

Email Correspondence 2003–2005

02/11/03

thoughts on Mute article

Dear John,

I'm looking forward to seeing flat time ho. Hope the final touches have been added by now and work well. I thought the interview with you and Barbara in Mute was quite a good off the cuff airing of your views. Here are some thoughts about what physicists or philosophers might think or want to ask on the basis of reading the article:

Physicists will most likely say they recognise a distinction between the temporal and atemporal in that they take theories and laws to be atemporal. They will say that the laws they are attempting to discover match the universe they are observing but can't explain why there is any universe with those laws. In addition to a set of laws, an ultimate theory will state boundary conditions, e.g. a specification of physical parameters at a first moment. Such a theory can only describe the boundary conditions, not explain why they are as they are. A theory might purport to explain why there was a Big Bang in terms of random fluctuations in a quantum vacuum. But this doesn't explain the boundary conditions as it just pushes the question back to why there was a quantum vacuum in the first place. On this popular view, certain facts, such as that there is a universe at all, and the fact that the universe is the way it is and not another way are contingent, i.e. without explanation (unless one goes in for theistic explanations). Similarly it might be thought that a give atemporal score can only describe the observed structure and boundary conditions of the universe, not explain why there is any universe enacting the score, or why there was a least event. Is this your view, or do you think there can be an explanation of why there is a universe, why it has the structure it has, or why there was a least event?

When it comes to the third component of time – time-base, physicists might say that they are aware of the possibility of temporal discreteness, but do not yet have evidence suggesting it, and don't see why your model of a temporally discrete universe should be helpful in understanding the actual world. And they are likely to say that their subject is exclusively concerned with the bottom end of the spectrum, while the other bands are the concern of chemists, biologists, geologists, psychologists, economists, sociologists, and theologians. For although they look at galaxies through telescopes, their aim is to come up with a theory of microphysics, or the lowest band on the spectrum, upon which all else depends in this sense: If one had a complete description of the universe in microphysical, or lowest band, language, then all the rest would be derivable from it. In other words, there could not be a possible universe that is a replica of this one with regard to microphysics or the lowest band, but which is different in respect to what goes on in the other bands. This picture is now widely accepted and there doesn't seem to be any good evidence against it. Current understanding of how the brain works, for

example, appears to be fully consistent with currently accepted electro-chemical laws. There appears to be nowhere in the brain where these laws are overridden because of any ideas of the person whose brain it is. I think that many will prick up their ears at the suggestion that space and time are derivable from a more primitive extendedness. But they will want to see you carefully lay out this derivation without using other words like 'then', 'first', 'second', 'next' which appear to assume that we already understand a notion of passing time. And they will want to know how to interpret the difference between seeing a single circle, and a line of circles typed across a page, without already understanding the notion of space.

Well I hope this comes across as reasonably clear and possibly helpful in preparing a meeting with Dana and others. Keep me in touch about news and dates.

Love, NOa

3/08/03
Re: news

Dear John,
Do send a draft of your answers to my questions for the website, or your plans for the talk at the London Institute. ...
Love, Noa

4/02/03
Re: news

Hallo N back in Calgary.

...

The text proposed so far for website runs:

introducing "flat time"

regarding 'sources of human action ..'.

"we cannot construct even false scientific theories about them"

Chomsky 1976

"the trajectory of art has delivered a numerate cosmology of 'person'"

JL 1991

The Incidental Person artist and the interests of global order

The media language and money have brought the world to the edge of an abyss.

A series of forms as art found to succeed zero action works (Cage, Rauschenberg 1951) was kickstarted in 1954 by the unit of mark made by a spray gun. The image was seen as a history, valid for any period in time, touching off a scientific enquiry and generating an unforeseen dimensional framework in terms of time and event. This has the apparent capacity to map all action, from proto-universe (U1) to complex universe (Unow) in which we exist..

As “flat time” the series defines the architecture of a Reflective Intuitive Organism (RIO).

Summary of the Flat Time (FT) argument We hear that theory of physics (TP) entails an unresolved contradiction (‘a singularity’)

To this dilemma the TP department of Imperial College London has introduced a concept of two kinds of time, acknowledging a basic FT art work as its physical expression (TIME-BASE ROLLER ‘72)

As interpreted from the forms as art, FT affords a third time-related component, an omnipresent ‘State O’. This concept is legitimised by a solution in general relativity (Einstein 1915) which shows all matter to collapse to a state <zero space, zero time, infinite temperature.

Physicists and philosophers often disregard such a result as inconceivable. In art however the result describes precisely its own dimensionality, now presented as an event structural envelope system, and diagrammatically as a “flat time” plane.

FT proposes this envelope to arise not from a ‘vacuum’ but from a proto-unit of action OI-IO, where OI is Impulse (to extend) and -IO is the discharge of Impulse. The State O source of Impulse is found in art (eg in music) as score, (the memory referent for, and ordering source of a performance). The two kinds of time argued by the ICTP physicists as ‘being and becoming’ are event-structurally thought of as
(a) count or clock time, and
(b) rhythm, recurrent states as entities

The third, informing component, shows up as the product of these, (the flat time plane).

The OI-IO principle as proto-universe U1 through to current Unow, may compare with characteristics of physics’ quantum concept, and with theologies.

A currently derelict philosophical base:

Whereas in verbal logic the condition <zero space zero time infinite heat cannot be imagined, adopting the dimensionality OI-IO, the conclusion is rational, logical and necessary. It proposes that Universe Unow has a prehistory as ‘Insistently Recurrent Accretive Event’, from a U1 origin.

Accretion occurs in State O, as does art and many other developments.

Theory of Physics cannot access State O (cf. ‘Vacuum’) or, therefore a prehistory of the Universe. Scientists, assuming the dynamics of space-time, spacetime, quantum indeterminacy, to be ultimately valid, have overlooked the realism in art media which bypasses verbal interpretation.

In FT the notion of heat translates into Impulse in State O, and is not restricted to a body-event.

The result 'Infinite heat without space or time' defines State O as the origin of Unow, and all subsequent action including specific time-based sources of a Reflective Intuitive Organism. jl.2.03.03

...

Love J

5/16/03

postvisit thinks.

NOa it was a great visit of yours and most helpful that you kept on the ball. I would have taken up your email of 12.02.03, which I have spent time on but will now pass by to consider the Chris Isham situation along with many other problems in physics. Even though physics is assumed to be the most precise and authentic of sciences there are glaring anomalies in its current versions.

Also worth mentioning is the acknowledgement implied in the third of three tv utterances by Stephen Hawking. In the second he said: "Let the 10 years start now (for solution of the Q-Grav problem) and if we haven't solved it by the end of the Century WE WILL NOT KNOW WHERE TO BEGIN". Interviewed Xmas day 1999 by Larry King and asked about progress all he had to offer was "LET THE TWENTY YEARS START NOW"

This situation must be too painful for other physicists to go public about without some alleged discovery, the reputation of SWH looking so unassailable. This goes for Janna too who would want to make the solution one for an astrophysicist. She wanted however to write about my frontage sculpture for years, and would have perhaps had it not reached a conclusion just when she is about to give birth.

I come across the set of problems faced by physicists today from the only privileged position possible, having notched up ten or so pristine discoveries in the trajectory of form as art, all in the minit 5 category (being about order in nature apart from being about art as previous) .. and finding they all lead to the Flat Time solution. This (T) dimensionality, event structure, being incommensurate with verbal logic, this primary question has either to be answered by a philosophical treatise on the comparison, or, I go out on a limb with a forthright claim that the sciences are flawed and have misled everyone into beliefs in unsubstantiated systems.

Here then is a Question 1: Do you know of any research project that has investigated a primitive universe in the form of a U1 U2 et cetera series?

The idea of an eternally recurrent Unow has (rightly) been dismissed. But given the zero- space-zero-time-infinite-heat solution to Einstein's GR the simple matter of a State O only has to hold the germ of an Impulse to extend to kickstart the OI-IO series. It seems to be a matter of preference which of these initial propositions we start with except that fluctuation and vacuum are both highly ambiguous words.

The word atemporal meaning independent of time, or abstract data, is not satisfactory either. In Flat Time number itself looks more like a State O

development: In the proto-universe era it is arguable that the difference between 121 and 123 is cardinal, creating in score the Habits A & B distinction (TBDI 1972). On that count the ISMI was decades ahead of physics and may now be half a Century up. Do I need to list anomalies found in physics?

Chris Isham and Savvidou struggle with the verbal medium which, as he tells me is **very** difficult. An example: The word Nothing has been tripping out lately as 'Everything'. So

Question 2 now: Can logic as we conceive it accommodate such a contradiction? State O shows the zero of State O to be either active or passive. (Nothing either means absence of anything, or, a nonextended Score; corresponding to a piece of paper in a drawer where it is neither acted upon nor heard.)

Hoping you made it back to Calgary intact. I look forward to your next.

Love, J

5/19/03

Re: postvisit thinks.

Hi JOhn,

It was a good visit to London, and I hope the opening attracts good press and gets people motivated to engage with your work. I am now in Portland, catching up with Curt before he heads off to New York at the end of the week. Got in a very good day's skiing today.

I think it would be helpful if you set out as clearly as you can what you take state 0 to be. It looks as though you talk of instances of state 0 as well as the score of a state 0. Questions to consider are whether instances of state 0 have duration, whether they occur throughout the universe sandwiched between instances of least event or other events, and whether there are also instances of state 0 that are states of a whole universe. This is one of the topics we didn't get around to discussing on my visit, that I think is important for communicating with physicists.

Love, Noa

5/19/03

Re: postvisit thinks.

NOa, good skiing in May? Its cold and wet here but not snowing. Re talking to physicists; these as PHDs are usually so keen to maintain their status that their ears won't hear the split to event talk. So am thinking of issuing a challenge for FLAT TIME first, and what follows if there is support will lead to understanding of this (I would have thought self-evident) critique of verbal logic. State O is nonextended in each generation preceding Unow and has many synonyms, from gravity to God in Heaven. Our mainline Informing Component in FT

5/19/03

Re: postvisit thinks.

Hi John,

My inclination is to engage in the clarification first, so that people can understand what the challenge is. If an instance of state 0 is nonextended how is it distinguished from no instance of state 0? Gravity and God don't have instances, so maybe it's a mistake to talk of instances of state 0.

Mount Hood looked spectacular from Portland today. There were 25 inches of snow on the mountain last week, but marvellous clear skies and 70F temperature today.

Love, NOa

5/20/03

Re: postvisit thinks.

Dear NO - I dont think I ever said there was such a phanomen. The atemporal omnipresent as State O is what nobody has so far seen as a numerate speakable architecture so they call the person-continuum by names such as gravity and God. There is no instance of a state O. An analogue from the architecture could be: Someone finding a manuscript and getting the idea in it in a flash, which happens without measurable instant. Extended action which follows is what we call physical, but is still event structured, measurable in count time and sensed as an ordering of time-based events ... only real because its heard or seen or whatever, in what is called time. A slice of count time. Is this so obscure?

I enjoy the thought of 70F now I come to think of it. And Mount Hood, tell me more it reminds me of a great ship.

Love<J

5/22/03

Re: postvisit thinks.

Dear John,

Here's an analogy. A musical score typically has instances that are located and extended in space and time. But there can be scores that are never performed and in that sense do not have instances. One might even say that there are infinitely many musical scores that are atemporal but no person will ever compose them. If state 0 is just atemporal but has no instances it is unclear to me what it's job could be. I thought you envisaged many instances of state 0 just as you envisage many instances of least event. Instances needn't be extended spatially or temporally, but I would find it hard to understand what they are if they are not extended at all.

Love, Noa

5/22/03

Re: postvisit thinks.

Noa, yes well I exclude tales of magic but the recognisable instances of State O sources are: in the origins of new IREs, art itself, the faiths and the development of RIOs on this planet. My FTHO is a description of this last but as a message ex State O, not a genetic freak, It has never before appeared as nature. All efforts to think of a source of such existences as eg in physics try to hide anomalies like 11D dimensions. 90% undetectable 'matter' in the universe, quantum gravity, 'the vacuum' everywhere ('nonlocality is the rule for our universe'). Science as presented to us today is not unlike a performance at Olympia circus - full of crafty illusions and practised improbabilities. Hoaxes having occurred in U(now-1) are sure to be enacted in principle the same and that could explain why Unow is so big. State O in flat time provides a dimensional manifold that is omnivalent for physics humans as and the whole as person-you-can-access and receive results from, the (T) diagram is a map of person from OI-IO proto-universe to god in heaven. We just haven't got the message (as a visual) before FT. Scores that are not meaningful may or may not be performed but we just don't admit them to our attention.

Looking forward to your come-back. Love J

5/26/03

Re: postvisit thinks.

Hi John,

Now you see what I mean by instances of state 0 I'm keen to know how you respond to my original questions. (Scroll down to see them.) Another question would be whether instances of state 0 have temporal and spatial locations. Your message suggests you think there were some instances of state 0 on this planet (spatial location) and presumably about 10 thousand years ago (temporal location).

Love, Noa

5/29/03

postvisit thinks plus.

NOa, am working on this. The most potent instances of state O take us back to the solution of Einstein 1915 which finds a state zero space zero time infinite heat. The infinite heat translates in flat time to a state O instance for the end/start of each Universe in the series to the alleged bigbang of Unow.

To ask for instances of state O within the Unow event evidently means instances of significant shift along any time-base, in art called originality or in chess a move denoted by (!). Each of these could be said to kickstart from a least event and to equate with that idea in kick. I would rate the significance if the kick by its origin(s) along the horizontal (T) spectrum.

Does this satisfy any question? Scores that are not performed here would lie idle but perhaps kickstart another part of Unow or in its next extended state (Unow+1).

5/29/03

Re: postvisit thinks plus.

Hmm. I was thinking instances of state 0 might be as ubiquitous as instances of least event, but you are describing them here as rare and momentous. In your first example, instances of state 0 trigger whole universes, but in the second examples they are instances within a universe of creative acts. These look very different. Are you sure you mean to say that a chess move and a Big Bang are instances of the same type?

5/29/03

Re: postvisit thinks plus.

Yes. The time-base of a chess game is low within body event range whereas a bigbang is on the U point of A-U. Of course, a creative act may be on a base long past the chess move, relevance restricted only to the planet event. <J

5/29/03

Re: postvisit thinks plus.

Are you saying that instances of state 0 are events, but they don't necessarily have the same time-base? What makes some events instances of state 0 while other events are not? I get the impression it's something like a successful innovation, though a bigbang could perhaps be an exact repetition of something and so nothing innovative.

5/30/03

Re: postvisit thinks plus.

I'd say this: The stuff we are accustomed to, as predictable in effect, pickup the habit from state O score via their normal (T) gravitas. The development of the planet event or just a body event has to depend on a gravitas level in state O that has been unpredicted and is felt to be unthinkable or impossible until recognised as a reality. The state O is all there all the time but has a U score from which the unexpected may occur, and perhaps be highly dramatic but in any case notice is drawn to a new reality.

B just called and is about to turn up so does this answer your Q?

love J

5/31/03

Re: postvisit thinks plus.

Dear John,

Your last message is suggestive, but I don't yet understand state 0. My guess from the second part is that state 0 is a type of event that's found on band U. But then instances of state 0 would have a duration of billions of years, and chess moves could not be instances of state 0. And the fact that you call it a state not an event also tells against this interpretation. Perhaps then state 0 is what you used to call plane Z, though it would not then have instances. (I once thought that state 0 might be the "nothing" that alternates with "not nothing" in forming primitive events.)

Hope progress on an exhibition continues with the Tate. I'd like to send Chris Isham an email, but am not sure what to say. He asked to see what I'd written about your ideas, but neither of us can find the two things I remember writing, one back in the early 80s, and another single sheet that was on your pinboard until recently. I could ask him to send me his Theism and cosmology paper that you showed me and I forgot to copy.

Love, Noa

5/31/03

Re: postvisit thinks plus.

Dear NOa I am just being whisked away to Devon until Monday. What do you personally make of the solution to Einstein 1915 ? Bye and will read email again next week. Till then, otb J

6/09/03

Re: postvisit thinks plus.

Dear John,

Hope you had a great time in Devon. Not quite sure what you mean by the solution to Einstein 1915. If you mean the prediction from general relativity that the universe could begin and end in a singularity, I suppose I don't find that inconceivable, or stranger than the idea of an infinitely oscillating universe with no beginning or end in time. If you mean your alternative to the idea of a singularity, I've been trying to get clearer about it in our email exchange over state 0, but don't really understand it yet.

I'm wondering what you've made of the various questions I've put to you in email, including the comment on the Mute article. Which if any have struck you as interesting and worth pursuing?

Love, Noa

6/10/03 Re: postvisit thinks plus.

Yes a great time.

...

The last point you ask about here should cover the rest of them:

I asked you the question you rightly interpreted as being about 'singularity'. To me and others this sets the imponderable zero-space-zero-time-infinite-heat interpretation. There is one answer that an artist may usefully give to such a contradiction: It is good sense to interpret the universe as an enactment from a score, where, in common sense parlance MUSIC is what one hears in count time, (ie. the effect in count time that an ordering of time-bases has upon the sensory perception of a listener).

For here are the dimensional components of what I call FLAT TIME, as represented by a Basic (T) diagram.

When translated into the equation $(\log x)(\log y) = U$, where x and y are count time and time-base respectively, the plane U affords a matrix in which any event e can be plotted as a point with a $(\log x)(\log y)$ position for its nonextended impulse or score. A score informs but is not itself heard.

The event e can be a thought or impression, a purely mental occurrence for which there are no means of specifying without a (T) diagram. To show this we have no need of a neurophysiology and only very little physics, a fact which demonstrates a linguistic flaw in its inability to identify state O in its space-evoking idea of 'the vacuum'. or its event-architecture.

You may have asked how come 'infinite heat' in the language of physics to refer to score and state O (?) It is easier to grasp if you consider that heat and energy may also refer to Impulse and in a psychological sense one often associates impulse with electricality. So there is nothing discontinuous here in the dynamics so far.. Let us infer now the idea of an Impulse ex state O to sub- or superpose any action within the U field.

Our event $Unow$, if not fuelled by some source other than that of fusion or inflation is going to come to an end either as entropy or crunch, or so we are asked to accept. The idea of a state O does imply a dimensionality at odds with 3-D space but I suggest it becomes as believable as 'an oscillation in the vacuum' as initial Impulse, in that a unifying new simplicity comes to the aid of our recourse to verbalisation.

To arrive at $Unow$ a proto-universe $U1$ is necessarily recurrent, from an accretive state O as has 'Music Now'..Moreover $U1$ et seq manifests a dimensionality of event that (a) has to begin as time-like, (b) afford us a $U3$ resembling a quantum unit and (c) afford us a spacetime and relativity $Unow$ that is in sync with art and with Organism. A body event obviously obeys many of the conclusions of science but not where (as Chomsky noted) the sources of human action are concerned.

Consequently a (T) diagram may serve to map an RIO to any degree of precision, independently however of conventions art, science and theology.

This is the way I would begin to answer questions which bear the traces of an (S) convention. The point to be made is that 3 T-related components (aplus for beginners a turning device or Roller) are all one needs to put the dualities into an assimilable framework. Practical issues aside, do you accept the status of a co-present (superposed or sub-posed) state O ?

If it does can we then perhaps tidy up some of the fallout differences between art and verbal logic.?

Love, J

6/10/03

Re: postvisit thinks plus.

Dear John,

I'm afraid I can't answer your question whether I accept the status of a co-present state 0 as I find it impossible to work out what state 0 is from what you say here and on other occasions. I get the impression you take my questions to bear traces of an (S) convention and think the way to answer them is not to discuss them individually but to keep hammering out your message. Experience suggests this isn't going to lead to any breakthrough in communication. If you don't see the point of engaging with any of my questions, we should acknowledge that our time together is better spent on other things.

Love, Noa

6/12/03

starting again

Dear Noa,

Sorry you think as in your last, which having tried to reply to by use of your actual e-text, I found nothing to add except to suggest that what you ask for is a State O theorem and proof. This is now interesting.

I have pointed to the zero-space-zero-time-infinite heat result discovered from Einstein 1915 gravitational collapse potential, and transposed that into a zero-extended (nonextended) state carrying infinite impulse.

Such a result is rationally unprocessable.as such, except as a description of God before creating the Universe. I made the connection between heat, energy and impulse where, if put in the language of physics, impulse is primarily electrical.

We already accept minuscule electrical traces in neural synapses, and the impulse to make art (something new) is a relatively powerful version of this kind of impulse. It is also gradable and able to account for the difference for example between a Mozart or Beethoven impulse and that of a would-be novice composer.

The case for an architectural mapping of the 'mind of God' is here about sources (ie. score) of histories, which have distinct advantages over what

in S language is unthinkable. Physics maintains the advantage only in the action area of band 1 (and perhaps the pre-band-1 'Planck era') of the 36-band spectrum you helped to notate. The rest I would call technology or applied physics.

Do let me know what thoughts you have as to the basic requirements for a theorem (nonextended state information architecture) from the evidences and inferences above and taking into account the basic (T) diagram.

(It may be useful as a preamble to note the way a language in terms of event structure only came into view as a sequential series of forms as art and that this is now on permanent record as FTI-IO.)

By the way, Laure came across a bunch of your letters some of which have questions in them. They are not the ones I had pinned up but I can go over those from Oakland, (May and Aug.'85) and perhaps give you some better answers.

love, J

6/12/03

Re: starting again

Dear John,

You seem to miss my point that I can't help you construct a theorem or a theory about state 0 if I don't have the faintest idea what state 0 is. I'm not optimistic, because I think the questions I've been asking were my best efforts at trying to understand what you mean by state 0. But here are some variants on them. If you can't answer them, try to say what's holding you up.

Scores are outside space and time and so are not spatially or temporally extended. If by saying that state 0 is nonextended you mean that the state 0 score is nonextended, then sure, every score is in that sense nonextended. The score for Beethoven's Fifth is nonextended, but individual instances (i.e. enactments) of it are extended in time and in other ways. They are also located in time. It seems highly plausible that not all scores have enactments (or instances) in our universe. Now for the questions:

Is the state 0 score one of those scores that has instances (or enactments) in our universe? If so, are those instances extended in time or in other ways? When in time are they located? Is state 0 represented on the T-base roller? If so, how?

Love, Noa

6/13/03 Re: starting again

> Dear John,

>

> You seem to miss my point that I can't help you construct a theorem or a
> theory about state 0 if I don't have the faintest idea what state 0 is. I'm
> not optimistic, because I think the questions I've been asking were my
> best efforts at trying to understand what you mean by state 0. But here
> are some variants on them. If you can't answer them, try to say what's
> holding you up.

> Scores are outside space and time and so are not spatially or temporally
> extended. If by saying that state 0 is nonextended you mean that the
> state 0 score is nonextended, then sure, every score is in that
> sense nonextended. The score for Beethoven's Fifth is nonextended,
> but individual instances (i.e. enactments) of it are extended in time and
> in other ways. They are also located in time. It seems highly plausible
> that not all scores have enactments (or instances) in our universe. Now
> for the questions:

> Is the state 0 score one of those scores that has instances (or
enactments) in our universe?

No, state 0 in flat time is a singular, (not 'one of those') accreted
omnipresent score which contains all histories dating from a proto-
universe. I outlined the basic data for a theorem in my previous. State 0
is co-present with current activity as a score in music is co-present with
a performance from it in count time (hours, minutes, seconds etc see
next:). It is best understood from a zero state prior to a creation of any
kind..I suspect it is what physicists refer to revealingly as a Vacuum.
in which there is 'fluctuation'.

> If so, are those instances extended in time or in other ways?

They extend in common sense and are further distinguishable
by reference to count time on clocks, and by time-base spectrum
constellations. from these the component parts of the action are
guided or driven by a Centre of Gravitass.

>When in time are they located?

You say 'in time' with the confidence of a space-based framework. As we
are talking in space-based language we may attribute a location to them,
as for example a body event is iwhere he or she (the proprietors of a body
event) happen to be at any moment in count time.

> Is state 0 represented on the T-base roller? If so, how?

State 0 is represented by the plane (plane Z in the early notation) which
in principle is the whole canvas, past and probable future. In practical
language state 0 relates to count time as represented by the optically
perceived state of the spectrum line's turning cylinder.

(Of course, without the logarithmic notation ($\log x$ and $\log y$) for the

measure of two kinds of time we would be hunting for location on a cone the base of which would be the diameter of the Universe and the point at the instant of proto-universe U1).

NOTE however: we can only notice such evidence of a prehistory on the (T) diagram by positioning the emergence of habits A and B at the point A on A-U and following out the logic which leads to the concept of such a proto-universe; also note well U1, U2 have to be time-like and without spatial context. This as space-time emerges in U4 and U5.

Do these replies answer your quota of questions ? ..love, J

6/29/03

Re: starting again

Dear John,

Back to our correspondence. I asked

- (1) Are there instances of state 0?
- (2) If so, are they extended in time or in other ways?

You answered (1) No. (2) They extend in common sense.

You seem not to notice when you give inconsistent answers like this. Or perhaps the inconsistencies are intentional. At any rate, this is one of the things that make it hard for me and others to understand your thoughts.

Let me try a slightly different starting point-your comparisons of state 0 to God and to a Quantum Vacuum. Here is a pair of questions for the proponents of each of these ideas: First to the theist (assuming for the sake of argument that God exists):

- (A) Why does God exist?
- (B) How does God's existence explain the existence of our universe?

A theist might answer (A) by saying that God necessarily exists. This is a hard sell. Another theistic response to (A) is to say that there is no answer, God just happens to exist – his existence is a contingent fact. A typical theistic answer to (B) is that God created our universe because, being perfectly good, he wanted to create a very good universe with no unnecessary bad things in it. This is also a hard sell

Second to the physicist (assuming for the sake of argument that a Quantum Vacuum exists):

- (A) Why is (or was) there a Quantum Vacuum?
- (B) How does the existence of a Quantum Vacuum explain the existence of our universe?

Physicists would probably answer their question (A) by saying a Quantum Vacuum just happens to exist. But they might say it exists necessarily (a very hard sell I would think). Or they might invoke a theistic explanation of the existence of a Quantum Vacuum-God in his wisdom chose to create one. They would probably answer (B) by saying that one

can see from the properties attributed to the Quantum Vacuum that it has a certain probability of giving rise to a universe just like ours.

Now to you (assuming for the sake of argument that there is a state 0):

(A) Why is there a state 0?

(B) How does the existence of state 0 explain the existence of our universe?

I think you should answer (A) by saying it is just a contingent fact. Do you agree? And what kind of answer would you give to (B), analogous to those given by theist and physicist?

Love, Noa

6/30/03

Re: starting again

Dear N .. Thanks for this. Here I reply

----- Original Message -----

From: <latham@ucalgary.ca>

To: "John Latham" <j.latham@netcomuk.co.uk>

Sent: 29 June 2003 07:40

Subject: Re: starting again

>>

>> Dear John,

>>

>> Back to our correspondence. I asked (1) Are there instances of state 0?

>> (2) If so, are they extended in time or in other ways?

>>

>> You answered (1) No. (2) They extend in common sense.

Surely I was not as blunt as this(!) having put forward many definitive texts previously: The simpler reply was intended to clarify complication..

>> You seem not to notice when you give inconsistent answers like this.

>> Or perhaps the inconsistencies are intentional. At any rate, this is one

>> of the things that make it hard for me and others to understand your

>> thoughts.

The replies may have seemed inconsistent but were intended to identify the difference between (S) dimensionalities and that of (T) Flat Time.

I have assumed that you did recognise this most original and necessary content.

>> Let me try a slightly different starting point-your comparisons of state

>>0 to God and to a Quantum Vacuum. Here is a pair of questions for the

>> proponents of each of these ideas:

Physicists posit a Vacuum in which there was an oscillation. to kickstart a big bang. In zero space-zero time these words are themselves lacking

coherence – as admitted in the concept ‘singularity’. State O is proposed as a more coherent way of getting to a singular dimensional reference frame.

- >> First to the theist (assuming for the sake of argument that God exists):
- >> (A) Why does God exist?
- >> (B) How does God’s existence explain the existence of our universe?

State O means what physicists propose as the Vacuum, which in (T) terms is a nonextended state of which a State I is the extended version. The sign OI can stand for the primary utterance of a Person who many recognise in theistic terms. The primary utterance is extendedness, which comes to an end and is therefore necessarily timelike (to an RIO) and nonspatial.

- >> A theist might answer (A) by saying that God necessarily exists. This
- >> is a hard sell. Another theistic response to (A) is to say that there is no
- >> answer, God just happens to exist – his existence is a contingent fact.
- >> A typical theistic answer to (B) is that God created our universe
- >> because, being perfectly good, he wanted to create a very good
- >> universe with no unnecessary bad things in it. This is also a hard sell

This theist will soon notice that God developed as art develops and that in many respects in Darwinian fashion via universes which evolved as species are seen to have evolved. The theist may find it tough that much experience in the process is experienced as bad. This is surely a body-event concept not a mathematical or universal one.

- >> Second to the physicist (assuming for the sake of argument that a
- >> Quantum Vacuum exists):
- >> (A) Why is (or was) there a Quantum Vacuum?
- >> (B) How does the existence of a Quantum Vacuum explain the
- >> existence of our universe?

The event sign OI-IO signifying the dynamics of initial (and subsequent) extendedness as event-structural (as proposed eg in TBDI), amounts to a unit of action where the State O replaces ‘vacuum’. More pertinently, the recurrence of OI-IO events permits a series of universes U1,U2,U3 et seq. thereby accreting potentials in State O as number. (U3 affording the ambiguity of Habits A and B as in TBDI). The Universe U_{now} is logically a descendent of this series, it having the same dimensional principle through.

- >> Physicists would probably answer their question (A) by saying a
- >> Quantum Vacuum just happens to exist. But they might say it exists
- >> necessarily (a very hard sell I would think). Or they might invoke a
- >> theistic explanation of the existence of a Quantum Vacuum-God in his
- >> wisdom chose to create one. They would probably answer (B) by
- >> saying that one can see from the properties attributed to the Quantum
- >> Vacuum that it has a certain probability of giving rise to a universe just
- >> like ours.

It is my submission that the notation OI-IO as given, leads (A) to this latter explanation, (B) to a resolution of the quantum gravity conundrum and (C)

to consonance between material and mental action.

- >> Now to you (assuming for the sake of argument that there is a state 0):
- >> (A) Why is there a state 0?
- >> (B) How does the existence of state 0 explain the existence of our
- >> universe?

May I regard these questions as answered above?

- >> I think you should answer (A) by saying it is just a contingent fact. Do
- >> you agree?

I can agree, but with the reservation that the contingency is supportable by a study of the architecture visualised in the series of forms as art, in particular the (T) Roller and diagram. These show (T) dynamics to be a lot more complete and anomaly-free than extant physics, which (a) has nothing to say about the sources of action of a RIO and (b) offers no coherent account of its resulting 'quantum gravity' (which in (T) terms is not a problem qv.)

- >> And what kind of answer would you give to (B), analogous to
- >> those given by theist and physicist?

I maintain that I have answered your (B). The idea State 0 and consequent event-structural universe is more plausible more integral and more economical than physical theories which start from an assumed origin in Unow's BigBang. See their dilemma from Goedel now.

- >> Love, Noa

Thanks for that and do we have contact?
Love, J

7/02/03

Re: starting again

Dear John,

The point of drawing your attention to the inconsistency was to try to help you communicate better with others by looking at some examples of where the communication breaks down and why. I hope you see that having answered that there are no instances of state 0 in question (1), you should not have answered question (2) at all. By answering question (2), which was about instances of state 0, with 'They extend in common sense ...', you are indicating you believe that there are instances of state 0.

I don't think you would have given these inconsistent answers if you took the usual approach to other people's questions of focusing on the question and answering it directly (and seeking clarification if you don't think you understand it). My impression is that your approach to questions is to let them trigger a chain of ideas which starts you speaking or writing, often at length, in the hope that the questioner is satisfied. Your latest reply is much in this vein as it intersperses various bits of

your views with my introductory remarks. When you get to my questions you ask whether you have already answered them. By this point I think you've said quite a bit that is relevant to question (B) but haven't shown any appreciation of what question (A) is about. When I get your responses to my questions I invariably find I have to sift out some clues from these tracts and figure out for myself what the answer might be. There are some clues regarding the explanatory role of state 0 in your latest, but I won't follow them up in this message.

Instead I think it potentially much more fruitful to try to get some understanding of the role of questions in the development of your own thought. I think it would be very interesting if you could give me an example of a question that you have asked yourself or are currently asking yourself, the various possible answers you have considered, and the reasons you have for favouring one of those possible answers. By seeing your thought in progress I might have better luck in engaging than by asking my own questions.

Love, Noa

7/05/03

Re: starting again

Dear Noa

Do you regard the zero state interpreted as a singularity as passive or active?

I have given you instances where a state O is relevant in resolving the apparent anomaly <zero-space-zero-time-infinite heat> by making the verbal idea energy equal to the verbal idea impulse.

To give instances of such a synonym-status which brings some primary proposition into focus I have given you a conceptual idea of state O from which an original instance is the sign OI, which states a positive version of state O in that for the impulse to be discharged the sign -IO is used. Thus OI-IO can be active in constituting, say, a proto-universe, or a performance (the sign IO) from an Impulse ex State O (the sign OI).

If I understand your meaning of 'question', for me to comment further on this answer would be to confuse the reader. Fine, but the follow-on discussion (in my experience) needs a further guideline.

Question: Do you accept the premise from which a dependable logical proposition leads to a dependable set of universally valid answers? If so I'd like to see your proposition.

7/05/03

Re: starting again

Dear Noa

Do you regard the zero state interpreted as a singularity as passive or active?

I regard any state of the universe together with the laws of the universe as active in producing the next state of the universe.

I have given you instances where a state O is relevant in resolving the apparent anomaly <zero-space-zero-time-infinite heat> by making the verbal idea energy equal to the verbal idea impulse.

I think you mean to say that the two ideas are similar but different. thus I would recommend that you don't use the words 'equal' or 'synonymous' unless you mean that it would make no difference which idea is used. So I think you should be careful not say the idea of state o is the same as the ideas of god and of a quantum vacuum, but should talk about how they are similar and how they are different.

To give instances of such a synonym-status which brings some primary proposition into focus I have given you a conceptual idea of state O from which an original instance is the sign OI, which states a positive version of state O in that for the impulse to be discharged the sign -IO is used. Thus OI-IO can be active in constituting, say, a proto-universe, or a performance (the sign IO) from an Impulse ex State O (the sign OI).

One might think you are using the symbol 'OI-IO' to depict an event consisting of a transition from a state o by way of an impulse to a state 1 and then by way of a discharge of impulse back to a state O. But this can't be right, for then state O would cease once state 1 has been reached, and there would be two instances of state O. I don't see yet how i should interpret 'OI-IO'.

If I understand your meaning of 'question', for me to comment further on this answer would be to confuse the reader. Fine, but the follow-on discussion (in my experience) needs a further guideline.

Question: Do you accept the premise from which a dependable logical proposition leads to a dependable set of universally valid answers? If so I'd like to see your proposition.

I don't understand what you are looking for. From the proposition 'all animals need water to survive' one can derive propositions such as 'giraffes need water to survive'. inductive logic goes beyond the premises to assert a conclusion with probability but not certainty, so for example from 'all known animals need water to survive' it follows with mere probability that 'all animals need water to survive'.

An example of a question that you might have put to yourself is 'how many primitive forms of extendedness are needed in order to derive spatial extendedness?' you might have considered two possibilities – (1) just one, a primitive nontemporal extendedness, (2) two, a primitive extendedness and primitive duration. You might have thought simplicity and elegance favoured (1) but decided that in describing patterns of extendedness in your attempt to derive space, you kept using terms like

'then' which called for a primitive temporal concept, thus favouring (2).
I was asking whether you could provide me with any examples like this
of your thought in progress.

Love, Noa

7/18/03

Fw: missed

From: John Latham

To: adipper

Cc: latham@ucalgary.ac

Sent: 18 July 2004 23:13

Subject: missed

Drew, I will now be too late to see you here, a really sad scene as my building in London se15 (peckham) is now a relief sculpture and called FLAT TIME I-IO. \Trouble was with the hot sun. In your sparse email to me you mention only equations and the language of physics. I have turned the event structure OI-IO which you brilliantly laughed up in Gallery House into the equivalent of an Insistently Recurrent Event (could never get into the spelling instantly) – and it looks for a mathmaker of far greater skill than I have so far met.

Well it proposes a proto-universe which proceeds to where U number 3 (U3) realises a quantum like a photon and U3,4,5 generate the mass-storyline; so disposing of the verbal hangup 'quantum gravity'. We are living in an Nth generation of the series which if you like a musical analogue is a Unow influenced by a combination of Unow-1 and Unow-2 (cf Fibonacci) as a performance is influenced by previous score. The canvas on the Roller is of course 2-sided but it so constitutes the order of the performance. We are a new version of a very long series of ancestor universes.

We should avoid the belief system of physicists in this regard, they can only arrive at the Insistently Recurrent Event, a 'bouncing universe' like academics can only recognise what they have been brought up to believe in.

In FLAT TIME, for the sake of introducing the initial shift in art, we can blow a one second drawing from a can, onto a grid formed by the vertical lines ('count time') crossing the horizontals ('Time-base') line of the spectrum, to give one an idea of a mapping procedure whereby a Reflective Intuitive Organism can be shown as a set of probabilities in the apparently space-constituted universe(!). [By the way, trained scientists would think of the actual structure as a cube. I refer to the horizontal line as log y and the vertical drop or count time as log x. They happen to be equal although they would not be regular when mapping as a graph or clock (count) time of a circumstance being mapped would not share the same linear measure.]

Hope you get the hang of the FT version. Am copying this to my next generation as he takes an interest.(but seems unwilling to relate the state

O of OI-IO to zero as in Einsteins singularity result). Hope also to hear from you if it makes sense at all yet.

otb >J

7/29/03

Re: Fw: missed

Dear John,

A pity you missed Drew. It must be over a decade since he left for Minnesota. I find it strange that you say I am unwilling to accept your statement about state 0. Willingness and unwillingness typically concern what one does, and don't directly concern what one accepts or believes. A willingness to put one's attention on a statement can influence whether one winds up believing it, though. And I have certainly been willing to devote a lot of time to trying to understand your thinking and help with its development. My problem with state 0 is that I can't get a clear idea of what you mean, so I am not in a position to accept or reject the various statements you make involving it.

I hope you get back to the message I sent just before you left for Devon. I thought it would be interesting and helpful if you provided, as an example of your thought in progress, a question you have been considering and what you take to be the various pros and cons of potential answers to the question. And I thought you might have some guidance to offer on how else to interpret OI-IO if not as indicating a transition from a state 0 to a state I followed by a transition back to a state 0.

...

Love, Noa

8/13/03

The Qs

Dear Noa, the questions which Barbara reports you'd like me to reply to:

1. A theoretical Q I ask myself.

R1: Is the initial form of universal extendedness T = timelike, .. or S = spacelike?

2: Some possible replies I consider.

R2: I am not a philosopher thinking verbal logic so I do not proceed by considering alternatives to what presents itself as a summary revelation.

However when the question of spatiality had to be contended with there were no serious alternatives to the reply that all 'things' are functions of Time-base constellation, event structure.. In the long term, knowing ISMI was looking at an event structure too, I looked at the spraygun mark as offering an abstract principle of history.

The question then concerns the dynamic or informing component in any action.

Once I had run through book relief forms in tandem with the point mark I had a coherent system using just three time-related components able to account for cross-disciplinary ideas. The (T) trajectory via forms as art offers its own set of hypotheses.

3: What reasons for and against one answer vs. the various other answers.

R: With this reduction (T) of dimensional components covering more phenomena than the sum of (S) others seems able to cover, am I not looking at an amplified means of comprehension? Why spend time considering experience from a viewpoint in a medium which has to take refuge in adding ever more dimensions to its constructs as physics, for an unfulfilled expectation of increased security ?

The rest of the forms turning up over the years are all deciphered in terms of event structure. The inverted book as an atemporal history with a temporal informing component; the 2-sided surface on a horizontal cylinder; do these not all imply the basic (T) diagram ? You will remember what I wrote as TBDI.

Perhaps this is enough to start with.?

If <J

8/14/03

Re: the Qs

Dear John,

Interesting message. I'll have to ask you later about the inverted book and 2-sided surface.

The question you have picked has alternative responses built into it, and you do consider reasons favouring the (T) answer over the (S) answer—amplified means of comprehension, fewer dimensions, etc. So far, this accords with standard scientific method (and perhaps what you call verbal logic). That method recommends that one scrutinise revelations and not just accept them uncritically. One aspect of this scrutinising is to look for reasons favouring them. Your message reports examples of this. Another aspect is to look for reasons against accepting them. Your message reports no examples of this and hints that it might be a waste of time. The point of doing it is to reduce risk of error, and if reasons against are found, to see whether there are good responses to be made to those reasons, thereby providing supporting arguments for the revealed view that might make it more persuasive.

When you say you don't consider alternatives I think you mean that (with this question at least) you didn't spend any time in an undecided state, pondering both alternative answers before you came to your answer.

Rather, you got the revelation together with the question. And you may also mean that you don't notice or look for any drawbacks to the view that is revealed to you.

I wonder if you think this is a fair summary of the contrast between your way of proceeding and what I'm calling standard scientific method. Concerning the question itself, I thought you considered a third candidate for the initial form of universal extendedness-something that is primitive and not yet timelike or spacelike. I thought you then used habits A and B to show how both timelike and spacelike extendedness could be derived from this primitive extendedness. When we add this third alternative, or compare it just with the (T) option, doesn't the question become one that you once pondered and considered reasons pro and con the various options before coming to favour one of those options?

Hope London is finally returning to a comfortable temperature.

Love,
Noa

8/14/03
Re: the Qs

Hi Noa, this review of last nights work showing up a convention of science is informative and also useful . Am thinking about ways of getting this across and to begin with could use your Qs as coming from an unnamed source. Janna Levin's last question to me was "are you going to maintain your TIME interpretation through all objections?" and I said Yes until someone persuades me that it is flawed. She went away and wrote her own book with a 'middle ground' supposedly represented by the letters to her mum. I have not commented to her about the absence of an architecture in which both astrophysics and mum are numerately relatable and wait while she does her childbearing in Oxford. Disappointingly she didn't make it to FTHO party but has not given me up either. Maybe the problem of transporting the infant from Oxford to SE15 London outweighing interest but I will send her some jpegs and perhaps the Tait piece.

Chris goes into College, but tells me he is in agony with his bodily neuro-problem. ... his (student) Ntina ... wrote the original thesis on 2 kinds of time noting T Roller as a visible demo. So several blockages besides my unscientific manner .

Our weather is indeed wonderfully cooler today. Lv<J

8/14/03
Re: the Qs

Hi John,

Good news about the weather. The summer here has been remarkably unfluctuating, with afternoon temperatures between 25 and 30, mostly

dry. Forest fires are always a problem at this time of year.

...

Sorry to hear that things aren't going well for Chris Isham. I'm trying to get hold of his paper on Big Bang theology by interlibrary loan. If that fails I'll ask you if you could send me a copy.

Love, Noa

8/26/03

Re: forwarding Isham Vatican paper

Hi Noa

The paper you wanted is coming with J-P. Also, a sheaf of correspondence between us and others has turned up in B's files, unfortunately without the hand-written letters I had pinned up for many years here. Am appreciating much in the explanations you gave of flaws in early stuff. The problem of the moment is how to begin making sense when the aim is to introduce (T) dynamics in a medium which has grown hardwired in (S) conventions. (It shows up in Chris's carefully honed language aiming to link physics with Christian theology, where temporality has not yet acquired his 'being and becoming' constructs, which are not the distinctions I personally draw in the Roller's 'times'. In the Flat Time argument, as you have pointed out, the plane as 2-sided canvas is invisible in space except as the nonsense if read along the horizontal. Histories manifest science to be self-confining in the vertical timebase columns, and the plane is atemporal, ie not time-related as with the event structured T universe. Contemplating the new academic status of the London Institute as a venue to get the (T) language into that still S-verbalising stream.

Hope you have time enough to update ourselves, a lot of movement on all fronts.

Love, <J

8/26/03

Re: forwarding Isham Vatican paper

Dear John,

...

good to hear about the old writing showing up. I might send Chris Isham a message letting him know, and maybe I'll also have some thoughts about his paper.

Love, Noa

8/29/03

lost last

Noa, I lost your last email in the spam, apologies, please resend. J

8/29/03

Re: lost last

Hi John,

My last message was about current plans. I'm now in Portland and will be seeing JP this evening. On the weekend we'll show him around, perhaps a trip to the St Helens volcano will be interesting.

I'm glad some of the early correspondence and my writing showed up. Barbara is saying that there is a growing interest in stuff like that for archives. You should decide if any of our recent correspondence should be made generally available. It was intended as private and quick thoughts and might not be representative of what we would say on careful reflection, but may be interesting nonetheless. I think it might be useful for us in any case to go back over some of the questions that were left hanging and pick out the one or two most fruitful ones to take up again. I would say that two recent ones for you are:

(i) say more about your preferred method of enquiry to what I have called a standard form of scientific enquiry in which one starts with a question, formulates possible answers, considers what factors would count for and against the various possible answers, and then tries to assess whether those factors apply.

(ii) say how one is to interpret OI-IO if not as meaning a transition from a state O to a state I followed by a transition from a state I back again to a state O.

Love, Noa

8/30/03

Re: lost last

Good. I hope you enjoy JP's session and that St Helens stays quiet during you visit.

You will have received Chris's Vatican paper from JP, it may help with the correspondence idea.

A lot of your letters are turning up in Anstey Road. They include an independent paper headed "A Discussion of Latha..." and dated July 1980.

When you ask [as (1) below, as if the idea had first occurred as a verbal question], I have to say that the form always precedes the written version. I remember when taking up the art option, it was the result of an experience of a particular art that decided it. When faced with the force of the early Bacon - I remember asking myself the question What does it look like, to Be? So the choice you ask about was pre-set, it had to be a formal visual answer. Looking back, there was no verbal consequence until an answer to my question had turned up. At that juncture, when G & K took up on the form, I remember saying thankfully that I would never need to write another word. I only changed my mind about that

when sure that something unseen before had come into being, and that while it was important but off-limits, it was what happened visually that put me on course..

Today it looks more than ever likely that the dimensionality of event structure is only compatible with linguistic rationality when an exnihilo proposition has been tabled.

Nay I leave it there for the moment.? Till you have time to spare.

Love, J

1/10/04

The restoration notes plus

Dear N,

It was a great break to have you on site and to hear some specifics about the incommensurable status between the two types of cosmology. That at least sets a scene for representing Flat Time and the (T) version. Here is the detailed action for you to apply on the book relief Noa's:

Re/ Detached book:

1: try out the placing of the detached book so you know its exact previous position.

2: Make sure you can maintain pressure on this piece when the glue is still wet. You should be able to leave it then in position for 2-3 hours.

3: When hard, dry and firm to touch you may reinforce it by covering the break line with a tetrion-covered piece of strong material, thread, untwisted. string Later, cover this with plaster and leave to dry.

Re/. Pedal part:

1: If the pedal part lifts, cover the underside and base with pva glue and replace it.

2. When hard (a day later) loosely smear the break line with tetrion paste so as to leave approximately as in the original state. If when dry you feel the result to be unduly white, rub it over with a dilute mix of pva, water and, say, tea or dust to make an even tone.

:

Hope this is enough to work from. Do not feel it necessary to conform exactly to the way it was originally.

Meanwhile thanks for the interest in my gym instruction. We went for a half hour walk yesterday and I have been left with a few exercises to do and things i should eat.

love, J

1/11/04

Re: the restoration notes plus

Dear John,

Thanks for these instructions. It looks as though I need to get pva glue and tetrion paste or the equivalent and be prepared with some sort of clamp to hold the book in place. I'll see if I can do it next weekend. Right now I'm still feeling quite jet lagged and will start teaching tomorrow.

Hope Ronnie will be helpful in building up strength.

I thought the incommensurability was primarily in the two different methods employed by artist/I.P and philosopher/scientist.

It was good seeing you all.

Love, Noa

1/12/04

Re: the restoration notes plus

Hi again, just two points here. You will find it hard to get a clamp on the site without putting its fix points out of shape. I am much more of an improviser for such work and imagine that a weight of something you have handy or a suitably sized stone would be enough as long as you had the base site (book) horizontal enough (by propping up the whole Work)

...

Hope your teaching stint has not started on jetlag.

love, J.

2/24/04

site

Hi Noa

...

From here the news is on www.flattime.net which I finally got round to. Crossroad between S and T and I hope you can access it because although the front page turns up here I tried to access the rest of it but got no response. I have had quick replies from both Chris and Savvidou (from Athens), both pleading for think time before commenting. I will be interested to see what you prescribe as strategies for intro talks to the Institute. B was there today and says it attains University status in a couple of months and want to include me in that fest.

Hope you keeping fit.

love, J

2/26/04

Re: site

Hi John,

Good to see the site. The initial image is striking and I then realised that the screen contains only about one tenth of the full image, which involves several repetitions of the spray painting. Is this your intention? I clicked on the dots and was connected to text and images. I'll also need some time before getting back to you about the site and some suggestions for the London Institute.

I bought some polyfilla and two types of glue to do the repairs, but have not yet tested them out to see if they would be suitable.

...

Love, Noa

4/01/04

Re: progress report

Dear John,

Just getting around to responding to your last message and various emails Barbara has sent me. There's been a lot going on in my life here.

...

I've looked at the flattime website recently and it still has a number of glitches that a computer technician could easily sort out. The spray painting image that comes up on the home page is repeated four times across and five times down. Is that your intention? The images that come up under the history link are good, but could be sharper.

What are you planning for the London Institute? Are you thinking of using their inauguration as a university as an occasion to announce your cosmological principle? I think an art event, like the last one there you said was very successful, would be a good idea for one of your presentations. I'm not sure what format would work well for the others. Maybe a short lecture for your announcement – I'd still recommend reading from a prepared text or delivering a memorised prepared text. Another idea would be to invite several speakers to give a presentation on how they understand or have been influenced by your ideas. Maybe Chris Isham and Janna Levin would agree to present views from physics, while others could present views from art. You might also want contributions from Ian Munro and Karl Birjukov. Robbie Kravitz might give an interesting view from her understanding of spirituality. Again, it might be useful to have contributors send in their texts in advance. These could become the basis for a discussion which could involve you, and an audience.

...

One last thing. I bought some materials to repair Noa's a while back, but they are not exactly what one can get in England and I'll need to experiment with them before trying the repair. I'll let you know when I'm ready.

That's all for now. Hope things are going well.

Love, Noa

5/04/04

Re: ahead

Dear N'

...

I have asked Chris Isham if he would like to meet to discuss a joint approach for the U of the Arts occasion to put on record and expect him to give me a date. Being on home territory at last with Chris the guest will put the onus on me to give a first brief account of what has occurred to bring art significantly onto the academic platform,

I feel confident enough to be able to state a strong new case without Isham & Savvidou initiative. I will be drafting a form of address when I've had a word with Chris.

...

See you soon

J

5/07/04

Re: ahead

Hi John,

Looking forward to seeing you and helping out with as many of the visits and appointments as possible. There's a lot of reading on your website, so it would help if you prioritised what you would like me to comment on. Or perhaps more to the point, if you have a text you are planning to deliver on the 20th, you could send me that for comments. My view is that you've produced a staggering and very pure conceptual artwork. But when I have difficulties in understanding aspects of it and ask questions I seldom get the clarification I need. I think that's because you don't get the point of my question, so you try saying it again in a different way and it still doesn't help.

All for now,

Love, noa

5/10/04

Re: ahead

N, to reply to your last:

I spoke to Chris this morning in his office, about his misgivings about having no particular function on May 20. However, we will be meeting there half an hour before the talking is due to start. I am introduced to

speak first, and will make the cosmology from art as quick as possible, and then mention Chris's claim to be a key player in physics in advancing the 2 kinds of time for the clearance of understanding quantum theory. I will use as many of the arguments from the web site as called for, and can't predict what the order turns out to be. I would imagine that the quote from Relativity which defines zero extendedness plus impulse will get to the art community, but it is the singularity in both fields that clears a way to a common origin...

What looks like emerging therefore is the existence of two versions of the cosmos an (S) and a (T), which we may then take to the AHRBoard for funding within the University structure. I have many a note of the order of my points but much depends on how Chris feels when we meet on site on the 20th May. The discussion however it goes is designed to give O + I the edge in the now prevailing "art in social contexts" competition.

Tomorrow there is a ceremony to announce the formation of this 'University of the Arts'. It lasts most of the day but there will be a chance to talk to people before we head home.

See you 19th. Love J

5/10/04

Re: ahead

Hi John,

I don't understand why there should be confusion and misgivings over Chris's function. Isn't it simply that he is going to be jointly presenting and discussing with you, up there on the podium? I would think it dodgy to make your presentation dependent on the half hour conversation with Chris just before you start. Is your plan to have you speak for x minutes, Chris speak for y minutes, then open to general discussion for the remaining minutes?

As you will be speaking largely to an arts audience, why not have some discussion of S and T traditions in art as part of your introduction of the idea of space-based and time-base traditions? And how about some illustrations from art? Some slides or a segment of film perhaps.

Love, Noa

6/06/04

Re: back in Calgary

Noa hi, yes there is a lot left over from your visit, most of it very positive. I had the feeling that my own judgement about storylines, strategies and objectives is not understood early enough for kindhearted interventions to avoid the scatter effect.

...

Perhaps Nic Log has got the point, he has made this new suggestion of a print series on the 1980 theme on the front of EVENT STRUCTURE, and it is very helpful if I can revise the line under MBKAG.

I see in the dimensionality OI-IO how the FLAT in Flat time is synonymous with the G in MBKAG.. Which we will be sorting out for the TG show in 05.

...

Thanks for all the work as well as for Vronnie time meanwhile, The notes to Ian will be passed. I am sure he will talk up the arguments for extendedness- nonextendedness and so the State O. It means that, taking Einstein 1915 as valid, the current Universe does entail a (scientifically nondetectable) zero space zero time, but also a prehistory of our Unow to a proto-universe in the same dimensionality (OI-IO). Ian also contends that Chris Isham is a true blue physicist unable to take O aboard.

Have a productive time the coming year off duty.

Love, J

6/16/04

different mental furniture

Hi John,

Have you made any further contact with Ian? I sent him my comments on his piece a few days ago and haven't heard back. I noticed he described me as having a fixed perspective coming from a different a priori, or something like that. I can only guess what he means. I wonder what you make of people like me and Chris Isham not "picking up" what you have to say.

Hope things continue to progress on all fronts.

Love, Noa

6/19/04

Re: different mental furniture

hi Noa,

...

What Ian and others around dimly realise is that verbal logic has arisen from the visible world and only tentatively from the mentally self-aware world. My point is that neither of these worlds have taken aboard the architecture which I have called flat time. Ian understands it with a fastlane techie sense not much in sync with me, and that's his great frustration. Chris Isham and I being unconcerned with applications of the FT architecture lost the grant money on offer from NESTA because we believed that the committee would grasp the status of the overlap as a pure conceptual insight, and ergo worth waiting for the applications to roll off.

That error of understanding on our part has raised Ian's temperature to the boil. He is dismissive of standard explanatory pattern, as I too, on grounds of the series of forms as art and what they present in the context of science with its canonical physical cosmology. Does this answer your 'wonder what' at all? Must leave it there for the day.

love, J

6/19/04

Re: different mental furniture

Hi John,

... I'm still in the dark as to why you think Chris and I haven't taken aboard the flat time architecture. Do you think Chris just refuses to pay any attention to the suggestion of a cosmology that goes beyond the purely physical? My impression is that he's happy in his nonprofessional moments to discuss very unconventional ideas. In my case, perhaps you think I am blinkered by verbal logic. But you and I are both using language supplemented with images, and are prepared to ask each other how we are using the various terms, so it would be good to know what you think the crucial difference is.

...

Love, Noa

6/20/04

Re: different mental furniture

Noa, yes, there are 2 avenues I have used to get to FT, the initial one as a shift to event as a dynamic of Impulse and Discharge of – which seems to both of you to be interesting but not to cover the world-in-space adequately for science and logic. The other absent bit of furniture is the series of forms as art which inherently supply the logic of 'energy' as

'IN-FORMING COMPONENT'.

I think Chris accepts the idea as formulated but cannot supply the symbols, That was why he was so keen on our NESTA project. I feel that you have a similar problem when addressing philosophers> (I have seen no Noa-originated attack on the traditional grammars to show where art-derived and reason-derived language intersect ... it has to be at the concept of extended / nonextended action, (which proposes a stricter 'ex nihilo' creation story than physicists are able to postulate in lab language)

...

6/23/04

Re: different mental furniture

Hi John,

...

I think I agree with you on the communication barrier between you and people like Chris and me. To put it in my own terms: we have difficulty

understanding your concepts and you have difficulty understanding our attempts to interpret your concepts. We are looking for a theory that can be tested and tied to technology. You are happy to say this can be done in principle without yet knowing how. Ian claims to have some ideas about this but they aren't apparent in the piece I read of his.

...

Love, Noa

6/24/04

Re: different mental furniture

Noa, yes, ...

Over to you and Chris now. What I cannot understand is the fixation of the entire educational establishment on the myth uttered by top brass physicists that Unow began with a "fluctuation in the vacuum", when the OI-IO concept spells out a previous development. As I tried to show on 20/5 without any objection from Chris, a prehistory of Unow in OI-IO terms, proffers a resolution of the quantum gravity problem. (doing so by proposing state O to be a nonextended dimensionality which many profess to know in personal terms, but which no one has admitted as a scientific idea).

If to postulate 10 or more spatial dimensions without proof of any such state passes for these luminaries, is it less reasonable to propose the series now put forward as flat time to resolve the range of problems addressed today? How come Chris, and you too, fail to see the simplification and increased rationality (re qq for starters) of the FT envelope as set out? Note well, neither Ian nor I have, like metaphysicians, dumped numeracy. It is just that the maths of the FT plane are not in the book yet.

hoping this goes further.

Love, J

6/24/04

Re: different mental furniture

hi John,

Fluctuations of a quantum vacuum are beyond my expertise to assess, so long as it is not being suggested that they somehow explain the origin of the universe. For that question would then just be pushed back to explaining the presence of a quantum vacuum. I find it perfectly reasonable to think that the origin of the universe is unexplainable, as is the fact that the universe is the way it is rather than some other way.

Prehistories of the universe are by definition hidden from empirical access so would have to be speculative. And we'd still be left with an unexplainable question why there was any prehistory at all and why it was the way it was rather than another way. I think Chris did object in a gestural way at the talk. The video will be a helpful reminder.

The problem of reconciling quantum theory and general relativity is to provide a theoretical framework that will allow one to preserve the experimental successes of the two theories upon which so much technology relies. You have hopes that someone will eventually develop flat time to accomplish this. I have major problems with the basic idea of 01-10, as I tried to explain in our email exchange several months ago. You didn't understand or see the point of my lines of enquiry.

The way I see it, you are applying the method of the artist that has served you well – using internal criteria to make a work or statement and then presenting it to an audience. This is what you do best and should probably continue to do. It has not been your professional job to get into the minds of other people, understand their needs and try to supply them. But I think this is what you would have to do to succeed in many of your aims of providing something of use to philosophy and physics. I see this as an inevitable source of frustration to you. I think the world-picture you have developed can always be of interest or inspiration to others outside the artworld and of course to people interested in your art. And it does seem that there are plenty of signs of interest picking up in the package of work and ideas.

Love, Noa

6/25/04

Re: different mental furniture

well ok N. I glean from your argument a rationale for leaving origins out of contention as beyond empirical evidence to support any theoretical proposition.

I write of a prehistory of Unow along lines adopted by Darwin when others accepted less documentable imperatives. Today, to suggest that Unow has a prehistory may be unthinkable, - unless one considers a new concept such as Least Event as a Habit, where the dynamics of an Insistently Recurrent Event (habit) require a nonextended source. If Darwin won out eventually by drawing attention to his new evidence, then FT has a similar chance. Here is an obvious example which would never occur to a physicist but which we (not just artists) insist on the production, reproduction and development of.

Using the FT model, music is an expression of event structure as an envelope framework where physics fails to deliver one. The trajectory of art carries a darwinian imprint does it not? Nobody can deny the 01-10 form there.

Your major problems with the basic idea 01-10 (not 01-10) are common, may I say, I recognise that you were writing with a trust in language that till now has experienced the problem in 'Nothing', unless it occurs as a math symbol.

In my previous email a question addressed was whether 10-dimensional space was any more plausible than the FT's 3 time-related components. vide music. I am endeavouring (to cover your question) to show that to apply the method of the artist where it extends the trajectory is good by

Darwin, and good also by physics in that we can identify the meaning of "fluctuation in the vacuum" by a good step down from those particular terms. The idea of the empirical adopts a new viewpoint just as they had to do for evolution.

[The said vacuum is a spatially evocative term. In FT 'extension as time' precedes that of space. A 'fluctuation' in it is meaningless and leads to botch-ups. With 'score' as in OI-IO, (nonextended Impulse and Discharge of) we reconsider that idea and discover resolutions of Chris's qq problem, plus manifestations of human history]

Do you still want me to take up the points you raised in previous, which I did discuss with Ian? ... Your conjectures were useful in being close to what we - I at any rate - have been trying to articulate.

Love, J

6/26/04

Re: different mental furniture

Dear John,

My message about different mental furniture was a rumination on why our attempts at discussing your theory don't get anywhere. I've never seen any signs that you found my input helpful, or understood the point of it, so I'm surprised to read that you took up our exchange over OI-IO with Ian and found my conjectures useful. Does any of this discussion with Ian survive on email or in your memory? And do you remember what conjectures you found useful?

I don't think the communications barrier can be put down to a trust in language on my part. We both know from much experience that communication in language cannot be guaranteed to succeed. The onus is on the language user to make the terms clear, and if communication is unsuccessful, to try to get the point across by alternative linguistic formulations with as much nonverbal help as necessary.

If you were looking to choose some parts of your theory that you thought stood a better chance of being understood and accepted than others, I wouldn't recommend claims about prehistories of the universe. People are reluctant to extend principles encountered within this universe such as natural selection in biology to principles governing relations between unknown universes. And there is no way of testing such claims, unlike with Darwin.

...

Love, Noa

6/27/04

Re: different mental furniture

To answer this:

----- Original Message ----- From: <latham@ucalgary.ca>
To: "John Latham" <j.latham@netcomuk.co.uk>
Sent: Sunday, June 27, 2004 1:15 AM
Subject: Re: different mental furniture

>> Dear John,

>>

>> My message about different mental furniture was a rumination on why
>> our attempts at discussing your theory don't get anywhere. I've never
>> seen any signs that you found my input helpful, or understood the
>> point of it, so I'm surprised to read that you took up our exchange over
>> OI-IO with Ian and found my conjectures useful.

The usefulness I refer to is in the articulation of what you don't understand in what I articulate as event structure and flattime. There is no talk with Ian in the ref. to useful, except in the longstanding agreement I have with Ian over the stateO as a nonextended state resembling score, and your difficulty there.

I had hoped you would get over that via my reference to the inference dating from Einstein 1915 where one solution of the equation reached the nonextended <zero space/zero time/infinite heat> and its potential sense when heat is tracked down to Impulse as in OI..

To me the meaning steps out of all life forms, which themselves develop from an inert origin to an IRE to an RIO. The origin hunted backwards gives us the Least Event OI-IO.

>> Does any of this discussion
>> with Ian survive on email or in your memory? And do you remember
>> what conjectures you found useful?

Implicitly, yes. It is useful to me to realise that this is where the problem lies. I mentioned Darwin as the scientist who had hit on an effect called evolution, but not yet thought back to an origin of the extended Unow.

>> I don't think the communications barrier can be put down to a trust in
>> language on my part. We both know from much experience that
>> communication in language cannot be guaranteed to succeed. The
>> onus is on the language user to make the terms clear, and if
>> communication is unsuccessful, to try to get the point across by
>> alternative linguistic formulations with as much nonverbal help as
>> necessary.

Agreed, but the dynamics of OI-IO are IN-formational. In ordinary techno speak the noun 'information' overrides FT's 'in-forming component'. As this concept implies a theism and scientists find it unwieldy beyond the scope both of verbal specification and of maths. The theism however is an envelope containing 'any alleged phenomenon' (to quote Gregory)

>> If you were looking to choose some parts of your theory that you
>> thought

>> stood a better chance of being understood and accepted than others,
>> I wouldn't recommend claims about prehistories of the universe.
>> People are reluctant to extend principles encountered within this
>> universe such as natural selection in biology to principles governing
>> relations between unknown universes.

Here is the confirmation in your own words!

> And there is no way of testing such claims, unlike with Darwin.

The test is in balance between the way evolution has been found to work,
the example of art as proposing a different dynamics to mechanics, how
it can even account for the origin of a quantum unit as physicists find it
factually predictable, and in the common experience of inspiration, ethics.

...

>> Love, Noa

And love to you. Hope I have answered adequately. ...J

>>

>>

6/28/04

Re: different mental furniture

Dear John,

It sounds as though things are progressing nicely on many fronts.
On the theory I have to just repeat what I said earlier about the fact of
our communications failure. You do get that I make objections and point
out places I find ambiguous or unclear. And perhaps there's a certain
usefulness in that. But you never seem to understand what the objections
are or why I find ambiguity, so we don't engage. As I said, it's not a
mature artist's business to revise a work in light of objections or requests
for greater clarity from an uncomprehending audience. So I should not
have been surprised or disappointed by the way things are.

Love, Noa

7/04/04

Next sit.

hi Noa

Quite a lot during the week, while I took to my couch to head off a flu bug.
Your last mail sounds resigned to a status quo, perhaps you are exhausted
by that lot anyway, but wait and see the new Lisson program. A currently
overcooked Sixties ("this is tomorrow") show just opened at Tate Britain.
That day I went to put to Marianne at the Lisson how we should run a
very spare exhibition now on the one subject BELIEF SYSTEM FOR THE
PLAGUE ORGANISM (keep quiet about this) represented by versions
of GisG..

When he heard this idea Nicholas was excited enough to start telling
us how it would be done. To come before the October 2005 TG project,
which will document how the dimensionality of belief systems came

to take form. For the unanswered questions perhaps it boils down to the hyphen in in-formation. With 'informing component' this looks like the key to our crossed lines. . U as event and U as space-time surfacing incommensurably.

Nicholas(L) has requested (and been granted) permission to print a series from the cover of Event Structure 1981 ('THE MYSTERIOUS BEING KNOWN AS GOD is an atemporal score ..etc')

The print series will be in the belief system show, which the TG project follows There may then be a Part 2 of the Lisson show in 06 which exhibits things now in boxes dating from 1948 that have led to Flat Time as put together now..

Can you see such an action plan eventually putting FTTHO on the map?
no art commentator yet in sight.

...

How does the new plan get to you?
Love, <J

7/07/04

Next sit.

Dear John,

Terrific news about the possible Lisson shows. No mention in your message about the digitizing of films and film show, but I hope that's still in the works too. Insightful commentary is most likely to come from broad-minded people in the art world I think.

The crossed wires don't stem from a hyphen or any part of your writing, but from our different approaches. As a philosopher I am concerned to understand other people's difficulties in interpreting my work and their objections to it. As an artist you are not. I find it enormously exciting trying to work out aspects of the way the universe works in the papers I write. They often turn out to differ quite a bit from most philosophers' views, so I don't think of myself as resigned to a status quo view or exhausted by it.

...

Love, Noa

7/7/04

Dear Noa,

Yes, and even people who have seen the current tv on TG's Sixties say my bit comes over well. Who is it suffering from Group Think? I was puzzled by the point where you refer to your philosophical papers, I would ask where you differ from previous or other current world view(?) Would you say the common cliché 'God knows' is used literally today, and if so in what dimensional framework?

...
Love ... J

7/09/04
Next sit.

Hi John,

We've made progress of a sort if your 'yes' signals agreement about the difference I've been pointing to between an artist's and a scientist's or philosopher's approach to their audience. It's my best explanation of the impasse we reach in trying to communicate about your theory.

My world view shares central features with many world views, such as the basic contingency of the universe, the bottom up picture in which the fundamental physical features of the world fix all the rest, and the largely deterministic view of the universe unfolding over time. Some of the controversial things I argue for are spatiotemporal regions as basic entities rather than the occupants of those regions, the paucity of objective causal relations, the in principle derivability of consciousness from physics, the undermining of desert principles by determinism.

Plenty of orthodox theists use 'God knows' literally, meaning that they think of God as a person, and use 'knows' in the same sense in which they say that a human knows something.

...
Love, Noa

1/07/05
briefing

hi Noa

A clash of our two projects here will occur from 20 Jan to the end of 2005 when my Tate show finishes. As Ian has got into ferments of his own he seems unlikely to be able to help explicate the view as a whole(?) (my "God is Great and Belief Systems as such" show opening 20th, ie. in a fortnight from now with its ultimate end at the TG; and Barbara and I with APG Archive show and O+I also at the TG in March)

The objective here is to show where the art trajectory actually led as a cosmological challenge to the current scientific firework displays. It is here that I take this opportunity to summarise:
Event structure from art now called FLAT TIME:

- * proposes a prehistory of the Universe Unow;
- * which is darwinian in its appearance but
- * uses Einstein Gen.Rel. equation to show how this forecasts evenstruck emrgence:

Zero Space Zero Time means 'nonextended State O'

Infinite heat reduced to minimum means 'Least Impulse to extend' and proto-universe.

Joined up, these components propose the Least event OI-IO where -IO is discharge of Impulse to State O'

Universes U1, U2, U3 arrive at the characteristics of extended behaviour comparable to the quantum of action familiarised in Unow; Universes U3, U4, U5 generate a 'solid' event structure which leads to an apparent space-time development over the series following and its observed behaviour from the now mappable RIO...

The series from this initial Ui proposes that extendedness as 'time' (arrived at in U2) precedes extendedness in space, which can only occur in U5 and series following.

In this account there is no such problem as quantum gravity, and as 'gravity' is essentially the Coming To An End of an extended U event, there will, as before predicted. .be no 'gravity wave' effect.

The proposition Flat Time is an inference from the art track, and not science as defined at present. However it occurred in an Incidental Person kind of relationship with a team of scientists attempting to articulate the unity between material explanation and that of the bio-human range of concepts.

As the sole surviving member of the ISMI and an IP with a recognised status as artist, I invite you, a philosopher with experience of the background, to provide for all curious people an estimate of what we can now say to have gone on, and so also 'to be going on'.as in TBD! 1972. Seeing you 12 days from now,

<J

1/09/05
briefing

Hello John,
just got back from Hawaii and am feeling well rested. Looking forward to your show. The visuals will make a powerful statement on their own. Are you intending to add a verbal statement yourself? What kind of statement are you asking me for? How about making an edited (or unedited) version of the Grace interview available? I'm not sure how I could improve on it.
Love, Noa

1/15/05
briefing

Hi John,
Looking forward to seeing you on Tue. I'm wondering whether you thought a part of my interview with Grace would be useful in connection with your show or for some other purpose, or whether you were asking

me for something different in this message. ...

Love, Noa

7/18/05

Re: Attachments ++

Hi Noa,

I have responded to Paul's enquiry about my bio. Have tried again to draw his attention to the break I made in finding the continuity of OHO from the zero action results of 1916 and 1951. My series shows as real the 10 or so steps taken to arrive at FT.

These were not chronologically sequential as in a reasoned thesis but then forms didn't arrive as though logically thought out. Their significance was not often recognised until more had been discovered, but the FT result now has a footnote to Basic (T) diagram which proposes an account of the way the Planck Era is absorbed when as in FT, the interval left out in the (T) diagram is seen to be contained in the first appearance of Habits A and B.

I think it would be useful if you can support this logic.. It was only realised when seen to be announced that the Universe was 300,000 years old by the time particles appeared.

The (T) dynamics of FlatTime account as I have said to PM, for the entirety of histories where current physics cannot reach life activity let alone a RIO at all. This is surely a point worth making in Paul's essay.

...

Great to see you. I will be going into the advantages of using your text & layout vis a vis my graphics approach to the front of PM's document.

Love<j

7/20/05

Re: Attachments ++

Hi John,

I have a hard time seeing how you accommodate this Plank era into your view of Unow. I'm not sure what interval left out on the (T) diagram you are referring to. Do you take U1, U2, etc to be separate from Unow, or are they parts of Unow, or do they exist both separately and as parts of Unow?

...

LOve, Noa

7/22/05

currently

Noa, I hope you have made sense of my amendments to Basic (T) diagram. Say if it does.

Have had further trouble with computer and e-server Viatel, who had me

on hold until the card paid up. So delays. Let me know if you can see how the explanations in Note: Planck era bring Basic (T) hypothesis into line. I am prepared to argue this through when the time comes but need to extract response from professors in order to make the case public.

Nicholas 's family and 30 artists on his List made a model of the Gallery for a birthday party for his 60th. It was held in the restaurant in Holland Park, and amounted to a banquet . My contribution was a 4" high glass/ book which he has fulsomely acknowledged in a most friendly letter.

...

For interest you might be able to get my interview with Alanna Heiss in Venice on line, I hear it said it was interesting. Arrangements are in hand now to export a show to PSI in NYC next year with David Thorp curating.

...

More soon, let me know how my explanation of FT sounds.

Love, <J

7/23/05

Late draft

hi Noa

...

re Planck era: I refer to the period between 10 to the -43 sec Planck time to 10 to the -23 sec when it is admitted that the universe Unow became particulate. I hope you follow the argument which fills the 300,000 years along with the scale of architecture between U1 and the 10 to the -23sec. which is taken as the time-base of the initial particulate state of Unow, (that of habits A and B, which are 'sibling twins' which act differently). I cannot pretend to work out the logic of architectural proportions between Planck time and its status in Unow. .

Your observations on this would be much appreciated, How would we test?.

If you did not send Paul the stanza-like formulation you made of my Hypothesis(1) I cannot find it in my disk so would you get it back to me by a new email asap..?

Thanks and I hope you recovered from the cold you took with you. B and I both had a similar malaise at the time.

Love<j

7/26/05

Re: Late draft

Hi John,

I hope you found the edited version I made of your hypothesis. I don't understand your recent writing about the Planck era. Is it supposed to be 10 to the -23secs or 300,000 years before the universe became particulate?

I don't see why you shouldn't leave it as an open question what the duration of the least event is.

I'm also unclear why you introduced the idea of previous universes and whether you take U1, U2 etc to be separate from Unow or parts of Unow or both. I think your claims about previous universes will seem more speculative and be less likely to be taken seriously than the claims you make about the universe we can observe.

Love, Noa

7/27/05

Re: Late draft

Noa, I have found your version of the FT hypothesis. Now how about this...

The trajectories of art and of physics (if not also of verbal logic) all hit the zero action barrier in the 20C, but have not resolved it except for the OI-IO notation for Least Event. To make sense of this notation I have defined the <zero space zero time> part of the Relativity singularity as nonextendedness.

This move only makes sense if we also interpret <infinite heat> as Impulse (to extend) and minimalise Impulse as for Least Event in the art track. The Universe U1 is now a proto-universe with an Impulse to extend from a nonextended state(OI).

The series of U universes is accretive, just as score in music is accretive. We have arrived today at a conception which is fragmented concerning sources of action. The arrival of the trajectory of art, first at zero action and then at a 'least informing accretion' from the ISMI coherence has led me as artist through about ten hoops of formal invention to the piece which the Tate has just bought, so conferring the necessary status of a discrete realism on this work... and so on to FlatTime as presented with a footnote on Planck era units.

The Planck era connection is argued as follows:

The photo-observation from Hubble of the earliest state of the universe, lately quoted as particulating some 300,000 years after the said origin (bang), lends authenticity to the number given in the Basic (T) diagram. The number used is equivalent to that of the generation of a particulate universe which we all know as common sensible.

The discovery of a way in which we can now plot a discrete RIO on the same map as a proto-universe offers a useable conception of the unity which to date has no finite explanation other than a variety of assertions such as 'God is Great'.

It is this which drives my personal combination of concepts to accompany a set of visual pieces which nobody would otherwise understand except as (conventional) visual art.

[To even up with the Planck era: putting Hubble's 300,000 years into seconds, we get 3×10^{12} , leaving a further 10^8 to be accounted for in the unknown accretions of architectural scale in the U series. We then have an arguable explanation with which to account for all histories. Do we not?]

love, <J

7/27/05

Re: Late draft

Hi John,

I'm guessing that the 300,000 years figure is the projected age of the universe captured by a Hubble photo. Pretty amazing. This would have no relation to the 10 to the -23 secs that is projected to be the age of the universe when the first particles emerged. My advice would be to leave the duration of your least event open and not try to map it onto the latest numbers coming up in scientific journals.

It looks to me as though your U1, U2, etc are stages of the universe rather than universes that can be regarded as existing prior to the Big Bang in some sense.

A difficulty in squaring your picture with the Big Bang picture is that so much happened in the first duration on the Big Bang picture. It doesn't look like a good candidate for a Least Event.

Love, Noa

7/27/05

Re: Late draft

hi Noa, thanks for the tipoff.

You could be right but my point is that there is guesswork anyway between my two periods and it is still as good an argument for the darwinian picture of this Universe as any other.

I accept that the ascription of a particulate state beginning at the time ascribed to the photo, but the criticism of the earlier Basic (T) argument rested on my not having extended the point A a mile to its left to arrive at Planck time as a Least Extended state. This would throw the hypothesis straight into the bin.

I want to stand firm enough to lay an argument on the table which (a) can account for the insufficiency of "quantum gravity" as their flaw, (physicists') and (b) to put a creative idea (Impulse to extend) which covers crises of belief systems as they stand into the whole picture from the art trajectory..

I send these exchanges on to Paul and the Tate so that there is a defence of the interpretation from art as FT in the face of the overbearing influence of current scientific imperialism.

If <j

7/27/05

Re: Late draft

Hi JOhn,

Did you send a separate note to paul asking him if you had any time to revise the hypothesis before it goes into print? Let me know if you will have the opportunity to do so and want to make some revisions. There is something to be said for leaving it as a pure artist's document. Some people might be interested in trying to decypher it. My proposed editing and the revisions I'd recommend come from my understanding of how other people think and what it takes to communicate with them. But I doubt that I can get across to you the rationale behind any of my suggestions.

Love, Noa

7/28/05

Re: Late draft

N; I have asked to see anything before it goes into print and am now trying to see him asap. Will see how Paul understands the two versions. I am not so sure that your 4 paras are precisely expressive of my FT hypothesis.

If<j

7/28/05

Re: Late draft

hi N, have been having eye tests and late lunch but have now spoken to Paul and he is coming to FTHO to discuss any amendments at 5pm our time tomorrow. He is willing to make them but they need to be in my voice. I do appreciate the succinctness of what you write but Paul seems to think the T vs S argument can be put across either way. The main aim is to create a broad discussion, during which individual points can reach media at an appropriate level.

Paul has got hold of Erica Bolton, who does get people to listen and she will be accompanying PM tomorrow. Do send an email which gets to all of us so I can bring up the issues without prejudice.

...

Hear from you tomorrow,

lv<j

7/28/05

Re: Late draft

Dear John,

...

My editing was intended for you to study as an aid to revising your hypothesis (I) if you wanted to. I didn't think you'd want to adopt it exactly as it is. The formulation that gets printed must be something you think best expresses your view.

It's a pity we can't discuss it face to face. You said you're not sure that it expresses your FT hypothesis but can you point to features of it that you think are weaker in the edited version? I think it says what your original says but reorganises it and has a very different look. I definitely wouldn't say that it was my version of your hypothesis or in my voice. You get that on the Grace interview.

My memory of your original and my editing is now fading as I don't have either version on computer. As I recall, I made two minor changes in substance: I added a phrase like 'all kinds of phenomena' in your description of what occurs on the time base spectrum to replace the cryptic word 'envelope'. I inserted the word 'resembles' in characterising the relation to the Fibonacci series. The major reorganisation involved grouping your points under four headings roughly in order of importance. Hope tomorrow's meeting goes well. I think it would be good if you could decide on a version of your hypothesis you like best before Paul and Erica arrive.

Love, Noa

7/29/05

Re: Late draft

hi Noa, thanks for this. I have adopted the two small amendments mentioned here for my version, and stick to the discovery claim as needing to 'hold the front page'. It must challenge both institutional premises to get the discussion out of their limpet habits.

Will keep you updated as we go through the process. Have relevant meetings Monday.

Ive<j

7/30/05

Re: Late draft

hi N,

Good meeting yesterday with PM and Erica. Saw draft copy of a catalogue with pics of each looking ok. P has left me with his draft statement of the hypothesis which is simply headed 'Flat Time'. Printed in white on black (a neg) and loose as in my draft. I do have time on Monday to send revisions and will use your modified terms eg for envelope.

Erica will be contacting the philosophical end of her list of commentators. I think there has to be something in the tenets which call for a disagreement, which you might make as well as anyone. Controversy is what commentary is all about in the media.

all for now lv <j

7/30/05

Re: Late draft

That's good. If I were over there I could suggest what I think best expresses the most important of your claims with a view to getting it across to someone who has no previous exposure to your ideas. I don't think there's any danger that it could come across as uncontroversial. And I do think there's a danger that some things you say will come across as dismissable and thereby tarnish the rest of the message. But that's thinking like a philosopher. Other criteria are in play when your hypothesis is viewed as a work of art.

...

Love, Noa

FlatTime

“Our current Universe (U_{now}) relates to an original ancestor Universe (U_1).

The envelope dimensionality of Universe U_{now} consists of

- 1. three time-related components only,**
- 2. a principle of event structure, evenometry which entails**
- 3. a nonextended state (state O) in which**
- 4. an Impulse-to-extend is its origin and in-forming component.”**

Commentary:

These components are derivable;

1. from general relativity, its implied conclusion in <zero space zero time infinite heat>. ('heat' as Impulse is omnipresent in the state O)
2. from prophetic traditions,
3. from the dimensionality of art, in particular as music, which manifests three time-related components only:
 - count time
 - time-base ordering and
 - an omnipresent score

A proto-universe U_1 is defined by the sign OI-IO, signifying Impulse OI and Discharge of, -IO

Subsequent discrete universes U_2 , U_3 et cetera universes to U_{now} are accretive of action in previous extended universes, evidently in a Fibonacci–discovered order, where the state O is omnipresent and equivalent to score in music. This concept of score is not found either in defined theologies or in physical theory.

During the twentieth Century all academic approaches to an overarching system arrived at an illogical conclusion. That in physics has been called a singularity, as interpreted from the current 'big bang' Universe (U_{now}).'

L Hypothesis:

The dynamics of a state <zero space zero time infinite heat>¹ is interpreted :

<zero space zero time>: a *nonextended state*

<infinite heat>: an infinite *Impulse (to extend)*,

Infinity of Impulse when minimised to a *Least Impulse* proposes

- **a proto-universe OI-IO** where:
- the part OI is a nonextended-state-carrying-a-Least-Impulse .
- the part –IO is discharge of Impulse OI as a least extended event.

The inference (drawn from history's trajectories) is that U_{now} stems from an antecedent series U_1, U_2, U_3 et cetera discrete universes².

This interpretation of U_{now} as amplified in the concept FlatTime³

bids to resolve current problems of understanding. Starting with 'quantum gravity' it proceeds to cover event structures observed in U_{now} , in particular the phenomenon of a Reflective Intuitive Organism (RIO). An RIO is *in-formed* from a *time-base spectrum* implicit in the (nonextended) 'score' of antecedent extended states, (as a musical performance is an ordering of time-based properties in-formed from a co-present 'score': three time-related components only).

1 general relativity

2 art work series and inferences post 1954

3 note: 'gravity' is originally a universe 'coming to an end' at state O and is presumed as such

L Hypothesis: Derivations, Forms as art,

The hypothesis 'FlatTime'(FT) follows from the trajectory of art. FT is reached via an initial 'least unit of mark' on an unmarked surface where immediate antecedents are zero action Works as art, c.1951. FT states:

Our Universe (Unow) has a prehistory dating back to an original singular extended universe U_1 .

U^1 is a least extended state emerging from a nonextended Impulse implicit in the famous result left by general relativity: the state <zero space zero time infinite heat>.

Universe U_{now} follows the same structural principle as U_1 :
An initial extended state is the discharge of an equivalent Impulse in the nonextended state O. The sequence U_1, U_2 initialises our concept of time. 'Space' appears and is particulate in U_5 .

Represented by the sign OI-IO, the dimensional dynamic OI-IO informs all subsequent universes via 'evenometry' covering in-forming components of all action.

See Basic (T) Diagram 1995. The development leading to this conclusion dates from a first use of a visual atomising instrument in 1954. FlatTime was discovered by way of a set of ten specific forms as art which continue the principle adopted in mid-19th Century, 'to discover More from Less'.

Flat Time Hypothesis

1. The dimensionality of the universe consists of three time-related components only: count time, time-base ordering of all phenomena, and an omnipresent score.
2. The principles of event structure relating these components, evenometry, entail a nonextended state (state O) whose origin and in-forming element is an impulse-to-extend.
3. These principles are derivable from the implied conclusion of general relativity "zero space, zero time, infinite heat" ('heat' as impulse is omnipresent in the state O); from prophetic traditions; and from the dimensionality of art, in particular music, which manifests the three time-related components.
4. Our current universe (U_{now}) relates to an original ancestor universe (U1). A proto-universe U_1 is defined by the sign OI-IO, signifying impulse OI and discharge of impulse -IO. Subsequent discrete universes U_2 , U_3 et cetera to U_{now} are accretive of action in previous extended universes, resembling a Fibonacci-discovered order, where the state O is omnipresent and equivalent to score in music. This concept of score is not found either in defined theologies or in physical theory.