

Gurdjieff Oskiano

26th October 2023

Objective Science and Modern Science Q&A

Attendees: Robin (presenter), Paula, Antonio Coutinho, Robert P, James, Kelly Connor, Bobbie P, Len Schwartz, Sandra W, Stephen F, John T Davis, Michelle F, Marnie Haluska, Sasa, James O'Donnell, Stewart J, Marsha, Sharon J, John Amaral (presenter). Jeremy Weir, Bonnie Philips.

Gurdjieff Oskiano, 26 October, 2023

OBJECTIVE SCIENCE & MODERN SCIENCE by Robin Bloor

Attendees: Robin, Paula, Kelly Connor, Sandra Whitmore, James, Bobbie P, Robert P, Robert D, Michelle F, Stewart, Sasa, James O'D, (John T Davis – joined and left), Stephen Franz.

RD: G says we are becoming more suggestible.

RB: Insufficient Being-Parktdolg-Duty –

RD: 16th Century?

RB: Yes. Nature of education – has become formulaic – a lot of people get by repeating things.

RD: The Aether was there before the Absolute?

RB: Before the creation. What happened before that – doesn't say.

RD: Beyond the Absolute – forever?

RB: Beyond the Absolute – and not known.

RB: Model of the universe that objective science suggests is that we are all living within the Absolute. The Absolute has boundaries and we cannot escape those boundaries.

RD: If outside of the absolute is infinite ...

RB: If it were to go on infinitely then the Megalocosmos could be regarded as extremely small. Absolute created universe within himself. For all we now the absolute may be down on the village green having a game of cricket with other absolutes ...

RD: Richard Feynman says he doesn't believe that electrons exist – created to make the maths work. Created a particle and forgot they created the particle – might not exist.

RB: Very discussable question. From PoV of experimental measurement – have hypothesised weight for electron and proton. Electron is known to move from shell to shell in atoms – known phenomenon. When they move they emit a photon and has a wavelength. That is the model. If Feynman is saying the model is wrong – he might be right.
Fundamental unit of charge is an electron if negative and if positive is a proton. Can't go much further

SW: Objective science doesn't hold with infinity

RB: Doesn't require it.

SW: Doesn't object to theory of the atom?

RB: G didn't think they were important. But they will be at a lower level.

SW: And important in Birkeland currents too.

RB: Yes. The word zero and infinity – get the following thought into your head. There isn't anything infinite you can point to. Nothing you can describe that is infinite and nothing that is zero.

Infinity is only established by a relative idea. We've got a series of numbers and someone says what is the biggest one? If I say $n - n + 1$ is bigger. That is a thought experiment, not a reality. Exists in mathematical space. Can't say I have a system and every time we do something one more is added – finite, have a limit.

I'm a mathematician and know math better than many people.

SW: How big is the universe? Are they all playing cricket? I like that. I quit thinking about it.

RB: A lot of those questions have to do with personal experience. At some point I just knew things to be true and couldn't logically explain. Some truth is beyond logical explanation. Semantics of mathematics can only take you so far.

SW: Linguistics also ...

RB: Idea that there are three universal languages and the language of the work is the a language in your native language. IN English a certain set of idea have been translated into that language and have to start thinking that way about the words. A verb and a noun have different meanings at different levels. In logical terms – things can be justified and proven within that model and map. There are truths that can't be expressed in normal words. We know that in some way – sitting down and trying to understand ... I had an emotion – can't explain logically. Doesn't fit. Measurement – logical thinking is happy with.

SW: Found it interesting what you said about iron ...

Quasars – showed coming out of black holes on TV. Guess I don't really know what a quasar is.

RB: Quasar is a very bright spherical sun. Bright as the galaxy it comes from – astonishing. Done various red-shift observations and all had following characteristic – appears to be a step function. Red-shift could be 1 or 2.2, but can't be anything in between. Something regular and mathematical happening. Almost certainly birth of galactic centers and come in twins.

Sasa: Main problem to call something objective is what we perceive. Atoms from world 3 – cannot be conscious about or conceive. Even 6 on edge of consciousness ... cannot be measured. How we can objectively approach higher worlds if we use measurements from our world – like 48. Even electricity and something from higher world we measure only by affect on lower world. What can we perceive and measure and understand things ... that we have feelings and approach to perceive higher worlds in scientific way. Impossible. Have to have a method and understand affect of lower and higher.

RB: Good articulation of fundamental problem. Logical structure of Ray of Creation not a problem. Point at which it becomes real for us in our psyche. If we can't create a state that corresponds to H12 can't measure H12. Not in position to measure. Forced higher and higher to maintain form of objectivity. NO different in anything written by G or O different to modern science at a level of world 48. Some of the statements may be correct, but not correct because not digested.

Come to conclusion that universe is measurable – if we found a way to measure ... could assign quantities to it. Once you create something at a high level, can create something at next level ... if you knew the extent at any level and could measure we could get measurements of the whole thing, but couldn't do anything. Appears infinite – too big to count.

Difference between one level and another is a multiple of 28K. H48 at 28000th of H24 ... Couldn't get anywhere with that. Out of our league. Can't manage that many objects.