

# Free-Will: Freedom of choice within limits.

**Vernon M. Neppe MD, PhD, FRS(SAf), DPCP(ECAO), DSPE<sup>abc</sup>  
and Edward R. Close PhD, PE, DF(ECAO), DSPE**

## **Abstract:**

*Does free-will exist? This debate is not new. It extends, at least back to the times of Homer. However, today we realize that the approach to free-will must be scientific: That requires not just using Popperian falsifiability, because we must also apply LFAF (Lower dimensional feasibility, absent falsification), including what is feasible but not falsified.*

*There are three major views of free-will:*

- *The current prevailing materialist, reductionist philosophy argues that free-will cannot exist: We are simply machines, who have been born with specific genes, have had no choice with our environment, and we interact with random events. We are conditioned to respond in specific ways, and then we ultimately die.*
- *The second view argues that if there is evidence for precognition and presentiment, then that would exclude free-will. The converse applies: If free-will exists, then precognition does not. That means we cannot have both free-will and precognition. However, because there's profound scientific data supporting precognition and presentiment, it's likely we don't have free-will.*
- *In this paper, we argue from a third perspective, for the legitimate existence of both free-will and precognition. We apply principles derived from the Neppe-Close TDVP (Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm) model. Key pertinent features to free-will derived from TDVP include*
  - *everything obeying the laws of nature;*

---

<sup>a</sup> Vernon M. Neppe MD, PhD, Fellow Royal Society (SAf), DFAPA, DPCP (ECAO), DSPE; and Edward R. Close PhD, DF (ECAO), DSPE. Pacific Neuropsychiatric Institute, Seattle; and Exceptional Creative Achievement Organization. For perspective, Prof. Neppe is a Behavioral Neurologist, Neuropsychiatrist, Neuroscientist, Psychopharmacologist, Forensic specialist, Psychiatrist, Phenomenologist, Neuroscientist, Epileptologist, Consciousness Researcher, Philosopher, Creativity expert, and Dimensional Biopsychophysicist. His CV includes 11+ books, 2 plays, 750+ publications, 1000+ invited lectures and media interactions worldwide (<http://www.vernonneppe.org/about.php>). Dr. Close is a Physicist, Mathematician, Cosmologist, Environmental Engineer and Dimensional Biopsychophysicist. *Transcendental Physics* is one of Dr. Close's 8+ books. ([www.erclosetphysics.com](http://www.erclosetphysics.com)).

<sup>b</sup> The material in this article has been peer-reviewed by several readers. We thank them all for the feedback.

<sup>c</sup> © Vernon Neppe and Exceptional Creative Achievement Organization. Reproduction requires written consent. Vernon Neppe & Edward Close. Free-will: Freedom of choice within limits. *IQNJ*. 10:1, 7-70, v3.3 18030610. 2018 7

- *applying an approach to free-will by individuals;*
- *multiple different levels of groups ('individual-units'), and an extensive Systems Theory approach implying that everything, even atomic particles, has some limited free-will; and recognition of the roles of meaning, guidance and consciousness, and of 'relative' influence, impacts, and 'relative free-will', cause and effect, and gimmel.*
- *Whatever else, we argue that free-will has limits: It is relative to our immediate experience of 'life-tracks'. We can metaphorically understand free-will by applying the TDVP 'life-track concept', where we can visualize leaves, branches, trees and forests, and in which most of us are impacting and influencing only our immediate branches. However, even subatomic particles would have some degree of non-random free-will, though it may appear random in the 3S-1t domain. '- free-will' might exist but only if we impact and influence from the infinite—that could imply G-d<sup>d</sup>: The implications of that broadest forest of infinity would be enormous, as a deity could theistically impact directly on us all.*
- *Provided we understand the mathematically-proven yet empirically feasible TDVP finding that we're existing in a 9-dimensional (9-D) finite quantized reality, and that this is embedded in a continuous infinite fabric, explaining the feasibility of free-will and precognition together becomes easy. This is because even though we only experience physical reality in three spatial dimensions in a moment in the present (3S-1t), to apply the free-will model, we would need to go beyond 3S-1t. The existence of the key free-will and precognition components are beyond our restricted physical 3S-1t domain.*
- *A convenient, though unproven, but eminently feasible, secondary TDVP proposal is that we can apply the theoretical model dimensional Time. 3-D Time is not absolutely necessary for free-will, but is a convenient conceptualization.*
- *Vernon Neppe's 'Neppe Law of Cause and Effect' (NLCE) appears to be a formidable model whereby choices can be changed and precognitions altered. The NLCE is fully compatible with TDVP. This contrasts with John*

---

<sup>d</sup> We chose to use the word 'G-d' in this paper. This is not so much a theological as a scientific decision. In 'TDVP', we emphasize the concept of the ineffable '*infinite continuity*'. We highlight the 'forever' concepts in eternal 'Time' (T); the unextended in boundless 'Space' (S); and the never-ending reservoir of unceasing 'Consciousness' (C): TDVP's infinite 'STC' provides a fundamental portrayal of a perpetual, incessant infinite reality 'without a beginning', and 'without an end'. We differentiate all of this by revering the term 'G-d'.

Dunne's Experiment with Time which has significant logical and empirical problems.

- Many of these ideas are in the Neppe-Close book Reality Begins with Consciousness: A Paradigm Shift that Works and in follow-up publications.

**Key-words:** 3-dimensional time, 3S-It, 9-dimensions, Absolute free-will, Actualization, Atom, Carballal (Jose Carballal), Cause and effect, Calculus of Distinctions, Close (Edward Close), Consciousness, Content, Conway (John Conway), Dark matter, Dark Energy, Deity, Dimensions, Dimensional Biopsychophysics, Distinctions, Domains, Dossey (Larry Dossey), Dunne (John Dunne), Electrons, Entropy, Experience, Existence, Extent, Evolution, Finite, Free-will, Freedom of choice, Free will theorem, Gimmel, Goswami, Iceberg analogy, Impact, Influence, Infinite, Infinite continuity, Intent, Kabbalah, Meaning, Meaningful coincidence, Neppe (Vernon Neppe), Neppe Law of Cause and Effect, Life-tracks, Materialism, Mathematics, Neutrons, NLCE, Order, Ordropy, Panentheism, Photons, Physical materialism, Physics, Precognition, Presentiment, Protons, Qualit, Quantum, Quarks, Reality Begins with Consciousness, Relative, Relative free-will, Systems approach, TDVP, Serial time, Theism, Time, Tree analogy, Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm

## **A short perspective: Does Free will exist? Section 1.<sup>°</sup>**

Free-will, also called Free Choice, or Freedom of Choice, refers to the power to be able to act without the constraint of necessity or fate. It is the ability to act at one's own discretion. Free-will is generally regarded as absolute (complete) or relative (partial). Fate refers to the development of events that are beyond a person's control. However, these events are determined and unmodifiable. Fate implies lack of free-will.

Free-will has been a dilemma for philosophers for millennia. It's prominent and even appears in Homer's Odyssey (Zeus)<sup>1</sup>: *"Oh for shame, how the mortals put*

---

<sup>°</sup> Vernon Neppe and Edward Close: A short perspective: Does free-will exist? IQNJ. 10:1, 9-12. 2018. S1.

*the blame on us gods, for they say evils come from us, but it is they, rather, who by their own recklessness win sorrow beyond what is given....” (1.32-34)*

On the one hand, today, some would argue that there is no such thing as freedom of will or of any kind of free choice. This fits well within the materialistic, physicalistic framework of, *“there is nothing else but behaviors which are the result of one’s genetics, any events in utero, and one’s environment during life, combined with random events that affect us, and which we are helpless to prevent. Life has absolutely no purpose, and when you die, you die. And we are nothing but machines.”* As ludicrous as this sounds for many, to others, this is how existence is. This is, now, becoming even more so: *“We are ruled by technology and machines. We have no choice in our actions:”* and even more so: *“There is no G-d; there is no meaning; there is no relevance to life; there is no good and evil, because we are all just automatons; and we are nothing more than machines. We are not even animals, because animals are also just their specific genetics, environmental exposures, experience their own random events, and respond based on their behavioral conditioning.”*

Personally, we find this view appalling, and sad. It takes away meaning from our existence. And we also find the view contradictory to fact<sup>2</sup>: We are not only dealing with falsifiability of information based on the Popperian scientific method<sup>3-5</sup>; but there is such a thing as *scientific feasibility*.<sup>6-10</sup>

Slightly better, because it has a possible optimistic tinge is:

*“Everything is predestined. We cannot do anything about predestination. Let’s live life to the full: Except we cannot, because we have no real choice. So, let’s hope we’re lucky.”* But that still does not help: *“There is no free will, no freedom of choice, and we must wait for our fate, though it might come from somewhere.”*

Carl G. Jung, the great and influential Psychiatrist, Psychoanalyst, Mystic and Polymath, who founded the Jungian school, had his own similar slant, though his comment in a letter sounds somewhat facetious: *“To this day, G-d is the name by which I designate all things which cross my willful path violently and recklessly, all things which upset my subjective views, plans and intentions, and change the course of my life for better or worse.”*<sup>11</sup>

Moreover, when one examines feasibility of events, there are contradictions to this purely materialistic, physical proposition: The Standard Model of Physics

has been mathematically refuted, for example, by the Neppe/Close model of TDVP.<sup>12-14</sup> This is a proven mathematical fact. It is also a fact that our current scientific method cannot handle Evolution, Cosmology, and even Quantum Physics. And that pure falsifiability barely handles much of the practice of Medicine and Psychology; and it does not deal with consciousness, dimensions, and psi. Applying this prevailing scientific model of physics based on Popperian falsifiability, we could call all these areas, *pseudo-sciences*. It is somewhat ironic that somewhere along the line, we make exceptions and do not call Evolution, Cosmology and Quantum Physics ‘pseudo-science’, even though Quantum Physics in current models involves a ‘*weirdness*’<sup>15, 16</sup> which cannot be explained<sup>2</sup>. But we do add this prejudicial term—pseudo-science—to *consciousness, psi, and dimensionality*<sup>2</sup>.

In regard to Feynman’s Quantum Weirdness<sup>15, 16</sup>, ironically, this term, ‘weird’, plays a role in this free-will topic: In general, little is written on free-will and fate, and it’s only an uncommon topic of conversation. Yet, the archaic Scottish word ‘weird’ originally referred to one’s destiny. Moreover, the *Weird Sisters*, are the creatures who prophesy the destinies of the main characters in Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*. The term, ‘Weird Sisters’, was first used by Scots writers as a sobriquet for the Fates of Greek and Roman mythology.

These many disciplines—Physics, Cosmology, Evolution, Consciousness, Dimensionality, even paradigm shifts—are all important in discussing freedom of choice. Fortunately, the scoffing attitudes may gradually be changing, and we’ve proposed extending the famous Kuhnian paradigm<sup>17</sup> to eleven stages.<sup>18, 19</sup> This is needed to be able to even conceptualize free-will and precognition, scientifically. Without a paradigm shift, this discussion is, effectively, dead: We simply cannot have materialistic reductionism explaining either or both of Free Will or Precognition! Therefore, the application of a new Philosophy of Science model beyond Popperian falsifiability, namely LFAF (Lower dimensional feasibility, absent falsification)<sup>3 2</sup> is needed, and LFAF allows for what is feasible but not falsified to be included.

There is an alternative, and marginally better hypothesis. If there is free choice—and here we introduce concepts pertaining to spirituality, and to right and wrong—it could be argued that there could be no such thing as precognition<sup>20</sup> (scientific foreknowledge) because the two factors, precognition and free-will,



may be contradictory. We do not believe that this is a contradiction and argue that both are likely true.

However, we argue that this limitation is unnecessary: There is a third hypothesis that is scientifically feasible. Initially here, we show that there is very profound evidence for precognition and presentiment. This evidence is so cogent that it is scientifically, statistically proven for precognition and for presentiment—a specific form of precognition specifically involving knowledge that is not even consciously made and looks at events just seconds before they are actualized.<sup>20</sup> *So, given that the data for precognition and presentiment are statistically scientifically facts, we have to deal with these facts if we are dealing with free-will.* In doing so, we may have to re-think the nature of time. Time may not be the simple linear flow we think it is.

We argue there is no contradiction if we apply finite *existence*, by using the proven fabric of a 9-dimensional<sup>21, 22</sup> finite quantized model<sup>23, 24</sup>, instead of our current physicalistic *experiential* model of ‘3-1t’—length, breadth and height (3-spatial dimensions being the 3S in a moment of time (1t). Moreover, it is likely that the 9-dimensional finite model is embedded within a continuous infinite reality making a unified whole. This means effectively that we are not only able to deal with free-will, but that *our free-will be limited inside that finite reality*, because we do not have complete control of all of the infinite.<sup>25-30</sup>

This is what this paper is all about. And there are different stages, because in order to explain this adequately we can first examine ‘linear time’—one dimension of past, present and future—from a precognition point of view. But this is likely inadequate.<sup>31-33</sup> It is very likely that we shall have to apply Multidimensional Time.<sup>32, 34</sup>

We will also discuss various models, such as the Neppe Law of Cause and Effect<sup>35 24</sup>; John Dunne’s ideas pertaining to causality and serial time<sup>36</sup>; and also multiverse or universe components<sup>37, 38</sup>. Freedom of choice links up with another very important area: the area of good and evil.<sup>39 40-45</sup>

## **Key amplifications about free-will: Section 2.**<sup>f</sup>

We now amplify key points of this introduction below.

- Ostensible free-will may simply reflect the subjective experience of determinism, and therefore not free choice at all. There is no freedom of action, and we are just the machines we've referred to. There is no growth or spirituality.
- Alternatively, there is the necessary historical justification for free-will: Rene Descartes applied free-will so we would have an excuse for imprisoning evil-doers: Otherwise we couldn't claim that they had free choice.<sup>46</sup>
- One difficulty in accepting precognition is largely because researchers think it conflicts with 'free-will'. But this is a non-issue, yet to some degree Charley Tart rejects precognition<sup>47</sup> for similar reasons, and so does David Griffin<sup>48</sup> and Michael Murphy<sup>49</sup> and there is apparent conflict with Whiteheadian metaphysics<sup>50, 51</sup>. Larry Dossey handles this issue well in his book the *Power of Premonitions*.<sup>52</sup>

Let's examine what should be some relatively simple explanations, but appear formidable:

- In our opinion, one explanation for the non-issue could be that, therefore, not the '3S-1t' of our *experience*. If this is so, this way, the precognition (relative to us observers) would have already incorporated what has been decided by free-will that was not in 3S-1t. This would presumably require existence outside 3S-1t and a multidimensional model. Whereas this explanation is adequate, it's not fully comprehensible. Later in this paper, we will discuss a model that is included in this explanation, namely multidimensional time.
- A similar way to explain precognitions would be that in valid event precognitions of actual future events, the future event already has been brought about by many freely willed activities. This way precognition would be one consequence in 3S-1t of what already existed as *multiple free-will* contributions. Alternatively, perhaps that future would not have occurred without deciding (making choices of) something by free-will. This explanation is again esoteric, but has not postulated multiple extra

---

<sup>f</sup> Vernon Neppe and Edward Close: Key amplifications about free-will IQNJ. 10:1, 13-15. 2018. S2.

dimensions or a multiverse. It is a direct cause-effect, but then the question is how.

- Essentially, one explanation would be when an impression is precognized in any state like a dream, meditation, or waking consciousness, it may be reflecting what is happening at that moment in another (possibly ‘thought equivalent’) dimensional domain. Here, a true impression is being picked up of an event that was actually occurring at that moment, but not in our limited time perceptual experience. Circumstances change when the current cause produces an altered effect. Effectively, a new event occurs in that ‘thought domain’ instead, and by ‘knowing’ this, the subject could make a free choice which ends up corresponding when the reality is actualized in our physical 3S-1t. Therefore, a precognition picked up by a ‘psychic’ may appear wrong when it doesn't happen; but it was not wrong, it just did not physically actualize because reality was altered.
- On the other hand, there may be overwhelming facets, with so much current cause for that thought of predestination that a precognition will come about physically and cannot be easily changed: Let us say that millions in our physical 3S-1t experience independently think X, which would produce Z into the future. Now a few individuals think Y, and unless those few persons influence the millions, that may not change the event X from actualizing in 3S-1t as Z. In fact, X may even be, for example, geophysically based, like an earthquake. It could be argued that our exerting our cognitive decision of free-will would be difficult to ‘trump’ the earthquake.
- These ideas are similar to the potential reality described by Louisa Rhine. Louisa Rhine examined those investigated cases in which the person had the opportunity to try to change the event that was precognized. She concluded that the *potential not actual event* is precognized, which suggests the future exists not deterministically but rather as a range of possible outcomes of varying probability.<sup>53, 54</sup> The degree that human intervention may affect events would vary in probability (as with the earthquake example). Our cause and effect postulate above in a thinking dimension/ realm, and the multi-universe idea, all might have the same fundamental idea of free choice somehow impacting precognition.
- These ideas are also consistent with the thinking of several physicists on the subject of free-will and indeterminism. What did Albert Einstein think? He proposed that we reside in an already determined block



universe in which we simply uncover the future as we creep along the time-line at, for example, one-second-per-second.<sup>55, 56</sup>

- But surely there can be an easier explanation not requiring the above complex ideas in 3S-1t, or alternatively rejecting precognition if one has free will?

### **The Neppe-Close Classification of Free-will: Section 3.<sup>g</sup>**

Free-will may be one of the most important questions in our existence. Without the freedom to choose for good or bad, or for success or failure, or for any other legitimate reason, what would be our purpose in life? How could we change?

The ‘short answer’ explaining how free-will works can be via a model that we call ‘TDVP’. This TDVP is very detailed<sup>57-59</sup> and covered in some detail in *Reality Begins with Consciousness* (RBC5).<sup>24</sup>

For perspective, we briefly describe the fundamental philosophical frameworks of this model called the Neppe-Close Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm (TDVP). We have extensively published on this scientific model in many publications.<sup>12 60</sup> All these principles are well supported empirically and mathematically.<sup>24, 61, 62</sup> In short, TDVP is a new metaparadigm—an extended theory of everything interfacing many specialties—that works scientifically. And from the science, we can explain the secondary philosophical underpinnings.

TDVP is an empirically proven model which is now mathematically demonstrated. TDVP recognizes that:

- there is a triad of Space, Time and Extent of Consciousness (STC) that are all tethered together. We call these STC substrates of ‘*extent*’, because they are measurable as ‘dimensions’;
- there are 9 finite quantized dimensions in a continuous infinite unified reality: We have proven this 9-dimensional finding by applying mathematical-physics;
- the extent of STC requires a specific ‘container’ of Mass-Energy and Content of Consciousness (MEC): MEC effectively involves the receptacle and its *contents*, and can be measured through STC;

---

<sup>g</sup> Vernon Neppe and Edward Close: The Neppe-Close Classification of Free-will IQNJ. 10:1, 15-23. 2018. S3.  
Vernon Neppe & Edward Close. Free-will: Freedom of choice within limits. *IQNJ*. 10:1, 7-70, v3.3 18030610. 2018 15

- there is *influence and impact* of any component of this Mass-Energy and Content of Consciousness;
- the need for vortices, with rotation and spinning applying angular momentum;
- TDVP necessarily includes a massless, energyless, third ‘substance’ or process, called ‘gimmel’. We have proposed that gimmel is, in part or whole, ‘Consciousness’. Without gimmel our world would be unstable and not able to exist: Gimmel is essential to physical existence.
- Consciousness has several components: There are neurological and psychological aspects. But we’ve proposed that there is a consciousness outside the brain, too, which can be quantized in the finite, or informational from the infinite, and experienced specifically as ‘meaning’.
- TDVP conforms at all levels, finite and infinite, to the laws of nature;
- what *exists* in our finite reality (such as 9 dimensions—9-D) is different from what we *experience* in our physical, ostensibly complete material reality of 3S-1t. 3S-1t is just the visible portion of the iceberg of our experience reflecting only a small, albeit important, portions of our existence in the finite (9-D) contained in (‘embedded’ in) an infinite realm (all making up a unified reality).
- TDVP creates a groundbreaking paradigm shift not only in understanding physics, mathematics and the sciences, but provides significant affirmative implications for the infinite reality and survival after physical death. These conclusions are important, as recognized by Larry Dossey.<sup>63</sup> Effectively, TDVP implies immortality and it is a model than can be applied to our transcendental growth, and to the uplifting of our world.<sup>24</sup> Though scientific, it interfaces with spirituality.<sup>64</sup>

TDVP also allows explains several fundamental but critical, though speculative, ideas pertinent to free-will, namely:

- Three dimensions of time.
- Multiple dimensions of consciousness.
- Cause and effect.
- Cognition-affect-volition, as three fundamental psychological concepts of mental status functioning.
- Ego-boundaries—the distinction of separation of self from not self;
- and Free-will and freedom of choice which can actualize (be fulfilled).

We (Vernon Neppe and Edward Close) regard free-will as critically relevant and devote a chapter in RBC5 <sup>24</sup> to Free-will. This is discussed later in this article, after prioritizing the basics of the Free-will model expressed by TDVP first.

The following, in our opinion, are the key features pertaining to free-will.

1. *RELATIVE FREE-WILL*: In our TDVP model (‘triadic dimensional distinction vortical paradigm’) <sup>23, 65</sup> there certainly is freedom of choice and of action. But this is ‘*relative free-will*’ – it is relative to our own experience and to our own contacts at the various system levels. Effectively we can impact and be influenced. <sup>28, 33 66</sup> But that is limited to our own metaphoric ‘tentacles’. Sometimes the extent of our influence may be enormous; sometimes it’s tiny. <sup>67</sup> The potentially great impact applies particularly today, where media and television can impact on millions. But that is all relative. Impact can be considerable or minor. The recipient can be influenced to varying degrees but still can respond by the relative and limited free-will, perhaps less if there has been significant impact.

We know this postulated idea is likely correct given the findings on psychokinesis in psi studies which reflect 6-sigma (1 billion to one against) data. <sup>24, 68</sup> In one of our papers, we even propose a mechanism for such psi based on models distant from the quantum but using such principles. <sup>68</sup>

2. *ABSOLUTE FREE-WILL*: The only absolute may be at the level of ‘infinity of infinity’ where everything in space, time, and consciousness is unending, continuous and extends forever. That could theologically imply a Divinity with a potential to influence all if we think theistically and not deistically. Consequently, our free-will is not absolute. It is relative because we do not know everything, and we cannot impact on everything. It obeys the laws of nature. It may only be absolute at the level of the ‘infinity of infinities’. At that level, we would be able to talk about ‘absolute free-will’. This fits into the TDVP distinction we’ve made of *impact*: Impacts can be a theological impact; it can be an impact in terms of our choice at our more limited kind of levels. It can be an impact, not only in terms of consciousness, but with mass or energy e.g. earthquakes.
3. *RELATIVE INFLUENCE*: Nevertheless, relative to the domain of our experience, we can make these limited relative choices. We think they’re

absolute but they're not. They're also influenced, inter alia, by our experiences, our learning, our impulses and our character.

4. *LIFE-TRACKS*: In TDVP, we use the analogy of 'life-tracks'.<sup>69</sup> We can go in particular directions, and we can deviate at any kind of direction. Let's imagine we're like branches on a tree. (Figure 1).

We choose which branch of our Life-Track road to travel in. In other words, when anyone talks about precognition or foreknowledge, the result is not a foregone conclusion: Changes can occur at any time by just changing the course. That is free-will. But it is a *limited free-will* because the free-will impacts our society, our families, our friends, and our groups, and our cultures, and our ethnic groups, potentially. So, all these different 'individual units' at that social systems level<sup>70 45</sup>, impact reciprocally, and interchange branches, roots and trees, and sometimes even cause the whole forest to rumble. Free-will can be at any one of those levels. John Donne's '*no man is an island intire (sic) of itself*'<sup>71</sup> appears to be more than poetic—it's correct!

**Figure 1: Life-Tracks of the leaves, branches and trees in the forest.**



5. *TIME*: Now comes, how do we put together this whole free-will component? We've talked about relative free-will at the philosophical, speculative level. The model that we use in TDVP is a model of multi-dimensional time. That's why we were talking about mathematics so much

in TDVP. Multi-dimensional time is one of those speculations, but it fits into the jigsaw puzzle <sup>6, 10, 72</sup>, and it is very feasible mathematically and, I would argue, even likely.

We can think of the arrow of time in terms of past, present and future – but that is one linear dimension. Philosophers often get caught up with such linearity, and yet it is *relative linearity because that's what we experience*.

We can graphically portray our dreams and the dreams of others: This shows on a graph that this is planar – this is two-dimensional: Each time experience is a little different, and this varies in our clock-time estimates, but our clocks are limited to linear time!

Three-dimensional time, we think, is linked to free-will – the choices we make, with the freedom to choose and to move on in different directions. Everything is in threes, and we need not talk only about our 'experience' of linear lines of time. We've seen how easy it is to graph two dimensions of time.

But portraying three is harder: But, if we have three dimensions of time, free choice can be rather obvious. We just turn off and go on a different life-track. As indicated, all of consciousness at this level is linked up with time, and at the infinite level, things are different because everything is eternal. Therefore, we are talking about relative finite time and relative finite expression of time.

Neppe has even developed a model called the Neppe Law of Cause and Effect (NLCE) <sup>35</sup>: Effectively, an event might be predestined at a specific moment, but that event can change all the time.

6. *CONSCIOUSNESS*: Of course, the key to free-will is choice. And that involves some kind of consciousness, however, rudimentary or advanced. The beauty about this is that in TDVP, Time at the higher dimensional levels is embedded at even higher dimensions with Consciousness. These domains are not separate, and just as we have horizontal systems theory levels <sup>73</sup>, we also have vertically different domains. <sup>74</sup> So, when we talk of our free-will in our experience, that experience is very different compared with our covert existence in the broader higher dimensional world.
7. *WHO HAS FREE-WILL?* Certainly, humans and all living beings have free-will. But because of our model with 'gimmel', this third substance is always in union with everything, including subatomic particles, even quarks, protons, electrons, neutrons, and certainly photons, we hypothesize that



there might be different impacts of that gimmel in the cause-effect relationships of every particle.

8. *MEANING AT THE ATOMIC LEVEL*: At the finite level, we differentiate ‘meaning’ from the nondescript ‘information’. And in that context, that meaning may even be special for every subatomic particle. These don’t have brains, they don’t function like animals or even like any animate being: They don’t have brain-like structures. But at the quantum level, there is a mathematical uniqueness. We have a clue in this regard, because when we look at the six more stable up and down quarks (and quarks are still part of the ephemeral ‘particle soup’) each quark is in union with different number of units of gimmel. In other words, the unit amounts of gimmel for the two up quarks and in one down quark in protons, and the two down quarks and one up in neutrons, all contain a specific different amount of gimmel units. This is fascinating, and does suggest something different, possibly each possessing some kind of meaningful quality. Moreover, the more loosely bound, electrons that rotate around the nucleus, have far more gimmel units, than there are in these quarks linked with the protons and neutrons. Again, this is part of a broader jigsaw puzzle in which we don’t understand all the pieces. It is something we can theorize and speculate about.<sup>75-78</sup> We can also extend free-will beyond this usual atomic fabric, including particles like photons.<sup>79, 80</sup>

6. *MEANINGFUL COINCIDENCE*: We introduce, too, a concept that has been implied before, the Meaningful Coincidence. However, we extend this to the ultimate extreme here. Because there are leaves, branches, trees, forests, and beyond, there is an extension of meaningful continuity and information into the infinite. This implies that all events are linked, and even supposedly random and also mundane events may have meaning, which we minimally at least can impact and influence. Two outside concepts may assist here:

- At the theological level, one kind of ‘meaningful coincidence’ would imply a higher supreme being possibly impacting our reality (theism)—not just being present, but without intervention (deism). The term for this meaningful event in Kabbalah is called ‘Hashgahah P’ratit’ (translated, it means ‘Divine Providence’).

Literally, nothing happens except that it's meant to happen that way. Everything that happens is a 'meaningful coincidence' and according to a divine plan. The qualitative impact is profound from the infinite. But, in Kabbalah, we can, nevertheless, also choose which way to respond to an event, so we have freedom of choice ('B'chira Chofshit' —literally Free-will). The two are non-contradictory because our choice is effectively 'local' on the branches of the tree, as opposed to the theistic impacts of the whole cosmos—more than the vast forests.

- The equivalent in subatomic particles plus also our material 3S-1t human reality is the '*Free-will Theorem*' of John Conway and Simon Kochen. In effect, *if any event is the result of free-will in the sense that our choices are not a function of the past, then subject to certain assumptions, so must all subsequent events also be the result of free-will including elementary particles.*<sup>81 81, 82</sup> An example would be the free choice of human experimenter in a quantum setup.<sup>83-89</sup> This corresponds with the independent view we expressed in TDVP in 2011: Effectively, there is no separation of any particles, be they quantal or even cosmic.

In addition to the TDVP compatibility of the Kabbalic B'chira Chofshit and Free-will Theorem models, we recognize in TDVP that consciousness is a key component to our choices.<sup>91</sup> This consciousness may be psychological or neurological as in the brain, but it may also be quantal, and from the infinite or finite experiences outside the brain.<sup>91</sup> The consciousness might be expressed, partly or in whole, as gimmel. Moreover, we propose that the infinite continuity contains gimmel, or may even be its source emanation. Gimmel from the infinite is in union with the finite reality. We propose that gimmel is possibly linked in some way with photons of light that might emanate from the infinite.

9. *INDIVIDUAL-UNITS AND SYSTEMS THEORY*: The 'individual-unit' in TDVP refers to a broader Systems Approach. There are many different systems suffixes<sup>45</sup>. For example, an 8-tier systems approach would be 'ethicospirituobiopsychofamiliosocioethnicultural'. The would be useful in more broadly conceptualizing free-will across humankind. A legitimate approach would be to examine each component individually and

separately—the psychological or social or biological, for example, and it would be logical to describe free-will relative to any of these levels.<sup>41</sup> But we can extend this systems approach: In fact, we have described a 300-letter word suggesting all of these, animate and even inanimate may be active in some level of free choice.<sup>41</sup> TDVP recognizes a complete unification of everything. Hence, we proposed the ‘monster’ 300-letter noun (with -ness or -ity depending on the context, or in other forms –al as an adjective and only 298 letters, or ally as an adverb) that easily reflects the logical theme of 38 related components in our book, *Reality Begins With Consciousness: A paradigm shift that works.*<sup>24</sup> and in a later article on Good and Evil.<sup>41, 45</sup> Here it is, even though we don’t expect anyone to remember it!

*‘Mathematicoinfinitofinitovorticospatiotemporoconscioquantomicomacroplanetoastronomocosmicophysicochemicoelectricometeorologicoinanimatoanimatogeneticoenvironmentobiophysilogicopsychopharmacofamiliosocioethicopoliticomilitarogeographicoeconomophilosophicospirituomysticoethnicoevolutionoculturalness.*

10. *EVERYTHING OBEYS THE LAWS OF NATURE.* Despite the mystical and very broad implications of TDVP, everything obeys the laws of nature.

Many of these points were made in Neppe’s spirited ‘Inner Cosmos’ Facebook discussion of August 2016 with a remarkable thinker, Fernando Luis Cacciola Carballal. We discovered our ideas were similar and we cite him here, with great respect.<sup>90</sup>

These are two small portions of Fernando’s lengthy and excellent public post: “One key requirement of free-will is that it needs ‘origination’: that is, there has to be a well-defined agent having the freedom to choose and to execute. When I want to raise my hands and I ‘do it’, the hands actually raising are made of elements that are in constant flux. While most of the hand is permanent, a lot of it is changing even as the hand goes up. So, what exactly is having the freedom to choose and to execute? The brain? But the brain is also itself a system in constant flux, so, what part of it? Some of the neurons? But a cell is also a dynamic system that changes permanently. Most parts of a cell (such as a neuron) are permanent (for instance the chain of nucleotides in DNA) but many parts are in and out the cell all the time.”<sup>90</sup> .....

“We can draw an analogy from a board game like chess, we are free to choose every move (freedom of choice) and we also have control over our pieces (they

don't move by themselves, we need to move them ourselves exerting our 'freedom of action'), but we cannot decide on the rules of the game, and each move has an impact that influences our next move *because* the current state of the game changed, and we do not decide how that game state change takes place. Something similar occurs with free-will agents: each action is freely chosen, no action takes place unless decided, but the action has an impact which 'sort of reconfigures' the elements from which choices are taken for the next action. And that 'reconfiguration' (for lack of a better word and concept), is based on the real fundamental laws of generalized nature (physical and not)".<sup>90</sup>

We can extend this analogy to active interventions that change our emotions and thinking. We can choose to smile, or we choose to be happy and not miserable, or to work hard, or to show discipline in behavior. Free will can make our lives better or worse. That freedom of choice is beyond our conditioned behaviors.

## **The relevance of Free-will of the Neppe-Close models as reflected in Reality Begins with Consciousness:**

### **Section 4** <sup>24 h</sup>

We have written extensively on this free-will topic. What follows, are extracts from the Neppe-Close book '*Reality Begins with Consciousness*'<sup>24</sup>: Much of this leads to multidimensional time<sup>31, 32</sup> and an awareness of dimensions of Consciousness.<sup>65, 75, 79, 80, 91</sup>. But essentially, we motivate too, not only free-will in an empty context but specifically using the data on precognition and presentiment, too. *This section 4 and the one that follows, Section 5, is complex and technical: Some may want to skip it.*

#### **IMAGINATION:**

- Let us imagine that one was able to demonstrate retrotime, or precognition, or presentiment even seconds before an event, this would also not easily be explainable in terms of the current physicalist definition of time. However, could it be explainable in terms of extra time perception, which might be describable in terms of extra dimensions? <sup>24p45</sup>

---

<sup>h</sup> Vernon Neppe and Edward Close: The relevance of Free-will of the Neppe-Close models as reflected in Reality Begins with Consciousness IQNJ. 10:1, 23-31. 2018. S4.

- Let us imagine showing that there were different levels of cause and effect, then could this require explanations that include some kind of extra time dimension or dimensions, or additionally or alternatively different ideas of “consciousness”? <sup>24p47</sup> ...We cannot explain reality on the basis of simply 3S-1t.
- By necessity, we have to introduce further higher dimensions of at least, ‘Time’ and of ‘Consciousness’. Without those further dimensions ‘consciousness’ would just be an epiphenomenon or an emergent property or a derivative of matter; and time would not include both free-will and precognition.”

Multidimensional order exists in our Reality, and Life is part of that order.

#### *LIFE TRACKS:*

We conceptualize Life-tracks in TDVP as a speculative finite model of individual-unit existence in the infinite. This is created by the conscious drawing of finite TDVP's Life Tracks. This allows for limited overall free-will, with significant and major changes in 3S-1t. The forest in Figure 1 reflects the physical 3S-1t Life-tracks.

Psi's potential influence on life, effectively allows us to extend our ‘metaconsciousness’ (higher outside finite and infinite extra-cerebral awareness) and impact significant changes on all levels of our culture. Whereas some would think psi components like precognition contradicts free-will, it may actually be useful, allowing not only for choice but actualization of events or changes in objects or knowledge, all dictated by our freedom of choice. But that assumes the presence of psi, and the evidence empirically and statistically for that is overwhelming. <sup>24</sup>

The awareness of objects in 3S-1t (like the visible portion of an iceberg) is a *relative state* event experienced by the observer. This establishes a higher dimensional ‘time-line’ through 9-dimensional (9-D) reality, reflecting part of the submerged iceberg ‘life-track’ of the individual (Figure 2). We can apply a Mysticism Metaphor to these higher dimensions of consciousness. <sup>24p373</sup>

Our higher consciousness becomes increasingly important as one goes higher and higher dimensionally at a substrate level. Applying a commonly conceived of mystical metaphor, one refers to ‘vibrations’, which become finer and finer as



the ‘consciousness development’ becomes higher and higher. Extending this metaphoric concept, in order to have vibrations, there has to be a frequency and there has to be a spatial and time component. (As an aside, we’ve recognized that there needs to be a Consciousness aspect, too, and we therefore use the term, VEF, standing for ‘*Vibrational Equivalence Frequency*’.)

Finer and finer vibrations imply, therefore, less relevance at a Space-Time level as one goes higher and higher in terms of a mystical spirituality. This would imply here the presence of Consciousness substrates in the higher levels of dimensionality (and embedded within those C-substrates would be all the lower dimensional one including the S and T substrates). Starting at 3S-1t, the gradation might be 3S-1t-1C (because in our physical existence there still might be some intuitive awareness) up to N-Consciousness dimensions in the finite. There is some, but not definitive, mathematical and logical evidence that this Consciousness would be volumetric and therefore 3C, just as one has 3S, and possibly 3T. Everything in our physical nature is 3-dimensional—all items in our real world are shaped as volumes; all other dimensions are simply representations: a 2D ‘plane’ can represent reality in a sketch; and we can draw a 1D line; yet, all of our experience can only be represented in a dynamic moving cubic reality. A question is can we extend this physical experiential tube of moving reality, to the latent, hidden ongoing time and consciousness that exists, but cannot be represented in a diagram we in 3S-1t can understand? This means that our free-choice is volumetric. The only question is whether that volume extends beyond our 3-dimensional space. We argue it does because there are 9 proven dimensions. These are dynamic but their exact dimensional representations, such as if the 9-D are comprised of 3S-3T-3C dimensions, are speculative. Most times, an observer would be experiencing only some of those dimensions. The most common, of course is our physical 3S-1t reality experience. At that domain level, we seem to have less impact directed on free-will at those higher levels—it’s easier dealing inside the box that is 3S-1t, than outside the box. Consequently, there would be few while still in 3S-1t, who would be able to reach the levels of a mystical infinite state. We could speculate that the reverse would apply as well, with greater impacts at ‘nearer’ dimensional domain levels.

Applying this logic, one could argue that though Consciousness at those higher levels still impacts on the lower dimensions, it would be far less on the more distant ‘lower’ dimensions (like our physical material domain—3S-1t).

Eventually, we could conceive of the extent of the space and time substrates approximating zero at the highest kind of levels of finite dimensions. Yet, although that Consciousness would assert only a relatively minimal impact, it would be across a very broad range of consciousness (like the whole world).

In this way, the Consciousness interface impacts metaphorically in an analogous way to the impacts of gravitation and the expanding universe. The dimensions have tiny force impacts, but act on a very broad level. This is contrasted with the equivalent of strong subatomic forces, which would impact very strongly, but only over a tiny dimensional atomic neutron area in 3S-1t.

As a consequence, metaphorically, the degree of free-will from higher dimensions is broad and slight involving a good part of the forest but superficially as if experienced from the air, as opposed to our free-will which is meaningful, but possibly more upon our leaves of the branches—upon ourselves and immediate contacts.

Applying this metaphor further, Consciousness could be purer possibly at those very high Consciousness substrate dimensional levels. That it has moved closer to a higher consciousness level may imply that consciousness is almost exclusive at those higher dimensional domains and that is why S and T may approximate 0, or possibly more correctly, reflect the sizes of quanta, in those domains. Beyond that, one would move beyond finite discrete dimensions into the infinite continuity, where existence is not quantized but literally continuous. That infinite may or may not be directly accessible to us in our physical 3S-1t. This then becomes the ‘locality’ or ‘non-locality’ for really impactful meaningful coincidences possibly at a define level.

‘Meaning’ might be a better expression than another we could have used, namely ‘guided’. But, even ‘guiding’ implies at the basic subatomic level the most basic meaning involving potentially apprehending or perturbing of objects, events or information. This is very close to information delivery, not consciousness, per se, and very different from atoms or stones acquiring ‘metaconscious’ realities compared with live beings. However, one speculation would be to regard ‘meaning’ as a one-dimensional extent variable, and ‘guiding’ as more volumetric (i.e., three-dimensional) cubic Consciousness content or extent, and we regard this speculation as paralleling these dimensional perspectives with free-will.

**Figure 2: The iceberg of awareness:**



The infinite would imply potentially some kind of meaningful reality, the difference being that the ‘guiding’ component may range necessarily from very broad but miniscule in impacting ‘force’ to any combination of the above. There is no reason why the infinite may not impact dramatically and broadly, or may be very directed onto a particular narrow bridge. Because it is infinite and there are infinities influencing every dimension, the impact could be powerful and broad. This mystically evokes again an idea of Primary Consciousness, which some theologically would regard as equivalent to G-d.

There is another component in Kabbalistic Mysticism in regard to Consciousness, life and higher dimensions <sup>92-94</sup>: What could be regarded as the ‘lower’ tiers of creation, such as plants, are in fact loftier than the human being's own vital potential spark of divinity: The ‘lowlier’ something is, the ‘loftier’ its spiritual core. Yet in Kabbalah, humankind is the most spiritual of earthly creatures. The animal exhibits a more sophisticated vitality than the plant, and the mineral shows no outward signs of ‘life’ at all. Yet, the sublimity of the spark of divine life in a thing is in converse relation to its manifest spirituality. Thus, the mineral nourishes the vegetable, both nourish the animal, and all three sustain human life. However, perhaps only humans have the capacity to direct the metaphorical equivalent of ‘vital energy’ themselves, and they alone have free choice. The animal, vegetable or mineral conformity with the divine will is automatic and inevitable, and thus, devoid of moral significance. <sup>95</sup> Perhaps we could argue that even an electron exhibits free choice, and some results of split screen studies in photons make predictions unpredictable: But are they completely random or chosen? The choice humans exhibit may qualitatively be different from an atom, and far more impactful, but that does not mean that not

everything, even particles, impacts and can be variably impacted by other particles and entities.

However, in TDVP, ‘meaning’ is also expressed by ‘meaning’ in that lowest of levels, even the inanimate. And applying a deep philosophical parallel, we could speculate on relatively more ‘consciousness’ in the inanimate at that ‘lofty’ transfinite / infinite, higher divinity type level than just mass-energy or space-time. Consequently, this could be similar though not defined as such but only in the context of the ostensibly spiritually. We also see a commonality of the free-will element, particularly in humans, and the concepts of the infinite to the concepts in Kabbalah are similar to TDVP.<sup>92-94</sup>

Free will becomes a way we can impact the future and give our special meanings to our reality.

#### *LOWER DIMENSIONAL INCOMPLETENESS:*

We have demonstrated how we need to have higher dimensions and infinity for our TDVP model to be complete. Inter alia, if we regarded all of reality as purely based on three spatial dimensions and one point in time, then there could be no “meaning”. If we extended “meaning” to a fifth dimension (variable of extent) of consciousness, we still could not explain completeness (which requires infinity) or asymmetry in nature, nor the incompleteness of awareness in the limited 3S-1t-1C reality of sentient beings. We could hardly conceive of higher realities, nor could we explain distortions of time, such as precognition. We would need to sacrifice either free-will or precognition, but not have both. By contrast, a multidimensional reality of extra time and consciousness dimensions explains why “bad things happen” in 3S-1t, and is, to boot, supported both mathematically with proofs and inductively with scientific empiricism.<sup>23 p393</sup>

However, Time is likely three-dimensional, and therefore has and has a volumetric component as does Consciousness Substrates in the 9-dimensional model. This makes dimensions quantized, integral and volumetric. Mathematically, each is volumetric because the most fundamental shape is three-dimensional, and these move through linear and planar dimensions, but they also differ considerably (as below).

*FREE-WILL IN THEOLOGICAL MONISM, PANTHEISM AND PANENTHEISM, AND OTHER PHILOSOPHIES:*

Theological monism usually implies terms like “unitary, eternal, unchanging, infinite, ineffable, immanent, transcendent, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, omnificent, omnibenevolent, incorporeal, and emanating divine reality”. In this sense, this divine reality would be a source of and responsible for all matter, energy, time, space, awareness and essence in this Universe.

If we redefine Theological Monism more broadly, we can allow for variants.

- At its extreme level, Stoics taught that there is only one substance, identified as G-d.
- One variant is called *pantheism*. This monistic view describes only one ‘Being’: all ostensible aspects of reality are appearances, modes or identical with that one being.
- Much closer to Unified Monism <sup>96, 97</sup> as one direct philosophical derivation of the TDVP model is the related term *panentheism*.
- The panentheist implies that G-d is *contained* in all things, though neither identical to, nor totally separate from all things. <sup>98</sup> This might imply that G-d is in ourselves and personal, and yet allows a connection with all creation.

In a way, applying TDVP, panentheism could be contained in the Neppe-Close philosophical model of ‘*Unified Monism*’ which is derived directly from the science of TDVP. However, panentheism must be specifically interpreted in the following manner: ‘G-d’ would *influence our content* being *tethered* to all of us, and maybe all ‘things’, through Space, Time and Consciousness (STC). <sup>31</sup> G-d would serve as an infinite continuous guiding reality. But we would have a separate existence, too. Hence, we would no longer be *part* of G-d in that sense, but ‘G-d’ could be *tethered* to all things, just like there are other tethers such as communication, psi, quanta and consciousness. G-d would, therefore, contribute ‘theistically’, and would not be just a non-participating observer as in ‘deism’. G-d would not be the sole source of impact. So, if panentheism’ allows for guiding and tethering as opposed to how ‘part of G-d’ is defined, then the panentheism concept is one kind of impact that exists in TDVP.

If a guided tethering from an infinite continuity was part of the distinction of impact in TDVP, we still would have *significant free-will* because we could choose what was going on in our own specific but limited restricted finite



reality: However, that free-will would be *limited* to our own experience. It would not be absolute because it could only impact our limited finite dimensional experiences in a vast unending infinite reality almost all of which is hidden. If we speculate that *meaning always* involves some kind of ‘guiding’ infinite ‘G-d-like’ element, we could argue that panentheism in that sense is ‘part of G-d’. That ‘part’ refers to ‘tethered’ to G-d, and therefore is a source of Distinctions of Impact on our specific existence—our content (our receptacle that contains all our events). Thus, in that context, the philosophical content of panentheism would be one part—one influence— of the whole TDVP model.

Let’s imagine the option of inducing change. We add in at least a limited degree of free-will: our life-tracks can be modified and change our fate: there is another direction component of free-will: a further direction. We can now graph other lines that are not linear, that project in a different direction to the original lines. Relative to 3S-1t this third line of a multitude of planar time-life choices makes Time Volumetric. That necessarily creates 3 dimensions of time because we have a multiplicity of time choices, the Time choices may be individual and also intersect with groups and others. The Time choices can change. This creates a very simple model for 3-dimensional time. We could also likely portray each Time linearity in waves: This is so as even though waves or curves are not straight, they could metaphorically be pulled into a one-dimensional straight line. So, we do not utilize the curves as extra dimensions of extent: Waves or vortices do not increase dimensionality as the curvature is relative and can be spread into a straight line.

Effectively, we simply cannot explain all of existence using 3S-1t-1C alone. The extra dimensions are born out of necessity. We need to make sense of reality: We can with extra dimensions, infinity, order, and meaning. And we can empirically justify this inclusive “process of everything metaparadigm” by applying feasibility to the small jigsaw puzzle pieces of the results found in our very restricted experiential 3S-1t-1C domain reality <sup>99</sup>.

Some final important comments: If *freedom of choice* were refuted, again a secondary hypothesis of TDVP becomes questionable. You may ask how could that be tested? We see free-will as a variant of not only influence or manipulation of future events such that they can change (so called ‘psychokinesis’ <sup>68</sup>) but as a subset of freedom of choice because psychological learned habits, reflexes, temperament and instincts, and spiritual philosophies

may partly determine outcome. Choice, even if potentially free, is therefore confounded. Technically, however, work with Random Number Generators (RNGs) could set up an excellent experimental model. But even then, there is still the limitation: Is this truly an influence on events, or is it simply a prediction of an event, that experimentally is deliberately manipulated to change, has changed? It must reflect some effect because statistically the chances of the RNG results are more than ‘six-sigma’—one in a billion against chance.

If *precognition or retrocognition* were refuted, then a secondary hypothesis of TDVP is refuted. But it is not: Again, there is excellent six-sigma meta-analytic data supporting precognition.<sup>24, 31, 100p237-245, 31</sup>

## **Time and Free-will: Section 5.<sup>i</sup>**

### *TIME MULTIDIMENSIONALITY*

*“The illusion of the passage of time arises from the confusing of the given with the real. Passage of time arises because we think of occupying different realities. In fact, we occupy only different givens. There is only one reality.”*

*Kurt Gödel*<sup>101</sup>

Time is particularly difficult in terms of conceptualizing multidimensionality. Scientists for a century have tried to talk about time. For us to approach multidimensional time is a challenge. Yet, we can tentatively demonstrate Time in many dimensions by applying three ideas:

- Our mathematical algebraical and geometrical evidence suggests 3 dimensions of Time, though we cannot, as yet, definitively prove it in the way we proved 9-dimensions.
- We can recognize that all spatial structures in our natural empirical world are volumetric—they’re in three dimensions, not linear (1-dimension) and planar (2-dimensions): We could possibly project this to Time and even Consciousness.
- We can also examine the inseparable tethering structurally of Space-Time-Consciousness: Space is embedded in Time. Time is embedded in Consciousness. There is a direct continuity.

---

<sup>i</sup> Vernon Neppe and Edward Close: Time and Free-will IQNJ. 10:1, 31-45. 2018. S5.

There also might be limitations to proving 3-Time dimensions specifically, as opposed to any number of extra time dimensions.

### *LINEAR TIME*

Our experience is of a finite time-line. Some would argue that this moment, the present, is a singularity with 0 dimensions—it is simply a point. We say this, because in a quantized 3S-1t there are no singularities, just volumes, in which case the present would be an infinitesimal volume. Linear time involves one dimension of time reflecting the individual's past, present, and future. This involves discrete moments in time that move forward all the time. Linearly, time involves a past, present, and a future—that describes only one dimension reflecting a straight line and not 3 dimensions as some mistakenly think. But, ironically, it's possible that what we conceptualize as linear time because it appears 1-dimensional in 3S-1t, might reflect volumetric 3D time in a 9-D domain. We can represent fluctuations suddenly in a plane with waves of time technically reflecting alternative routing and alternative directions. We can access records of the past very easily on a VCR or DVD, in newspapers, by memory, in movies, and possibly through retrocognitive awareness. We can access possible future knowledge by logical predictions or via precognitions or through combinations of the two. With predestined precognition one cannot modify anything. The future seems to move inexorably with us having no part in our future, except via learning to plan for the best options. We look at this *linear* time-line helplessly, or with the serenity that we can only impact through logic or our best attempts.

Subjectively this linear time might be distorted and curved. This is so because we interpret subjective time differently. For example, our estimate of the duration of some dreams may be very different from objective clock-based reality. If this were so we are superficially each experiencing two dimensions—our own subjective one and our clock one: Each “Time” has “extent” in that we can estimate time—the clock accurately and intervally, the dream only ordinally and very approximately. So, each fits the Time dimension definition and we can graph this on a plane—two dimensions. However, we could argue that the time experience is parallel here and a single dimension. Add to this everyone else and one is, therefore, producing an infinite number of linear time-lines, but we're not aware of them because we *experience* our time only as a single linear phenomenon. Our own individual world realities with these subjectively variable rates of time do not per se, reflect different dimensions, just a way to

conceptualize the same single parallel dimensions. This is why *existence is very different from experience*.

However, Time may be an irregular wave progression—it is not entirely parallel, so we could argue that actually we’re experiencing planar dimensions (two Time Dimensions). Add to this different directions or angularities of choice (as in the Figure 1 tree and branches) and we could have a subjective three dimensions of Time. Let’s re-examine this.

#### *ABSENCE OF CHOICE, FREE CHOICE AND 3-DIMENSIONAL TIME*

Without choice, however, we have one single unmodifiable direction, but given that linear direction of time might be curved or wavy, we could conceive Time as two-dimensional. But with freedom of will we have a hypothesis that is difficult to test empirically. That is because we don’t know what would have happened if we had acted differently. However, we have different routing, different directions and waves or curvature.

With the original non-choice, we therefore get to three dimensions of Time, even individually. Even more so, collective time is a cultural phenomenon and may be measured akin to a Turing Apparatus <sup>102</sup>, in this instance, a 3D- clock. That collective commonality of time we could argue would be another dimension. Yet, we cannot go beyond our 3D-Euclidean space, so can we in time? Our collective commonality of space, exists with our own individual collective “space” because we have our percepts and our concepts. We likely could not get beyond three dimensions by using collective time. Moreover, that “collective time” purely reflects the parallel experiences of many individuals in the same Time Dimensions. Applying TDVP, the 3 dimensions of space are embedded in the dimensions of time, not separate from them, and therefore when one speaks of Time, we also describe dimensions of Space as well.

#### *ESTIMATION OF THE FUTURE*

We can also access the future mathematically by estimation. At a simple level, if somebody is walking 16 steps and we know how long it takes from step A to step B, and each step is similar, we can project, but only with some degree of accuracy, and not absolute certainty, that a quarter of the way through the individual would have, for example, completed the fourth step. However, because with our limited senses, we only experience one quantum of time, this produces the whole indeterminacy components in terms of velocity and space,

we can make logical predictions in the future but only with some statistical likelihood.

Linear time usually might be mathematically interval or ratio in nature, for example, clocks or VCRs, or dates in newspapers, but examples of memory or precognition may not be interval but ordinal in nature <sup>103</sup>.

### *TIME SERIALITY AND INFINITE REGRESS*

John Dunne <sup>104</sup> pointed out the paradox of a series of moments and their timing, for example in dreams. We could, if we were an observer outside such time, measure the time accurately with a clock. We could perform that repeatedly forever, until therefore, we could produce an *infinite regress*. Dunne contradicts himself arguing this is not infinite and we can understand why: This is not a continuous infinity, but a countable one—hence transfinite. Therefore, Dunne's infinite time dimensions appear to apply the logic of Georg Cantor's model of a transfinite series of numbers in finite reality <sup>105</sup>, which in this instance would be a discrete, countable infinity, not the real continuous infinite. However, applying Close's new math called the 'calculus of distinctions' <sup>106-108</sup>, this is not 'infinite dimensions' of extent, they are instead 'infinite dimensions of content' with each reality parallel or parangular (at 90 degree angles to higher dimensions) to each other in a non-Euclidean existence. Dunne's descriptions are esoteric and very difficult to follow, even after reading his theory and book several times. The major difficulty is the mixture of science with, not even speculation, but ideas that are stated as fact, yet are clearly not facts.

This kind of model involves observers outside a box. It is a theme Neppe used in his initial N-dimensional vortical paradigm <sup>109-112</sup> <sup>109-112</sup>. It can be one way to apply infinity, but in a finite way, it would be meaningless to conceptualize infinite continuity discretely as in the finite context.

More generally, the absence of free-will simply produces a philosophical helplessness, a fatalism of inaction. But complete free-will in 3S-1t would imply no learning of psychological, social or theological behaviors. It must be relative to one's experience. Therefore, more correct terminology is *potential freedom of choice*: Here we can potentially act by overriding our learnt and genetic predispositions.

### *DUNNE AND MULTIDIMENSIONALITY*

John Dunne's basic thesis relates to demonstrating 'serial reality' of time.



Translated into TDVP finite terminology, time is occurring in discrete periods and discrete points: It is moving from one period to another, and we can demonstrate that we can experience information pertaining to the future, in the present time. Therefore, Dunne's main hypothesis relates to the fact that time is not a moment in time, but *a single dimension of time* with it occurring in a *series of discrete* events. As indicated, his further examining different observers observing time from the outside, produces an 'infinite regress'—the observer observes other time, then the next observes their observation, ad infinitum. This allows Dunne to talk about 'multidimensional time', but it is always 'serial'—like electricity jumping from node to node. The other difficulty is how he defines concepts such as 'seriality' and series. Yet this model of a different kind of multidimensional time—different times in observers in parallel, or regressive time, jumping from one observer to another like a serial electrical current should be examined in the TDVP context.

#### *INFINITE REGRESS AND DUNNE'S PARALLEL TIME IN THE TDVP CONTEXT*

How would we explain Dunne's 'infinite regress' concept applying the TDVP model? Because "regression" implies jumps from one Time variable to another, it produces different dimensions of extent each involving 'conscious' observers outside the box. This means the observers become transfinite. We propose that thinking about these Time dimensions in isolation is incorrect because it produces purely time domains. Transfinite Time dimensions alone cannot exist alone, because by necessarily impacting an observer, they impact "Consciousness". The key therefore is a "Time-Consciousness regress" not a "time infinite regress" alone: The transfinite Higher Consciousness dimensions have "Time" playing only a subordinate role. We, therefore, can describe it as NC- (0 to N) T (where N in T may be any of 0 or imaginary through to transfinite numbers). Space may or may not be relevant in this context. Moreover, this will vary by the domain (series of dimensions) conceptualized: Space and Time could easily appear relatively nonlocal, so S=0, T=0 or they may be SN-TN-CN. However, the C may fluctuate in dimensional quantity (fluctuating dimensions) and cannot be 0.

#### *PARALLEL TIME IN THE TDVP CONTEXT APPLYING DUNNE'S CONCEPTS*

Dunne critiques anything pertaining to "parallel time" happening at the same

moment, yet implies that each person lives in his or her own particular universe. If this were so, then this does involve tens of different dimensions of Time as these are content variables. The density of such events may be converted to different Time Variables of Extent paralleling themselves depending on actions and thoughts, and modifying themselves through choice implying three time dimensions. However, these could reflect only the first three time dimensions in the first nine STC levels. Beyond that, the TDVP model necessarily requires time be part of “metaconsciousness” in the transfinite.

#### *FREE-WILL IMPLIES THREE FINITE TIME DIMENSIONS*

If there is such a thing at that finite level of freedom of choice and freedom of will, this means we can actually meaningfully, at least to a limited degree, control our future. This for many, including ourselves, is philosophically satisfying and a philosophical necessity. *Now freedom of choice may not occur at the infinite level* because time, space, and consciousness all exist as a unit and therefore, ultimately the infinite regress could look similar but the “routing” to such infinity for any individual-units may be necessarily different, because we would have chosen which way to go.

#### *CLOCK REALITY AND ORDINAL TIME*

However, in 3S-1t physical standard reality, our second and third dimensions of time are logically ordinal not interval, relative to our observations in 3S-1t, if they exist (and theoretically, they do if we have free-will to make choices). In other words, if we made a different choice via free-will, then the choice went into a different direction, and we can’t measure that time as interval moments of time with a clock, because such a clock would be purely subjective. We can only measure the gradual directions and possibly the end-points but the exact timing is indeterminate—effectively, we cannot locate and predict the ‘orthogonal velocity’ (or ‘density’) of the new time experience unless we are occupying that specific dimensional clock and, without considerable mental expansion, we cannot appreciate all three time dimensions at the same time.

*If free-will exists, then time is necessarily multidimensional.* Free-will could reflect the second time dimension, and because of density of impacting other individual-units a third time dimension: Choice implies a further linear wave so a plane—2d. Free-will might demonstrate additional time dimensions because there are multiple metaphorical branches which may lead to other options.

### *TIME AND CONSCIOUSNESS, AND STC*

At the end of those choices, consciousness manifests or may be conceived or not experienced as those extra dimensions, although time might have components of that consciousness, just as space does. If in a dream, you dream about a place and a duration of time, is that a consciousness dimension, or is it a time dimension or is it space? This is an example of STC in our TDVP all inseparably tethered together at a higher dimensional level, with each dimensional domain embedded in the next higher dimensional level, but manifesting individual tentacles of one or more dimensions of space, time and consciousness, that are theoretically separated by a complex TDVP process that we call ‘vortical indivension’ and manifesting, for example, as entanglement or psi. (Technically, indivension is an important new TDVP term. It referring to the movements of *individual*-units [such as electrons] across, between and within *dimensions*. The movements are usually rotating and spinning, which means they are ‘vortical’.)

### *ARE THERE OTHER MOTIVATIONS FOR THREE DIMENSIONAL TIME?*

We list a few of these briefly and without comment here.

- *Physics*: 3 dimensions of time are based on the concept of warped fields.
- *Consciousness*: The unified STC demonstrates  $S=3$ . Therefore, at the tethered area,  $T$  must be 3 in lower dimensional reality.
- *Psi*: If free-will exists, then time is necessarily multidimensional. Free-will reflects the second, and because of density of impacting other individual-units a third time dimension: Choice implies a further linear wave so a plane—2d. Only free-will demonstrates another third time dimension.
- *Archetypes of actual time?* This could be debated both in terms of existence and implications: Memory and precognition all reflect 1 dimension. ‘Akashic records’<sup>113</sup>, if they exist, may reflect parallel or parangular time but not necessarily in non-linear dimensions. On the other hand, these ‘records’ might not reflect time, but merely an analogy of time in pure consciousness.
- *Thought experiment*: Time will be passing at different rates on the sphere and the plane. We can calculate the relativistic time distortion and establish points defining a time-line for each dimensional world. Thus, there are two time-lines that coincide only when the clock on the sphere is exactly in the plane. In this case, time can be represented by two lines crossing at a single point. Two lines crossing define a 2S plane. Thus,

time is, in this case, two-dimensional, and this is a 3S, 2T reality. If not, is it in a further dimensional reality because there are more than two time solutions?

- Multiple alternative realities present in each individual-unit. But terms such as “many-worlds”, “many universes”, “alternative realities” are not mathematical as they may not necessarily imply worlds or universes or multiverses. Therefore, a term like “co-existing reality” could be used as less prejudicial. ‘Co-existing’ is often referred to as within 3S-1t, but it could be applied to any dimensional representation and even the infinite because it is not specific. However, reality may not be co-existent or parallel, because it is relative to the domain, and also because it can be ultimately unified. Hence, we prefer to use our neologism “parangular”.
- *Relativity*: Passage of time as measured by atomic clocks is ultimately tied to light speed. So, if light is slowing down, so is time. This is a dance that we refer to as ‘Relativistic time’.
- *Origins*: The time singularity is this moment in time.  $T=0$ .
- *Logic*: All populations parallel to these linear dimensions reflect a second and then a third dimension depending on the complexity of the description.

### *VOLUMETRIC TIME DENSITY*

The ‘density’ of that choice could be through a consciousness expressed in terms of the time. It is impacting others with the same different kinds of linearities and their own special vortical expressions in 3D reality. Free choice reflects all coming together. It ultimately expresses a 3-dimensional Time in one way, at the same time perceived or conceived as conscious finite experience with an extent of discrete time because it is in moments.

But also, this time consciousness can express an N-dimensional time in another domain, because metaconsciousness reflects both conscious infinite experience because if we move to N-dimensional time, the dimension beyond 3 hypothetically may not be pure time, but time consciousness. It experientially will not have any effect on the time lines that are experienced by 3S-1t individuals.

### *PARALLEL DIMENSIONS AND UNIVERSES AND THE USE OF PARANGULAR*

The term “*parallel dimensions*” is a misnomer. They are not necessarily

parallel: Indeed, they may be anything from orthogonal to parallel and at any angle—parangular—some intersect other dimensions and this is why we have intersections, e.g., via vortical indivision. There is a literature on parallel universes, but *parallel universes* do not necessarily imply parallel dimensions. Parallel in this sense was initially used in an inexact manner and has just been perpetuated. It was never intended to mean that all of the dimensions of say two universes reflect the consequence of the drawing of distinctions of two universes whose dimensions were parallel.

#### *WHAT IF WE COULD APPRECIATE 3T AND THEREFORE, 3S-3T?*

A conscious entity in the rare state of being aware of the finite S3T3 so 6-D continuum would be enormously advantaged in awareness but not be in an omnipotent, omnipresent position of being aware of all of the time-lines, all the pasts and futures of all individuals as this is necessarily linked with the infinite. This distinction can be drawn applying an infinite number for time and space but not for finite time.

#### *SUPPORT FOR 3 DIMENSIONS OF TIME AND EXTENSIONS: SOME COMPLEX SPECULATIONS* <sup>24 P251</sup>

1. Time as a moment is a singularity. Linear time may be planar. Free-choice is 3D finite. The moment experienced is in 0 dimensions. Linear time in an individual involves the past, present and future, e.g., memory. Because of curvature or waves of time, we have, at least, planar dimensions. But what could have been (ending as one alternative being free-will = choice) provides for different parangular routings (directions). Therefore, we get to at least 3 finite time dimensions because the resultant collective time is at least 2 dimensions added to the first.

2. Interestingly the poet WB Yeats, recognized gyres of time. Intriguingly, the way it was described was really vortical time, which is 3 dimensional. <sup>114</sup>

TDVP's Life Track allows for limited overall free-will, with significant and major changes in 3S-1t.

- Psi's potential influence on life, effectively allows us to extend our metaconsciousness and impact significant changes on all levels of our culture.
- An observation (i.e. the awareness of objects in 3S-1t) is understood to be a *relative state*, an event experienced by the observer, establishing a "time-line" through 9-dimensional (9-D) reality, part of the "life-track" of the individual.



### *FREE-WILL IMPLIES THREE FINITE TIME DIMENSIONS* <sup>24p240</sup>

If there is such a thing at that finite level of freedom of choice and freedom of will, this means we can actually meaningfully, at least to a limited degree, control our future. This for many, including ourselves is philosophically satisfying and a philosophical necessity. Now freedom of choice may not occur at the infinite level because time, space, and consciousness all exist as a unit and therefore, ultimately the infinite regress could look similar but the “routing” to such infinity for any individual-units may be necessarily different, because we would have chosen which way to go.

However, paradoxically, if any individual has free-will as opposed to predestination, the logical consequence is to posit that he is experiencing not only the second dimension of time, but necessarily the third dimension of time, as well.

Moreover, our specific postulate of three-dimensional time further suggests free-will. In TDVP, we posit that if that watch then ran only purely automatically, without guiding or meaning in the current finite subreality, then TDVP would make less sense, because even limited free-will would be compromised.

Effectively, by asserting free-will, we are making a choice. This is not just a parallel reality choice based in a second action linked up with time progression into the future. It is therefore, not just another parallel linear time line but it is a plane because it has impacts on everything else: It changes the actions of others, be they finite animate individual-units and on finite inanimate objects. That choice therefore, links up with others, producing a density, because we have our initial linear time, and our new choice, which impacts on others. This creates a 3D component. Applying TDVP, we describe the variations of impacting others vortices by vortical indivension. No man is an island entire of itself! <sup>71</sup> That choice necessarily has a certain curvature or planarity because of fluctuations: This reflects something that is a plane plus a line. This contrasts to absence of choice, a certain fatalism, because then the linearity (which may technically be curved one way but experienced as a single time-line) has its own kind of manifold—its own kind of movement through a curve—producing one reality of predestination without free-will. Of course, again we would have an infinite regress. Technically, as Georg Cantor would describe it, we would have an ‘infinity of infinities’ <sup>105</sup> at the continuous infinite level of reality.

How would an infinite regress affect free-will? Free-will may be relative, and in this context relative to the 3S-1t domain. The depth of time is consonant with the potential for choices and free-will. However, that free-will could be linked with C-substrate multidimensional manifestations that may be tethered with our apparent 3S-1t -1C domain of time and C-substrate. Using this explanation, free-will occurs in individuals in the apparent 3S-1t. This is because they are not really living in 3S-1t but in, at minimum, a 3S-3T-1C or even 3S-3T-NC. This allows individuals to manifest their free-will choices in 3S-1t without contradiction. Free-will in any domain might not be free-will in another domain. However, if one combines the infinite and allows for meaningful interventions at that level, any finite multidimensionality should theoretically reflect some level of free-will. This is not complete free-will because it must conform to higher dimensional elements as well and must be part of the broader order of reality.

#### *TIME, MINKOWSKI, QUATERNIONS AND IMAGINARY NUMBERS*

In retrospect, the idea of space-time of Minkowski<sup>115</sup> has been dramatically extended: TDVP may have succeeded when others did not because of the recognition of the needs for multidimensionality, extended consciousness, ordropy, life, infinity, tethering, content / process (vortical indivension), origins and a supporting mathematical model as well as applications of LFAF and falsifiability, the empirical methods of science and the calculus of distinctions.

#### *WHITEMAN'S MULTIDIMENSIONAL TIME*

The remarkable mathematician and mystic, J.H.M. Whiteman, supported the idea of multidimensional time. This was not only based on Eastern mysticism<sup>116</sup>, but uniquely this scientist and polymath had more carefully documented deliberately induced subjective experiences<sup>117</sup> than possibly anyone else ever<sup>118</sup>. His complex writings examined hierarchical potential versus actuality, structures in physics, and the implications for multidimensional thinking of such subjective experiences.<sup>119-122</sup> Whiteman also described three levels of time<sup>123</sup>:

1. He used “*T*”, more broadly than we use it in TDVP where we reflect passage of time. Whiteman describes this as the interior causation of a potentiality field that is set up or modified by interference with the field through a force such as gravitation or psychokinesis. Time *T* is more structural or spatial, a “plan” that can be accessed in the right state, potentiality from which one can read off past or future, although the plan is not completely fixed. This allows for the intervention paradox. But the “plan” is largely fixed.
2. He used “*t*”, like we use it in TDVP, to reflect this moment in time, but

also recognizes this as passage of time. Whiteman describes this as the actualization or manifestation of a not necessarily physical space-time reality; and

3. Whiteman's third "dimension" (different from our use of dimension as space-like variables) was the term  $\tau$  ("tau") and this reflected intelligible structure and means. Unlike  $T$ ,  $\tau$  is mechanical and unalterable, what one might compare to collapse of a wave function once the actualization has been triggered. But neither  $T$  nor  $\tau$  are measurable: This is only possible with the actualized 't' as in clock-time, and so becomes measurable 'passage of time'.

Interestingly, Whiteman's three variables of time were combined with the three spatial dimensions of length, breadth and height. Of course, we draw this triadic distinction in TDVP and link the initial three dimensions of T-substrate and C-substrate with the S-substrate. Finally, Whiteman recognized the relevance of objective and subjective time, of the data on psi, of non-physicality, the laws of nature, quanta<sup>120</sup>, hierarchies and universality.<sup>122-125</sup> As can be seen later in Table 5, and combining these with Whiteman<sup>123</sup> and Dunne in his *An Experiment with Time*<sup>104</sup> where although he talks of time seriality, he effectively is describing parallel time, there are 16 different models of Multidimensional Time. Such an idea is therefore not a rarity.

*Let's introduce the concept of parallel universes, here as a comparison:*

Parallel universes are whole sets or whole domains. In fact, parallel in the literature of Everett<sup>86</sup> and other people who use that to understand quantum physics, refer to it as just a stratagem because even if parallel universes exist they don't interact, and if they did they would do so in a way that we would never detect. They were using it in rather a loose manner—here's a universe and here is another one. While they may be very much alike they are not co-existent. Our model requires interactions involving all of reality: Such interactions enhance and diminish individuals, groups, families, societies, cultures and ethnic identities. We are never the same when interacting or meeting others and the same applies even not only to sentient beings but also to the so-called inanimate world. Everyone changes everyone and everything else.

Congruent realities may be momentary with time-lines crossing. To become totally congruent would be like cloning, in effect. Two consciousnesses with the same congruent time-lines would mean the same consciousness and logically,

two physical individuals or individual-unit entities should not have exactly the same consciousness.<sup>45</sup> We suggest defining a new word so we don't need to use the word parallel, an unfortunate choice of words by somebody many years ago to describe the situation where a decision or the drawing of a distinction by a conscious being causes the universe to split into "parallel universes". Similarly, the phrase, *many worlds* exists<sup>119</sup>, yet using another term like angular<sup>126, 127</sup> (where angular can be anything from parallel to orthogonal) may be logical. We propose the term *parangular*, and we've used the phrase *individual-unit dimensions* to reflect that *parangularity* has subjective components.

#### *WHAT IF WE COULD APPRECIATE 3T AND THEREFORE, 3S-3T?*

TDVP specifically provides a model for limited free-will, continual life—immortality,<sup>63</sup> origins, and the unextended continuous infinity of time.<sup>24p367</sup> An eternity in the infinite where time always exists at every moment and yet is dynamically changing at the finite levels, and where the present is the only moment in time that we in our physical world of 3S-1t can experience. This means that when we talk of 'free-will' it is relative to our 3S-1t experience, and that 'free-will' may have different levels depending on the dimensional domains we're in: It might not occur or be quite different if we were experiencing, as observers, dimensional domains 6 through 8, for example. Therefore, free-will is also relative to the domains of the observer's experience.

Also, by utilizing both the finite and the infinite, it explains that nothing begins or ends, and the finite beginning origins of such events as the 'Big Bang' can be seen as a 'Primary Consciousness'<sup>128</sup> (? G-d) event in the finite, contracted into a so-called 'singularity'<sup>129</sup> and then expanding continuously into the cosmos: This is one reason why our book is entitled *Reality Begins with Consciousness*.<sup>24, 57-59, 61</sup> At the infinite level, there is no beginning or end, and existence goes on forever: The beginning and the end are the 'same' in infinite time, except that there is no beginning and end in the infinite continuity.<sup>25-30, 33, 130</sup> But that existence involves impacts and influence as an order of existence, dynamically changing all the time—except that all the time is now when 'observing' from the framework of the infinite!<sup>131</sup> This refers to an order, and not a misnomer like 'chaos',<sup>132-136</sup>. It would only be 'chaos' as in the models that might not conceptualize the relevance of the infinite.

Awareness of more time dimensions could allow us to examine *evolution*<sup>137-141</sup> as it was happening: TDVP conceptualizes evolution<sup>23, 24, 28, 65, 68, 142-144</sup> as part of

the required STC tethering: it would not just slow changes in structure occurring over time. The model of evolution being a progression without meaning would not fit the fabric of continual free-will. This means evolution must necessarily be meaningful and involve consciousness.

The TDVP model has also demonstrated a link of gimmel with ‘dark matter’ and ‘dark energy.’<sup>78, 145</sup> The correlation is so strong that gimmel could *be* the dark substances themselves, or in union with them,<sup>78, 145</sup> if we were to understand multidimensional consciousness. Similarly, we now know that gimmel is closely in union with sub-atomic particles.<sup>77, 146-148</sup> This union was what we had originally formulated as ‘qualits’<sup>57, 58</sup> early on in our model.<sup>65</sup> That was before we formulated the idea of ‘gimmel’<sup>77, 147, 149-152</sup>, but it was, in a way, the same: It was the realization that even at the quantal level there had to be a linked consciousness that was tethered to the quanta or was part of the quanta. Even then, in 2011, we recognized these subatomic components as more than quanta because they had consciousness. The concept of quality and later of gimmel are pertinent in our free-will formulation because we can recognize that it is not just the particles or dark substances that would be involved. It would imply rotations through 9-D and eventually impacts through infinity and that would introduce again the role of control of the infinite by choice, again a deity, in free-will. Moreover, we would want to conceptualize that the infinite continuity was ordered and impacting that order on our physical existence.<sup>30</sup>

Interestingly, TDVP supports the idea of a multidimensional order in the infinite (‘ordropy’)<sup>30</sup> —in contrast, with the classical tendency towards disorder called ‘entropy’ in 3S-1t<sup>26, 27, 29, 130</sup>, a model that does not explain life well as life involves order. The ordropy impacts possibly through the finite because the infinite and the finite are always unified at every dimensional domain level including 3S-1t. This implies that ‘G-d’ (or the infinite equivalents) always can influence the action of everything (ranging from humankind to subatomic particles) in the finite. The impact obviously varies in degree, and we would regard the so-called ‘quantum or qualit consciousness’ as being at a far, far lower level than humans, except paradoxically humans are made up of quanta. This might be the reason why Kabbalah gives a primacy to lower beings in terms of their potential to actualize their behaviors by free-will (?) into good or positives. But effectively, we speculate that the concept of ordropy, with the impact of order from the infinite to the finite, would be a major way in which theism would happen.



Gimmel in union with particles, and ‘qualits’ are different from another who has written significantly on Quantum meaning, namely the respected physicist, Dr. Amit Goswami, who has used the phrase ‘Quantum Activism’. Goswami recognizes probabilistic features and limits freedom of choice to areas associated with ‘conditioned choice’, which effectively means that even within limits, we do not really have free-will. TDVP, too, points to Quantum Consciousness, and therefore probabilities, but this is applied predominantly in the dimensional context and eventually within the probabilistic infinity. TDVP’s bidirectional link of the finite and the infinite, reflects part of the unification of the single unit, and recognizes the core unification with the infinite.<sup>24 pp 370-371</sup> Goswami<sup>153-155</sup> does not utilize concepts equivalent to ordropy, which are fundamental to TDVP in its multidimensional context, nor does he show how life is infinite and therefore immortal or allows for life in 3S-1t. However, he does not perceive physical death not as an extinction but as a transition: But he doesn’t scientifically explain physical life or survival adequately, instead, he applies it as a belief system of , for example, Theosophy<sup>156</sup> and Indian teachings.

## **Neppe Law of Cause and Effect Revisited: Section 6<sup>j</sup>**

For an important summary perspective, we mention a concept Neppe strongly regards as true because of his own experience and some follow-up theorizing. We have referred previously to the *Neppe Law of Cause and Effect* (‘NLCE’).<sup>35</sup> Any spontaneous events are difficult to prove because there are no validating standards on what we perceive as our ‘single point-to-point time-dimensional reality’. However, briefly, in NLCE, we postulate that a ‘psychic’ may sense precognitive data. In some way, this may be because it has become a ‘reality’ in some kind of alternative, ‘thought-like’ (consciousness?), multi-dimensional domain that is nascent, unfixed, and fluctuates from moment-to-moment. This instability can be compared with an altered-state like we experience in dreams. At that time, the ‘psychic’ may obtain impressions that are correct, but only at that moment in 3S-1t. Nevertheless, our more stable, usual 3S-1t physical reality can still be altered because it hasn’t happened, and when that change actualizes physically in 3S-1t, the psychic seems to have missed the precognition. But, from the framework of that original dimensional domain, he may have been spot on at the time of the prediction. The cause has change; consequently, the effect

---

<sup>j</sup> Vernon Neppe and Edward Close: *Neppe Law of Cause and Effect Revisited IQNJ. 10:1, 45-47. 2018. S6.*  
Vernon Neppe & Edward Close. *Free-will: Freedom of choice within limits. IQNJ. 10:1, 7-70, v3.3 18030610. 2018* 45

has changed. But we just cannot prove this cause-effect relationship to scientists. Yet, we may have contributed to the spontaneous reality experienced by mankind.

The following is recounted in first-person by Professor Vernon Neppe: “More than fifty years ago, as a twelve-year-old, after a rather remarkable ‘show-me’ experience, I developed a model that I, at that point, named the ‘Neppe Law of Cause and Effect’ (NLCE). Effectively, I proposed that we have free-will and yet can change the future. This is, even today, a problem that even till now has proven largely insoluble using other explanations. We could give some examples, but they are lengthy. Suffice to say the following: Essentially, when an impression is precognized (e.g. in a dream, altered state, or waking consciousness), it may be reflecting what is happening at that moment in another, let us call it ‘thought-realm’: In effect, a true impression being picked up of an event was actually occurring at that moment, but it was not (yet) in our restricted moment of our present time-perception in 3S-1t. Now, circumstances change. The current cause-change produces an effect-change. Effectively, a new event occurs in that ‘thought- realm’ instead. Therefore, a precognition picked up by a ‘psychic’ may appear wrong when it doesn't happen; but it was not wrong because it happened in the ‘thought realm’: It just did not physically actualize in 3S-1t.

On the other hand, there could be other overwhelming impressions (or in TDVP terminology ‘impacts’), with such powerful current causes in that thought-realm predestination, that a precognition would almost certainly come about physically, and not be easily changed: Let us say that millions independently think X which would produce Z into the future. Now a few individuals think Y, but unless those few persons influence the millions, that may not change the event X from happening as Z. As a variant, sometimes the cause may ultimately be expressed through mainly ‘physical’ not ‘consciousness’ causes: X could be so powerful because it might be geophysically based, as in a strong earthquake. But, even then, perhaps, we might be able to prevent some of the anticipated damage by acting on an intuition and moving away from the epicenter. ”

“Historically, I developed this model long before I discovered Dunne's *Experiment with Time*.<sup>36</sup> I thereafter studied Dunne's thesis several times, and confirmed that Dunne's model does not emphasize changing causality, and therefore actualized free-will. It is not clear how Dunne treats precognition in

the context of modified cause and effect. He refers to ‘serial time’, when possibly aspects could better be conceptualized in ‘parallel time’. But I regard both as too simplistic. I prefer to apply a broader model of an N-dimensional reality of time, space and consciousness, where events may interface but at parangular levels (a concept that we developed only much later in *Reality Begins with Consciousness*.<sup>21</sup>). Nevertheless, Dunne’s conceptualization of serial time, can reflect the discrete quantal measures we describe in TDVP.<sup>157</sup> Discrete quantized events portray very much TDVP’s finite reality, however, we also recognize that these events must be volumetric, and there is also a continuous infinite reality impacting everything.”<sup>158</sup>

“Remarkably the fundamental tenets behind NLCE have not changed in a half-century, remaining with the same basic structure: Change the cause, and alter the effect. The cause may be hidden, but the effect can be noted in our physical reality—the change may be minor: You cancel a cab that you have a bad ‘feeling’ about, and take another, and no adverse event happens. Effectively, based on spontaneous experiences to which I’ve been exposed, and then descriptions of cases drawn to my attention, I postulated that both precognition and actualized free-will was demonstrable.”<sup>35</sup> Precognition data, as indicated, is now regarded as overwhelming (more than six-sigma or a billion to one against chance).<sup>159, 160</sup> However, *sometimes intuitive certainties about the future do not come about*: Possibly the prediction was wrong, or misinterpreted, *but maybe it turned off*. In the NLCE, one explanation is that at any point, in our limited 3S-1t-1C sentient reality, the events that were moving inexorably toward one result, change because *we changed the fundamental cause: by so doing, we change the effect*.”

“My experience working with ‘psychics’ who specialize in precognition is that most of the time (maybe 90% of the time) the events do not actualize, almost as if the event has turned off before it reached them. This again, encompasses the life-tracks concept and turning off the track. Yet, the data on ‘prayer’ and healing strongly suggests that we can impact such events—we can either impact the adverse event directly, or perhaps bi-directionally influence by allowing our visualized prayer to reach another source (? G-d, or the infinite—and those may be synonymous) that then impacts events at the 3S-1t level, changing the effect.”  
161-166

“Nevertheless, we cannot ‘verify’ most events in our physical 3S-1t domain. For

example, a ‘precognizer’ (someone who does precognitions and has been successful) had a strong intuitive impression. He posted this on what might be regarded as a monitored Internet site that was being read by authorities. He ‘felt’ that a launch due for that morning would lead to the space-shuttle exploding. He needed to warn of this. Yet, apparently all checks had been done and the shuttle was ready to go within some minutes. It turns out that NASA further investigated and they found a problem. The launch was delayed till the problem was fixed, and nothing untoward happened when the launch occurred.

This begs the question, however: Would the accident have occurred? We don’t know but given the logic it might have, and changing the cause of the precognition is conceivable. This kind of example, and the many other unproven ones that I encountered in a precognitions group I ran, might imply one is *master of one’s own fate*. But, on the other hand, there is no easy way most psychic predictions can be validated: They are subjective. Even more so, fragile individuals might psychotically misinterpret reality <sup>167</sup>, a major complication psychologically.”

NLCE explains free-will, and the changed cause appears rather obvious, but this had not scientifically been written about before, and so translated. For example, later, in 1975, Alan Vaughan<sup>168</sup> pointed out, as an aside, that one can rarely change patterns of ‘prophecy’, by not acting on an already established cause. However, in my opinion, in NLCE, Vaughan’s ‘rarity’ is not a rarity at all, but something that should work every time provided the cause is modified, and there are no other alternative factors opposing it. This allows a simple escape valve for us as individuals where we are the only one’s making the choice—large or small. However, there often are alternative factors, because ‘life-tracks’ involve multiple intervening factors from many other areas. Changes of our ‘life-tracks’ requires us incorporating all other related tracks.

NLCE therefore is part of the whole ‘life-track’ matrix conceptualized in TDVP. Because there are changes in time dimensions it implies multidimensional time. And it refers to consciousness in higher dimensions, as well.

## **The Evidence for Precognition: Section 7** <sup>24p207. k</sup>

And now a final element: How do we know Precognition is true, and what of presentiment?

There are nine psi—consciousness—protocols with six-sigma data (Table 1). This is truly remarkable and each reflects more than one in a billion frequentist statistics against chance. The ninth of these six-sigma protocols involves research in precognition: Precognition reports are often spontaneous and difficult to quantitate, particularly as there may be complex psychological elements existing, as well. We examine in this instance individual site research, which also combines into a meta-analysis, both of which generate six-sigma data.

It must be emphasized that these are rare events. <sup>24p208-209</sup> This is why studies require large sample sizes because there are just slight deviations from statistical chance. This explains, too, the reason 3S-1t appears to work most of the time in our usual life. We could have classified precognition as one of the solid six-sigma protocols, but instead we're listing it as the ninth because the data though impeccable, has derived only from one main source and some subsidiary sources (which for any other scientific endeavor would be sufficient)! <sup>24p219</sup>

### **PRECOGNITION AND SIX-SIGMA DATA** <sup>24p221</sup>

Precognition involves information about knowledge of the future, which is not obtained by statistical prediction or logic. It can be studied in the lab situation with excellent controls for any kind of information leakage, particularly as the event being considered has not yet occurred in our current reality. Nevertheless, precognition research demonstrates six-sigma data in psi research. In this regard, there are two important databases: The first is a meta-analysis of many studies, and the second is a particularly impressive study from one lab, both with overwhelming data that is more than six-sigma—roughly more than one billion to one against chance. <sup>169</sup>

The meta-analysis was performed by Charles Honorton and Diane Ferrari <sup>159</sup>. They analyzed research data from 1935 to 1989 pertaining to precognition. They examined 309 precognition experiments carried out by 62 investigators. 50,000

---

<sup>k</sup> Vernon Neppe and Edward Close: The Evidence for Precognition IQNJ. 10:1, 48-52. 2018. S7.



participants were used and there were more than 2 million trials. 30% of these studies were statistically significant, whereas only 5% would be expected to be significant by chance. The statistical significance of this meta-analysis is overwhelming even for six-sigma data:  $10^{20}$  against chance. This on its own constitutes overwhelming evidence for a mechanism occurring that cannot be explained by chance.

**Table 1: The Nine Six-sigma Protocols in Consciousness Research**

- 1.) RV: Remote viewing
- 2) REG: Random event generator
- 3.) Ganzfeld
- 4.) GCP: Global consciousness project
- 5.) Presentiment
- 6.) Backward precognition (Bem protocol)
- 7.) Survival-superpsi
- 8.) Staring protocol
- 9.) Precognition

The single lab study comes from the Princeton Engineering anomalies research labs in Princeton, NJ. Robert Jahn, Brenda Dunne and Roger Nelson performed 227 formal experiments on precognitive remote perception<sup>160</sup>. Individuals were asked where one of the researchers would be hiding at a pre-selected later time. The probability against chance was 1 in 100 billion. The description was accurate to the same degree whether the viewer was looking hours, days or weeks into the future. This has implications about the concepts of future time and the inverse square law.

*An aside:* It may not be precognition but psychokinesis (mind over matter; or mind controlling events). This might mean that free-will actively impacts what appears to be precognitive events.<sup>169, 170</sup>

Often results can be interpreted as supporting psychokinesis because of the set influence of the REG (Random Event Generator) attempted<sup>170, 68</sup>, but conversely this may support precognition knowing what to predict.<sup>24p217-219</sup> Essentially, in a meta-analysis by Radin and Nelson, the odds against chance were far less than even a staggering one in a trillion to one—they were 1 in  $10^{17}$ . Their study assigned each experiment a quality score, examined the 152 references they

found in 832 studies. 68 different investigators performed 597 experimental (of which 258 were from the PEAR lab in Princeton) and 233 control studies (which were well within chance levels).<sup>171, 172</sup>

## THE EVIDENCE FOR PRESENTIMENT

One highly relevant recent exciting piece of research looks at unconscious responses, sometimes in the brain, other times in other parts of the autonomic nervous system (e.g., heart)<sup>173</sup>. The most provocative is research on presentiment, because not only is this psi research, but research where one has to change one's perspective of time.<sup>173-176</sup> Effectively, this is work with precognition with the difference that this knowledge is not even consciously made, it is completely unconscious and looks at events just seconds before they are actualized. The apparatus generally is very sophisticated and therefore, such studies are usually very expensive. The most important physiological measures used in presentiment studies are heart rate, EEG, fMRI (BOLD signal), and electrodermal activity (EDA). So far, all of these have shown evidence of presentiment, so the whole body appears to be involved. Presentiment is measured in terms of certain physiological changes in the brain, the heart or in one's brain waves. Communications generally involve two different individuals, if necessary separated in different rooms, but monitored together by a stimulus to the one which can also be recorded in the other, and surprisingly reflecting, at times, the response seconds before. Quantitative measures include functional MRIs or positron emission tomography (PET). Experiments have also been done in a free-running environment. Much of the early work to that date has been well-summarized by Radin and Nelson<sup>84, 171, 172</sup> but research continues. Testing presentiment hypotheses in experimental research designs that are familiar to mainstream psychologists, such as studies about learning and habituation, may encourage psychologists to better appreciate the anomalous results and to attempt to explore presentiment hypotheses themselves<sup>173</sup>. However, the methodology has to take into account appropriate techniques to perform and interpret: Harvard researchers have stumbled<sup>112</sup>. Presentiment research has even been done in non-humans, including earthworms! It is interesting, as an aside, that there do not appear to be significant declines in presentiment research, possibly because it involves unconscious measures. Essentially, when one again does a meta-analysis in terms on presentiment studies, the overall carefully assessed statistic suggests these results happening by chance are less than one in a hundred million billion ( $p < 1 \times 10^{17}$  based on 37 studies between 1978 and 2010 based on Mossbridge, Tressoldi and Utts, 2011<sup>177</sup>)! Many studies in this field of

presentiment research have confirmed what appear to be these retrocausal effects, in which physiological arousal occurs *before* the stimulus <sup>178</sup>.

Presentiment research has shown some special characteristics <sup>173</sup>:

- Emotionally arousing visual or auditory stimuli produce stronger anticipatory effects than more neutral ones.
- Women appear to be somewhat more sensitive to presentiment than men. Effects of meditation are mixed.

#### THE ROLE OF PRECOGNITION. <sup>24p234-235</sup>

If we accept the cogent evidence for phenomena like precognition, locality becomes untenable. Therefore, we would have no impediments to the preference for realism. In fact, the Leggett inequalities, a somewhat improved extension of the Bell inequalities <sup>179</sup>, are frequently touted as having ruled out nonlocality and forced the acceptance of nonrealism. The Leggett inequalities (from Anthony James Leggett) are a related pair of mathematical expressions concerning the correlations of properties of entangled particles. The inequalities are exemplified in terms of relative angles of elliptical and linear polarizations. They are fulfilled by all physical theories that are based on certain non-local and realistic assumptions that may be considered to be plausible or intuitive according to common physical reasoning. <sup>180</sup>

#### THE ROLE OF TIME

However, Leggett's assumptions in deriving those inequalities specifically ruled out the backward-in-time nonlocality that consciousness and time researchers are accustomed to dealing with. <sup>179, 181, 182</sup> Therefore, nonlocal, realistic theories are appropriate and supported by precognition.

The Leggett inequalities are violated by quantum mechanical theory. <sup>179, 180, 182, 183</sup>

The results of an experimental test in 2007 by a team directed by Anton Zeilinger showed agreement with quantum mechanics rather than the Leggett inequalities for a broad class of theories. <sup>184</sup> The Leggett related work is probably the most important theoretical advance, though the inequality refutation doesn't quite accomplish the task of absolutely proving nonlocality though with precognition, it could be argued that it did. The Leggett–Garg inequality is always violated on the microscopic quantum mechanics scale. <sup>179</sup>

## REVISITING NONLOCALITY

Establishing nonlocality is based on significant supporting data. The original experiments confirmed that entangled particles violated the Bell formulas. Nevertheless, there was still an "out" for those insisting on "local realism":<sup>180</sup> The experiment was slow enough that information about the detector settings could propagate from one end of the apparatus to the other long before the photon measurements could take place. This meant that a purely local process could, technically, be carrying the information the particles needed to "make up their minds" about how to be measured. There were no particular candidates for what might carry such information, but the communication was possible in principle.

Aspect refuted these local-realist ideas by randomizing the choice of detector settings on extremely short time scales. This made it such that there was no way before the measurement was complete that any light-speed-limited signal could carry information about the outcome of detector A over to detector B (or vice versa).<sup>185, 186</sup> Technically, extending the causal gap to miles does nothing to make the demonstration of nonlocality more rigorous: It simply tests the QM prediction that EPR correlations don't weaken with distance—which they don't.<sup>180</sup> But such research has been done to consolidate the previous work.

## **TDVP and Freedom of Choice: A perspective: Section 8.<sup>1</sup>**

In this final section, we will summarize Triadic Dimensional-Distinction Vortical Paradigm (TDVP) briefly in the context of causality. TDVP is complex, but the work of sixty years of combined cogitation by the authors (Edward Close and Vernon Neppe) is being articulated. We encourage a full reading of *"Reality Begins with Consciousness"* to further appreciate the finer points, particularly as the focus here is free-will. Can we choose? Yes, but to a limited degree.

Effectively, a pertinent aspect, in this instance, of the TDVP model involves 'metatime' (a universal all-existing time in the *infinite*). Metatime is an aspect of our "infinite subreality" and involves all of time (in what we would conceptualize as) "simultaneously". The continuous infinite subreality necessarily interfaces with our discrete finite dimensional subreality. This 'finite

---

<sup>1</sup> Vernon Neppe and Edward Close: TDVP and Freedom of Choice: A perspective IQNJ. 10:1, 53-57. 2018. S8.  
Vernon Neppe & Edward Close. Free-will: Freedom of choice within limits. *IQNJ. 10:1, 7-70, v3.3 18030610. 2018* 53

subreality' includes our current physically *perceptually* experienced 3S-1t (the three-dimensional space—moment in time domain that we experience every day). However, our 3S-1t domain is limited greatly by the "*physical reduction valves*" we have (for example, limits in all our senses and also of the instruments to measure extended extremes of such phenomena as vision and sound): This creates limitations of perception and consequently in *conceptualization* and *interpretation* of our subjective 'experience' in our 'consciousness'). Because of the commonality of higher systems like physical, life, consciousness and social science experiences, our subjective experiences ultimately, partly express themselves as "common actualized realities". These common realities can be shared almost completely (e.g. 99% or more) with other individuals. One common experience is experienced in 1t— the experience of this moment in time (and today it could be commonly experience by billions on a TV screen — correcting for slightly different delays in transmission and receiving).

Our perceptual limitations create a conceptual illusion of forward time only in 3S-1t, but given that time exists in infinite metatime, there might be no problem with backward or forward conceptualizations of "time" in specific domain realities involving much higher discrete finite dimensional levels or in a "continuous" infinite subreality. However, in 3S-1t, we cannot perceptually experience the revision of the backward track of time because we're experiencing only 1t. We can interpret the past but not change it: We can remember what we remember; we see use videos or other mechanical instruments to help—so we can conceptualize pictures of the past: But we cannot modify it in 3S-1t, and we cannot read two different simultaneous moments in the past in 3S-1t because the *discrete* changes we're dealing with, namely 1t (a moment in time) are conceptualized as results of previous *linear* time events. The aspect of "time" that is relevant to us and can be partly conceptualized is 3S-1T. But that is literally but a moment in the infinite metatime fabric. 3S-1t limits us to 1 momentary point in time and incomplete discrete linearity of past and present, with limited expectation or predicted conceptualization of the future). In finite subreality, in TDVP, one postulate (and motivation) is multidimensional time, and a subpostulate is that it is likely 3S-3T. Space and time is also associated with a "fluctuating" number of postulated dimensions of "consciousness" in finite subreality producing a finite 3S-3T-3C subreality. In 3S-1t we are very limited in conceptualizing the parallel or crossing optional tracks in finite "multidimensionality" ("dimensions" outside 3S-1t) including multidimensional time, because we cannot perceive them.



## IN ESSENCE, IS THERE FREE-WILL? AND CAN THIS CAUSE A DIFFERENCE?

We answer these questions speculatively, but based on the data presented.

- *Is there free-will?* Yes. We argue there is ‘freedom of choice’, a term that we’ve used synonymously with ‘free-will’. But our free-will has limits: freedom of choice can impact our immediate primary contacts, analogous to the leaves on a tree touching other leaves, but leaving the forest largely untouched, though minimally possibly creating some wind: This wind—our impact—can spread further and further, to other non-contacts (our primary, secondary, tertiary, quaternary, quinternary and more distant groups) through the influences of these immediate and then distant contacts. This continues, theoretically, ad infinitum. This means that to a limited degree, we can make the whole world better, even if that is in a tiny manner: Our free-will is ‘relative’ only, not ‘absolute’. <sup>20 21</sup>
- *Is there only individual free-will or is there some kind of collective one?* Free-will can be more easily conceptualized in individuals. But, like all other ‘systems models’ it can involve various collective levels. This is why in TDVP, we use the term ‘individual-unit’. <sup>45</sup> The individual unit can be all encompassing and at every group level such as family, social, cultural, ethnic and even collective world groups, and the same choices can be made at the individual and ethnic levels together at the same time. We could speculate that the same choices performed through many people or groups could have more impact than just one act of free-will. But, we could argue that the intensity of the choice would also be logical. This appears to borne out by psi data. <sup>24 68 21</sup>
- *Is free-will available to everything, even electrons?* Yes, free-will is available to everyone and everything, but all to the restricted limited degree that the limitations of the specific living or inanimate object might allow. Humans hypothetically should have relatively far more free-will than atomic particles. But even those subatomic particles can potentially apprehend or manipulate objects or events: pure randomness is unlikely; even at the electron level, there may be some component of free-will, and a multitude of billions of subatomic particles make up humankind, and everything else. There are, of course, major differences qualitatively and quantitatively between mankind and electrons. But to each their own.
- *What about G-d?* The only complete free-will would be if we could control the infinite. Theologically, this might imply a deity in an infinite

continuity, impacting and influencing everything in our existence, and in every other universe. The degree of those impacts can be profound on our world. And our interaction or intercession at that mystical, G-dly, level may be through ‘prayer’. <sup>161-166</sup> Perhaps the power of a deity, increases our free-will enormously. Perhaps that reciprocity could allow great impact for ordinary individuals.

- *On what model is free-will based?* This, again, is a speculation. We argue that free-will can be successfully applied from the Neppe-Close TDVP model. This Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm covers all the bases to explain free-will and its actualization, as well as precognition. TDVP is not only not contradicted by any known data, there is great and growing empirical and mathematical support for TDVP. <sup>12-14, 24</sup>
- *Can that free-will have an effect?* Yes, it can. That would imply ‘actualized free-will’ where not only did we *influence* other living beings, objects or events, but our free-will can *impact* on the nature of reality. Such impact might often be only minimal or slight. This is because there are many other influences all interfacing in our existence. This implies that precognition or psychokinetic influences exist. The data supports this and we’ve discussed the data <sup>24</sup> on precognition and presentiment in this paper. <sup>170, 178, 173, 68</sup>
- *How does free-will work?* We think that free-will may occur in more than just in our physical or material realm of 3S-1t: That is just the tip of a largely submerged iceberg. Applying a multidimensional model, the free-will concept goes beyond 3S-1t, possibly to varying but appropriate domains of the finite 9-dimensions.
- *Is time alone involved in free-will or is there more?* Free-will likely involves multidimensional time. It is possible that some or all of TDVP’s proposed three dimensions of Time is involved. But there is more: Applying TDVP, there is a continuity with higher-level dimensions including the lower ones. For example, Space (S) might often be embedded within Time (T), and Time within Consciousness (C). This way all of STC is involved.
- *How specifically does any actualization of free-will come about?* It may be that the ‘Neppe Law of Cause and Effect’ provides significant insights. <sup>35</sup> Certainly, this model can explain short-term and long-term precognition, as well as free-will. Moreover, when the cause actualizes reality in our 3S-1t (physical) domain, or at least impacts at any higher dimensional domain level, it implies cause and effect. We might not know

that effect has come about, but this is a very spiritual message for our whole existence. Additionally, the NLCE argues that we can almost definitely change our *immediate future* by making decisions, because there likely would be less interference from other ‘life-tracks’.

- *Is NLCE then an alternative free-will model to TDVP?* There is no need for that. NLCE can be part of TDVP<sup>12-14</sup>, and is fully compatible with it:
  - NLCE<sup>35</sup> can involve extra dimensions: this was originally described as “some kind of thought form or other reality”;
  - NLCE<sup>35</sup> recognizes the need for a time change as events could then be actualized in 3S-1t, and is therefore compatible with multidimensional time;
  - NLCE<sup>35</sup> applies impact and influence;

Moreover, NLCE<sup>35</sup> appears to be the only model we know of that is compatible with both free-will and precognition. Because it’s compatible with TDVP, this makes it a subset of TDVP, which then is also compatible, without contradiction, of the dual existence of free-will and precognition.

---

## Acknowledgments:

We extend our great appreciation to:

*Dr. Larry Dossey* for his kind comments and to

*Dr. Leonard Horowitz* for a profound and positive exposition about our work.

We thank *Jacqueline Slade* as English Editor of the IQNJ, who has assisted us not only in this article, but many others.

We also greatly appreciate the indirect creative ideas of *Fernando Luis Cacciola Carballal*.

*Shauna Mason, Lis Neppe, Standa Riha, Mike Tymn, Erich Von Abele and Suzan Wilson* (alphabetically) have also made contributions.

## **References on Free-Will: Freedom of choice within limits:** **Section 9<sup>m</sup>**

1. Homer. *Odyssey* in (translator). Edited by Fagles R. Circa 700 BCE (1997)
2. Neppe , VM. *Applying feasibility, falsifiability, and certainty in scientific method to Forensic Science: Raising the Bar in Forensic Science: Keynote address, Interdisciplinary Symposium.* . Program, 70th Scientific Meeting, American Academy of Forensic Science, 21. 2018.
3. Popper, KT. *The logic of scientific discovery*. London and New York, Routledge / Taylor and Francis e-Library 2005.
4. Popper, K. *Replies to my critics*, in The Philosophy of Karl Popper, Part II. Edited by Schilpp PA. Illinois, The Open Court Publishing Company. 1974.
5. Popper, K. *Conjectures and refutations*. London, Routledge and Keagan Paul 1972.
6. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Why lower dimensional feasibility (LFAF): Application to metadimensionality* Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1209:1209, 2352-2360. 2012.
7. Neppe, VMC, Edward R. *Falsifiability versus feasibility*. Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1201:1201, 2011-2020. 2012.
8. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Mathematical and theoretical physics feasibility demonstration of the finite nine dimensional vortical model in fermions*. Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1301:1301, 1-55. 2013.
9. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The second conundrum: Falsifiability is insufficient; we need to apply feasibility as well Lower Dimensional Feasibility, Absent Falsification (LFAF) as a scientific method* IQNexus Journal, 7:2, 21-23. 2015.

---

<sup>m</sup> Vernon Neppe and Edward Close: References on Free-Will: Freedom of choice within limits IQNJ. 10:1, 58-70. 2018. S9.

10. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Interpreting science through feasibility and replicability: Extending the scientific method by applying “Lower Dimensional Feasibility, Absent Falsification” (LFAF)*. World Institute for Scientific Exploration (WISE) Journal 4:3, 3-37. 2015.
11. Jung, CG. *Letter to M Leonard 12/5/1959*, <https://quotefancy.com/quote/782691/C-G-Jung-To-this-day-G-d-is-the-name-by-which-I-designate-all-things-which-cross-my> 1959.
12. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Fifty discoveries that are changing the world: Why the Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm (TDVP) makes a difference*. IQ Nexus Journal, 9:2, 7-39. 2017.
13. Neppe, V, Close, ER. *Beyond Physical Life How ‘TDVP’ (Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm) explains survival after bodily death*. J. Spiritual and Consciousness Studies, 40:1, 42-62. 2017.
14. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Tough questions on, and useful answers to, the Neppe-Close triadic dimensional distinction vortical paradigm (TDVP)*. IQ Nexus Journal, 9:1, 7-55. 2017.
15. Feynman, RP. *Electrons and their interactions. QED: The strange theory of light and matter*. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press. 1985.
16. Feynman, RP (ed). *The Feynman lectures on physics*. USA, Addison-Wesley. 1965.
17. Kuhn, T. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press 1962.
18. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Revisiting Thomas Kuhn: An extended structure for Scientific Revolutions: Part 2* IQNexus Journal, 8:1, 11-19. 2016.
19. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *What is Science? A perspective on the revolutions of change*. IQNexus Journal, 8:1, 7-19. 2016.
20. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Glossary of terms in Dimensional Biopsychophysics*. Seattle, WA, Brainvoyage.com. In press.
21. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The Cabibbo mixing angle (CMA) derivation: Is our mathematical derivation of the Cabibbo spin mixing angle (CSMA) equivalent?* IQNexus Journal, 7:4, 120-128. 2015.
22. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *The seventh conundrum: the mathematical derivation of the Cabibbo mixing angle in fermions*. IQNexus Journal, 7:2, 41-43. 2015.
23. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *TDVP: a paradigm shift that works —how the Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm challenges*



- conventional scientific thinking and explains reality*. Telicom, 27:1, 24-42. 2014.
24. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Reality begins with consciousness: a paradigm shift that works (5th Edition)*. Seattle, Brainvoyage.com 2014.
  25. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Relative non-locality and the infinite*, in Reality begins with consciousness: a paradigm shift that works (5th Edition). Seattle, WA, Brainvoyage.com. 2014.
  26. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The discrete finite contained in the continuous infinite: some speculations (Part 13C)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 120-122. 2015.
  27. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The infinite (Part 13B)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 117-120. 2015.
  28. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm (TDVP): The nine-dimensional finite spin metaparadigm embedded in the infinite* Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1401:1401, 4001-4041. 2014.
  29. Neppe, VMC, Edward R. *The infinite-finite boundary*. Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1204:1204, 2170-2179. 2012.
  30. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The Infinite: essence, life and ordropy* Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1204:1204, 2159-2169. 2012.
  31. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Space, time and consciousness: the tethered triad*. Seattle, Brainvoyage.com In press
  32. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Multidimensional time and 3S-3T-3C (Part 13-J)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 136-138. 2015.
  33. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *A Proposed Theory of Everything that works: How the Neppe-Close Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm (TDVP) model provides a metaparadigm by applying nine-dimensional finite spin space, time and consciousness substrates and the transfinite embedded in the infinite producing a unified reality*. IQNexus Journal, 16:3, 1-54. 2014.
  34. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Science, multidimensionality, and feasibility: Section 4*. IQ Nexus Journal, 9:1, 30-41. 2017.
  35. Neppe, VM. *The Neppe law of cause and effect (NLCE)*, in *The Neppe law of cause and effect (NLCE)*. Johannesburg, South Africa 1964.
  36. Dunne, JW. *An experiment with time*. Charlottesville Virginia, Hampton Roads 2001.

37. Radin, D. *Entangled Minds*. New York, Paraview 2006.
38. Talbot, M. *The holographic universe*. New York, Harper Collins 1991
39. Neppe, VM. *Conceptualizing good and evil in psychiatry and social groups*. IQNexus Journal, 9:3, 7-37. 2017.
40. Neppe, VM. *Do evil acts reflect mental illness or are they just evil? Section 2. In Editorial Opinion: What are we missing? Is there a moral judgment in psychiatry as well as mental illness?* J Psychol Clin Psychiatry 9:3: 00507, 4-5. 2018.
41. Neppe, VM. *Editorial Opinion: What Are We Missing? Is There A Moral Judgment in Psychiatry as Well as Mental Illness?* J Psychol Clin Psychiatry 9:3: 00507, 1-16. 2018.
42. Neppe, VM. *Of Good and Evil: Complexity and Perplexity: Section 1* J Psychol Clin Psychiatry 9:3: 00507, 1-4. 2018.
43. Neppe, VM. *Good and Evil: Can we classify it? Social responsibility: Modifying behaviors in regard to perceived evil: Section 4.* J Psychol Clin Psychiatry 9:3: 00507, 9-11. 2018.
44. Neppe, VM. *A Perspective on Good and Evil: Section 5.* J Psychol Clin Psychiatry 9:3: 00507, 11-12. 2018.
45. Neppe, VM. *'Ethicospirituobiopsychofamiliosocioethnicultural': A Legitimate Approach: Section 6.* J Psychol Clin Psychiatry 9:3: 00507, 14-16. 2018.
46. Descartes, R, Cress, DA. *Discourse on method and meditations, 4th Ed.* Seattle, WA, Amazon Kindle 1999 (circa 1600).
47. Tart, CT. *The end of materialism: how evidence of the paranormal is bringing science and spirit together*. Oakland, New Harbinger 2009.
48. Griffin, DR. *Parapsychology and philosophy: A Whiteheadian postmodern perspective*. Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, 87:3, 217-288. 1993.
49. Murphy, M. *The Future of the Body: Explorations Into the Further Evolution Of Human Nature*. New York, Tarcher (Penguin) 1993.
50. Whitehead, AN. *Science and the modern world*. New York, Free Press 1953.
51. Whitehead, AN. *Process and reality*. New York, Free Press 1978.
52. Dossey, L. *The power of premonitions*. New York, Plume, Penguin 2011.
53. Rhine, LE. *Hidden Channels of the Mind*. New York: William Morrow 1965.

54. Rhine, LE. *The Invisible Picture: A Study of Psychic Experiences*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co. 1981.
55. Einstein, A. *Physics and Reality*. <http://www.kostic.niu.edu/>, Monograph 1936.
56. Einstein, A. *Relativity, the special and the general theory—a clear explanation that anyone can understand (Fifteenth Edition)*. New York, Crown Publishers 1952.
57. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Reality begins with consciousness: a paradigm shift that works (First Edition)*. Seattle, Brainvoyage.com 2012.
58. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Reality begins with consciousness: a paradigm shift that works (Second Edition)*. Seattle, Brainvoyage.com 2012.
59. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Reality begins with consciousness: a paradigm shift that works (4th Edition)*. Seattle, Brainvoyage.com 2013.
60. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The groundbreaking paradigm shift: Triadic Dimensional- Distinction Vortical Paradigm (“TDVP”): A series of dialogues*. Telicom, 29:1-4 52-177. 2017.
61. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Reality begins with consciousness: a paradigm shift that works (3rd Edition)*. Seattle, Brainvoyage.com 2013.
62. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Reality Begins with Consciousness (RBC)—Key Features*. Seattle, WA, Brainvoyage.com 2014.
63. Dossey, L. *Consciousness and TDVP: Welcome to a New World*. Explore (NY), 13:4, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28526397> 233-237. 2017.
64. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Spirituality and Science: Answers 2*. Seattle, Brainvoyage.com In Press
65. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Applying consciousness, infinity and dimensionality creating a paradigm shift: introducing the triadic dimensional distinction vortical paradigm (TDVP)*. Neuroquantology, 9:3, 375-392. 2011.
66. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The groundbreaking paradigm shift: triadic dimensional-distinction vortical paradigm (“TDVP”): a series of dialogues*. IQ Nexus Journal, 8:4 — V6.122, 7-125. 2016.
67. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Translating fifteen mysteries of the universe by applying a nine dimensional spinning model of finite reality: A perspective, the standard model and TDVP. Part 1*. Neuroquantology, 13:2, 205-217. 2015.
68. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Explaining psi phenomena by applying TDVP principles: A preliminary analysis* IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 7-129. 2015.

69. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *TDVP and life tracks: Speculations that fit the model (Part 13F)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 129-130. 2015.
70. Dossey, L. *Care giving and natural systems theory*. Top Clin Nurs, 3:4, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6915668> 21-27. 1982.
71. Donne, J. *Meditation XVII*, in *The works of John Donne*, vol III. Edited by Alford H. London, John W. Parker. 1839.
72. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Re-evaluating our assessments of science: The approach to discovery, applying LFAP to the philosophy of science* IQNexus Journal, 8:1, 20-31. 2016.
73. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The most logical psychology: The “horizontal” approach” to Transpersonal and Humanistic Psychology in the TDVP context: Part 3*. IQNexus Journal, 15:2, 20-24. 2014.
74. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The most logical psychology: The “vertical” approach” to the transcendental and Transpersonal Psychology in the TDVP context: Part 4*. IQNexus Journal, 15:2, 25-38. 2014.
75. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Putting consciousness into the equations of science: the third form of reality (gimmel) and the “TRUE” units (Triadic Rotational Units of Equivalence) of quantum measurement* IQNexus Journal, 7:4, 7-119. 2015.
76. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Empirical exploration of the third substance, gimmel in particle physics (Part 10)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:4, 45-47. 2015.
77. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Speculations on the “God matrix”: The third form of reality (gimmel) and the refutation of materialism and on gluons*. World Institute for Scientific Exploration (WISE) Journal 4:4, 3-30. 2015.
78. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *A data analysis preliminarily validates the new hypothesis that the atom 'contains' dark matter and dark energy: Dark matter correlates with gimmel in the atomic nucleus and dark energy with gimmel in electrons*. IQ Nexus Journal, 8:3, 80-96. 2016.
79. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Relative non-locality - key features in consciousness research (seven part series)*. Journal of Consciousness Exploration and Research, 6:2, 90-139. 2015.
80. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The concept of relative non-locality: Theoretical implications in consciousness research*. Explore (NY): The Journal of Science and Healing, 11:2, [http://www.explorejournal.com/article/S1550-8307\(14\)00233-X/pdf](http://www.explorejournal.com/article/S1550-8307(14)00233-X/pdf) 102-108. 2015.
81. Conway, J, Kochen, S. *The free will theorem*. Foundations of Physics, 36:10, 1441. 2006.



82. Conway, J, Kochen, S. *The Strong Free Will Theorem*. Notices of the AMS, 56:2. 2009.
83. Zee, A. *Quantum field theory in a nutshell*. Princeton, Princeton University Press 2003.
84. Radin, DI. *Entangled minds: extrasensory experiences in a quantum reality*. New York, Simon & Schuster (Paraview Pocket Books) 2006.
85. Everett, H. *Relative state formulation of quantum mechanics*. Reviews of Modern Physics, 39, 454-462. 1957.
86. Everett, H. *The many worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics*. Princeton, Princeton University Press 1973.
87. Einstein, A, Podolsky, B, Rosen, N. *Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?* Phys. Rev., 47:10, 777-780. 1935.
88. Cramer, JG. *The transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics*. Reviews of Modern Physics, 58, 647-688. 1986.
89. Bell, JS. *On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics*. Reviews of Modern Physics, 38:3, 447-452. 1966.
90. Carballal, FLC. *Free will: Inner Cosmos Facebook discussion*. 2016.
91. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *EPIC consciousness: A pertinent new unification of an important concept*. Journal of Psychology and Clinical Psychiatry, 1: 00036:6, 1-14. 2014.
92. Scholem, G. *Kabbalah*. NYC, NY, Jewish Publication Society 1974.
93. Kaplan, A. *Inner Space: Introduction to Kabbalah, Meditation and Prophecy*. New York, NY, Moznaim Publishing Corp 1990.
94. Leet, L. *The secret doctrine of the Kabbalah: Recovering the key to Hebraic sacred science*. New York, Simon and Schuster 1999.
95. Jacobson, S. The kabbalah of nutrition, in *The kabbalah of nutrition*. Edited by Jacobson, S, [http://www.chabad.org/parshah/article\\_cdo/aid/298378/jewish/The-Eastern-Colonists.htm](http://www.chabad.org/parshah/article_cdo/aid/298378/jewish/The-Eastern-Colonists.htm) 2011.
96. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Where does unified monism fit into the triadic dimensional distinction vortical paradigm (TDVP)* Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1211:1211, 2428-2439. 2012.
97. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The fifteenth conundrum: Applying the philosophical model of Unified Monism: Returning to general principles*. IQNexus Journal, 7:2, 74-78. 2015.



98. Barua, A. *God's Body at Work: Rāmānuja and Panentheism*. International Journal of Hindu Studies, 14:1, 1-30. 2010.
99. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Why lower dimensional feasibility (LFAF): Application to metadimensionality* Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1209:1209, 2352-2360. 2012.
100. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Free Will: Are we free? Or does Determinism and Probabilism dominate?* Dynamic Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1211:1211, 2531-2540. 2012.
101. Rucker, R. *Infinity and the Mind* Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press. 1995.
102. Gray, P. *Alan Turing – Time 100 People of the Century . . Providing a blueprint for the electronic digital computer. The fact remains that everyone who taps at a keyboard, opening a spreadsheet or a word-processing program, is working on an incarnation of a Turing machine*, in Time Magazine. New York, Time 1999.
103. Koltko-Rivera. What is nominal ration interval?, in What is nominal ration interval? Edited by Koltko-Rivera, Demand Media. [http://www.ehow.com/facts\\_7300954\\_nominal-ratio-interval\\_.html](http://www.ehow.com/facts_7300954_nominal-ratio-interval_.html) 2010.
104. Dunne, JW. *An Experiment with Time*. London, Black 1927.
105. Cantor, G (ed). *Contributions to the founding of the theory of transfinite numbers*. New York, Dover. 1955.
106. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *The Calculus of Distinctions: A workable mathematicologic model across dimensions and consciousness*. Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1210:1210, 2387 -2397. 2012.
107. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Further implications: quantized reality and applying Close's Calculus of Distinctions versus the Calculus of Newton(Part 19)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:4, 110-111. 2015.
108. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Understanding the calculus of distinctions and its role in TDVP: chapter 8* IQ Nexus Journal, 8:4 — V6.122, 107-114. 2016.
109. Neppe, VM. *Vortex N-dimensional pluralism: scientific empiricism, the heuristic approach and natural law*, in Vortex n-dimensional pluralism: scientific empiricism, the heuristic approach and natural law. Seattle, WA, USA pp 1-44. 2003.
110. Neppe, VM. *Vortex N-dimensionalism: a philosophical–scientific paradigm and alternative to mind-body theories*, in Vortex N-

- dimensionalism: a philosophical–scientific paradigm and alternative to mind-body theories. Seattle, WA, USA pp 1-30. 2003.
111. Neppe, VM. *Vortex pluralism*, in American Philosophical Association: The Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness. Seattle, WA 1996.
  112. Neppe, VM. Vortex pluralism: a new philosophical perspective, in Vortex pluralism: a new philosophical perspective. Edited by Neppe, VM, [http://www.pni.org/philosophy/vortex\\_pluralism.shtml/](http://www.pni.org/philosophy/vortex_pluralism.shtml/) 1997.
  113. Laszlo, E. *Science and the akashic field: an integral theory of everything*. Rochester, Vermont, Inner Traditions International 2004.
  114. Yeats, WB. Geometry, in Geometry. Edited by Yeats, WB, <http://www.yeatsvision.com/Geometry.html> 1921.
  115. Minkowski, H, Lorentz, HA, Einstein, A, Weyl, H. *The principle of relativity: a collection of original memoirs*. Dover 1952.
  116. Whiteman, JHM. *Aphorisms of spiritual method*. Gerrards Cross, U.K., Colin Smythe 1993.
  117. Whiteman, JHM. *Induced experiences*, in Personal communication to V M Neppe 2004.
  118. Whiteman, JHM. *The scientific evaluation of the out of body experience, in Parapsychology in South Africa*. Edited by Poynton JC. Johannesburg, SASPR. 1961.
  119. Poynton, JC. *Many levels, many worlds and psi: A guide to the work of Michael Whiteman*. Proceedings Soc. Psy. Res 59:222, 109-139. 2011.
  120. Whiteman, JHM. *Quantum theory and parapsychology*. J. Amer. Soc. Psychical Res., 67, 341-360. 1973.
  121. Whiteman, JHM. *The mystical life*. London, Faber and Faber 1961.
  122. Whiteman, JHM. *Old and new evidence on the meaning of life: Universal theology and life in other worlds*. Gerrards Cross, U.K., Colin Smythe 2006.
  123. Whiteman, JHM. *Old and new evidence on the meaning of life: The dynamics of spiritual development*. Gerrards Cross, U.K., Colin Smythe 2000.
  124. Whiteman, JHM. *Parapsychology and physics*, in Handbook of parapsychology. Edited by Wolman BB. New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold. 1977.
  125. Whiteman, JHM. *Old and new evidence on the meaning of life: an introduction to scientific mysticism*. Gerrards Cross, Colin Smythe 1986.
  126. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *The eighth conundrum: angular momentum and intrinsic electron spin*. IQNexus Journal, 7:2, 44-45. 2015.

127. Anonymous. *Angular momentum*, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Angular\\_momentum](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Angular_momentum) 2013.
128. Close, ER. *Transcendental Physics*. Lincoln, I-Universe 2000.
129. Schroeder, GL. *Genesis and the big bang*. New York, Harper Collins 1990.
130. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Special concepts in the finite and infinite anomalous process (Part 13)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 114-122. 2015.
131. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Revisiting terminology: Relative, framework and immediacy in psi (Part 11)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 90-97. 2015.
132. Dossey, L. *Coherence, chaos, and the coincidentia oppositorum*. Explore (NY), 6:6, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21040880> 339-345. 2010.
133. Anonymous. Chaos theory, in Chaos theory. Edited by Anonymous, Wikipedia Foundation. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chaos\\_theory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chaos_theory) 2011.
134. Prigogine, I, Stengers, I. *Order out of chaos*. New York, Bantam Books 1984.
135. Morris, HM, Morris, JD. Can order come out of chaos?, in Can order come out of chaos? Edited by Morris, HM, Morris, JD, Vital Articles on Science/Creation. <http://ldolphin.org/chaos.html> 1997.
136. Freeman, W. *How brains make chaos in order to make sense of the world*. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 10, 161-195. 1987.
137. László, E. *Evolution Presupposes Design, So Why the Controversy?*, in Huffington Post April 15, 2010, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ervin-laszlo/evolution-presupposes-des\\_b\\_537507.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ervin-laszlo/evolution-presupposes-des_b_537507.html) 2010.
138. Peacock, KA. *The quantum revolution*. New York, Greenwood Publishing Group 2008.
139. Penrose, SR, Hameroff, S. *Consciousness in the universe: quantum physics, evolution, brain & mind*. Cambridge, Cosmology Science Publishers 2011.
140. Neppe, VM. *The neologism: a personal evolutionary exploration*. Telicom, 22:2, 39-48. 2009.
141. Anastopoulos, C. *Particle or wave: the evolution of the concept of matter in modern physics*. Princeton, Princeton University Press 2008.
142. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Concepts and definitions in the triadic dimensional distinction vortical paradigm (TDVP) model*. Dynamic International Journal of Exceptional Creative Achievement 1205:1205, 2190 -2203. 2012.

143. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Free-will: A TDVP perspective (Part 13 I)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 135-136. 2015.
144. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Summation: Psi and TDVP: Two concepts that are synergistic (Part 14)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 139. 2015.
145. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The fourteenth conundrum: Applying the proportions of Gimmel to Triadic Rotational Units of Equivalence compared to the proportions of dark matter plus dark energy: Speculations in cosmology*. IQNexus Journal, 7:2, 72-73. 2015.
146. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Introductory perspective to the God matrix. Part 2*. World Institute for Scientific Exploration (WISE) Journal 4:4, 5-12. 2015.
147. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Key ideas: the third substance, gimmel and the G-d matrix. Part 1*. World Institute for Scientific Exploration (WISE) Journal 4:4, 3-4. 2015.
148. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Introductory summary perspective on TRUE and gimmel (Part 1) in Putting consciousness into the equations of science: the third form of reality (gimmel) and the "TRUE" units (Triadic Rotational Units of Equivalence) of quantum measurement* IQNexus Journal 7:4, 8-15. 2015.
149. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *More questions answered on the elements, TRUE and gimmel (Part 17)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:4, 82-102. 2015.
150. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *The gimmel pairing: Consciousness and energy and life (Part 13D)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:3, 122-126. 2015.
151. Neppe, VM, Close, ER. *Speculations about gimmel Part 5*. World Institute for Scientific Exploration (WISE) Journal 4:4, 21-26. 2015.
152. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Understanding TRUE units and gimmel as part of TDVP: chapter 7* IQ Nexus Journal, 8:4 — V6.122, 97-106. 2016.
153. Goswami, A. *The Visionary Window*. New York, Quest Books 2006.
154. Goswami, A. Quantum activism for better health and healing, in Quantum activism for better health and healing. Edited by Goswami, A, <http://www.amitgoswami.org/category/papers/> 2011.
155. Goswami, A. Can science and religion be integrated?, in Can science and religion be integrated? Edited by Goswami, A, <http://www.amitgoswami.org/category/papers/> 2011.
156. Faivre, A. *Theosophy*, in The Encyclopedia of Religion. Edited by Eliade M, Adams CJ. New York, Macmillan. 1987.
157. Planck, M. *Max Planck: Scientific Autobiography and Other Papers*. New York, Harper 1949.



158. Close, ER, Neppe, VM. *Filling in the gaps of volumetric stability (Part 18)*. IQNexus Journal, 7:4, 103-109. 2015.
159. Honorton, C, Ferrari, DC. *Future telling: a meta-analysis of forced choice precognition experiments, 1935-1987*. Journal of Parapsychology, 53, 281-308. 1989.
160. Dunne, BJ, Jahn, RG, Nelson, RD. *Precognitive remote perception*, in Tech Note PEAR 83003. Princeton, Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research 1983.
161. Dossey, L. *The forces of healing: reflections on energy, consciousness, and the beef stroganoff principle*. Altern Ther Health Med, 3:5, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9287437> 8-14. 1997.
162. Dossey, L. *How healing happens: exploring the nonlocal gap*. Altern Ther Health Med, 8:2, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11890378> 12-16, 103-110. 2002.
163. Dossey, L. *Truth and healing: a time for hard questions*. Explore (NY), 1:4, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16781540> 235-240. 2005.
164. Schwartz, SA, Dossey, L. *Nonlocality, intention, and observer effects in healing studies: laying a foundation for the future*. Explore (NY), 6:5, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20832762> 295-307. 2010.
165. Hawkes, JW. *Cell-Level Healing: The Bridge from Soul to Cell*. New York, Harper Collins 2011.
166. Radin, D, Yount, G. *Effects of healing intention on cultured cells and truly random events*. J Altern Complement Med, 10:1, [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15029876](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15029876) 103-112. 2004.
167. Neppe, VM. *Subjective paranormal experience psychosis*. Parapsychology Review, 15:2, Mar-Apr, 7-9. 1984.
168. Vaughan, A. *Patterns of prophecy*. New York, NY, Hawthorn 1973.
169. Lounds, P. *The influence of psychokinesis on the randomly-generated order of emotive and non-emotive slides*. Journal of the Society for Psychical Research, 59:832, 187-193. 1993.
170. Bosch, H, Steinkamp, F, Boller, E. *Examining Psychokinesis: The Interaction of Human Intention With Random Number Generators- A Meta-Analysis*. Psychological Bulletin, 132:4, 497-523. 2006.
171. Radin, D. *The conscious universe*. New York, Harper Collins 1997.
172. Radin, DI, Nelson, RD. *Evidence for consciousness-related anomalies in random physical systems*. Foundations of Physics, 19:2, 1499-1514. 1989.



173. Lobach, E. *Presentiment research: past, present, and future*, in *Charting the Future of Parapsychology*, Utrecht II. Utrecht, The Netherlands pp 16-19. 2008.
174. Radin, DI. *Electrodermal presentiments of future emotions*. Journal of Scientific Exploration, 18, 253-274. 2004.
175. Radin, DI. *Unconscious perception of future emotions: An experiment in presentiment*. Journal of Scientific Exploration, 11:2, 163-180. 1997.
176. Bierman, DJ, Scholte, HS. *A fMRI brain imaging study of presentiment*. Journal of International Society of Life Information Science, 20:2, 380-388. 2002.
177. Mossbridge, J, Tressoldi, P, Utts, J. *Predictive physiological anticipation preceding seemingly unpredictable stimuli: a meta-analysis*. Frontiers of Psychology 3:390 doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00390. eCollection, 2012.
178. Braud, W. *Wellness implications of retroactive intentional influence: exploring an outrageous hypothesis*. Alternative Therapies in Health & Medicine, 6:1, <http://inclusivepsychology.com/uploads/WellnessImplicationsOfRetroactiveIntentionalInfluence.pdf>. 37-48. 2000.
179. Leggett, AJ. *Nonlocal hidden-variable theories and quantum mechanics: An incompatibility theorem*. Foundations of Physics, 33, 1469-1493. 2003.
180. Dobyys, Y. *Entanglement interpretations and psi*. Edited by Closed-research-group. International Discussion Closed Research Group 2011.
181. Anonymous. Leggett–Garg inequality, in Leggett–Garg inequality. Edited by Anonymous, Wikipedia. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leggett%E2%80%93Garg\\_inequality](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leggett%E2%80%93Garg_inequality) 2011.
182. Suarez, A. *Nonlocal "realistic" Leggett models can be considered refuted by the before-before experiment*. Foundations of Physics, 38 583-589 2008.
183. Leggett, AJ, Garg, A. *Quantum Mechanics versus macroscopic realism: is the flux there when nobody looks?* . Phys. Rev. Lett., 54 857 1985.
184. Gröblacher, S, Paterek, T, Kaltenbaek, R, Brukner, C, Zukowski, M, et al. *An experimental test of non-local realism*. Nature:446 (19 April), 871-875. 2007.
185. Smullyan, R. *Gödel's incompleteness theorems*. Oxford, Oxford University Press 1991.
186. Berto, F. *There's something about Gödel: the complete guide to the incompleteness theorem*. New York, John Wiley and Sons 2010.