but instead it is another which is posited, or the This is sublated, and this otherness, or the sublation of the first, is itself again sublated and in that way returns back to the first. However, as reflected into itself, this "first" is not wholly and precisely the same as what it was initially, namely, an immediate. Rather, it is just something reflected into itself, or a simple which remains

> in otherness what it is, namely, a Now which is absolutely many Nows, and this is the genuine Now, or the now as the simple daytime that has many Nows within it (that is, hours). Such a Now, an hour, is equally many minutes, and it is this Now which is equally many Nows, etc. – Pointing out is thus itself the movement that declares what the Now in truth is, namely, a result, or a plurality of Nows taken together; and pointing out is the experience that the Now is a universal.
>
> Hegel (1979. p.65)

What seems to come out of this is a description of a movie were one frame of the movie is true for the short duration it is on the screen but is supplanted by another truth, and then another and so on. Hegel wrote his description of consciousness almost one hundred years before movies were invented and so would have had no knowledge of movies to use as an explanation of consciousness. This is the problem of reading texts written in another time and place. All texts belong to the history of their writing and need to be read in that context.

If consciousness is like watching (perceiving) a movie space is what exist in this moment, the here and now, and time becomes the movement from one frame to the next. Space and time together become the observable changes to the here and now, and conscious becomes the awareness of the changes to the here and now. Without change there is no movement from one frame to the next and consciousness ceases. If consciousness cease so does thinking.

The quote from Ludwick Fleck, (AYTWIAT p.9) reads:

> One can never say that the same thought is true for A and false for B. If A and B belong to the same thought collective, the thought will be true or false for both. But if they belong to different thought collectives, it will just not be the same thought!

This quote began the research, but it was modified to the different use time and space. This was revisited in the extension to AYTWIAT see if the difference in thinking was in fact a due to the same thought not existing. Was there some force/factor that interrupted the flow of time and space that made it impossible for an individual to think the same thought as another? Before pursuing this question the revised system of thinking needed to be clarified to understand the interruption to thinking.

Thinking is the ability to make choices, and that ability comes from the consciousness of the choices available in the moment. Consciousness comes from observing and measuring change. Change is measured in terms of time and space. From this measurement comes the ability to discern the choices that are available and think about those choices. The consciousness/thinking system becomes a closed loop based on the measuring of change in time and space. Change creates a duality of what was/what is and measuring that duality creates the choices to think about. If this hypothesis is correct then the inability to think a thought would mean that the circular chain has been broken. Since the system relies of the measurement of change in terms of time and space the break in the system must occur in the area of time and space.

The section of AYTWIAT that identified the different use of time and space as the instigator of differences in thinking was the section on fairness versus morality (p.21). As Kant noted thinking in time and space is ‘intuitive’, belonging to the individual. As a result fairness is determined in moment on an individual basis and space and time are whatever the individual

wants them to be. This ‘consciousness’ is highly volatile according to individual whim in the moment. Morality on the other hand is deemed to be system of absolute truth that is fixed in time and space for ever and ever amen. With morality change has ceased (for the follower of that morality system) and so has consciousness because time has been deemed to not exist. Both fairness and morality are judgements, and both interfere with the nature flow of change and hence consciousness. Could it be that judgement leaves a ‘black hole’ in consciousness rendering the person doing the judging incapable of thinking within the area of judgement. In the case of fairness there is a black hole where consciousness rattles around looking for a home that does not exist, and the case of morality time has nailed to a medieval torture rack and rendered incapable of movement. Absence of the consciousness of change in both fairness and morality make any understanding between the two impossible because thinking has ceased for both. Fleck said that the thoughts are not the same thoughts, but it is likely that where there is judgement there are no thought at all. What is left is a ‘blanket’ single answer covering every possibly situation for anything that has been sucked into the black hole. Dogma has replaced thinking.

The analysis of fairness/judgement seems to apply wherever a judgement is made. A judgement such as ‘All men (women) are ….) leaves another black hole in consciousness that renders consciousness of men/women as individuals impossible. Such judgements mean that whenever a man and a woman meet each will ‘see’ only the image of their judgement instead of the person. Judgements based on skin colour leaves another black hole in consciousness. Add in ethnic judgements, religious judgements, and many other judgements such as beauty, money, wealth, and power and before long the black holes join up and all that is left is a biological robot acting only according to a mishmash of judgement. The biological machine may still be operating, creating the illusion of a thinking person, but that thinking is only dogma working the way an algorithm operates a computer. It is entirely robotic. This robotic mishmash of judgements controlling the robot as often sanitised by labelling it a belief system. The biological machine still operates as a machine but there is only a black hole where consciousness and thinking are supposed to reside. The sum of a person’s judgements may add up to a ‘nice’ robot or a ‘nasty’ robot, depending on how nice and nasty are judged, but it is still robotic. Also, where there is a conflict of judgement the robot might switch between nice/nasty chaotically on a random basis depending on what judgement is dominant at any moment.

Whereas ARTWIAT assigned the inability for understanding to exist between groups (extended to people) due to the different use of time and space this addendum has been extend to judgement destroying the measurement of time and space (change). Hence consciousness and thinking has been replaced by unconscious dogma. Change as a universal will continue unabated, but the question is ‘will we (as individuals and collectively) be conscious of those changes and think about what we want to do’ or will we function as robots without any consciousness of time moving on.