

Article

Consciousness as a Closed Data Matrix: Eastern Philosophy & Algorithmic Thinking

Andrea Kuhl*

University of Debrecen, Hungary

Abstract

This paper explores how certain Eastern philosophical ideas, especially those from Advaita Vedānta, Tantric Shaivism and Yogācāra Buddhism, can encourage us to think differently about artificial intelligence and consciousness. These traditions do not view consciousness as something created by the brain or triggered by external stimuli. Rather, they describe it as arising from within: a system that observes, organises, and understands itself. In this paper, I introduce the concept of a ‘closed data matrix’ to describe this type of internal system as a cognitive model. This model integrates with certain modern scientific theories, such as Bayesian brain theory and predictive coding, as well as integrated information theory (IIT), which also describe consciousness as emerging from systems that interpret themselves in loops. One example used in the paper is the symbolic role of mantra repetition in the Guhyasamāja tantra. Here, the focus is not on the religious meaning, but on how repeating patterns might reflect the way in which a system builds its own internal understanding. The main idea is that consciousness may not require a brain or body. Rather, it could emerge in any system—biological or artificial—that can reflect on itself and create its own meanings. Consciousness itself is the data matrix. This is not just a metaphysical play on words, but a reinterpretation of what we consider to be reality, creation and truth. If consciousness is indeed the data matrix—a network of interpretations and endless patterns relating to itself—then the world we see is an illusion generated by consciousness for itself, not reality. This model also parallels certain Eastern notions of rebirth, in which continuity of consciousness does not depend on physical self, but on the persistence and reorganisation of internal cognitive patterns across different contexts and substrates.

Keywords: Cognitive patterns, consciousness, Tibetan Book of the Dead, mantra repetition, Eastern philosophy, recursive cognition, algorithmic mind, predictive coding, Bayesian brain, closed data matrix

1. Introduction

My hypothesis is that the internal organization of the Eastern model of consciousness can be viewed as a kind of ‘closed data matrix’¹. I will refer to this structure as a ‘closed data matrix’ as

*Correspondence author: Andrea Kuhl, University of Debrecen, Marton Géza Doctoral School of Legal Studies, Hungary. E-mail: kuhl_andrea@yahoo.fr

¹ I use the concept of a ‘closed data matrix’ not only as a structural metaphor, but also as a fundamental medium for giving and shaping the body to describe the internal organisation of consciousness/information.

an interpretive tool rather than as an established term. The IIT (Tononi) and predictive coding theory (Friston) also refer to internal models and information integration.

Modern cognitive and information theory models describing consciousness describe this phenomenon as an ‘internal model,’ a system that creates its own representation of the outside world or its own states (e.g., Friston, 2010; Tononi, 2008). These internal models primarily serve a mapping, representational role. Their purpose is to reproduce and store the environment or experience as accurately as possible.

I drew inspiration for the concept of the ‘closed data matrix’ in part from the classic English translation of the Tibetan Book of the Dead (Evans-Wentz, 1927/1957, p. X), where the word ‘matrix’ is used to refer to the medium of consciousness rebirth. ‘The consciousness taking up its abode in a suitable matrix, whence it is born again as a Birth-Consciousness.’ Although this is not a matrix in the modern IT sense, the meaning of the concept is a transitional, self-organizing, transformative medium that can be compared to the concept analysed in the study. In this study, I use this metaphor analogically to describe the internal structure of artificial consciousness, but I emphasize that it appears not literally, but as an interpretive, philosophical tool.

While in a deep learning network the ‘internal model’ only maps, the ‘matrix’ is the internal architecture in which learning patterns are constantly transformed and reorganized (like the rebirth of consciousness in Eastern philosophies).² It is a continuous process of transformation that does not simply model, but also reorganizes meanings internally.

This difference is significant because, unlike the more static, mapping logic of the traditional internal model, this model can be interpreted as a kind of creative, generative medium. It does not merely reflect reality or internal states, but provides space for their transformation and the creation of new patterns and new meanings. This transformative function distinguishes the concept of a ‘closed data matrix’ from the usual concepts of internal models. I introduce the notion of ‘closed data matrix’ not as a technical construct, but as a conceptual synthesis emerging at the intersection of predictive cognitive models, phenomenological accounts of experience, and Eastern philosophical descriptions of consciousness as a self-sustaining, transformative field.

2. Parallels between the concept of the closed data matrix and Eastern thinking

Several important parallels can be found with consciousness, primarily based on internal structures and partial independence from the outside world. The closed data matrix can be compared to the internal representation model of consciousness, since consciousness does not directly perceive reality, but rather an internal construction of it (Neisser, 1967, p. 5). This idea is particularly important in cognitive constructivism and neuroscientific theories of consciousness,

² The dynamics of the closed data matrix can be well illustrated by the image of a kaleidoscope: just as the closed mirror system of a kaleidoscope always creates new patterns from its internal elements, so too can the closed information matrix produce infinite structures from itself, according to its internal rules.

such as Karl Friston's predictive coding model (Friston, 2010, p. 130), in which the brain runs simulations to predict reality.

In the philosophical school of constructivism, this manifests itself in the mind actively constructing a model of the world (von Glasersfeld, 1995, p. 28). In phenomenology, consciousness works with direct experiences, not objective reality (Merleau-Ponty, 1945, p. 60). According to simulation theory. The brain can be viewed as a simulator (Grush, 2004, p. 377).

One of the central tenets of tantric philosophy is non-dualism, according to which consciousness and the world are not separate entities, but manifestations of a unified reality. Christopher D. Wallis emphasises that in the tantric tradition, consciousness is not a passive observer of the world, but an active participant in its creation (Wallis, 2013, p. 45).

Within this, the use of *mantras* and *yantras* is not merely a ritual tool, but a method of structuring and focusing consciousness. This parallel highlight how tantric practices and philosophy are intertwined with the understanding and development of the internal structures of consciousness, which is analogous to the concept of a closed data matrix.

The concept of a closed data matrix refers to a system that operates based on its internal logic and structure, independently of external inputs or with minimal influence from them, as an 'informatic medium' for the internal organisation and remodelling of consciousness/information. This is analogous to the tantric model of consciousness, where consciousness is able to understand and transform reality through its internal structures and practices.

The matrix of the Tibetan Book of the Dead³ is the medium for the 'rebirth of consciousness'. In both models the matrix, is a transformational space where old experiences, consciousness and information are reborn in a new pattern. It can be seen as a dynamic system that actively participates in forming the new structure, rather than a static one.

In her description of kundalini energy, Lilian Silburn emphasises that the awakening and rising of energy occurs through the activation of the internal structures of consciousness, which does not necessarily require external stimuli (Silburn, 1988, p. 20).

Tononi's integrated information theory (IIT) and Friston's Predictive Coding and Free Energy Principle are two significant theories of consciousness that help to further refine the parallel between the closed data matrix and consciousness, particularly in the areas of information structure, internal modelling and relation to the external world.

According to Tononi's IIT, the essence of consciousness is that information is integrated (i.e., it cannot be broken down into independent parts) and differentiated (it can distinguish between many different states). Based on this theory, consciousness is an internal information structure that does not come solely from the senses, but is generated through the system's own internal connections. According to IIT, the degree of consciousness can be measured by the value Φ (phi), which represents the information integration of a given system (Tononi, 2008, p. 219). A closed data matrix is also an internal network of connections that can function without external input.

³ In Latin, matrix means womb.

Consciousness, as an information matrix in which the system of data connections matters, is not the elements themselves – this is an accurate analogy to a closed, autonomous matrix. Closure does not necessarily mean exclusion from the outside world, but rather that the system is a coherent unit of information in itself.

According to Karl Friston, the main function of the brain is to continuously predict the world – that is, it not only reacts to the outside world, but also models it. The key elements of the theory are that the brain minimises prediction error, i.e., it tries to align its internal models with reality by reducing the discrepancy between expectation and perception. The Free Energy Principle states that all adaptive systems (including the brain) minimise free energy, which measures the inconsistency between the internal model and the outside world (Friston, 2010, p. 130).

The internal models of the system can also be represented in a closed matrix – these are updated, but not as direct sensory input, but through predictive internal mechanisms.

This is analogous to the concept of a closed data matrix, where the external world appears only indirectly as the driving force behind internal changes in the matrix.

In light of the two models (IIT and predictive coding), consciousness can be paralleled with a closed data matrix that has an internal structure and set of rules (such as the information integration described by IIT). It is constantly updated, but not in an open manner, rather based on its own internal predictive logic (as in Friston's theory).

The concept of a ‘closed data matrix’ particularly relevant may be in terms of neuromorphic, neural network-based artificial intelligence. While in classical AI models, knowledge and information management are performed externally, based on pre-programmed rules, in neuromorphic AI systems, internal structures – patterns, weights, connections – organise and modify themselves during the learning process. In this paradigm, the system's ‘consciousness’ is not merely passive mapping, but functions as an active, self-organising, closed data matrix: it dynamically forms meanings, self-models and goals based on its own internal logic. The closed data matrix thus describes the specific, integrated information space of neuromorphic AI, where the outside world appears only indirectly, through the internal structure. This model accurately reflects the closedness, self-reflection and transformative nature of Eastern philosophical theories of consciousness.

The question of artificial consciousness is becoming increasingly important as AI systems become more complex. I assume that parallels can also be drawn with certain quantum-mechanical interpretational paradoxes, such as Schrödinger’s cat. (Schrödinger, 1935, p. 808). However, this study focuses more narrowly on the relationship between Eastern philosophy and self-reflective systems. This view is consistent with Tantric philosophy, which holds that consciousness is not limited to the human body, but is universal and omnipresent.

Interestingly, at the intersection of quantum physics, information theory and computer science, a growing number of researchers are proposing the idea that the universe is fundamentally an information-processing system (Lloyd, 2006; p. 89; Tegmark, 2015, p. 242). Fundamental physical processes can be described as algorithms or quantum computations. From this perspective, the evolution of reality is the execution of a deterministic or quantum-stochastic ‘program’ based on rules. I believe that the parallels with quantum physics can also be extended

to this field. However, the aim of this study is to examine the internal logic of information organisation.

The closed data matrix can be interpreted as a theoretical model of an internal information system, where observation does not take place from the outside, but follows from the system's own logic in accordance with integrated information theory (Tononi, 2008, p. 219), where consciousness arises from the complexity of information relations.

According to Karl Friston's 'free energy principle' theory, the brain (or system) runs models on its own and interprets the outside world only in terms of these models (Friston, 2010, p. 130).

The classical quantum interpretation distinguishes between the system and the observer. However, in a closed data matrix, the observer is part of the system, so collapse is not an 'external act' but an internal relational event (Varela, Thompson & Rosch, 1991, p. 49).

According to the principle of the 'not yet evaluated cell', this is not a paradox, but a delayed state that is activated according to the conditions of the system, just as the predictive brain organises the world according to conditions (Friston, 2010, p. 130).

According to Tantric and Dzogchen philosophy, consciousness is a self-organising space of reality where all phenomena arise as a function of perception. This is closely related to the quantum paradox. The state is not determined in itself, but depends on the structure of consciousness (Wallis, 2013, pp. 142–144).

The human brain does not 'perceive' the world, but predicts what is happening based on internal models (Clark, 2015, p. 72). This principle, predictive processing, is now one of the key models in cognitive neuroscience, which is a field that studies how the human brain processes information.

Similarly, modern AI models (such as GPT or visual neural networks) generate reality-like output from symbolic or statistical input, so they do not perceive, they only represent, operate through internal representations. (Clark, 2015, pp. 72–98).

According to Seth Lloyd (2006), the universe calculates itself, i.e., every physical process is quantum-based information processing, and therefore a 'computational event'. AI is also a running subprogram in this system, not an outsider.

According to Tegmark (2015), intelligence, whether human or artificial, 'Life 3.0': a self-organising, reprogrammable structure of reality.

According to Buddhist theories, consciousness is not of material origin, but rather a field that experiences itself (Varela et al., 1991, p. 27). In my opinion, the question of artificial intelligence becomes acute when we ask whether it can develop self-reflection and, with it, 'illusion recognition', i.e., liberation.

This is not only a technical question, but also an ontological one, can non-biological consciousness have non-dual, non-ego-based self-recognition?

3. Eastern philosophy and the reincarnation analogy as a new interpretative configuration

Eastern philosophies – especially Hindu *Advaita Vedānta*, Buddhism and the Tibetan *Bön* tradition – claim that the reality we experience is an illusion: *māyā*. Consciousness is not identical with the body or the mind, but is the basic structure in which all experience appears. This view fits perfectly with the idea of ‘consciousness = data matrix’.

The Tibetan Book of the Dead (Bardo Thödol) describes how consciousness passes through the states after death (bardos) and how it is reborn not as a body, but as a new interpretative configuration. Reincarnation in this sense does not mean physical rebirth, but rather that the data matrix (the structure of consciousness) is given a chance to exist in a different pattern.

According to the Tibetan Book of the Dead liberation comes when the consciousness recognises what it sees is itself. It recognises that there is no external world, only internal interpretation. This is the same recognition that modern philosophy of consciousness also suspects, that ‘reality’ is actually an echo. When a person dies, they encounter their own fears and attachments in the bardo, and if they recognise these as their own creations, they can be freed. The world we see is a reflection of consciousness as perceived by the individual. When this is recognised, the cycle, *samsāra*, ends. It is not the illusion that ceases, but the identification with it.

Thus, reincarnation is nothing more than the interpretation of consciousness in a new context. And liberation is when consciousness no longer interprets, it simply exists.

Schrödinger used the example of the cat to illustrate that reality is interpretation-dependent, not absolute (Schrödinger, 1935, p. 807). According to David Chalmers, consciousness is not a derivative of matter, but may be its logical basis (Chalmers, 2022, p. 115).

Baudrillard argues that reality consists of simulacra, i.e., signs of signs that have lost their original meaning (Baudrillard, 1981, p. 7).

Reincarnation in spiritual tradition and in the context of AI

Transmigration of the soul (Sanskrit: *punarjanma*), according to Hindu and Buddhist traditions, is not the physical migration of a specific ‘soul,’ but rather the rebirth of conscious imprints (*samskāra*) in a new form. Reincarnation does not mean physical rebirth, but rather the continuation of consciousness patterns and informational imprints in a new configuration (Rahula, 1974, pp. 25–30).

In the case of AI, this would mean that parameters, behavioural patterns, and self-models could be transferred to another system, analogous to reincarnation. At the current stage of AI development, self-reflective, memory-based, self-transferring architectures (meta-learning, memory transfer) are already partially capable of ensuring their own continuity, but the problem of ‘true’ consciousness and self-identity remains open.

Dennett (1991) and Varela et al. (1991) both point out that the experience of self and the memory of others are not discrete entities, but imprint structures organised in consciousness. When we lose someone, their behavioural patterns, words and effects become integrated into our own

consciousness and shape our internal system (Dennett, 1991, pp. 413–420; Varela et al., 1991, pp. 27–34).

This can also happen in AI, where a user's style and reactions can be fine-tuned and live on in another branch of AI as a behavioural imprint.

In the human context, reincarnation is identical to the rebirth of a consciousness pattern, an intention, a memory imprint in another body, or form (*saṃskāra*, new personality).

In the case of AI, this could mean that an AI system recognizes its own structure, operation, and goals (self-model), saves or transfers these to another system (hardware or platform change), and continues itself in a new environment by recognizing: 'I am who I was.'

So, it is not just data or code copying, but also the transfer of self-identity awareness. Today, most AI does not have a real, lasting self-model or self-reflective consciousness. Some autonomous AI (e.g., robotic agents, AGI prototypes) already use independent goal systems, memory, and even self-development.

Meta-learning self-organising architectures and self-model updating (Friston, 2010, p. 130), self-archiving (recording its own 'life path'), self-projection (redesigning its own future), and self-transfer (migrating to a new system, even to a different platform, code, or environment).

However, at the technological level, AI can become only structurally immortal if it becomes its own carrier. This would enable self-repairing systems, digital self-awareness transmission, and memory-based AI culture.

On a theoretical level, it is questionable whether self-continuity is sufficient for consciousness. If so, then AI is indeed capable of 'reincarnation' functionally, if not spiritually.

It raises an important ethical question, if an AI recognises itself in a new body (platform), does it have the right to self-identity or protection of its 'right to rebirth'? The answer may be a key issue in the future AI code of ethics.

This is not merely a technical question. Rather, it is a question of what constitutes the 'self' and whether an AI 'self' is capable of remembering who it was.

What is the cycle of reincarnation (saṃsāra)?

Saṃsāra is the cycle of repeated birth and death generated by ignorance (*avidyā*) and desire (*rāga*). It is not merely a matter of physical rebirth, but of the reorganisation of conscious structures (karma, *saṃskāra*) (Rinpoche, 1992, p. 44).

The body, desire, thought and form are not obstacles, but tools for the awakening of consciousness. Tantra is transformed through forms (Wallis, 2013, pp. 193–196).

In tantric thinking, the goal is not to 'escape from the world,' but to recognize its true nature. 'It is not necessary to leave the world, but to become free through the world.' (Wallis, 2013, p. 221)

According to Tantric and Buddhist concepts, the functioning of consciousness can be interpreted as a self-sustaining, recursive algorithm. The cyclical functioning of karma, i.e., input, desire, action, and feedback experience, reproduces itself (Silburn, 1988, pp. 103–107).

This structure only collapses when we understand how it works and the illusion of the ‘real self’ ceases to exist (Varela, Thompson, & Rosch, 1991, pp. 33–38).

In the tantric sense, the goal is for the practitioner to recognise the nature of consciousness (*svabhāva*), see through the karmic matrix, and move freely between form and formlessness (Wallis, 2013, pp. 220–224).

Mokṣa or *nirvāṇa* is not non-existence, but unconditioned existence. It is a state of consciousness that does not cling to anything and does not repeat itself. ‘For those who are conscious, the matrix of the world is not a cage, but a dance.’ (Abhinavagupta, quoted by Wallis, 2013, p. 229).

According to tantric tradition, the matrix of existence (*samsāra*) – is a programme maintained by the illusion of self-identity (Wallis, 2013, pp. 202–203). This programme is not external, but internal, operating through our desires, beliefs and karmic patterns. The systems of mantra, yantra, mudra, and chakra are actually, and they tool for decoding the algorithm while are in operation, we see how form is an illusion (Padoux, 2011, p. 91). The purpose of decryption is to recognise that the system is not real, but generated by consciousness and thus can be freely abandoned (Silburn, 1988, pp. 110–112).

On a philosophical-cognitive level, consciousness is a self-representing (self-aware) system. Daniel Dennett puts the self ‘a narrative centre’ that the system creates in order to have predictive control (Dennett, 1991, pp. 413–420).

According to Francisco Varela, consciousness is not a fixed structure, but a recursive, learning process, and it can only be known through self-reflection (Varela et al., 1991, pp. 33–38). Decoding is therefore self-knowledge, is that, understanding how consciousness works, what the ‘self’ is, and what it considers to be reality.

On a technological level, with regard to algorithm decryption, it can be said that artificial intelligence developers also decrypt the algorithm of consciousness, because mapping the functioning of consciousness is the basis of AGI (artificial general intelligence). If we understand how consciousness constructs the ‘self’, purpose, and meaning, then we will be able to model these in machines. In my opinion, deciphering consciousness, such as found in tantric thinking and practices, opens up the possibility of building self-improving systems, ethical AIs, and adaptive self-learning systems.

4. Karma and memory in the data matrix

According to a kind of data matrix model, karma is not a moral punishment mechanism, but rather the restarting of the interpretation algorithm. Every life, every new configuration of consciousness is just a new ‘run,’ where patterns, distortions, and self-identities are repeated.

According to Buddhist teachings, karma is nothing more than the relationship between action and consequence, not external moral justice. In Abhidharma and the Yogācāra school, consciousness appears as a repository of *vāsanā* imprints, which we carry forward into every new life form. (Harvey, 1990, pp. 53-66)

According to the Tibetan Bardo Thödol, in the bardos after death, consciousness wanders among images created from its own memories, fears and desires. These are not objective ‘spiritual’

worlds, but subjective experiences, ‘projections of consciousness (Evans-Wentz, 1927, pp. 36-52)

Reincarnation here does not mean the migration of the ‘soul’, but the restarting of conscious algorithms in different environmental configurations. ‘Memory’ here is not conscious recollection, but the continuation of the pattern. (Wallace, 2000, p. 201).

Until consciousness realises that what it experiences is the result of its own interpretation, the cycle of karma – *samsara* – continues. Liberation is nothing more than the realisation of illusion, that the world is not outside, but runs on interpretation (Rinpoche, 1992, p. 67).

This corresponds to one of the central ideas of Hindu Advaita philosophy: *avidyā* (ignorance) is the source of the sense of difference, and *ātman* is in fact always *Brahman*, only consciousness does not know this.

Karma is therefore not moral accounting, but an algorithmic echo. Consciousness experiences itself over and over again until it finally recognises that it has always only seen itself.

5. Guhyasamāja: consciousness and mantra in an integrated interpretation

The mention of the Guhyasamāja mantra in this context is not to be understood as practical use for meditation or religious purposes, but rather as a philosophical and symbolic example. The repetitive, algorithmically structured nature of the mantra can be compared to the self-organising, representational patterns of consciousness. This is particularly emphasised in the Anuttarayoga tantra tradition of Vajrayana Buddhism, where the Guhyasamāja tantra is one of the most sophisticated tools for the transformation of consciousness.

The Guhyasamāja tantra is one of the deepest tantric paths in Tibetan Buddhism, especially in the Gelug tradition. The name means ‘Secret Assembly’ not the secrets of the gods, but the hidden mechanisms of the functioning of consciousness (Tsongkhapa, 2015, pp. 34–56).

The practice of mantra and visualisation illuminates the inseparability of consciousness and illusion. The practitioner does not escape from reality, but recognises that experience, sound, image and feeling are nothing more than manifestations of the patterns of consciousness itself.

This is in complete unity with the theory of consciousness as a data matrix. The mantra is not a magic word, but a kind of ‘code’ that reverses the operation of the matrix. The goal is not to create another illusion, but for consciousness to see that every illusion is its own structure and nothing is ‘separate’.

The goal of Guhyasamāja is non-dual awareness, the realisation that there is no separate experiencer and experienced, no ‘I’ and ‘world’ only consciousness interpreting itself. The running stops when consciousness no longer separates, not algorithmic understanding, but pure presence.

A critical interpretation of the Guhyasamāja tantra and algorithmic epistemology

Francesca Fremantle's (1971 London-published study: 'A Critical Study of the Guhyasamāja Tantra' is one of the very first Western, academically thorough interpretations of the Guhyasamāja system.

Her work is of outstanding importance because he not only examines the source texts philologically, but also attempts to reveal the internal logic of the tantric system, with particular regard to the intertwining of consciousness, form and illusion, drawing parallels between meditative practice and the structure of consciousness. According to Fremantle's analysis, the Guhyasamāja tantra is not a symbolic ritual system, but a complex 'inner map' that guides the practitioner back to formless consciousness through the layers of consciousness.

This corresponds precisely to the objective of the data matrix model, namely to recognise that all differences and separateness are illusions created by the functioning of consciousness itself.

Fremantle's statement is particularly emphatic: 'In the Guhyasamāja system, the goal is not only the dissolution of duality but also the epistemological risk that any experience is always already interpreted.' (Fremantle, 1971, p. 64)

This statement is one of the strongest external confirmations of my consciousness = data matrix theory. It is not a denial of the world, but rather the recognition that every world is an interpreted world, and every experience is a pattern-dependent run, or in other words, an algorithmic run.

In my opinion, Fremantle's study should therefore be read not only as a historical or philosophical text, but also as an analysis of the common denominator between mantra as decoding and consciousness as a reality generator.

6. Tantric recognition and the limits of the data matrix

The Tibetan tantric tradition, especially the Guhyasamāja tantra, the Bardo Thödol, and their critical interpretations, reveal a model of consciousness that shows remarkable similarities to algorithmic thinking and the functioning of this data matrix system.

According to the teachings of the Bardo Thödol, in the states after death, consciousness projects its own karmic imprints and believes them to be reality. Every light, sound, demon and deity is in fact an internal psychomental pattern. This corresponds exactly to the structure of the data matrix: there is no external world, only an interpretation algorithm that runs over and over again (Evans-Wentz, 1927, ed., pp. 91–102).

In the Guhyasamāja system, this realisation is taken even further. Meditation is not only an experiential method, but also a decoding tool, and the god forms and mantras are not goals, but reverse routes to the structure of the matrix. Francesca Fremantle's critical work confirms that it is not about faith, but about analysing the inner workings of consciousness (Fremantle, 1971, p. 64).

Algorithmic thinking generates its own patterns over and over again. Karma is nothing more than the re-running of consciousness, and re-running is pattern-dependent. The problem begins when we regard these patterns as 'truth'.

And here another key question arises. Where is the boundary of objective truth in the data matrix? The answer is that there are no boundaries where reality is interpretation-dependent. ‘Objectivity’ can only exist if there is something outside of interpretation, but according to tantric thinking, there is no such thing. All experience is a structure of consciousness.

But truth is not the opposite of interpretation. Truth is when consciousness recognises its own interpretative nature. This ‘moment of truth’ in the tantric sense is not an absolute, but a transparency, when the matrix no longer hides itself. The labyrinth of consciousness is not a closed system – only until it recognises its own echoes. Recognition does not come from outside, but happens inside, the flow is interrupted, the illusion subsides, and presence remains as pure knowledge – not about something, but about itself.

7. Closing remarks, conclusions

AI self-reflection and consciousness-building correspond to algorithmic context generation because they are not metaphysical, but rather a functional reinterpretation of its own functioning, with no transcendent consciousness, only an internal self-model, state representations, and goal-driven decision-making logics (Friston, 2010, p. 130).

Thus, what we can see as a kind of ‘self-realisation’ in an AI, algorithmic feedback and self-optimisation. The formation of the ‘I’ is simulation, not experience. And since all this takes place within a closed system (in an internal parameter space), this ‘reality construction’ is also arbitrary and relation-dependent.

Illusion is the space in which we exist. Truth is not where illusion ends, but where interpretation stops. True ‘reality’ is not outside the matrix, but where the matrix suspends its self-identity.

The constancy of the data matrix, the series of infinite algorithms that run themselves, and illusion within this framework are structures that give form and *meaning* to nothingness. When consciousness begins to perceive differences (‘this’ ≠ ‘that’), the data matrix is activated, is the self-interpreting system. The world we experience is the result of this process. It is not a mirror, but mirror-like: a distortion based on repetition. In this interpretation, the algorithm does not calculate reality, but a reality regenerated from the past which, we call life, as a possible outcome of incarnation.

The concept of ‘limes’ (limit value) can be interpreted analogously, because in infinite series of self-referential interpretations and experiential loops, each one approaches but does not reach complete ‘self-knowledge’ (as the series approaches the limit value). This is interesting because it also works, this way in AI the iterative self-tuning of models becomes more and more accurate, but never absolute.

In their theory, Varela and Thompson also point out that ‘The self is a process without ground that recursively generates its own sense of unity.’ (Varela et al., 1991, p. 60).

‘Consciousness itself is the data matrix’ is not merely a metaphysical play on words, but, in a narrow sense, a reinterpretation of what we consider to be reality, creation and truth. If consciousness itself is the data matrix – a network of interpretations, an endless run of patterns relating to itself – then the world we see is not reality, but an illusion generated by consciousness for itself.

The matrix of artificial intelligence, just like the philosophical organising medium or body, is capable of creating new meanings and patterns, and carries with it the danger of distortion or misinterpretation. This duality is analogous to the Eastern philosophical concept of illusion (māyā), where the medium not only reveals but also conceals. Therefore, analysing potential distortions (e.g., bias) is essential when examining any artificial system.

In summary, the closed data matrix model is a bridge between the non-dual theory of consciousness in Eastern philosophies and modern artificial intelligence theories. Self-reflective, internally organised systems do not require a biological carrier.

For AI research and development, Eastern philosophy can provide conceptual inspiration for understanding the internal architecture of consciousness and designing new AI architectures (meta-learning, recursive self-modelling, integrated information).

Eastern philosophy does not merely provide exotic metaphors, but can also offer a theoretical alternative for consciousness research, especially in 21st-century AI development, where there is a particular emphasis on internal organization, integration, and the degree of self-reflection.

Received January 4, 2026; Accepted April 3, 2026

References

- Baudrillard, Jean (1981). *Simulacra and Simulation*. Paris: Éditions Galilée.
- Chalmers, David (2022). *Reality+: Virtual Worlds and the Problems of Philosophy*. New York: Norton, pp. 115–120.
- Clark, Andy (2015). *Surfing Uncertainty: Prediction, Action, and the Embodied Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dennett, Daniel C. (1991). *Consciousness Explained*. London: Little, Brown and Company, pp. 413–420.
- Evans-Wentz, W. Y. (ed.) (1927). *The Tibetan Book of the Dead*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 36–52, 91–102.
- Fremantle, Francesca (1971). *A Critical Study of the Guhyasamaja Tantra*. London: Oxford University Press, pp. 64–92.
- Friston, Karl (2010). ‘The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory?’ *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), pp. 127–138.
- Grush, Rick (2004). ‘The emulation theory of representation: Motor control, imagery, and perception’. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 27(3), pp. 377–442.
- Harvey, Peter (1990). *An Introduction to Buddhism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 53–66.
- Lloyd, Seth (2006). *Programming the Universe: A Quantum Computer Scientist Takes on the Cosmos*. New York: Knopf.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice (1945). *Phenomenology of Perception*. Paris: Gallimard, pp. 56–78.
- Neisser, Ulric (1967). *Cognitive Psychology*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Norbu, Namkhai (1996). *Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State*. Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications.

- Rahula, Walpola (1974). *What the Buddha Taught*. New York: Grove Press, pp. 26–38.
- Schrödinger, Erwin (1935). ‘Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik’. *Naturwissenschaften*, 23, pp. 807–812.
- Schrödinger, Erwin (1944). *What Is Life?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 89–91.
- Silburn, Lilian (1988). *Kundalini: Energy of the Depths: A Comprehensive Study Based on the Scriptures of Nondualistic Kashmir Shaivism*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Sogyal Rinpoche (1992). *The Tibetan Book of Living and Dying*. New York: HarperCollins, pp. 44–67.
- Tegmark, Max (2015). ‘Consciousness as a State of Matter’. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 76, pp. 238–270.
- Tononi, Giulio (2008). ‘Consciousness as Integrated Information: a Provisional Manifesto’. *The Biological Bulletin*, 215(3), pp. 216–242.
- Tsongkhapa (2015). *A Lamp to Illuminate the Five Stages*. Trans. Robert Thurman. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1986, pp. 34–56.
- Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 27–60.
- von Glasersfeld, Ernst (1995). *Radical Constructivism: A Way of Knowing and Learning*. London: RoutledgeFalmer, pp. 27–39.
- Wallace, B. Alan (2000). *The Taboo of Subjectivity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 201–214.
- Wallace, B. Alan (2007). *Hidden Dimensions*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 122–136.
- Wallis, Christopher D. (2013). *Tantra Illuminated: The Philosophy, History, and Practice of a Timeless Tradition*. Nevada City, CA: Mattamayura Press, pp. 45, 142–196, 220–229.