



teozofija v sloveniji



Alexis Dolgorukii

HERE WE ALL ARE, SO?

Republished from the website www-parascience.org

alexis dolgorukii © 1998

Prispevki k raziskovanju zgodovine Teozofskega gibanja - v izvorniku

Introductory comments

Just a short word, if I may, regarding the “game plan” of this work: This work is a very broad spectrum and eclectic statement of philosophical conclusions. In order for this philosophical statement to lay itself out in a clearly expository manner, it’s going to need to be rather long. I view it as a collection of interconnected and relatively contiguous essays and as such I don’t see where it’s possible to divide it into volumes or any thing as restricting as that kind of division requires.

I am going to be starting the process by delineating for you my developed view of intrinsic reality which is based upon thirty years of intense study and research, and using that as a base, I am then going on to suggest an appropriate social paradigm based upon that view of reality. The first group of essays, while based upon the cutting edge of modern science is, never the less, entirely cosmological, trans-personal, and meta-physical. The second part, which deals with our social milieu, is entirely as pragmatic and physical as reality itself permits.

The work then goes on to deal with religion, its relationship to that view of reality cum world-view, and most importantly, not simply an exposition of its historical effects on human evolution and life, but in addition, an exposition on what its effects on human life SHOULD be ...

It’s a very tall order I admit, but I think I have accomplished what I set out to do. It is my strongest belief that if many people were to accept the ideas in this work, and change their attitudes and lives accordingly, then the world would become a better place for all of us to inhabit. And that is my goal.

Alexei Dolgorukii-Urievskii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-----|
| <i>Part 1</i> | Getting started | 3 |
| <i>Part 2</i> | Mortality | 17 |
| <i>Part 3</i> | Enlightenment - 1 | 38 |
| <i>Part 4</i> | The Human Condition - 1 | 42 |
| <i>Part 5</i> | Tripolarity - 1 | 48 |
| <i>Part 6</i> | Enlightenment - 2 | 53 |
| <i>Part 7</i> | Anthropology One | 58 |
| <i>Part 8</i> | Human Liberation | 63 |
| <i>Part 9</i> | The Human Condition - 2 | 67 |
| <i>Part 10</i> | Tripolarity - 2 | 75 |
| <i>Part 11</i> | The World We Live In | 86 |
| <i>Part 12</i> | Nationalism | 89 |
| <i>Part 13</i> | The Impossible Goal | 91 |
| <i>Part 14</i> | Childish Things | 93 |
| <i>Part 15</i> | Adult Things | 94 |
| <i>Part 16</i> | Absolutes | 97 |
| <i>Part 17</i> | Dualism | 103 |
| <i>Part 18</i> | Individualism | 110 |
| <i>Part 19</i> | A New Social Paradigm | 112 |
| <i>Part 20</i> | Economics | 118 |
| <i>Part 21</i> | U.S.A. Today | 135 |
| <i>Part 22</i> | Laws and Justice | 139 |
| <i>Part 23</i> | Human Sexuality | 141 |
| <i>Part 24</i> | Controlled Substances | 144 |
| <i>Part 25</i> | Abortion | 146 |
| <i>Part 26</i> | Dispute - Mediation | 149 |
| <i>Part 27</i> | Education | 150 |
| <i>Part 28</i> | The Information Media | 157 |
| <i>Part 29</i> | Governments | 159 |
| <i>Part 30</i> | A More Perfect Society | 162 |
| <i>Part 31</i> | A New Social Contract | 169 |
| <i>Part 32</i> | The Planetary Environment | 172 |
| <i>Part 33</i> | The Human Condition (Reviewed) | 181 |
| <i>Part 34</i> | Are Humans Perfectible? | 185 |
| <i>Part 35</i> | Human Evolution | 188 |

PART 1 - GETTING STARTED

“In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and God was the word”:

And the “word”, science has shown, was BANG, a very big bang indeed. That “Bang” was the creative happening which produced the universe in which we all find ourselves.

It is very interesting, isn't it, how science and religion can sometimes be complimentary exactly when they seem to be most dichotomous? Let's talk about “science”, as it will be a very important part of the basis of our further discussions.

I want to make it clear that Quantum Theory, Chaos Theory, and Particle Theory, along with the work of Werner Heisenberg (The Uncertainty Principle); are the sciences upon which I base all of the thinking which resulted in my work. These disciplines are the inspiration of my thoughts, and also of my work, as it was their total dichotomy from our personal day-to-day “reality”, as well as the way in which they contradicted all of our philosophies and religions that, each in its own way, had attempted to define that reality, that prompted me toward a scientific approach to the questioning of the nature of our reality.

The “names” of these disciplines may describe them as “theories”, or as “principles”, but they are sciences nonetheless, and they are “hard”, or totally pragmatic and empirical, sciences at that, but they do not deal with physical reality. They all of them deal with what we now know is beyond physical reality. As a result of that orientation, these sciences may therefore be accurately defined as “Trans-Physical”, “Para-Physical”, or, if you like, and the meaning truly is totally identical, “Meta-physical”. Odd isn't it, to think of Quantum Theory as a branch of Metaphysics?

Disciplines such as: Physiology, Chemistry, Medicine, Biology, Physical-Anthropology, and Zoology, among many others, are also sciences, and they too are “hard” sciences, but they deal solely with physical reality, physical “facts”.

What we really lack today is a branch of “hard” science, or more than one branch, which bridges the gap between the physical sciences and the Para-physical sciences.

Here we are, all of us, all living things, and all other things too. We, all of us, in ourselves, if the cutting edge of science is right, very clearly each individually bridge the conceptually broad “gap” between physicality and Para-physicality. It therefore behooves us to come to understand how that occurs. In order for us to reach that understanding it is required of us to develop a new view of reality, a new view of the nature of the human condition.

“I think therefore I am” has an exact corollary which is “I am, therefore I think” ... You also “are”, therefore? ... We, all of us, very clearly “are” therefore? (So?)

But science tells us that once, before the “big bang”, there was “nothing at all”.

But, that statement can't be entirely true, for it seems to me that, (and the following double negative is distinctly “on purpose”), there wasn't “nothing at all”, it seems so because: Here we are, all of us, all living things, all sentient things, all insentient things, and all other things too, things we can see and feel and things we can't..

So then, what was “nothing”?

If “nothing” is usually understood to be the opposite, or rather the contradiction of “something”, how shall we understand a “state”, or condition, within which it appears that, “nothing at all” is far too much?

We can't.

Absolute nothingness is a thing which cannot “exist” because, of course, as “absolute nothingness”, it does not exist, and it cannot exist, nor can it be productive of anything but nothingness. But we, and all other things, do exist. Can we, and all other things, which are clearly something, be a product of absolute nothingness? No, we can't. Because of this absolute contradiction, “absolute nothingness”, as a condition pre-existing the manifested cosmos, is an entirely anti-rational condition.

Science also assures us that the Universe, as we know it, began with “THE Big Bang”. But, if there was absolutely “nothing at all”, what was it that exploded? What was it that made “The Big Bang”? You can't get a “bang” out of “nothing”.

If there really was a “Big Bang”; and I do believe there was, not simply because I think so, but because it's very clear that there truly is an overwhelming body of mainstream scientific clearly empirical evidence that makes a very strong case that, in fact, there was such a thing; then I'm right.

There wasn't “nothing at all”.

Out of nothing nothing comes ...

But, here we all are ...

Then what was there?

We don't know. We can't know. We most likely will never know, at least not until we too are “nothing”, and then? Later. (Maybe)

What do we think we know about “the Beginning”?

Let's agree to completely ignore all of so-called “Revealed Religion”. In all of “Revealed Religion”, what isn't totally fabricated proclamatory history, is puerile and atavistic.

I think that religion is primarily a big “con job”. I think that it is an almost totally conscienceless “sting”. Religion's fatal fault is that it claims to know things that it cannot possibly know, because the knowledge is not there to “know”. Religion utilizes that absolutely false assertion of knowledge and the equally false assumption of power which that knowledge is claimed to confer, to at once assert immense authority over the most intimate, and also the most trivial, details in the day-to-day lives, thoughts, feelings, and actions of others. Authority to which it has no right whatsoever. Authority, of a type and character, to which no one, whether it is an individual or a corporate body, has any right.

People need to be left alone unless they ask for some kind of assistance. People cannot grow if they have their thinking done for them by some one else.

NO ONE CAN EVER BE “TOO FREE”!

Human, or rather individual rights, and personal privacy need to be extended greatly from where they are now. Corporate powers, which are those of the aggregate individual, or state; need to be very much more limited than they are now.

Freedom is power, power confers only responsibility. Freedom confers only responsibility. Sure individuals have rights, but each of those rights is also a responsibility. The possession of “rights” carries with it the absolute responsibility for the possessor of the rights to maintain them. Rights unexercised are rights abdicated; they will always be abrogated by others. Of all of the forces present in human society which abrogate the rights of individuals, religion is the most egregious offender.

Well, having so abruptly relegated religion rightfully to the dust heap, what’s left? The power of the individual human mind and intellect, carefully, empirically, and unambiguously applied, that’s what’s left. By “unambiguously applied” I mean to say that the “chips are let to fly where they may”. I mean to say that scientific findings are scientific findings, they apply to our search for reality no matter how much they may contradict or revolutionize our most cherished shibboleths. Emotional and intellectual “security blankets” must not stand in the way of an open minded search for reality.

There was, we are told by science and by some philosophies, “chaos”.

But, what is really meant by the word “chaos”?

For one thing, “chaos” is an elegant way to say “an awful mess”.

So, we can say that: “In the beginning there was an awful mess” and here we are, all of us still in “an awful mess”.

Now there’s 15 or 20 billion years of cosmic progress for you!

Do you have any idea of the truly vast amount of “smoke-ware” that has been generated by the human mind in search of a soothing answer to these questions:

How did “everything” come to be and WHY?

How did I come to be, and WHY?

What happens next? (The “to me” is rarely spoken, but believe me, it’s there!)

When I die ... will I be ... NOT?

People want and need rational answers to their rational questions regarding a subject to which “reason” is utterly irrelevant.

That’s a really big problem.

And that’s an understatement!

Here we all are, So?

What does it all mean? That’s not a silly question, and it shouldn’t be limited to sensitive adolescents.

When I first confronted this question I realized I had three distinct choices.

I could just say: “Here we all are because here we all are.”

But I am far too much the descendent of curious little monkeys for that to appeal to me.

I could make the “leap of faith” prescribed by religion and say: “Here we all are because it’s part of “God’s plan” ...

But I’m not that much of a monkey!

Or, finally; I could think it all out myself.

I'm writing this down in order for me to be able to keep track of that "process", and also, to share that process with others, because I think it's an interesting process.

So, we start out with "chaos". But, aside from an "awful mess", what does "chaos" really mean? (Aside from the natural condition of human societies.)

But immediately there is divergence.

Science has one set of fairly clear definitions for what it calls "chaos", while philosophy has far more than just a few definitions, many of them not at all clear.

Science tries to be rational. Philosophy is only rarely guilty of being so. So, let's try to at least start off rationally and begin at "the beginning", "rationally".

So then, we've had "The Big Bang".

I take the position that; while I am not at all sure we had "THE Big Bang", the physical evidence I've seen, such as the "red shift" and all that, makes it clear to me that we had "A Big Bang". In other words, I believe that "The Big Bang" is very likely simply an incident in a continuing process, rather than the process itself.

Or at least I can say that the physical evidence that we have makes it clear that the "Universal Energy Field" is expanding rapidly outward in response to some cataclysmic energy event in its center.

So?

It's pretty clear that the "cataclysmic energy event" or "big bang" had, as its most immediate effect ... chaos.

It's also pretty clear that at the time of the "cataclysmic energy event" there was nothing at all, that is to say nothing at all but energy and there still isn't.

Within that energy field, of course, the "Big Bang" produced an incredible maelstrom of chaotic energy and here we all are!

I really admire Stephen Hawking and all of his colleagues and associates who play so productively with super-computers, for they are slowly but surely coming up with a definitive body of solid evidence as to how all of this "came to be" after "the big bang".

I know that there are many hundreds and more probably thousands of really brilliant scientists working at these problems. In a way, I use Dr. Stephen Hawking as a symbol of all that the world of truly scientific inquiry means. I use him as a code-word meaning "all scientists".

I cannot fully express the admiration I feel for him as a human being, for his accomplishments, for his visible joy in living, and for his wondrous sense of humor. I find him the perfect example of what a person should be in the face of a bad throw of the dice.

"How?" is a rational question.

I don't know about you, but personally, I am very much more fascinated by the considerably less rational, but much more intellectually intriguing question "why?", than I am in knowing the technological answers to "how?". I think it's fair to say that, while I am surely very interested in the subject of "how?", I can easily live without knowing all of the technical details of "how?". But then I've never taken clocks apart either. "Why?", which I think is the far more urgent question, can never be answered

in a solely rational manner. But, I have to admit, the more we come to know about “how?”, the far more likely we are to eventually “glom on” to “why?”.

We must really come to fully accept the simple fact that, from a human perspective there’s an awful lot that we do not know, that we cannot learn, and that we probably never will understand. It’s very frustrating, it’s much more than a little frightening, but here we all are!

For a while, forget about the scientific definitions of post “big bang” chaos. Let’s look at the early moments of all there is with the idea of dealing with more than just the traumatic aspects of “chaos”. Let’s try to arrive at something which is at least a reasonably rational response to the question:

Here we all are! So?

First there was nothing then there wasn’t.

Our response, as humans, to that startling idea has produced first; (unfortunately) religion, and then both philosophy and science.

But not immediately.

Our most remote ancestors were far too busy simply surviving from moment to moment to worry about such things. More about that, and them, later. But, I will say this now: we are almost totally divorced from our environment, they were totally “married” to it. They were also its children. Religion, philosophy, and “science” (as opposed to technology), are products of the divorce.

O.K. Let’s return to the subject of “The Beginning”, and its by-product, chaotic energy fields.

What did “happen”? Was there a reason that it did?

Once again, we don’t know and we really can’t know. But we sure can surmise. By that I mean we can use logic, reason, the very important information which science is constantly giving us, and the evidence of all our senses to “puzzle” the problem out. At least to our own satisfaction. I certainly won’t exclude some degree of intuition being part of our process. I believe it to be just one of our senses. Intuition is not a “controversial” sense. Without intuition there wouldn’t be any humans!

Intuition is one of the greatest survival factors in the physical evolution of any life-form. Without intuition humans wouldn’t have invented or discovered anything. Without intuition, humans wouldn’t have survived long enough for them to need to “invent” or “discover” anything. But, intuition has absolutely nothing at all to do with “wild flights of fancy”.

I think it’s pretty clear that it would be best to exclude “wild flights of fancy”, for they lead to religion, and that we’d be better off without.

Intuition is one thing, fantasy is another. Intuition is one thing, imagination is another. They are all valuable and useful in their own ways, but they are hardly identical. Without intuition there is neither survival nor progress. Without fantasy and imagination there is no art, no music, no creativity. Without creativity there is no progress! Where fantasy and imagination (and ambition) have led to religion, they are almost entirely negative factors. Where fantasy and imagination have led to Mozart, or Michelangelo, or Milton, or Marconi, they are entirely positive factors. This is true even though Mozart, Michelangelo, and Milton have served the goals of religion with their art, as have so very many other artists, composers, and poets.

The most important question seems to be: Is there an element of “order” integral to “chaos”?

The second most important question seems to be: Is there an element of volition present as part of that “order”?

There are other “follow-up” questions too: We are conscious; is consciousness therefore a function which is integral to the Universe? Is there a consubstantiation existent between energy and some form of consciousness or awareness?

1. Can these questions be answered objectively?
2. Is it necessary that they be so?
3. Is there anything wrong with an element of subjectivity entering into the process?

The answers to these last three questions are:

1. Partially.
2. As much as is possible.
3. No, unless the subjectivity completely overwhelms the process.

Do we use induction or deduction in the course of this process?

It's clear to me that we will have to use either method, and/or both of them at once, if and when, it becomes necessary.

So, we have “A Big Bang”, and, as a result, the universal field of chaotic and relatively undifferentiated energy is expanding outward at colossal rates of speed here we all are what do we have to “do” with that? Is it perhaps possible that we have absolutely nothing at all to “do” with that?

Here we all are! Would we be here if we had nothing at all to “do” with that, if we were meaningless ciphers without any real significance in the process which is that?

It's certainly possible.

On the other hand, I've thought, and thought, and thought, about the significance of an utterly meaningless process, both where we're concerned as well as where “everything else” is concerned, and everything which I do know, argues fiercely against it. No, I do not think so. Of course, as my opinion, while it is based on objective information, is primarily subjective, I could easily be wrong, but I do not think so.

Is there an element of order integral to the chaos created by the “Big Bang”?

The work of Stephen Hawking and his colleagues, and their associated supercomputers, as they deal with particle physics, and with cosmology in the quantum theoretical and “Chaos Theory” sense, as I understand their results, appears to me to indicate a strong element of order integral to the universal energy field. Though in fact, the best description of that “element of order” that I can come up with is “orderly chaos” or “chaotic order”.

By simple extension, the place in which we are is also distinguished by a strong element of order integral to its basic, but not its social, nature. So then, on that basis, it appears to be at least relatively safe for us to assume an element of order to be integral to the nature of the cosmos. That assumption clearly causes this question to present itself: If an element of order is integral to the nature of the cosmos, is

order then, the natural (and “accidental”) state of things, or is that “element of order” imposed upon chaos by the process itself; or if not by the process in general, by some unknowable element of the process itself; or by something which is entirely external and independent of the process itself?

When I say “process” I mean: “Bang + chaos = universe”.

If order is other than accidental, and it seems to me that even “chaotic order”, considering its nature, is surely obliged to be something which is other than entirely accidental; then the question of an element of volition becomes both cogent and imperative.

If our integral element of order is imposed upon chaos by the “Big Bang Process” itself, it could then possibly be a totally mechanical by-product of that process, and, as a result, while it was not the product of random accident, it would be something which is entirely other than the product of any kind of volition.

But, I must ask: if that is so, what does that make of the “Big Bang Process”?

And here we are! What would that make of us?

Of course, if in fact, that statement is so, then it’s so! We surely cannot really know that it isn’t so, even if we are uncomfortable with the implications. It’s one of the very many things we can’t know! In any case it’s a more productive operating premise than is random meaninglessness.

All the same, as in the case of the premise of “nothing at all” existing before the “big Bang”, and for the same reasons, I am forced to reject mechanistic models.

It seems to me that; for a process, which itself is clearly chaotic, and which therefore should be entirely without any vestige of either order or consciousness, to unconsciously impose order, would seem clearly contradictory to all experience.

Out of nothing nothing comes.

Out of chaos, without volition, nothing but chaos can emerge.

As the cosmos which we know of is fairly obviously, albeit uncertainly, ordered in all of its parts, and the world that we live in is (with my usual exception of Human societies), also relatively ordered in all of its parts; and as we possess no evidence that I know of, of any kind of chaos ordering itself, I am going to assume that the ordering of chaos is not mechanical any more than it is accidental. Therefore I am assuming some element of volition, by which I mean to say, consciously directed will, to be involved in bringing order out of chaos.

NOT “GOD”!

“An element of volition, or consciously directed will, involved in bringing order out of chaos” is not “God”!

“GOD” ISN’T!

“God” would, by definition, clearly have to be a consciousness of an ultimate and/or transcendent nature. A consciousness which is utterly external to the process, imposing itself and its will, upon the process.

Religious myth and legend are not, and cannot be considered to be, empirical evidence. Religious cosmologies are all fairy tales. There isn’t one shred of either historical or scientific evidence of an

empirical nature to either indicate or even to hint that such a “supernatural” power exists or that such a thing has ever existed!

It seems clear to me that the existence of an already ultimate intelligence, of some “thing” which, of necessity, is external to, and therefore perhaps is also foreign to, our universal field of energy; which itself, was nevertheless so singular, which itself, possessed the unimaginably immense potency to effect, in any way, something to which it was, and perforce had to be, entirely alien and external; would therefore be a potency of such gigantic magnitude that its very existence, its very beingness; could not help but make itself completely obvious, in a totally unavoidable way, to all of us who are here.

IT HASN'T!

AND IT WON'T!

If there was such a “God”, it seems clear that it could not hide itself. If there were, in fact, an entity extant such as the one which is described by the Priestly and Rabbinical classes; a “thing” which is not merely mindlessly ferocious and childishly petulant, but also an eternal cosmic busybody you bet we'd all know it was there!

BUT WE DON'T KNOW IT'S THERE! BECAUSE IT ISN'T!

The Priests and Rabbis prescribe that “leap of faith”, but, “leap of faith” (“Trust Me!”) is clearly the con artists credo.

We don't know anything at all about a “God”. And neither do the Priests and/or Rabbis. There's no intellectually or ethically acceptable evidence of any kind! I used the term “ethically acceptable” because ethics, the study of proper human inter-relationships, is a necessary and valid conception.

“Morality” however, which is a “sin” based conception, and which comes to us out of religion, is; like “sin”, simply one of religion's many egregious lies.

The only possible idea which might be correlated to or with “God”, is the conception that the “process” is “God”, but why should anyone bother to force such an issue? When such a thing as “God” doesn't really exist, or at least it cannot be shown to exist, I have to ask: Of what possible purpose, good, or use to humankind is the creation of an ultimate authority figure, except as something upon which to palm off one's responsibilities?

“Volition” clearly requires “will”. They are synonyms. The exercise of “Will” absolutely requires an awareness to exercise that volition. Does not the process itself, which imposes such order as does exist on chaos, seem most likely to do so by an act of will? Does the process itself not impose order on chaos by “wanting” or “desiring”, or perhaps, and I think this more likely, “needing” that order? The language available to us for descriptive purposes is very far from entirely satisfactory. Nevertheless, I think so.

The process initiated by the “Big Bang”, or cataclysmic energy event, integrally imposes order upon the effects of that event. But not mechanically or accidentally so! It is volition, and not simply order, but rather purposeful order, which is integral to “the process”.

“The Big Bang”, or as seems far more likely to me, an infinite series of “Big Bangs”, is surely also integral to “the process”.

What is “the process”?

“The Process” itself, is abstract creation. “The Purpose” of “creation” is further creation. The function of each and every integral aspect of creation is creation. Here we are our purpose too is creation. Abstract creation. Not pro-creation, though that too is a completely valid and extremely necessary sub-routine for most, but not all, of us.

Abstract creativity; the mind, and the mind alone, on its own level, creating “something” out of the essentially chaotic nothingness of itself.

This is accomplished in just the same fashion that the creative “process” imposes relative order on chaos. And here we all are!

“The Process” is an infinitely continuous one of creation creating itself out of itself. “The Creation” is not a particular moment in time!

“The Creative Process” is an infinitely continuous process which is constantly creating an infinite series of inter-related realities, all of them relative in their reality to one another. Each and everyone of them continuing the creative process on varying levels. The ultimate result of “the process” of self-creative creativity is the infinite evolution of consciousness.

The series of “Big Bangs” are punctuation marks in this process, they are the scission points.

Before the cataclysmic energy event which sent our particular universe careening outward in chaos, there was chaos!

“Volition” implies two distinct things: Consciousness and Awareness. They are not the same thing! It is both easy and very common for something to possess awareness and yet be unconscious of that fact. In other words: to “know” and yet not “know that it knows”!

The “Volition” concerned is that of “The Process” itself, in a condition in which that “Process”, in its early stages, is at least relatively unaware of itself, but needing to become more so. This is a fairly accurate description of the conditions existing in which the imposition of relative order upon chaos occurs within the “process of creation”.

Entropy too, is an integral part of the process of creation. The process of creation is an infinite sequence of creation and destruction, building and demolition. Stasis is the antithesis of creation.

Chaos, when it is an integral part of an over-all process, does not impart its own disorderliness to the process itself. The process itself, clearly is ordered. If it were not, it would be an occurrence rather than a process.

When the “Big Bang” took place, it’s immediate results were, of course, as utterly and wildly chaotic as one would expect. A wild maelstrom of chaotic energy flux within the universal energy field.

But I have to ask, what was the condition of that field just immediately prior to the cataclysmic energy event? For I am totally convinced that the unified field did exist prior to that event, but that it did so in a radically different state or condition. Prior to the maelstrom of activity initiated by the cataclysmic energy event, I believe that the unified energy field existed in a different state of “chaos”. In this instance, I am using a definition of “chaos” which does not imply any particular kind of activity on its part, but only implies an unordered energy field of any type.

I think it is reasonable to state that any process, no matter how disorganized it is in part, is nevertheless in a kind of order if it can be identified as a process.

This “other state of chaos” is not at all “chaotic” in the wild maelstrom of energy sense of the word; but is rather a state of almost absolute nullity, which is utterly passive and quiescent, but which contains within itself an integral potential for action. It is totally mindless. It has only border-line awareness. It contains within itself the embryonic integral potential for true awareness, true consciousness. It is clearly without form or even the potential for form. It is totally unaware of either self or not-self. It is chaos in a state of absolutely static passivity. It is embryonic creative potential, totally unlimited by even the idea of action.

The “Big Bang” is its alarm clock and here we all are!

Nothing exists at all in any form other than energy. This so-called “visible universe”, as well as the entire cosmos which exists beyond the range of human senses, and which exists as well, far beyond the range, not only of the many mechanical instruments, but also beyond the scope of the quantum theoretical formulae which have been developed by humanity to assist it in the extension of the range of human senses; is one immeasurably vast energy field. All things which appear to exist within that unified field, no matter in what state they appear to exist, are nonetheless simply energy patterns within the unified energy field. This is as true of a microbe as it is of a galactic system.

I think that given the state of science, and the combined arts of information and communication, today, it's very difficult, and not just a little atavistic, to attempt to argue that energy is not the basic state of all that exists, physical or otherwise.

If “atomic bombs” explode, and we know that they do, the above statement is proven true.

Now I will return to a question I asked earlier: Here we all are, we are sentient, we are aware, and we are fully aware that we are, but we are also nothing but energy fields in our inherent or intrinsic reality. We are conscious. Consciousness is not merely integral to our beingness, it is the most vital aspect of that beingness. We are, but when we lose conscious awareness that we are, we really aren't!

Breathing, and a heart beat, and even brain functions, aren't life, they're simply mechanical functions, it is the conscious awareness that one is breathing, and the knowledge that one's heart is beating coupled with the clear awareness that one is so aware add to this the consciousness that there are “others” which are separate from self add to all that the full consciousness of one's immanent “death”, and that's the only valid description of life.

Awareness is not sufficient. It is the complete awareness of that awareness that is vital.

It is clear to me that consciousness is very much more than merely a by-product of physicality. It is very much more than the by-product of electro-chemical reactions. Quite the opposite.

I believe that when you get right down to it, physicality is one of the by-products of consciousness. I am certain that consciousness is an inherent part of our true reality, and that our reality has very little if anything to do with physicality. It can't be otherwise if energy is the true reality of all things.

Physicality, it is clear to me, is a thing which is far more apparently real, or virtually real, than it is intrinsically real. But real or apparent, here we all are!

There are those religions who proclaim that physicality is merely “illusion”. It is, in a way. But to me, the word “illusion”, when it is left unmodified, carries with it strong connotations of hallucination, and while energy is all that truly exists, physicality, as a manifestation of energy, is not entirely an

hallucination. It is not completely unreal. When I say that physicality is “more apparent than real”, I am also saying that physical things represent what is a “virtual reality”. Perhaps not an “intrinsic reality”, and physicality is surely not the “absolute reality”, for we really haven’t got the slightest idea of what that may be, or even if that may be; but surely and clearly, physicality is a “virtual reality”.

It seems to me that what we are, are individual consciousnesses, and very little else, if anything, of real meaning. If we are intrinsically individuated consciousness, which we clearly are; and if we are also simply individuated energy patterns, which we know we are because science has demonstrated this to be true; then it becomes necessary to assume some degree of consubstantiation between “energy” and “consciousness”.

Here we all are and we are clearly disparate individual conscious self-aware energy fields.

By this I do not mean to say that energy and consciousness are invariably identical phenomena. I do mean to say, that I think that they are both inter-connected and interrelated phenomena, and that while energy is not always conscious, consciousness always has an energy-field as its foundation.

The maelstrom of chaotic energies extant immediately following a “Big Bang”, is clearly anything but consciously aware either of itself or of its environment. But it does possess the inherent potential to become so. That’s what “all this” is all about, the evolution of consciousness.

How does “it”, or rather, how does the unified field, develop this potential in the course of the creative process?

It does so by way of the infinite expansion of the over-all consciousness of the unified field of energy itself, and also by way of the infinite expansion of the component disparate individual awarenesses which are integral to the unified energy field.

“Component disparate individual awarenesses” and here we all are!

This is the point in most discussions of this subject at which most of the “smoke-ware” gets generated. Because, of course, it is the point of maximum personal insecurity and discomfort. That is why this is the point at which most “wild flights of fancy” take wing ... fantasy and unbridled imagination implacably catering to the “religious impulse”. This is the point at which rationality has usually melted away and fancy and fabrication taken command.

I want to avoid that if I can. Or at least try to.

I think that I’ve begun to develop a rational case for the consubstantiality between energy and consciousness. While it seems clear to me that this concept is both scientifically and intellectually completely valid as a theory, I think it needs to be much stronger than theory. Most people find it difficult to fit their lives into theoretical parameters.

What we think must really be based ONLY on what we know.

Theories must be based upon knowledge, and not upon supposition, fear, or wishful thinking. Theories must be an extrapolation from a factual foundation. I want to continue the development of that proposition.

I really don’t think I want to get too much involved in the web of intricacies which define the mechanisms requisite in getting from the “Big Bang” to Downtown San Francisco. I’ll abdicate the greatest

portion of the investigation of actual mechanisms, in other words, of “HOW” and leave that to Dr. Hawking and company.

What I believe I need to accomplish is a fairly extensive development of “WHAT” and “WHY” on a rational abstract level. In doing so I will happily rely on the scientific community and their super-computers for my factual foundation.

“WHAT”? And “WHY”? That’s just a shorter way to say: Here we all are! So?

Developing answers to the questions “what” and “why” on only an abstract level which is not at the same time a rational one, would be fun, but it would also be woefully inadequate. What use is such a philosophical development if it serves no positive purpose? What use is any theory if it can’t be related to “real-life”? The answer to that question is: “Of almost no use at all!”

Oh, theories that cannot be related to “real-life” may very well be what they call “consciousness-raising”, in that they exercise the mind, and in some cases expand it, and extend its capacity to be aware of its situation. That’s a good thing. But it’s not nearly enough. I certainly will attempt to relate all these very abstract speculations to “real-life” in due order.

“The Process” (chaos + bang = chaos = universe + entropy = chaos + bang = chaos, etc.), on the abstract level, has very little resonance in day-to-day human lives. I do not mean to say that the process couldn’t have a major relevance to human life if it were understood beyond it’s most obvious abstract definition. It can be so understood, and it will be so understood, in time.

The effect of that understanding, in addition to broadening the spectrum of awareness, will also be productive of an intrinsic change of attitude.

What does it really mean that we who are here, are “intelligent, self-aware, other-aware, individual energy patterns within a unified field of consciousness/energy”?

Answering that question is my second task.

Proving its basic premise likely to be true is my first task.

O.K.

What do we who are thinking about this subject, supported by quantum theory/chaos theory and the uncertainty principle, feel relatively safe in assuming to be probably true? I feel better about saying it that way than saying “What do we know?” Even though there are some clear indications that we do know some things, most of this, I feel, is well-supported assumption.

There was “nothing” and then there “wasn’t”!

I clarify that statement this way: There was a “null”, which is an inert, passively chaotic energy field, there was a cataclysmic energy event, then there was an actively chaotic energy field expanding outward furiously. Outward from “what” or “where”? Clearly outward from a central point.

But ... here we all are!

I suggest that the so-called “central point” was not simply a relatively tiny spot. I assume that we have no “beginning”, no “start”, but simply a continuum, an ever-active process. So, in the course of that “process”, an inactive or passive energy field experiences an “event” that transforms it into a violently

active energy field furiously expanding outward from a center that is no where at all and yet is at the same time every where at once.

A center identical with the field itself. A center which expands with the field.

All this takes place in a theater of activity which we call "space". What that is, or what it may be, we have no real idea at all. What contains our unified energy field we do not know, we can not know, we most likely never will know. Unless there comes a time when our consciousnesses are identical with the unified field in which they are contained. Which situation, it seems to me, is exactly what the evolution of consciousness has as its goal.

Remember that the arena in which Luke Skywalker and Darth Vader and the crew of the Starships Enterprise and Voyager perform is an area completely within the parameters of our expanding universe, "space" is the arena in which the expanding universe performs.

Can that arena be "absolute nothingness"? It perhaps can, but only if "nothing" can contain "something". The unified energy field is certainly "something". Does "space" expand and/or contract in response to the requirements of the unified field? If it does, it's hardly "absolute nothingness", for "nothingness" can not be expected to expand and contract in respond to something so totally "other" than itself as "something" must be. In fact, "nothing" being "nothing" can do nothing ... "nothing" is not an "it", "nothing" is the absence of an "it". Expansion, contraction, or any other action or thingness is utterly irrelevant in regard to "nothing".

The creative continuum exists, and "the process" takes place, in a theater of activity that is beyond rational conception. That I am sure is true. Beyond that I am both unwilling and unable to speculate.

You know, I really think that; not only is the nature of the thing which contains the manifested universe totally "beyond rationality", I think it quite safe to assume that whatever it is that contains our expanding universe is what I call a "radical irrational", which means that it is a thing to which reason is irrelevant.

And so, we have a field of energy alternating, by way of a cataclysmic energy event, between periods of quiescence and periods of furious activity.

Yet, here we all are, how do we "fit in"?

It's far easier to begin to see a place for "us", if you consciously regard "us" as "intelligent energy patterns", than if you try to relate the virtual reality of the physical state to "the process". That "process" is not only not physical, but it does not even possess the potential for physicality. To tell the truth, I do not think it's at all possible to relate physical beings to "The Process" without seriously regarding them as essentially energy fields.

How it is that intelligent energy patterns manipulate energy in order to participate in the virtual reality of the so-called "physical plane", we'll have to leave to Hawking and his associates to eventually discover and explain to us. I, for one, have no idea at all how this is accomplished. I don't think that, for my own purposes, it really matters at all "how" energy manifests as physicality.

But this we all of us do know Here we all are!

Now, there's another question that arises. If we are "intelligent energy patterns" experiencing a physicality that represents only the shadow of virtual reality, what are we?

That's the most important question.

We also need to define the relationship that exists between the "intelligent individual energy pattern" which is integral to the unified energy field, and the individual human (or other) being which is an integral part of the physical expression of virtual reality.

I am not discussing the human personality per se, which is, I am sure, a completely separate phenomenon from what I am talking about, which is "the intelligent individual energy pattern" as it manifests on the levels of virtual realities. The human personality cannot be ignored, it's amazingly complicated and therefore extremely interesting. I'll get to it later.

That is why I maintain that answering these questions will cause a change in human attitude. How can the knowing awareness that one is an energy-field, rather than only a physical "thing", not force a really strong change in one's attitude towards one's reality and all with which/whom one shares that "reality"? The Human Condition when seen as an energy state rather than a physical state gives rise to some rather fascinating vistas.

There is a theory, or rather an axiom, called "The Law Of The Conservation Of Energy" which states that: "Energy, once created, is never lost".

PART 2: MORTALITY?

Here we all are intelligent energy patterns. What does the “Law of The Conservation of Energy” imply in that case?

The Universe is an ever expanding field which is composed entirely and solely of energy. Energy is all that there really is. I don't really think I have to actually prove those statements to be probabilities. Science already has.

To those for whom science is not acceptable and who prefer the analgesic fabrications of religion, I could never, under any circumstances, prove those statements to be “likely to be true”.

Energy is all there is; we are intelligent energy patterns which exist independently within the over-all field of the unified field and yet here we all are! What does all this have to do with each of us, and our lives, hopes, and dreams?

Here we all are! So?

If all we are is basically individuated energy fields, so what? In our physical state of reality we are also people. What does being a sentient physical being have to do with the intrinsic reality of being only an intelligent energy pattern?

Does being aware of these ideas and hypotheses make a difference to us as individuals? Is it something that would be helpful to us in “living out our lives”? Is it something that would help us understand the “meaning of our lives”?

I really think so.

Why do I think so? Well, it seems to me that, especially in this context, it is clear that ignorance is not really “blissful”. Science is very busily clearly proving that all there is is energy. For sentient beings to hide on this knowledge because it makes them uncomfortable, surely does not make them any more comfortable it just makes them insecure as well as uncomfortable.

It is clear to me that if our intrinsic reality is that of “intelligent energy patterns”, while our virtual reality expresses itself as that of “physical beings”, then it clearly behooves us to try to find out what the relationship between the two conditions of beingness are.

We are “two different things”, that is clear. What needs to be made clearer is whether those “two things” are dichotomous, whether they are actually contradictory, or whether they are perhaps complimentary.

What needs to be made clearer is the implication to each sentient being personally of these “two states”. What needs to be made clearer is some idea of “what it all means”.

What needs to be made clearer is here we all are! So? We all know very well that “we're all here”, it's the “so?” that's so very problematical.

Within the virtual reality, all physical beings expressing that reality are terribly finite, they are born, they live a while, and they die.

We know that this is true, and we also know that it speaks absolutely equally of each of us. We usually don't like it, but most humans basically accept their mortality. The dislike of mortality is what keeps religions in business selling euphoria.

They also “sell” status and social acceptance, but that's a story for another time later.

On the other hand, we are also “intelligent energy patterns extant within the unified field of energy which is our so-called Universe”. Energy is our intrinsic reality. “Energy once created is never lost.” What does that mean to us?

To find out what it means to us, an important series of questions must be confronted here:

When did our “individuated intelligent energy pattern” come into being?

If our “individuated intelligent energy pattern” is created for the first time in the womb, and if “energy once created is never lost”, we must then ask: what happens to that “individuated intelligent energy pattern” when the physical being dies and is then apparently “lost” to the virtual reality?

If the “individuated intelligent energy pattern” is created in the womb, out of what is it created?

On the other hand:

What is the true nature of the “individuated intelligent energy pattern”?

If the “individuated intelligent energy pattern” is not created in the womb, when is it created?

If the “individuated intelligent energy pattern” is not created in the womb, what is its connection with the physical sentient individual being born into the virtual reality?

If the “individuated intelligent energy pattern” goes on to “post-exist” the physical being of the virtual reality in a post-mortem state, what “happens” to the nonphysical element?

If the “individuated intelligent energy pattern” represents the intrinsic reality, what is the meaning of the virtual reality?

Truthfully, it is not clear to me that the absolutely accurate answers to these questions are anything that sentient physical beings can ever reach.

One of the most important things I’m trying to say is that; being entirely enmeshed as we are in the physical levels of the virtual realities, it is clear to me that there are probably things about intrinsic reality that are completely beyond our scope.

As I said before, there’s an awful lot we don’t know, and can’t know, and which we will, in all probability, never know. That is a fact that it is important to accept. But, accepting that, as we must, as an unpleasant and uncomfortable “fact of life”, it is also true that we can and must go ahead and try to answer these questions to the best of our ability.

How?

Well, “Here we all are!” We know that!

We also can say that we accept science’s assertion that nothing exists but energy. So, in effect, we can say we “know” that too.

There’s a lot of other scientifically and experientially based things we “know” too. So using what we already “know” as our basis, I think it’s quite possible to extrapolate answers to all those questions. Answers that possess a relatively strong element of probability. Strong probability of correctness is, I think, the best that the “virtually real” can hope for. At least in this portion of our quest for understanding of ourselves and our environment.

To me, at least, not reaching for that kind of understanding is the only thing which would make our virtual reality almost entirely meaningless!

To me, curiosity is absolutely the most vital ingredient in sentience.

To me, the passive acceptance of what seems to be, without making any effort at all to find out what really is, is the abdication of sentience.

To me then, a life which is spent without endlessly questioning all authority, and without asking “Here we all are ... so?”, is not much of a life.

Here we all are, all sentient things, and all other things too, so?

This we are sure of; there was a cataclysmic energy event that brought our particular unified field of energy into chaotic being.

THE ENERGY THAT EXISTED THEN. EXISTS NOW.

At some time, and in some fashion, a kind of order was imposed upon utterly chaotic energy fields.

We exist, both intrinsically as energy patterns, and virtually as sentient physical beings. We are aware of our own identity and we are also aware of our environment in great detail. We are clearly aware that we are aware. We can create many things with our minds as the energizing factor of that creativity.

Our brains, which I perceive as something which is entirely different than, and entirely separate from our minds, are fantastically efficient switching relays for electrical impulses. They may also be very efficient, enormous capacity, sort of very rapid retrieval “random access memory” storage devices for knowledge and experience. On the other hand, they may not be. We are sure about the electrical switching capacity, because we can both observe and measure it, but we are not as sure about the storage capacity. Oh there is storage capacity, amazing amounts of it, but as we can neither truly observe or measure it, we do not know where it is stored or how it operates. Science really knows far much less than it would like, and certainly less than I would like, about the functions and capacities of the brain.

I believe that our “minds”, or that part of our intrinsicity which is the source of all true creativity, are an integral part of that “intelligent energy pattern” on the extra-physical levels of virtual realities. I do not believe our “minds” to be a part of our physical bodies.

In fact, I see a strong probability that the “intelligent energy pattern” of/on the non-physical levels of the virtual realities is the mind. What I mean to say by that is that the brain is very much like a computer. while the mind takes the role of the operator of the computer. Of course I can't prove it to you. It's one of those un-provable things. But at least I can say that I strongly believe this to be the case.

The important question is when is this “individuated intelligent energy pattern” brought into beingness?

It's clear to me that the energy which is contained in the “individuated intelligent energy patterns” exists and by “exists” I mean to say that it is, it was, and it will ever be, time out of mind. It existed before the cataclysmic energy event in one form, it existed during the event in perhaps a different form, and it existed after the event in still another form. It exists now in the various manifestations of energy in both the intrinsic reality and the virtual reality. I am part of that energy, and so are you, and so too, is every other thing that exists within the two separate but inseparable paradigms which I call “virtual reality” and its reflection, or “shadow” which is what I call “physical reality”.

Now then, I'm comfortable with the idea that the energy field itself always existed. I am also comfortable with the idea that we are integral to that energy field.

The remaining question though is still when did the "individuated intelligent energy patterns" coalesce out of the seething mass of energy particles that formed the chaotic energy maelstrom that existed after the cataclysmic energy event or "big bang"?

The energy which is our intrinsic reality clearly has "always" existed. But, when did it differentiate into the "patterns" of which we are the physical manifestation here in the virtual reality? I don't think that the question of "when in time" the differentiation of energy into individuated energy fields took place is answerable, at least not at this time. On the other hand, there are clearly certain inferences that can be drawn from the things we do know.

For instance, that the original mass of energy became more orderly, that it differentiated itself into various "things" such as Stars and Planets, birds and bees, is something that we very clearly do know for here we all are!

If the intrinsic reality of the consciousness which we identify as our selves is energy and only energy, then in common with all other energy, it is infinite, and therefore duration, i.e. mortality, is not relevant to any discussion of it.

But, here we all are and, at least as individuals, we are clearly and unarguably mortal what is the connection that exists between an infinite energy pattern and a totally mortal sentient physical being?

The answers I have developed to these various questions are clearly hypothetical rationalizations based upon a combination of my understanding of things I have studied and my own intuition. That's all they can ever be. There's just so much about which we cannot ever be sure. This however, is the rationalization I have developed from my thinking about these matters.

You will recall that earlier I said that: "THE PURPOSE OF CREATION IS CREATION".

That is, in fact, what I believe.

But, what is the reason for or rather goal of creation, if it's purpose, which I do not believe to be identical with its "reason" or "goal", is abstract creativity? It is my strongest belief that consciousness and energy are basically identical. That belief is based upon the following reasoning:

Here we all are we are clearly sentient beings ... we are also clearly intelligent individual energy patterns ... therefore it seems to me that energy and consciousness are, at least in that instance, unarguably consubstantial. Therefore it seems to me that if some energy can be demonstrated to have developed consciousness, then it is hardly unreasonable to assume that energy per se possesses at least the potential for the development of consciousness.

If, in fact, it is true that energy and consciousness are consubstantial, and that would certainly seem to be at least partially true, then if energy is all that exists, then potentially at least, consciousness and awareness are all that exists. The implications herein are enormous.

Because of that belief I think that the reason for/goal of creation is the infinite extension of awareness within the unified field of energy.

I think that the universe, or rather the unified energy field, is a gigantic playing field of both consciousness, the "thing-in-itself", and the evolution of the conscious awareness of consciousness, "the

thing-in-itself". The individual intelligent energy patterns intrinsic to that unified field are the medium for that infinite extension of awareness.

If I am correct, and the reason for "all this" is the infinite evolution of consciousness and awareness, then that has very definitive connotations connected with the virtual reality and with the meaning of life within that reality.

The implication then, is that the purpose of virtual reality, and therefore the purpose of everything which exists within that reality, is the infinite evolution/extension of the awareness of self, and other-than-self, and of consciousness the "thing-in-itself", within the over-all paradigm of the intrinsic reality.

After the cataclysmic energy event or "Big Bang", the unified field clearly began to order itself. The multitude of particles of which energy is composed, a thing which science is clearly demonstrating to be factual, began to order themselves into patterns. We know that they did so, because there are an infinity of different "things", each of them actually a different energy pattern. The eventual result of this patterning is virtual reality and its "shadow", which is the visible physical universe.

Intrinsic reality is the existential context of the energy patterns of which virtual reality is composed. I believe that all the various energy patterns within intrinsic reality were formed prior to the manifestation of the virtual reality. That clearly includes all the individuated intelligent energy patterns of which each and every sentient being is the manifestation. Obviously I believe that the individual intelligent energy patterns clearly pre-exist their manifestations within the virtual reality.

My answer to the question: Is the "individual intelligent energy pattern created anew for each physical being in the womb?" is No! But the answer is also Yes!

The individual evolving intelligent energy pattern on the levels of intrinsic reality comes into being with that intrinsic reality. It is immortal. The "individual intelligent energy pattern" which is its "shadow" on the levels of the virtual reality also evolves, and it is immanently immortal. It is an original creation which is made to be each time the evolving individual intelligence of the intrinsic levels of reality requires a projection of itself on the levels of virtual and physical reality. The "individual intelligent energy pattern" which is the physical projection and the "shadow" of the virtual reality intelligence, does NOT evolve though it grows and changes as its personality evolves, and it is distinctly mortal. The energy field which is its true reality is created, or rather given consciousness, in the womb.

The physical being is manifested by the individual intelligent energy pattern by way of a process which I do not even pretend to know. "Reincarnation" is clearly not an acceptable description of that process. When you get right down to it, "reincarnation" not entirely, but as popularly conceived, like most basically religious ideas, is entirely analgesic in intent, it's also very silly, and while it usually is, in one way or another, tremendously ego-gratifying, as usually presented, it clearly doesn't make any sense at all.

But then, if the popular notion of "reincarnation" doesn't make any sense, it's also very true that neither does an even more common, but much less soothing religious conception "one-shot" mortality, with "eternal reward or punishment" depending entirely upon many things, some of them hopelessly trivial, which made up the character of that life. Physical mortality of an individual human personality may very well be "one-shot", in fact I really believe that in most cases, it is; that's not the foolishness. What

is absurd is the idea that “eternal reward or punishment” exist, and depend upon finite mortal actions and thoughts.

Historically speaking, most notions, and all Dogmas, having to do with mortality and postmortem existentiality, are religion-based social paradigms rather than either philosophical speculations or the result of scientific experimentation. Their primary goal is control.

That is not my goal, and so I see a universe which is far less rigid than others have seen. My goal is simply the satisfaction of my own curiosity, the clarification of my own wonderment.

I think though, that if I am “right”, and if my musings have brought me to an approximation of reality, then we all stand to benefit from an attitude toward reality that is at once more valid, and very much more benign, and a great deal more vivifying, than the one we have used for so long.

The relationship between the sentient physical being projected by the actual consciousness entity which exists in the virtual reality and the individual intelligent energy pattern in the intrinsic reality which manifested that consciousness entity; is, I am forced to conclude, a relatively complicated one. It clearly differs from individual to individual. The two centers-of-consciousness, in fact it might better be described as three centers-of-consciousness, are intrinsically the same, and yet they are any thing but identical. They are certainly connected by way of some kind of consciousness-link. But it seems to be a oneway linkage only. At least most of the time.

“The Three centers-of-consciousness” are:

FIRST: The intrinsic evolving intelligence that is intrinsic to the unified field.

SECOND: “The Consciousness Entity” which is it’s projection or manifestation on the levels of virtual reality. “Virtual Reality” is a level of reality which while it is actually neither, is none the less immanently physical on the one hand and immanently spiritual on the other.

THIRD: The Physical sentient being, which is the projection or manifestation of the consciousness entity of the virtual realities, and therefore, by extension, ultimately the projection or manifestation of the Intrinsic Evolving Intelligence.

The physical being is a manifestation of what I have to think of as the consciousness entity, but it is not usually aware of the fact. When a broader scope of awareness and its resulting deeper understanding develops on the part of both components in that linkage, then it seems to me that the inter-connection or linkage between the components is strengthened, and the awareness of the connection begins to clarify itself.

This is an entirely abstract conception and therefore is not any easy one to understand. Let’s try to assist understanding by putting some order into this.

Nullity (or passive/inactive chaos) + A Cataclysmic Energy Event (Big Bang) = The Intrinsic Reality (apparently active chaos) and its shadow, The Virtual Reality (apparently both active and ordered) + entropy = Nullity and so forth.

I think that’s an accurate depiction of where I’ve come so far.

I think it’s an accurate depiction of what we really know of cosmology today.

It is the three-way inter-relationship that exists between the consciousness entity of the intrinsic reality, its temporary expression on the virtual reality which I call the “Mind”, and the equally temporary sentient physical being of the physical reality that must be investigated.

I think that it is vitally important for the individual human being to begin to understand (and perhaps that understanding is only totally possible by way of apperception), exactly where they “fit in” in a universe, or more accurately, a multiverse which is composed only of energy, but which seems to be, and in fact functions, as if it were as physical and material as it appears to be.

I think it a matter of equal importance, and, when all things are considered, not just a little urgency, that human beings begin to clearly understand that SENTIENCE, which is the only important aspect of physical existence, is not something which is peculiar to the human species.

I think that this is necessary not simply because I know it will improve living conditions here in the physical reality, but also because it is my belief that the energy, of which the virtual reality is composed, is, itself, intrinsically consciousness. Senticence, therefore is a much more important connecting link than form.

As I understand it, the multiverse, while it is simply a field of unified energy, is at the same time, and perhaps primarily, a field of unified but nevertheless totally individual awareness's.

The purpose behind the creation of the virtual realities and their shadows the physical realities, is the infinite extension of that awareness, the infinite extension of that consciousness.

As energy itself is broken down into components which form themselves into various energy particles, bodies, patterns, et cetera, so too, awareness is also broken down into various more individuated patterns and forms. In either case, the individuation is not separate from the unified field. The unified field grows as its contents grow.

Here we all are, all living things and all other things too.

We are physically real, we are also virtually real, and yet we are also intrinsically real, and yet the three conditions are clearly not identical.

Non-living things are every bit as much energy patterns within the intrinsic reality as living things are. When I say non-living what I mean to say is non-aware. Because both “things” are essentially energy patterns. All things are intrinsically only energy patterns.

The primary difference between animate things and non-animate things is the possession of awareness. The primary difference between sentient things and insentient things is consciousness. All living things are aware, sentient things are conscious that they are aware!

The multiverse is an immeasurable field of conscious energy, what we don't know, what we need to find out, is the answer to the question: Is the multiverse conscious of the fact that it possesses the potential for both full awareness and full consciousness?

I don't really think so. At least it is not so aware at first. It is my thought that “the process”; at its inception, is one which might accurately be described as an evolution of energy from a state of completely un self-conscious, totally passive, awareness to a state, finally, in which that same energy; and the unified field too, is an “individuated intelligent energy pattern”, and has become both fully self-conscious

and fully other-conscious, and is, as a result, definable as something which is an omni-consciousness/omni-awareness.

Eventually, I think, this result will be true too, of each and every one of the individuated intelligent energy patterns that exist within the unified field.

What the unified field of universal consciousness/energy will be when that conclusion is reached, or even if that “conclusion” is, or will be, a conclusion in the sense of a termination of “the process”, or a conclusion in the sense of a scission point in “the process”, I have absolutely no idea at all.

That’s not true! I may not have an “idea”, but I certainly have an intuition that “the process” never terminates. Therefore, “scission points” are all there can be.

It is also my thought that the media for this developmental process are surely the various relative virtual realities and their shadows the physical realities.

Now, I have said that there were “various relative virtual realities” more than once, and in more than one way. Why?

Well, you will remember that I said earlier that in my opinion the universe has experienced a “series of cataclysmic energy events”, or rather a “series of “Big Bangs””.

That clearly implies that in each instance there is at least the partial series: “Nullity + Bang = Chaos = Universe”. Recent research carried out by way of the Hubble Telescope and various other space borne instruments have uncovered a surprising thing. There are apparently Stars extant within our Universe which pre-date “The Big Bang” and therefore also pre-date the universe which contains them. Those new findings very strongly support my intuition that creation is continuous. The result of those continuous scission points of creation is a thing which we must then call THE MULTIVERSE. because that is what it is.

Energy, once created is never lost.

The multiverse creates itself from out of itself.

I believe that the creative process itself may very well be the only Absolute reality.

The result, as I see it, is an infinite series of intrinsic realities each one of them containing a almost infinite series of virtual realities.

The term “virtual reality” includes and implies within itself, those other “stepped-down realities” which are the shadows or projections of “virtual reality”. Physical reality is one such shadow. THE PHYSICAL REALITIES ARE, TO THE VIRTUAL REALITIES, EXACTLY WHAT THE VIRTUAL REALITIES ARE TO THE INTRINSIC REALITIES. And here we are, all of us, all living things ... and all other things too!

If all that is true, and I believe that it at least approaches a kind of “truth”, then what does that make of an individual sentient creature? I suppose that it can, and perhaps should, make such a being feel infinitely inconsequential, infinitely irrelevant. Viewed in the context of even the virtual realities, and surely in that of the intrinsic realities (we really have no context whatsoever for the absolute reality) that’s pretty true. The individual physical sentience is certainly inconsequential. But, it is my thought that the individual sentience is very far indeed from being irrelevant.

Now, as I am personally an “individual sentience”, that thought could easily be a kind of analgesic. But I don’t really think that it is.

Why is this so?

If, as it seems to me to be kind of obvious, the virtual reality is the primary medium for the evolution of the intrinsic reality; then the virtual reality, despite its relative impermanence, is very important as a part of “the process”. WHAT IS TRUE FOR THE VIRTUAL REALITY IS TRUE TOO FOR THE PHYSICAL REALITIES. The physical realities are the primary venue for the evolution of the virtual realities and as such are anything but insignificant despite their fleeting nature.

The various sentiences that exist within the virtual reality, and their physical level reflections, are, while impermanent, still not unimportant as they contribute to the growth of consciousness of the intrinsic reality.

There’s another aspect too, and I think that it is an important one.

That aspect is the linkage or inter-connection between the individual intelligent energy pattern which exists as integral to the intrinsic reality, and the apparently separate but not entirely disparate individual non-physical sentient being who is integral to the virtual reality. There is an element of intrinsicity about the duality formed by the linked consciousnesses.

As you know, I see “creation” as a continuous and on-going process rather than an event isolated in time.

You also know that I believe that the innate context of that process is a unified energy field. That unified energy field is the manifested multiverse.

You also know that I believe energy and consciousness to be consubstantial, but that the energy, in its initial and intrinsic reality, is not at first self-conscious.

You also know that I believe the infinite extension of that self-awareness is the goal or purpose of “creation”.

You know that I think that the medium for the evolutionary development of the intrinsic reality is the virtual reality, and that the venue for the evolutionary development of the virtual reality sentience is, at least at first, primarily the physical levels of the realities.

Lastly, you know that I think there is an inter-relationship or linkage, on an individual basis, between individual sentient physical creatures through the individual virtual reality entities of whom the physical beings are the reflection, with the individuated intelligent energy patterns that are their intrinsic reality.

It is that thesis that I want to develop fully now.

Why?

Well, because it is that relationship which I believe has the most immediate relationship to the question: Here we all are, so?

I think it is also clear that this particular aspect of the subject is the least abstract aspect of “the process”, and I feel that it is always easier to work one’s way from “least abstract” to “most abstract”, when considering topics and subjects that are not entirely rooted in the virtual reality of physical existence.

I don't think it's necessary to do any really deep investigation of the nature of the physical levels of virtual realities.

Here we all are and we are quite familiar with most aspects of our own level of reality.

In any case, there are hundreds of thousands of scientists and technicians all working away like ants and beavers to tell us more and more about the nature of the physical levels of the virtual realities.

There are also an equal number of philosophers, psychologists, anthropologists, and sociologists all busily engaged in telling us more, and more, and more, and more, and more, and more, and more, and more about the social nature of the human condition as it existed in the past and as it exists now.

But, while all that is extremely useful, it doesn't answer the most urgent questions we all have the existential ones.

So then, here I am. I am a individual physical sentient being who is the reflection of a nonphysical sentience which exists in the virtual reality I am, at least inwardly aware that physicality which is my primary reality is only a reflection of a non-physical reality which I call the virtual reality. That's a good start.

It's impossible to get anywhere existentially speaking, if you're totally up to your eyeballs in physicality and cannot see or admit the existence of any other reality.

O.K.

I know that my every day physical reality is only a relative thing, relative to the virtual reality, which is, itself, only relatively real when compared to the intrinsic realities. I also know that intrinsically, I am a force field, an individuated energy field. I know that I am a conscious, aware, thinking being. Thanks to science, I am sure that it is safe to assume that I can extend that to saying that I am a conscious, aware, thinking energy field. I am self-aware, I know of myself as a distinct individual. I am other-aware, I recognize that my environmental situation is distinct from myself. I am fully conscious that I have all these awarenesses. I am aware of my own mortality, and fully aware of the passage of time.

I am a creative person, an abstract artist. Out of my own mental processes I can bring into being things which never existed outside of my mind. This thing I have written too, of course!

Those are all things that I am absolutely certain that I know. They are not supposition. They are not assumptions.

But what do they mean?

I am an individuated, conscious, aware, thinking, feeling energy pattern. A force field with personality. What does that mean? What does it mean in the abstract intellectual sense, and what does it mean to me, the physical person?

Well, first it means that there's an awful lot more to "me" than meets the eye. I am a much more complicated object than I may seem. I exist in at least two realities which are relative to one another. I exist in two forms, the intelligent energy field (The Virtual Reality Being), and the intelligent physical creature (The Physical reality being). I believe that the "mind", or consciousness, which manifests in both of those forms, is a unitary thing.

This physical entity is only just beginning to actually clearly consciously experience that tripolar condition. I say that because the abstractions which I am discussing with you now, are more than just hypothetically real to me personally. If they weren't, I shouldn't have the effrontery to discuss them.

Without having a frog in our pocket, each of us is a "we", even though we may be totally unconscious of that fact. Most people surely are unconscious of that fact.

I'm under the impression though, that our most remote ancestors were not at all unconscious of the duality of their natures.

But, as I said earlier, more on that subject later on.

In any case, it's very clear that I know plenty about "me" as a physical being in the physical levels of the virtual realities. That's true of you too!

So then, the first effort should be directed at the individuated intelligent energy pattern. The thinking force-field. But which?

Do we concentrate on the individuated intelligent energy pattern in/on the levels of virtual realities, or do we concentrate on the one whose shadow it is, the one in/on the more basic levels of the intrinsic realities? How different are they? How disparate are they? If we can begin to really understand that, then all else about us becomes much easier to handle. To accomplish that, let's go back once again to "the beginning".

After the "big bang" ... what?

Well, we know that there was/is an enormous flux within a newly self-defining "space" of theretofore undifferentiated energy particles of some type, probably infinitely minuscule. The whole mass is expanding "outward" furiously from "nowhere", to nowhere else that we really know about.

Upon that seething maelstrom of energy, and for no reason that we can ever know, a kind of primitive order is imposed. I very strongly believe, but surely don't know, that the order is imposed from within the unified energy field itself. That "order" becomes less primitive and far more orderly as the process continues.

Eventually, in much the same way that cream clots, various "patterns" begin to form within the unified field. The field itself, slowly and probably very much insensibly, mutates from being a seething maelstrom of formless energies to something which more nearly resembles a tapestry of energy.

Within that tapestry there are figures or patterns that, while they are totally still entirely intrinsic to the unified field, they are nevertheless also totally distinct and individual within the aegis of that field. These "figures" range in size from the immense to the infinitely small. They are, all of them, integral to the unified field. They are, all of them, integral to the intrinsic reality. They are the secondary patterns.

These "secondary patterns", some of them, also contain patterns or figures within themselves that are integral to the virtual reality. They are the tertiary patterns. Etcetera and so forth.

All the many patterns of which we know, contain within themselves, within their individual pattern, other individual patterns. This is true whether we are discussing the unified field itself or an individual human being. A person, of course, is an individual energy pattern, but that person contains within

themselves various organs, like the heart and kidneys and brain, which both in the person, and when removed from that person, retain their identity. They too are individual energy patterns.

The Multiverse, the unified field of energy itself, is a pattern, the Galaxy which contains our Solar system, is a pattern within the pattern of the unified field. The Solar system which contains our planet is a pattern existing within that of the pattern of energy that is our Galaxy. Our planet, too, is an energy pattern, it exists within the over-all pattern of our Solar system. Each thing on the planet, living or otherwise, sentient or otherwise, is also an energy pattern. One which exists within the pattern of the planet.

Some of those patterns, while existing fully within the intrinsic reality, also manipulate energy in some unknowable way, and thereby manifest on the virtual reality as humans. Clearly too, others of those various energy patterns which are integral to intrinsic reality also manifest on the virtual reality as Blue Whales, Microbes, trees, other plants, rocks, and various insects.

Somatotype aside, the major difference in how a particular intrinsic energy pattern will manifest on the virtual reality, and, in fact, whether the energy pattern will do so, depends entirely on the intensity of the particular energy pattern.

Science tells us that the particles that coalesce to form the individualized force-fields which in turn individuate various physical forms, are carried on "particle carrier-waves". These waves take the shape of sine-curve patterns, and the length of the sine-curve dictates the "speed" with which the carrier-wave oscillates. This oscillation speed is what governs the intensity of the force-field in question. I believe that is that intensity which determines how the force-field will manifest itself, and where.

Each and every "object" which exists on/in both the level of virtual reality and its projection the physical realities, is the exact manifestation of the intensity of the force-field which is its intrinsic reality.

I am under the impression that the growth of awareness within the intrinsic reality patterns, is delineated by the intensity of the sine-curves which produce the particle carrier waves which individuate the force-field in question. I am also under the impression that this intensity is clearly reflected within the virtual reality. Obviously, the intensity is also reflected upon the physical levels which shadow the virtual reality.

So then, I (you too) am, incidental to being a physical being, both an inhabitant of the virtual reality as well as an integral part of the intrinsic reality.

Well now, if you can seriously take into consideration some of the things I've been saying, there are a lot of implications.

Let's explore them.

I think it's more than adequately clear that I believe strongly that there is a very intense degree of consubstantiality which exists between consciousness on the virtual reality and the energy pattern individualizing that consciousness from the intrinsic reality.

O.K. That's clear.

Now what isn't yet clear is what does this consubstantiality mean to the finite mortal manifestation on the physical levels of virtual reality? I am mortal and so are you. But, to what extent? Physically, of course, we are clearly mortal. Probably we are also completely mortal in those parts of the physical

consciousness which deal with some aspects of personal physical identity. But, it's also clear that the energy pattern, the individual intelligent force-field of the virtual realities, is, while only mortal by projection, certainly not measurably finite.

Is it possible that the physical personality, the creature which exists on, and in, and through, the virtual reality; the creature that exists as a "shadow" of that reality, has, at least, aspects of "immortality" intrinsic to its nature? I really think so.

Is it possible that a portion, at least, of what existed in and on the virtual reality evolves separately, on its own behalf, concomitantly with the intelligent energy pattern of the intrinsic reality? I think so.

Consciously so? While it is clear that this is not the case usually, if it is viewed as a potential, it is, I think, quite likely so. It is also, I feel, easy to see how this has nothing at all in common with so-called "reincarnation".

The way I see it is that each and every denizen of the virtual reality, in our case human beings, is born, lives a while, and dies. That's clearly true. But it's also quite simplistic. For this to be true, the physical realities would have to be the only reality. But the physical realities are not the only reality. Human Beings, and other sentient physical beings, while confined bodily to the physical levels of the multiple realities, are nonetheless primarily denizens of the virtual realities which are not physical.

For the idea that physical realities are the only realities to be true in a universe which is simply a unified field of energy and nothing else but energy, raw energy would have to come out of chaos, take a very temporary form, and then return to chaos. This may be possible, we surely can't know that it's not.

But if it is the case, then the whole cosmos is apparently devoid of meaning, which is a concept that I am both intellectually and emotionally unable to accept as in any way consonant with what we do know about this universe. Once again, I could be wrong but I don't think so.

In any case my hypothesis cannot be described as analgesic.

The energy "tapestry" which is the multiverse, exists as a context for the evolution of consciousness. The whole infinite unified field of energy/consciousness evolves. Each of the individuated energy patterns within that unified field also evolves.

Here we are, all of us, all living things all other things too!

Do all these things evolve? Yes, to a degree, but as species and types, not as individuals. Individuals of the pre-sentient and non-sentient classes within the physical levels of the virtual reality, evolve only in response to the evolution of their archetypes on the intrinsic reality.

Archetypes?

Yes, Archetypes! I think that, especially on the more primitive levels, archetype is a really valid term. It fairly accurately describes the condition I am describing. That is not nearly so true as primitivity recedes. The further it recedes the less true the premise.

I think some defining is necessary.

What "Archetype" means to me, is the intrinsic or elemental individuated intelligent energy pattern, of which any thing, living or not, sentient or not, on the levels of virtual realities is a manifestation, a

“shadow” if you will. Of course, it can also mean the ideal formation, the model upon which all less ideal forms are based. I think it really means both things at once.

When the individuated intelligent energy pattern formulates itself out of the basic energy of the intrinsic energy levels it is only potential. It is, if you will, a “space” waiting to be filled. It is inchoate consciousness participating in a process which will eventually achieve the full potential with which it began. It is formless inchoate awareness embarking on a voyage of self and other discovery which in time will result in a condition that can be defined as omniawareness.

The virtual realities and their physical reflections are one of the most important steps in this process. I believe that as the process continues the virtual realities themselves evolve as a context for experience. That is also true of all the things which exist within the virtual realities. The virtual realities which will be extant at the termination of the phase of the process to which they are relevant, clearly will bear little or no resemblance to the virtual realities extant at the commencement of that phase of the process.

In fact, I think that, in time, what we call the physical levels of realities will probably not exist at all, as they will no longer be relevant to the virtual reality of the intelligences functioning at the intrinsic levels. This eventuality is not at all catastrophic!

Obviously, a human being exists as an intrinsic part of the virtual reality. That is hardly arguable. But, what about the intelligence that ensouls or animates that human being? To which of the realities, intrinsic or virtual, is it integral? I think that intelligence, which I view as aware consciousness, is a thing which is basically integral to the intrinsic reality. Such intelligence as is possessed by the human on both the physical reality and the virtual reality is expressive or reflective of the nature of the intelligence evolving on the intrinsic levels of the realities.

One of the things I have come to believe, based upon experience and study, is that, as human intelligences are clearly an extreme variable, it is very likely that the intrinsic intelligences, or arche-types, of whom the individual human beings are the secondary shadow, must also be an extreme variable.

I believe that creation, on the intrinsic levels of reality, is an absolutely continuous process.

I also think that it is very likely that those “objects” which science calls “black holes” are the driving forces behind that creative process. They are the “husks” and “seeds” of cataclysmic energy events, past and future. Of course I can’t prove it to you, but I think it’s so.

In that case then, individuated intelligent energy patterns are continuously being created, and because of that continuity, it is therefore clear to me that their various evolutionary processes are occurring at what must be almost infinitely different levels of awareness~consciousness~attainment~achievement~evolution~understanding. That is why humans and other thinking things are so clearly operating on different and ever-changing levels of intellectual and abilital development.

I think that it is in their possession of potential talent and ability, that sentiences on the virtual realities best reflect the reality of their intrinsic individuated energy pattern or archetype.

On that basis then, I want to try to clearly establish the nature of the relationship between the archetype, which is the individuated intelligent energy pattern extant upon the levels of intrinsic reality, and the sentient being which is the intelligent individual energy pattern extant on the levels of virtual reality. That they are in fact integral to one-another, I have no doubts at all even though I cannot prove the connection other than logically.

One of the things that confronts us first is the comparative and very different duration of the two things. "All things pass", that's clearly true within the virtual realities. It's unarguable.

Now, the more Stephen Hawking and colleagues tell us about their researches into the "How" of the intrinsic realities, the clearer it becomes to me that, on an entirely different scale, viewed in light of what we're coming to know about "the process", in the intrinsic realities too, "all things pass". Not entirely by way of entropy either.

The difference is that we can accurately measure duration in the virtual realities, while we really have no idea of the potential duration of the intrinsic reality. We may assume that duration is meaningless upon the level of absolute reality, and that thereupon, "all things do not pass". But, having no idea at all as to what exactly "Absolute Reality" may be, who really knows?

It is my premise that sentient things are clearly mortal but that the source of their sentience is relatively immortal. How do I justify that statement? Obviously I cannot prove it to be true. But my premise is based upon something that does not need to be proven, and that is this: Sentient physical beings are intrinsically energy fields. Energy, once created is never lost from the universe.

If those statements are true, and I am sure that they are, then the energy which is the actual reality of each sentient thing is relatively permanent. Also, the energy is the source of the sentience.

Naturally that is true too, of all inanimate things. But I see a considerable difference. In inanimate things the energy field is not an individual intelligent energy pattern, it is just a basic but differentiated energy pattern. If what I have come to believe about our universe is true though, that "differentiated energy pattern" possesses the potential for consciousness and its present state of insentience is not to be viewed as permanent. But then, as the entire character of the universe is continuous evolutionary change, what does "permanent" actually mean?

It is my hypothesis that the individuated intelligent energy pattern (the archetype, peri-spirit, over-soul, soul, spirit), is an evolving awareness of extremely long (near-infinite) duration, which, in the course of its development, manifests consecutively and sequentially upon the levels of virtual reality.

In my model of reality then, each finite sentient being in the virtual levels of realities, is the physical manifestation of a relatively infinite but never-physical intelligence.

Every sentient being in the virtual levels of realities is the clear expression of the level of development of the intrinsic or elemental archetype which animates, expresses, ensouls, or manifests them. The entity on the levels of virtual realities is therefore "An Avatar" of its manifesting archetype.

Each physical being expresses clearly the nature of the entity on the levels of virtual reality of which it is the projection. It is, therefore, "An Avatar" of that spiritual entity. No two physical beings in the levels of relative physical realities are the same because no two entities in the levels of the virtual realities are the same* [*Same = identical = equal] because no two individuated intelligent elemental energy patterns in the intrinsic realities are the same.

This has nothing to do with any kind of judgmental comparative evaluation of the individuals involved on either set of realities. This also clearly does not mean that they cannot be very similar indeed. But "similar" is a very long way from being "the same". The intrinsic or elemental evolving intelligent energy pattern is of vast duration (infinite to us), its shadow, which is the evolving intelligent energy pattern extant upon the levels of virtual reality is of immeasurable duration, while the shadow of the

virtual reality, which is the sentient being on the physical levels of the virtual realities, is of distinctly measurable duration. That this is so is clearly true. That the connection which my model shows exists between them exists I have no doubts whatsoever. How this is accomplished, and what are the mechanisms for creating the connective linkage, are things about which I really have no opinion. But that the linkage exists I have absolutely no doubt at all.

In my model of the universe in which we exist then; the intrinsic or elemental evolving intelligent energy pattern implements its evolutionary development, which consists of the infinite extension and intensification of its awareness, by vicariously experiencing the consecutive sequential existences, through the virtual levels of realities, of individual sentiencies which are the direct expressions of its nature and evolutionary status upon the physical levels of the virtual realities.

The various sequential virtually real intelligences are inter-connected but not connected. They are inter-connected by way of being a part of the memory/experience data bank of the intrinsic or elemental consciousness energy being. They are not connected to one another in any way. A physical being on the level of physical realities within the levels of virtual realities, is born, lives a while and dies. It will not be “born again”. It had not been “born before”. It has continuity only as a pattern of experience and memories in the consciousnesses of both the intrinsic or elemental individual intelligent energy pattern that was its manifesting archetype, and that of the virtual reality consciousness of which it was the shadow.

This continues to be the way that things work for as long as the intelligence extant on the physical reality remains unconscious of the arch-archetypal consciousness, and the linkage between them retains its disparate character.

As time passes, and the process proceeds, this disparateness blurs. Eventually an awareness develops on the part of the physical sentiency that there is another dimension to its nature. It becomes aware of the greater reality which exists outside of, and beyond physical reality. When that occurs, the model, as it relates to the nature of physical intelligence entirely changes its basic nature.

I will return to the nature, and results, of that “change” later on. That is a very intriguing topic, because from then on things stop working the way they had always worked before, and begin to work in a completely different manner.

But first we are confronted with what has always been humanity’s greatest question. ... What is going to happen to “me” when I die?

THE ANSWER IS: NOTHING AT ALL HAPPENS, YOU DON’T DIE!

Did I just say that “You don’t die”? Yes, in fact I did!

“Death” is stasis, and in a universe composed of constantly changing energy fields there is absolutely no such thing as stasis! Constant change is constant change, and in one of those changes, each individual human being comes to that place at which the body is no longer of any conceivable use to them. It is also a point at which that particular vehicle is no longer of any “use” to the manifesting spiritual entity which it had also served, and so BOTH the individual human being~intelligence on the levels of virtual realities, and the evolving spiritual entity, the “Reincarnating Jiva”, simultaneously leave the body behind and that body, bereft of BOTH its animating forces, dissolves into the universal energy field.

At this point the two consciousnesses, which are not and never were, identical, go their separate ways. The excarnate Human Being isn't the "Reincarnating Jiva", and the "Jiva" isn't a human being at all. The connection between them ends at this point. The now excarnate human being is the sum of all the experiences that Jiva has had to date, plus the human beings own experiences, and so it goes on with its own evolution. THEY BOTH DO!

I admit that's a pretty outrageous and radical statement so let's go through the reasoning that brought me to it.

On the virtual reality, all living things are born, they live awhile, and then they die. That's really all we absolutely know about it. In my model of the unified field of consciousness, the essential life experiences and memories of that life are absorbed into the data-bank of the manifesting arch-type, and therein contribute to the infinitization of awareness that the process is "all about".

But, is that all there is?

Is "death" then, the end of all striving, of all hope, of all things?

The totally materialist model of reality answers that question with a resounding "Yes"! When the physical body dies, consciousness dies with it, and "that's all she wrote"! Obliteration, extinction, annihilation, is the result of life. It's a scenario that is clearly very possible, I won't argue with it, and I can't deny it.

But once again, I don't really think so. I cannot, in any honesty, say that I think or feel that it is at all true. I don't think that scenario is really valid. Though I do think that death, as a complete ending, is certainly far more likely than the religious paradigm of retribution and reward, "carrot and stick". In my model of reality though, there seems to be more to it than that.

What?

Well, I see it this way: "Energy, once created, is never lost from the universe" right? Well, we think so. I am not sure it's an entirely experimentally proven thing, but we believe strongly that it is so. It's relatively axiomatic, but, like all things we believe in, it could be totally wrong. I don't think it is, but it certainly could be.

O.K.

The case made in my cosmic model is that the never physical "intrinsic", or if you prefer, "elemental", individuated intelligent energy pattern, in some unknown fashion, manifests an expression of itself on the levels of virtual realities. That expression or manifestation is a virtually real sentient non-physical being, a "Perispirit" or "soul". That "virtually real being" also in some unknown fashion, manifests an image of itself on the physical levels of the virtual realities. That image is a physical sentient being. However, we know that: "Nothing exists but energy".

Is it not logical to assume then, that the sentient being which exists upon the levels of the virtual realities, is also, by virtue of that existence, an independent energy field on its own behalf, even though it is at the same time the expression of an intrinsic or elemental intelligent energy field which not simply never manifests physically, but which is absolutely incapable of doing so?

The finite, mortal, sentient being which exists on the physical levels of the relative realities, is essentially the projected image, or expression, or "shadow", of what is virtually the "true", or rather the essential

reality of the never-physical, relatively infinite, relatively immortal, individuated intelligent energy field which exists as a “thing-in-itself” as part of the nonphysical levels of the virtual realities; but which, “thing-in-itself” or not, is no more than the projected image, or expression, or “shadow”, of the infinite, truly immortal, intrinsic elemental individual intelligence which exists on the intrinsic levels of realities.

There is, I am coming to believe, far less difference/separation between the intelligence which exists on the non-physical levels of the virtual realities and that which exists on the physical levels of the virtual realities. There is a difference, that is clear to me, but I no longer think it's anywhere near as large a difference as that which exists between the virtual reality and the intrinsic or elemental reality.

Why does the intrinsic or elemental intelligence not manifest physically itself? Intensity of energy is the answer. What do I mean by that?

Well, I think we are all fairly comfortable with the idea that this universe in which we find ourselves is simply one gigantic, unimaginably immense, energy field. That's something science both proves to us and helps us to imagine.

Now within that unified field of energy, the essential energy itself, which consists of various energy particles carried on waves, or rather sine-curves of particle carrier-waves, has various characteristics which are based entirely on the speed of oscillation of the sine-curves of the particle carrier-wave in which/on which it is contained. The speed of that oscillation is the sole thing that determines the nature, character, dynamism, intensity, strength, and force of the energy in question.

On the intrinsic levels of reality which are absolutely non-physical, these differences of intensity of energy appear to be either harmless, or if not entirely harmless, to “sort themselves out” in ways that appear not to turn out at all disastrously. At least not in a relative sense. But, on the physical levels of virtual reality, on the so-called physical levels of realities, dichotomous intensities are things which are horribly destructive indeed.

If we regard the virtual reality as the field in which “matter” is suspended, then the energy intensities representative of the intrinsic realities are clearly possible to describe as “antimatter”. It is the constant inter-play of “matter” and “anti-matter”, the ceaseless flux and flow of differing energy levels, the constant play of construction and destruction, possibly by way of the medium of the “Black Holes”, that is the basis for the continuous act of creation that the multiverse represents in my model.

Obviously then, the intrinsic or elemental individual energy pattern that exists on the levels of intrinsic realities cannot manifest itself directly on the levels of virtual reality because it would damage or partially destroy those realities.

The individual physical sentient being that is, in its own way, the virtual reality of the elemental intelligence itself, is intrinsically only a force field containing within itself the energy particles which give it the appearance of “matter”. It is a force field which exists at levels of intensity of energy which are appropriate to the levels of virtual realities.

How does all this relate to my statement that death isn't a reality?

An individual, physical, sentient being is born, it lives a while, and then it dies. That is true. Every word of it is true and we all know that to be the case. It's not hypothesis, it's not opinion. But perhaps, our definitions of some of those words are entirely inaccurate. Individual sentient beings go to sleep, they dream, and they wake up. That's true too. But what does it mean?

Our definitions of reality are infinitely too constraining. They are also far too static. "Static" is, I think, one word that should never be used to describe reality. Reality is anything but static, it is a constant flux and flow of multiple realities within a multiplex universe. "Matter" isn't truly a solid. It is simply energy assuming the appearance and characteristics of a solid. "Matter" is not a "thing-in-itself", it is simply a function of energy.

I have obviously intentionally made a connection between "life" and "dreaming", between "sleep" and "death". That's true. But why have I done so?

In this model of reality, and I am sure it is a valid one, energy, of various intensities, is all that exists. I think it's quite safe to say "I know that to be true". In that paradigm then; "life" and "death", "awake" and "asleep", must only exist relative to the reality of only energy. In any case, as integral to the virtual realities, they are clearly less real than is energy itself, which is clearly the more intrinsic reality.

It follows then, that "life" and "dreaming", while they are hardly identical, they do clearly possess certain very strong elements of commonality. "Dreams" are very real to those who are experiencing them. "Life" is very real to those who are aware that it is finite.

How it seems to those who are not so aware, I have no idea. One must be completely self-aware to be mortal. Mortality is an intrinsic function of consciousness. What it is like to be aware, but to be not at all conscious of it, I have absolutely no idea at all.

So then, in my model of reality; an elemental intelligence, which is an individuated intelligent energy pattern that exists within the unified field of energy that is the cosmos, in the course of an intrinsic quest for perfect awareness, manifests, or expresses itself, sequentially and consecutively, on a level of reality inferior to its own, which I call "virtual reality".

The Intrinsic intelligence accomplishes this purpose through the medium of vicarious experience by way of some kind of consciousness linkage with the individual intelligent energy field "being" which is its projection, or "shadow", or virtual reality, on the non-physical levels of virtual realities which, in turn, is the source of linkage with the individual physical sentient being extant within the levels of physical realities. It is the physical sentient being which is the actual source of the necessary experiential data. Not forever of course, but for now.

The individuated intrinsic intelligence exists at its own level of energy intensity, and its virtually real projection, or "shadow", on the planes of virtual realities, exists at its own level of energy intensity.

The physical individual is born (goes to sleep), it lives awhile (dreams), and then it dies (wakes up). Yes, that's the connection I want to establish. I see an intimate connection between the nature of the two states.

I don't even pretend to comprehend how the elemental intelligence goes about manifesting its virtual reality or expression. But that it does so, I don't doubt at all. How it maintains it's consciousness link I also do not pretend to know. But that it does so, I don't doubt at all.

How it shares the experiences and growth, successes and failures of the virtual reality being I have absolutely no idea (some kind of telemetry?). But that it does so, I have no doubts whatsoever.

Whether there is ever any conscious linkage between the elemental intelligence and its virtual reality on the physical planes; except in one set of circumstances, I do not know.

The “circumstances” is one which I alluded to earlier. It is when consciousness develops, within the virtual reality being (and, by extension, within the consciousness of the physical being, it’s own “shadow”), of the existence of the intrinsic elemental intelligence of which it is only a part. As I promised earlier, I will discuss that instance later.

In my “reality paradigm” therefore, death would mean that the sentient physical being has “lived its life” (“dreamt its dream”) and “died” (“woke-up”). It would also mean that the intrinsic elemental intelligence has garnered the experiential and existential datum that it requires. But what about the sentient physical being?

Well, on its own level of energy intensity, because energy is all that is, it too is an energy field. After its physical “death”, it is only an energy field with no apparent physical component.

What happens to it then?

I think that, entirely dependent upon the level of intensity of its energy field, it remains an independent consciousness. The duration of that state also is entirely dependent upon the intensity of that individual’s energy field. By “independent consciousness”, I mean to say exactly what the words would seem to mean. I mean to say a self-aware, other-aware, consciousness, almost identical to the physical sentient being it was, but, minus the physical component.

A “ghost” is it? A “spirit” then? As you will!

Of course the largest percentage by far of so-called “Ghost Stories” are totally fiction, and usually badly crafted fiction at that, no matter what the spiritualists claim. On the other hand, as I read the empirical data, there are just enough otherwise inexplicable examples on record to make a not unacceptable case for some kind of conscious survival of physical death. This is one of those instances wherein our most remote ancestors probably had more actual knowledge than we. After all this is what animism-spiritism-Pan-theism, and the more sophisticated phenomenon, Shamanism is all about.

In any case, we’re talking about an excarnate intelligence rather than a discarnate one. How long does it maintain this state and what happens when it can no longer maintain its independent existence? This I believe I can answer even though as usual I can hardly “prove it”. An excarnate intelligence can maintain its disparate existence depending on two very important characteristics it demonstrated while incarnate.

The first of those characteristics is its own personal sense of self-hood, and whether or not that self-hood was entirely materialistically oriented or entirely abstractly directed, or some combination of the two. The second of those characteristics is its “charisma” or “force of personality”, which is entirely dependent upon the level of energy intensity which individuated the elemental intelligence which manifested that personality by way of its “shadow” projection on the levels of the non-physical virtual realities.

The first characteristic, I think, is entirely dependent on the nature of the second characteristic. If both of those components are very strong the individuality can be maintained for significant periods of time. Sometimes far longer than the entity had existed physically. When one or both components are weak or unsure, then the duration of continuity is less.

When the physical individual is very much abstract intellectually pre-occupied, the duration of continuity is greatly extended. When an individual lives life primarily “in the mind”, or oriented to study

and abstract thinking and abstract creativity, rather than life “in the body”, and by “in the body”, I mean to say a life consciously or unconsciously devoted only to physical needs and wants; then as appropriate to their life-style, their eventual fate is going to be either tied to that of the mind or that of the body. It is entirely dependent on orientation. There’s absolutely no moral or ethical judgment being made or implied by me here. It’s not a thing which has anything to do with value judgments. It’s entirely pragmatic. I’m perfectly willing, indeed glad, to make judgments about things based on ethics. I utterly refuse to view things from a “moral” standpoint, as I think that morals are an invalid concept.

If a conscious physical personality identifies only with it’s physicality, its body and with that body’s needs, wants, and desires what does it have when it no longer possesses such an organ? On the other hand though, if a conscious physical being basically identifies with its consciousness, with its intelligence, then when the physical body is lost to it it remains itself!

It is my belief that ordinarily, during this survival period the sense of self-hood gradually diminishes and at last the energy field dissolves and disperses back into the unified energy field. The energy field delineates the sense of self-hood which delineates the energy field, the delineation and the diminishment is mutual. The “details” of the basic disparate individuality of that excarnate remain in the data-bank of the intrinsic elemental intelligence.

And so, that’s what I think happens when you die.

It’s not analgesic, it’s not entirely negative, it’s not entirely positive. It’s not entirely hopeful. It’s not entirely hopeless. It just is!

I also very strongly think that it has an obvious corollary. “Life”, and “death” too, are precisely what you make of them. It’s all really a matter of ordering priorities!

Obviously, there are no coercive aspects to this “life/death” paradigm of mine. I think that it is not a reality paradigm that can be used in any way to control others for one’s own benefit, or even for theirs.

It’s very clear that this idea is not original with me. The organized religions of this planet, in their usual draconian, authoritarian, coercive manner, have tried to force their version of this idea on the human race for millennia. The problem with their version is that it is always a draconian morality/sin-based conception that they utilize in the course of their coercion. I don’t really see how they think this can be accomplished, no one can really be coerced into living life almost exclusively either “in the mind” or “in the body”. The reason I don’t think it possible, is that this kind of orientation has to be a natural process. All one gets as a result of coercion is a pretense of interest, and pretenses will not produce any results at all.

Now, I want to turn to that idea of mine I promised to return to earlier on. I wasn’t really avoiding the subject, but I did feel that it would be more appropriate at this point in my argument, a point at which I have already discussed my “life-death” paradigm.

PART 3: ENLIGHTENMENT - 1

What about the condition I have alluded to earlier, in which the physical individually sentient being becomes aware that it is far more than it seems? What happens when the physical shadow of the virtual reality being becomes aware of an added dimension to its intrinsic reality? What happens when the consciousness linkage between the elemental intelligence and its shadow reality on the virtual levels of realities becomes a reality to the individual physical sentient being? Does this condition ever come into being? Yes, of that I am sure.

How does it happen? Well, this is one time I think I have an answer to a “how” question. At least I do in terms of my reality paradigm. It happens that in this instance the answers to “how” and “why” are identical so I can handle it.

It happens as a direct result of the evolutionarily driven intensification of the energy field of the manifesting intrinsic or elemental intelligence. I think that this intensification of energy results in direct proportion to the expansion of the awarenesses and consciousness of the elemental intelligence. That “expansion” is the result of evolution.

As the elemental intelligence of the intrinsic reality evolves and grows, the intensity of its force field’s energy also evolves and increases. As it does so, there is a qualitative effect in the basic energy nature of the virtual reality manifestation of that elemental intelligence. It too experiences increases in the intensity of its energy field. It too changes in its basic nature and grows both in its awarenesses and in its consciousness of that awareness.

The end result of this process; and I firmly believe it to be a very long-term thing, by which I mean to say not simply more than one reflection on the virtual levels of the multiple realities naturally reflected by more than one physical life-span, but rather many centuries of time, is that the elemental or intrinsic intelligence and the virtual reality intelligence merge entirely, and their mutual shadow reality, the intelligence on the planes of physical realities merges with them. As a result of this three-way merger, they cease to be three disparate individualities.

In other words, where once there was an entirely subtle linkage of consciousness and awareness, there is now a virtual continuum of awareness. Tripolarity becomes monopolar.

I think that it can easily be said that when the final stages of this merging process are completed, there is no practicable difference in either quality or identity, between the elemental intelligence and its physical counterpart. In other words, the physical human being becomes the reality of what religions describe as “Avatar” or “Divine Incarnation”. But of course, as usual, Religion gets its emphasis wrong. Oh the individual is the exact duplicate of its manifesting intelligence alright, but were religion gets it wrong is in the “Divine” appellation. That kind of Authority Figure is not a real thing.

Religions tend to call this “ENLIGHTENMENT” and they make a great “to do” about it. But in my cosmic model it is simply a result of the evolutionary process. In my view this occurrence is just an inevitable part of the process. It’s not a particularly singular or “special” thing. I will go into what I think are its pragmatic repercussions on the levels of virtual realities later on.

When the intrinsic energies within the force-field individualizing the elemental intelligence reach a certain level of intensity, and in response to that intensity, the energy field delineating the virtual reality of that elemental intensity on~in the planes of virtual realities reaches a corresponding level of in-

tensities, then the two apparently disparate intelligences, which were theretofore bi-polar, merge completely, and become a singlefocus unity within the over-all field of the unified universal force-field. The physical sentiency which was a shadow or rather the projected “third pole” of the combination of intrinsic intelligence and virtual intelligence continues its shadow function only now it reflects the monopolarity of that which manifested it.

In my reality paradigm that’s all there is to it! No glory ... no status ... no deification! It’s just something that happens, because it’s supposed to happen, and it happens whenever it happens to happen.

Now, of course, the obvious question considering the tenor of our argument is: what does excorperation (“death”) imply in this particular set of circumstances. I ought to point out too, that perhaps the best term is “eventual excorperation”, for this evolution in consciousness does not occur in any particular relationship with physical dissolution. I believe that it occurs most frequently in situations in which the physical “shadow” of the now mono-polar consciousness is fully functional.

I think that where physical dissolution or excorperation is concerned, to the “enlightened individual”, there’s an immense difference from the experience as it effects ordinary human beings. The difference is, that to the integrated personality (the “enlightened”) there is no perceptible difference at all between “life” and “death”. In this situation, as the consciousnesses of the elemental intelligence and the shadow sentiency which is its virtual reality, are fully merged, the excarnate sentience becomes the spiritual entity of the virtual realities, of which it has always been a part, and therefore perceives no difference in its situation whatsoever. In those individuals who have not reached this stage of evolution this is not the case and the perceived differences are immense though surmountable.

Here I think I ought to point out too, that there is a infinitely broad spectrum of conditions that exist between “no conscious linkage at all” and “full conscious linkage”. I have absolutely no doubts whatsoever that the spectrum is one of only very gradual changes. I have absolutely no doubts at all that this “complete linkage” is never a sudden thing.

However, the relative realities are anything but a simple thing and so there’s another element which must be considered in this context.

What about the personal individualized force-field which is left on the physical levels of realities of this sentient excarnate entity as that sentient excarnate maintains its individuality on the plane of virtual realities?

Let’s take stock, as it were, of what has happened. Prior to the integration of the personalities, we were dealing with three independent, disparate, but connected force-fields. But afterwards we are not. The situation changes entirely.

Firstly, with “enlightenment”, or, as I prefer to designate it; personality integration, the consciousness~awarenesses of the intrinsic elemental evolving intelligence has entirely merged with those of the intelligence entity which was its manifestation on the levels of virtual realities. They are now one.

At this point the physical manifestation becomes an expression of that oneness. When that physical person quits the physical vehicle, its consciousness becomes an inseparable part of the oneness. But, what about the field of force which had maintained that physical vehicle in the temporary stasis that allowed it to be “physical”? “Energy once created, is never lost”, so then if it isn’t “lost” what happens to it? Does the merger of consciousnesses to the higher levels of reality mean that in my model of

reality we have suddenly mindless force-fields floating around on the lower levels of the realities? No, it doesn't.

Well, now you see what I was talking about earlier when I discussed survival based upon intensity of energy. That force-field in being maintains its individuality for as long as its intensity of energy permits it to do so. In the case of the energy relict of "the enlightened" it may, in fact do so permanently, becoming a elemental evolving intelligence of relatively basic status. In the course of this continuing evolution it too processes its growth of consciousness and awareness by way of serial manifestations on the lower levels of the realities.

What does all that mean in practical terms?

Well, what do I think it means in relation to my model of reality?

I am beginning to think that if my relativity paradigm is correct, then after the merger of consciousness, prior to its eventual excorporation, the force-field which had individuated the sentient physical being, now that its over shadower, the "virtual reality being" which is now completely unified with the primal overshadowing consciousness that is its intrinsic reality. As the direct result of that merger; that physical level "force-field" becomes simply a "step-down" or "transformer" of the intrinsic energies and commences to act simply as a source of additional intensification of the energies of the physical levels of the realities. By that I mean to say that the physical manifestation of an integrated personality acts as sort of an "extra-energy source" on the physical levels of the relative realities, and as such help to intensify the energy levels available to other evolving sentiences of all varieties, which obviously, aids those sentiences in their own developmental growth.

As far as "death" is concerned, in the case of merged consciousnesses or personality integration, where-in physical reality, virtual reality, and intrinsic reality merge, the loss of the physical component or "shadow" is almost completely meaningless and so, "death" is irrelevant. Shall we say it "loses its sting"?

Consciousness is energy. Energy we know, is all that exists. Energy, once created can never be "lost" to the universe in which it exists.

To an infinite consciousness "death" is irrelevant. Except perhaps as an additional piece of experience for the data-banks.

And that, I think, says all that can really be said in regard to the topic of dying.

It does occur to me though, that in any paradigm in which "death" does not mean instant and absolute extinction "death" then, itself, is an irrelevance. I think I have adequately "made the case" that this is such a paradigm.

But there is an additional aspect to this topic that I haven't really addressed. That is what does all this "enlightenment" folderol mean to the individual physical personality? You will remember that I said that I don't believe this consciousness merger takes place only at physical dissolution. How does the individual, finite, absolutely mortal Human personality "fit" into this paradigm of reality?

To answer that question will require an investigation as to the nature of the human condition as it relates to this model of reality.

What's a person?

What is a human being that we should be mindful of it?

In this model of reality a physical human being is the least real aspect of the reality of consciousness and energy. Are Mayflies like that really worth the effort to explain?

You bet they are!

I am a person, I am reasonably sure of that. Anyone likely to be sharing this effort of mine with me by reading these words is most likely to be both a person and a human too. I am strongly determined to find out what that condition means.

Back to the age-old quest ...

Who am I? What am I? Why am I?

Some of that I think I've already answered. But not enough, not nearly enough.

PART 4: THE HUMAN CONDITION

What exactly is a physical person now that we've established its low order of reality?

But wait you know as well as I do that as far as each individual human being is concerned that person's terribly real when push comes to shove, that person is very sure that it's the only real thing that matters!

I know that's true, and so that's why I am trying to answer that group of questions.

A physical human being is a personality which lives in a physical body it identifies as identical with itself.

THAT SELF-IDENTIFICATION IS ENTIRELY INACCURATE.

While it's clearly true that a physical human being is a personality which lives in a physical body, it is entirely incorrect to say that the personality and the body are identical. It certainly isn't correct in regard to this model of reality.

"A physical human being is a personality". That's certainly true enough. The question is, what does the personality mean in terms of the individuated intelligent force-field which is the higher or virtual reality of that physical human personality, just as the intrinsic reality is the higher reality of all things which exist on/in the levels of virtual reality?

There we have the greatest difficulty which we encounter in this quest for understanding. It's really terribly difficult to correlate the levels of reality. There's physical reality, virtual reality, intrinsic reality, and our permanent unknown, and, if truth is to be told, the permanently unknowable which is the thing called "The Absolute Reality". Which, in fact, may, or may not, exist, there's just no way to know. The fact of the matter is, that as far as we are able to know, the intrinsic reality, which does exist, may be identical with the "Absolute Reality", whose existence is postulated, but never the less problematical.

How do these things relate? Not simply to the paradigm of reality I'm developing, but also to those, like me, who are encapsulated within the physical aspect of that paradigm?

As one who is quite experienced at being a physical human being, I see no reason to explain what that means to others who are also experienced in the condition. But the personality which makes each human being unique, that is not nearly so easily explained.

It is my belief that the individual human personality is one of the most complicated phenomena in a universe which is anything but uncomplicated.

Why?

Perhaps it's because life itself is so complicated and the fully developed human personality is the end product of life itself.

An elemental intelligence, which is an individuated intelligent energy pattern extant upon the levels of intrinsic reality, casts a shadow of itself upon the levels of virtual realities. A shadow which is the clearest possible expression of the reality of the nature of the elemental intelligence and its energy field.

Somehow, and I have absolutely no idea of the mechanisms which are involved, this shadow, this intelligent force-field on the levels of virtual reality, develops a human or other sentient being which is concomitant to itself.

How we go from an energy field to a human baby or other sentient being, I have absolutely no idea. But here we all are so we obviously do!

Obviously the intelligent force-field which operates on the levels of virtual realities contains within itself some kind of information bank which is the interim end-product of all the information and experience in the “data-banks” of the intrinsic or elemental intelligence whose shadow it is. For it is surely the product of that past.

In addition, in this model of reality; the entire basic nature and character of the “virtual reality being” is a clear and accurate representation of the development of its elemental intelligence before it develops a physical human personality, so it’s hardly a “tabula rasa”.

As to the baby?

Well now, we all know where and how babies come from physically, that’s no mystery. But, viewed from the perspective of this paradigm, we have no idea how or when the intelligent force-field of the Virtual Reality is integrated with, or perhaps “into”, the baby of the Physical Reality.

It’s a question I simply cannot answer. Although the fact that everything is simply a state of energy and contained within a unified field of energy gives us some indication.

Now the baby, however, is a clean slate!

It is, isn’t it?

Somehow, that “clean slate” gets very full indeed before the end of that life! In the case of the baby I can answer what happens with no trouble at all.

But, considering this model of reality, is a baby such a “clean slate” after all?

Maybe not! No, most likely not!

If I’m right in the development of my reality paradigm, then while each baby is certainly a brand-new person, and its personality slate is certainly clean and new, that of which the baby is the expression is not a brand-new thing at all, it is an interim end-product of immeasurable evolution. According to this model of reality that is very clear.

This is an absolutely “bare-bones” simplification of the process.

The intrinsic reality casts its shadow on virtual reality, and virtual reality in its turn, casts a shadow, on physical reality.

In other words, “the shin bone is connected to the knee bone”!

In that case then the baby, for all its newness on the physical plane is nonetheless the end product of a process which has very little connection with the physical plane.

The “baby” is essentially a medium for the expression for an intelligent force-field extant on~in the virtual realities just as that virtual reality entity is a medium of expression for an elemental intelligence on the intrinsic levels of realities.

The baby is also essentially itself and, of course, is also the end product of its parent’s genetic patterns.

What a tremendous load for a little kid to carry. There’s the parent’s genetics, the parent’s personalities, their family histories, their ethnic and national and racial histories, and then too; there’s the inexplicable

connection with that mysterious data-bank that's integral to the elemental intelligence of the intrinsic levels of realities!

In essence then, each individual is the product of what can be called "Dual Genealogies" there is the physical or genetic genealogy and there is, and it's far more important, the spiritual genealogy which is all of the evolutionary growth of consciousness and awareness of the elemental evolving intelligence of which the infant is the newest manifestation on the levels of physical realities.

The fully developed Human personality (and it never stops developing, even at excorporation) is the end product of an individual's responses to all of those conflicting pressures, and to physical plane societal and peer-group pressures as well! Some clean slate!

Every baby is born the end product of some 15 or 20 billion years of cosmic evolution.

When it comes to human evolution there's no such thing as a clean slate! We are what we are, true, but we are also a lot of what we seemingly aren't!

That's what makes all this "finding out" such fun!

So now, we have our poor little baby, all buried under all that excess baggage that it's born with what is the effect of that load of baggage on the development of that baby as an individual, a distinct and singular personality?

Let's start with the simple effects of physical babyhood and work our way up into the more subtle effects of energy fields.

While it is totally impossible to know everything about anything, we certainly do know a very great deal about how babies are "made".

I cannot in any way explain the connection between the all-too-human process of "making babies" and the way in which those babies are also the shadows of entirely non-physical intelligent energy fields on two disparate levels of realities. So I won't try.

O.K. The baby is born. It's a really safe place to start because it happens all the time! Far too often, perhaps. No "perhaps" about it!

Leaving out, for now, all non-physical aspects, what does the new little person really have to start out with?

Well, first and foremost it is either healthy and whole, or it is impaired or disadvantaged in some way. You want to talk about rigid paradigms? Try being born with something like cerebral palsy if you want to know about restrictive parameters.

A whole life experience is clearly based upon just this one thing.

I want to make it extremely clear that, at least in my model of reality, people are born with birth defects caused either by circumstances or genetic heredity, simply because that's the way things worked out. There was either a genetic flaw or something went "wrong" during the gestation period!

The "flaw" was there, or "something went wrong" just because the "flaw" was there or "something went wrong"!

Folks are born disadvantaged in some way, in anyway because "that's the way the cookie crumbled"! So-called "lucky people" are lucky for the same reason "chance" worked in their favor.

No one is born into any particular set of circumstances for any particular reason. The idea that people are born into particular circumstances as either “punishment” or “reward” for “past actions”, or as a “lesson” based upon past action, is one of the most egregious bits of nonsense in Reincarnationist theory. Infants are born into families whose energy levels are compatible with their own. New Age reincarnationists claim that physically manifesting entities “choose” their birth circumstances to meet their developmental exigencies. I can neither affirm nor deny this but I will say that there are occasionally evidences that at least certain aspects of this idea may be valid. But only in the sense that “like is drawn to like” and the resemblance is limited to energy level.

The intrinsic capacity to deal with these circumstances hinges on the intensity of the elemental intelligent energy field of which they are the twice remote shadow.

Nobody is ever born disadvantaged or advantaged in any way because of some “plan” (“God’s” or otherwise). Certainly not in response to some “developmental lesson plan”.

Folks are born the way they’re born, because they’re born the way they’re born!

I believe that people make babies because it’s absolutely natural for them to do so. People do not procreate because of subtle non-physical motivations, they procreate because it’s fun to do so and they desire children. At some point in the gestation process, (probably later than sooner), a “virtual reality intelligence” meshes its energies with that developing fetus because the energies are complimentary to one another, and because the fetus is available. The “fetus is available”, I believe, due to a bipolar development process. The physical aspect of this process we all know very well. It has been photographed in the womb for all to see and marvel.

But, what about the energy field involved? After all the baby too, is an independent energy field. Well, there is, I believe, a class of extremely basic virtual reality energy beings that are popularly called (for lack of a better term) “Elementals”; though they have very little to do with what I have named the elemental intelligences of the intrinsic reality beyond being, as are all other living intelligences, a “shadow” of an intrinsic or elemental intelligence but an extremely basic one. This is so because the created universe or the unified field is a continuously on-going process with new energy ever being created. For that reason the gamut of new intelligent force fields runs from extremely primitive to extremely advanced and everything in between. Well the basic elemental intelligences people call Elementals are the projections of the most primitive of intelligence fields.

Other than the original and immortal evolving intrinsic intelligence entities, and the tertiary creations the finite mortal physical plane sentiences, there are only virtual reality entities. The greatest majority by far of intelligence exists on the planes of the virtual realities.

There are more intelligences on the planes of virtual realities than the other levels combined. The “Elementals”, those particular basic and primitive energy patterns to which I am referring, are ubiquitous on the lowest levels of the virtual realities and because of that, the physical levels of those realities literally “swarm” with them. They are malleable and utilizable by any intelligence stronger than theirs and that means literally any intelligence.

In any case, whatever you call them, they are the lowest level of intelligent evolution on the levels of the virtual realities and, as I see it, at some period of the developmental process shortly after the formation of the zygote, one of these “entities” infuses itself into the picture and creates the basic energy

field around which the “baby” will develop. It becomes an integral part of that individual and stays with him or her permanently because while the physical body does not and cannot evolve during the course of one human life-span, this elemental grows and evolves in the course of the life experience.

I am strongly inclined to agree that the “control” of these elementals is assumed by the intelligence extant on the Virtual Reality plane and inspired by it to become the force field around which the “baby” develops.

As usual, I can't prove that statement but I am as sure it's true as I am sure of anything in my life!

But there's lots more. A baby is the product of its parent's genetic patterns and we don't know nearly enough about how genes work yet. But we do know that there is an almost infinite number of variables that can effect a life experience just as powerfully as a non-genetic birth-defect (birth accident?).

Human beings start out carrying a large burden of problems and potential problems. They say into each life a little rain must fall, well, most folks are born in a hurricane! Not all, of course, but an awful lot of them. Most!

I've been doing “guidance” and “counseling” of folks with problems regarding coping with life, for many, many years now. I have certainly concluded that there is no such thing as an “ideal” or “problem-free” birth situation.

Time and time again, I am confronted with the simple fact that while very few people suffer from exactly the same problems, they all have problems.

Most of those problems, especially the psychological ones, I find, are the end-product of the “nuclear family”. I am not sure this is true of all who counsel, but I personally have come to believe that families probably cause more trouble than they prevent.

In the course of human history, there have been far more lives destroyed or totally disfigured by “nuclear families” than by nuclear bombs!

No wonder most babies seem to be born protesting their lot!

But, protest or not, here they are, so?

O.K.

I believe that in terms of this model of reality, I've established the fact that each new-born is born having been the object of certain formative pressures even before the actual birth. I would then have to describe some of these pressures as “intrinsic”, and some of them as “extrinsic”.

Intrinsic formative pre-natal pressures would, in terms of this paradigm, be those pressures which originate with the elemental intelligence in~on the intrinsic levels of realities itself.

These are the spiritual genealogy factors.

Secondary to these pressures would be the influences of the intelligent energy field which is the shadow of that intrinsic reality, the virtual reality being or the thing which ensouls the physical being. These too, are factors of one's spiritual genealogy. Both of these are the “Intrinsic Pressures”.

Lastly there are the many physical plane influences which are the direct result of the histories, the lives, and the life-styles of the physical parents. These are a combination of both the genetic genealogy and

environmental developmental elements. These too are “Intrinsic Pressures” though the genetic pressures are more intrinsic than the environmental ones.

A baby is born, and as an inevitable result develops a human personality. But not in a vacuum. The personality which that child will develop is the end product of that poor little kid’s reaction and interaction not simply to all the basic influences I’ve just quickly outlined, but, in addition, due to what the person becomes as a result of it’s reaction/inter-action with all those pressures, there are innumerable additional instances of reaction~inter-action with every single element of the external world with which or whom the person comes in contact. These are the “extrinsic” pressures.

A person is the end-product of their reaction to, and inter-action with, the level of energy of which they are the shadow, everything that their birth made them, everything that happens to them in their post-natal lives, and most important of all, their reaction to, and inter-action with every single human being they chance to encounter and many things which are nonhuman too. As I said, the human personality is anything but a simple thing!

I want to relate the physical human personality which I think can rightly be called the extrinsic intelligence (The Ego, or Personality-self), to the virtual intelligence (The Id, or Over-soul), and beyond that to the intrinsic or elemental intelligence (The Spirit, or Perispirit).

PART 5: TRIPOLARITY - 1

Oops, does tripolarity equate to a “trinity”? I know there are three elements I’ve just identified (The Intrinsic, The Virtual, and the Physical). It’s completely true, many of man’s religions also contain some kind of triplicity. But they don’t, while “Intrinsic”, “Virtual” and “Physical” may seem to be three or not, make a “trinity”! Because when all is said and done, they are intrinsically unitary just as is the field of energy (the unified field) in which they exist. The apparent “triplicity” I have identified is far more unified than the various religions permit their symbolic trinities to be. Then too these three elements are real, they are not symbolic.

We live in, and are, the unified field!

The intrinsic intelligence which is the individuated intelligent energy pattern integral to the intrinsic levels of realities, casts a “shadow”; that shadow is also an individuated intelligent energy pattern, but it exists within the parameters of the virtual realities, it too, “casts a shadow”, and that “shadow” is the individual human personality, the extrinsic intelligence.

INTRINSIC INTELLIGENCE → VIRTUAL INTELLIGENCE → PHYSICAL INTELLIGENCE

They are certainly inter-related. Each level, in “descending order”, by which I mean moving further and further away from the intrinsic reality, and thereby from absolute reality (whatever that is); is nonetheless, the clear and accurate expression of, manifestation of, symbol of, and is virtually the reality of the “level” or intelligence which is “above” them in that developmental order.

All things being otherwise equal, which they seldom are, a primitive person is the basic extrinsic expression of a primitive intrinsic intelligence, while someone like Stephen Hawking or Wolfgang Mozart is clearly the shadow image of an advanced intrinsic intelligence.

Now then, when I define someone as a “Primitive Person” I must not be understood to mean someone in a tribal or non-urban living situation. Many of those people are anything but “primitive” in the sense that I use the term. The Australian Aborigines, for instance, while socially totally non-urban are spiritually and philosophically anything but primitive. What I mean to say by primitive, are people, no matter what their living situation, who are unintelligent, crude, brutal, and potentially violent, all of these traits being manifested in an extremely puerile manner. There are probably more of these kind of “primitives” in urban jungles than in the forests of Amazonia.

It’s politically incorrect, it’s at least socially elitist, but within this model of intrinsic reality, it simply has to be the way it works. I am entirely pragmatic about the evolutionary paradigm and what it means. There is absolutely no way of avoiding the recognition of the simple and non-political fact that evolution, by definition, is clearly “elitist”. What other possible definition is there to be had of the phrase “survival of the fittest”? Of course that phrase defines physical evolution without any question.

But there is another definition of evolution and it applies not simply to physical evolution but to emotional, intellectual and spiritual evolution as well. Evolution is the inexorable process of gradual change and growth. Evolution proceeds from the simple to the complex and beyond complexity to abstraction. Primitive and simple are synonyms when applied to sentient beings.

In any case, in this model of reality there is not simply an abstract connection between the intrinsic and the extrinsic, between the abstract and the physical.

I think that one of the ways in which this model of reality demonstrates its integral orderliness, is in the ways that the differing levels of reality, the intrinsic, the virtual, and the extrinsic or physical; relate to one another, and evolve~devolve one into another.

The absolute reality, though we do not, and cannot know anything about it, must nevertheless, though we shall never understand it, exist in some form or another.

The absolute reality is the “thingness” out of which emanates all other realities, therefore it must exist. We know that intrinsic and virtual reality exist, there is no question about it. But, they are not absolute. Therefore there must be something which is or they couldn't be and they wouldn't be!

The absolute reality is. That's clear. We human beings, along with absolutely everything else that is, are part of the absolute reality, as it is part of us.

But, what those words, “absolute reality”, actually mean in any sense at all, we do not know, we cannot know, and, I think, we will probably never, ever, know, at least not from within the virtual realities. Do we need to know more about absolute reality? Do we need to know anything at all about absolute reality?

I do not think so.

We need to acknowledge its highly probable existence, and then sort of forget about it. The absolute reality is so far removed from our existences that it is almost entirely irrelevant to us. It is, because we are, because it is. It is hard, as a finite, mortal, fragile human being to relate comfortably to a reality of which we are an unlikely aspect. Being only virtually real is not the most copasetic position.

We get born, live a comparatively very short time, and then we die.

Not much to look forward to is there? At face value, it's all kind of meaningless, isn't it? What sense is there in it? At face value, there's no sense to it at all. Just like cattle in a feed lot. This is the position in which atheistic materialism places its adherents. Not a very happy situation is it?

Then there's its most common alternative religion. (Bunches of them, all of them “THE ONLY TRUE RELIGION”) I think they're all of them, far worse than even the most hopeless materialism. They don't really answer humanity's most basic existential questions. They don't really fulfill humanity's most basic emotional existential needs.

What do they do?

They pretend to knowledge they haven't got. They assume an importance they don't deserve. They use the “God Myth” and fear of death and “eternal retribution” to control people almost entirely for the religion's own benefit and that of some state, though they claim to use the control only for the well-being of those controlled. But they can't demonstrate that this control is in any way benign, they can only pretend that it is. INTIMIDATION IS NEVER BENIGN. THE USE OF POWER TO CONTROL AND INTIMIDATE OTHERS IS NEVER BENIGN.

RELIGION EXISTS BECAUSE HUMAN BEINGS ARE AFRAID OF DEATH.

But they die anyway, and for the most part, experience would clearly indicate that the greatest majority of humans die just as afraid as they would be if they had no “solace of religion”. Perhaps far more afraid, if one fully takes into consideration religion's horrifying post-mortem retributive threats.

There's no real historical proof that religion really does much good for anyone. It certainly has a lousy record when it comes to making people care about each other, and behave ethically and kindly toward one another. "Crusades" and "Jihads" are hardly demonstrative of "kindly behavior".

Fear is not a constructive motivating factor. Authoritarianism is not at all a constructive basis for human societies. External control very effectively stifles most of the capacity for internal control. Control, and only control, or rather malign control, is what religions are all about! I don't care for being controlled and I don't care for religions.

That's what started this whole search for answers I could live with.

That's what we all, of us, really need non-manipulative answers to our existential doubts that make life better and easier. Answers that make us equanimous to life's inevitable final curtain.

Perhaps absolute reality would be a more comfortable thing to contemplate if we just called it abstract reality and left it at that. But you know, perhaps there is one factor we could extend into our contemplation of abstract reality. That factor is consciousness.

If all that exists is energy, and we can sort of safely say that we know that to be true, and that energy and consciousness are consubstantial, and we can safely say that we assume that to be true, then perhaps that relationship extends itself into the abstract reality, and it too, is an energy field which has consciousness as its primary attribute. It does follow logically that this would be so.

In fact, if this model of reality is at all valid, that pretty well has to be the case. Because in this model of reality, the unified field of energy is an evolving consciousness of immeasurable extent, and that unified field of energy, as I see it, is apparently also the absolute reality.

I'll leave it at that.

The unified energy field which is our universe is the context of an absolutely innumerable number of things. All of those things are intrinsically simply energy fields. Some of those energy fields are utterly unaware of themselves or anything else. Some of those energy fields are aware, but insentient. Some of those energy fields are semi-sentient. Some of those energy fields are fully sentient. Some of those energy fields are probably more than sentient. Some of those energy fields are probably one hell of a lot more than simply sentient.

The unified energy field is sentience perfecting itself through the process of creating itself.

Does that sound crazy? It probably does but I don't think it is nearly as crazy as it may sound. Why? Well, to tell you "why" it's not a crazy as it seems, I have to go back to what is going to be my basic litany in this process.

Here we all are!

We are real to ourselves, and we are really the only judges of our reality. We are also aware that science has proven that the only reality is the reality of energy. So then, it's quite clearly safe to assume that our intrinsic reality is that of energy.

Now, having accepted those two complimentary ideas, we have to say that it is clear that reality is only a relative thing.

Each level of the multiple-realities is “real” sure enough, but it is only truly real relative to itself. It is only comparatively or relatively real when it is compared to other forms of energy.

In descending order of reality then, we have abstract reality, intrinsic reality, virtual reality, and extrinsic or physical reality. They are each of them completely real relative to themselves, but with the exception of the abstract reality, they are only relatively real when compared to one another. The abstract reality, as such, cannot be compared with anything else.

The best analogy would be to compare it with the simple process of putting light through a prism. It stays the same light, sure enough, but it gets separated into differing colors based on their wave length. It's never different from what it was, it simply manifests differently.

This is true too, in the process which differentiates physical reality from absolute reality. Absolute reality may be equated with the “clear light”, therefore extrinsic or physical reality would of necessity be compared with “Ultra-red”. Everything else, by which I mean both Intrinsic Reality and Virtual Reality is the spectrum “in between”.

Now then ... here we all are ... where do we fit in?

If energy is all that there is, and it is; and energy is consciousness, as I think it is; then consciousness or “mind” is all that really matters. In that case does “matter” matter?

It matters!

Well, within that set of parameters, we are physical beings. Which means that, on the physical paradigm we are absolutely real to ourselves and all those things which share our condition of physicality.

That's why, if you kick a stone hard enough, like Dr. Samuel Johnson did in his celebrated reply to Dr. (Bishop) Berkeley and the French epistemologists, you, like he, will break a toe!

But, we also know that we are actually far more intrinsically simply force-fields of individuated intelligent energy than we are physical beings.

How do we deal with that contradictory status in which we find ourselves?

Do we really have to “deal with it”?

I think we do. It may not seem a pragmatic necessity, but, all things considered, it is exactly that a pragmatic necessity.

Why?

I am absolutely certain that it is necessary to reconcile our two personal states of being, the physical individual personality and the individuated intelligent energy field, in order that we may more comfortably live out our lives.

Knowing, not thinking but knowing, that you are primarily a non-physical consciousness and only secondarily a physical object, really gives one a different outlook on life. It really gives you a different viewpoint of the various things with which you share your physicality.

Knowing, not thinking but knowing, that you exist in at least two realities at once, and that one of them is not as finite as the other, gives you a completely different attitude about all things.

Knowing, not thinking but knowing, that at least one portion of your various realities is not mortal gives you a different feeling than you had when you believed that all of you was mortal.

Now then, the “trick” here is attaining the “knowing” state. It’s very easy to think these things may be so. It is not nearly as simple to get past hypothesis and into surety. I can’t really help you with it. It’s an entirely personal thing. It’s also an entirely experiential thing. You’ll have to “get there”, that is, if you do, entirely on your own. I can give you a road map but you’ll have to take the trip yourselves.

Have you yet begun to think about the ramifications of all this?

Human beings are completely mortal, but not really! Human beings are flesh and subject to all the “ills that flesh is heir to”, but not really! Human beings are exactly what they seem to be, but not really!

See what I mean?

Sicknesses exist on the physical reality, people regularly get sick, but people are also energy fields ... so?

Here we all are but then again here we all aren’t, so?

What does it all really mean? What do you all think it means? What do I think it means? Well, I am more than tentative in thinking that one thing it “means” is that life is infinitely more interesting than we’ve all been led to believe! It’s also infinitely more complicated and therefore a lot more confusing!

That’s what makes all this “thinking things out” such fun!

We are all individual physical personalities.

All of those individuals are each of them, simply the independent “shadow” of an individuated intelligent force-field which exists independently on the virtual reality, which, in turn, is also the “shadow”, of an elemental intelligence which exists independently on the intrinsic levels of reality where it had originally coalesced out of chaos after a “big bang”.

A sort of “train of individualities” could we say?

The purpose of this “train of individualities” is the infinite expansion of conscious awareness, on the part of the “train of individualities” itself, and also on the part of each of its components, and also on behalf of the unified field of intelligent energy, the cosmos, of which each of those various individualities is a part. A valid, but simplistic, analogy might be to say that ... a brick wall is a brick structure composed entirely of individual bricks ... the unified field is a consciousness/energy structure composed entirely of individual consciousness/energy structures.

There are still some loose ends to tie up before going on to other thoughts.

I talked a bit about what religion calls enlightenment earlier and said I’d go into it a little deeper and I think this is the right time.

PART 6: ENLIGHTENMENT - 2

The conscious, sorrowful, and painful merger of the consciousness of the physical plane being, the extrinsic intelligence; first with that of the individuated intelligent energy pattern on/in the levels of virtual realities whose shadow it is, and then ultimately the merger of that expanded awareness with the consciousness of the intrinsic intelligence on the intrinsic levels of reality whose shadow or projection it really is, or rather was, is what some religions and some philosophies call “enlightenment”.

It is sorrowful because knowing that one is, and isn't, at the same time is sorrowful.

It is “painful” because the inescapable confrontation with one's own very low order of probability is painful.

It is painful to be totally aware that one is only a shadow of something very much more real.

It is painful because the increases in the intensity of the force field individuating the person are, themselves, the cause of actual physical pain.

It is painful because it involves the experience of a kind of “little death” before the “real thing” comes along!

In this model of reality, “enlightenment” is every bit as inevitable as physical death!

Enlightenment is the purpose, the goal, the reason, the meaning for the existence of the virtual realities and their shadow, the physical realities.

Enlightenment has to do with the expansion of consciousness and the expansion of scope of awareness. The reason that this physical universe exists is as an arena for the extension of conscious awareness to an infinite degree. The process through which this goal is attained is, on the physical plane, the process called “enlightenment”.

Enlightenment has absolutely nothing to do with anything at all resembling so-called “purity” and/or “sanctity” or “holiness”. Those things are all part of the fear and control paradigm of religion.

We are, what we are, what we are, and when “that” happens we know it! When the merger of consciousness occurs, the “tri-polar” physical being becomes clearly aware that it was multi-polar in nature before, but that it is so no longer. The intelligent being becomes completely both existentially and experientially aware of the greatly extended reality of which it is part, and it then goes on living within the parameters of that very much expanded/extended reality. Life becomes very much easier and far more purposeful. Fear of death no longer exists as a major motivating factor. Because, for all intents and purposes, the individual person has already “died”.

Being aware of the various realities, the sentience involved becomes able to utilize that knowledge, on its own behalf and that of others.

Being aware of the essential unity of all consciousness, the being involved can help to manifest that unity on the physical levels of reality, in the so-called “real world”.

The aware sentience, the unified awareness, the “enlightened being” is not “saintly”, it's not “holy”, it's not “better” or “superior”. If everyone's lucky, it's simply helpful! Or at least it tries!

The most important thing is that everyone, every single intelligent or sentient energy pattern on the levels of the virtual realities, will reach this stage in the course of their evolution. But not every physical

sentient being! Like “death” for the physical being, “enlightenment” is totally inevitable for the consciousness being!

You know what? That’s about all one can say in dealing with “the basics”.

By “the basics” I mean to say my discussion of the elemental “ologies”; things like Cosmology, Ontology, Epistemology, and Eschatology. I don’t discuss “Theology” because I do not believe one can study the nature of a “God” who isn’t!

Now let’s get down to more specific items.

Stuff like this really isn’t worth a “hill of beans” if it doesn’t make life easier and better for regular ordinary human beings and the other conscious things which share the world they live in with them. “Stuff like this” really represents a kind of “enlightenment”, a thing which confers what I call “enlightened awareness”. It’s not anything like what can only be called “spiritual enlightenment”, but it can easily be described as a kind of “intellectual enlightenment”. When a sentient being has been “intellectually enlightened” and that intellectual phenomenon has produced a concomitant “emotional enlightenment”, then it becomes very much easier for the process to continue towards its inevitable end.

That should be pretty obvious.

So then, given that my thoughts as expressed in this effort are valid, how does knowing about the abstract reality etcetera, etcetera, make life better and easier?

Does it?

I think so, at least I think it does so for me.

Fear is harmful to your health and well-being! Far worse than cigarettes and whiskey and wild, wild women/men(sex?!). Frightened folks, like frightened animals, are twice as dangerous!

Humanity’s religions scare people! Their main methodology is the development of the fear of death and the unknown, and the provision of supposed refuge!

Everyone dies, the only question is when and how. When you get right down to it, I think it’s kind of silly to fear something which is absolutely inevitable. But, having the idea that physical dissolution isn’t the end of all things is helpful. Having the idea that the physical side of you is the least important side, is very helpful. Having the idea that there’s neither punishment nor reward awaiting you on the other side of death is very helpful. Not going through life afraid that your every act, your every thought, is being spied upon by some puerile, querulous, petulant, judgmental, sadistic “thing”, is also helpful!

THE BEST WAY TO ALLAY FEAR IS KNOWLEDGE.

If one is forced to choose between hypothetical world-views, between hypothetical cosmic models, for hypotheticality is all that we are capable of having, it’s probably best to select one which allows you to comfortably be whatever it is that you are!

It’s because I couldn’t find one that did so, that I’m doing this.

Here we are, all of us, all living things, and all other things too!

We’re sort of “stuck” with one another.

What do we need to have, what do we need to do, what do we need to know, in order to create conditions so that being here together isn't too, too, awful?

What must sentience accomplish for it's condition to be bearable?

How can all things be provided a nurturing, nurtured, environment in which to live and grow?

Do sentient things have a meaningful effect on their environment?

I think so, and I think that sentient things possess the capacity to effect their environment in multiple ways. Some of them entirely physical, some of them entirely attitudinal, and the rest of them some combination of the two.

If the multiverse itself, which is the ultimate environment of all that is, is simply the "playing field of consciousness", and it is; then everything, on the face of it, is far more subtle than it seems to be. Everything, on the face of it, is far more complicated than it seems to be.

If the only reality is that of energy, and the reality of energy is that it is aware, then reality itself cannot be anything other than subtle.

But life on the physical plane, the life shared by all sentient physical beings apparently isn't all that subtle? Is it?

It is once one is aware of what it really is. When a sentient being becomes aware, even only tentatively and peripherally, of the infinitely greater reality which exists external to itself and of which it is nonetheless an integral part, life changes its meaning and value. This awareness is "enlightenment" too. It is very valuable.

How?

WELL, IT DOESN'T MEAN YOU CAN SHOOT LIGHTNING OUT YOUR ASS!

One thing it means is that egocentricity becomes absolutely irrelevant to the individual concerned. The "ego" is the physical level self-identification the "me"! At this point, the point of enlightenment, the "me" isn't!

The most desirable thing it "means" is the development of equanimity in the face of life's many exigencies!

If you don't think that's greatly beneficial, think about it for a good long while!

It also, and in direct proportion to how comfortable the individual is with this new identification, takes most of the stress out of day-to-day life. That too, is beneficial.

There is another very important benefit, when this identification of, and with, the greater reality, really takes place, there's a concomitant awakening of the recognition of the essential unity of all consciousness. And that is really beneficial on a wide scale.

A lot earlier I said that looking at "life" from this perspective would cause a basic, and very important, attitude change.

That is, of course, most true of those who have begun to identify themselves with the greater reality.

But in its own way, it's equally true of those who are only just beginning to make the effort to see this as simply a hypothesis worth considering seriously. That too causes a basic change in attitude.

A person cannot possibly be as egocentric as they were when they have at least admitted that a greater reality than themselves might just possibly exist.

Besides egocentricity, there's also a real change in response to all of life's exigencies. They tend to lose their fearsomeness.

Viewed from the perspective of this cosmic model, what is physical life?

Viewed from within the morass of physical existence, what is physical life?

Viewed from within the morass of physicality, physical life is all there is. Even to the religiously inclined.

Viewed from within the morass of physicality, physical life is a tremendously confining, circumscribed, limited life, a life so limited, in fact, that it can be described as an imprisonment.

Viewed from within the morass of physicality, what is there?

You're born, you live, you love, you hate, you strive, you win, you lose, you "break-even", you are happy, you are unhappy, you're bored, you suffer, you get old, you get sick, and you die. Then the religions give you the additional burden of spending the last years of life worrying about retribution and reward.

Sad isn't it?

The along come Albert Einstein and Steven Hawking and all the other scientific explainers and they make it perfectly clear that nothing exists but energy.

The question is how does one relate those two paradigms?

"Relate those two paradigms" that's what I'm trying to do. I think that I've "made a start".

Obviously, I am not as I "seem" to be! You are not as you "seem" to be! We are not as we "seem" to be! Life is not what it "seems" to be! Nothing is really what it "seems" to be!

There's this big maelstrom of energy of which we are an insignificant part, is that all?

As you know I don't think so.

Could I have developed this model of reality out of wishful thinking?

Sure I could have! But if I did, I am totally unaware of it.

Given that I'm not crazy, and while I hope I'm not, I'm not sure it matters, cause I'm not sure what it means; what does all this mean to you and me?

Do I think that this hypothesis is sufficiently valid to change my attitude toward life and the "real-world"?

YES I DO, AND I HAVE!

I think this hypothesis is a very much superior hypothesis than the one we've been operating under for these last many millennia. It is superior because it is infinitely less materialistic. All human religions currently extant on this planet are entirely materialistic in their point-of-view. Any religion or philosophy which is entirely concentrated on providing euphorics against the fear of death is, by definition, materialist.

The "real-world" itself, however, if the scientists are correct, and I believe they are, is not material at all. This paradigm recognizes that reality.

I think our most remote ancestors also recognized that reality.

I said I'd return to this subject when it was appropriate, and that time has come.

PART 7: ANTHROPOLOGY ONE

Our most remote ancestors were very primitive people. As a result their world-view and reality paradigms were also very primitive. But that doesn't mean that they were wrong! Or at least it doesn't mean that they were entirely wrong!

Whether we like it or not, we are an intrinsic part of our environment. But we modern humans are divorced from that environment, our ancestors existed in almost perfect intimacy with it.

As a result, while they didn't have Stephen Hawking and his colleagues to explain the nature of reality to them, they intuited very much the same thing, on a far more primitive level.

They had no idea at all that energy was the only real thing. But they did find out that what they called "spirit" was the only real thing. Sure they were primitive, sure they were ignorant, but "spirit" is not the worst word for intelligent energy! Is it?

They believed that everything had a "spirit" connected with it. Rocks, trees, springs of water, rivers, mountains, animals, birds, insects, people everything. Unfortunately they interpreted that "spirit" to be "divine" a power to be tempted or appeased.

That idea was wrong and it had extremely negative results. But if one views spirit as energy, they weren't altogether wrong, they just misunderstood. They were terribly primitive after all.

Their method of dealing with the reality of what they called "spirit" was a life-style cum religion which I call animism-spiritism/pan-theism/shamanism. It was socially and ethically no better than any other religion since!

IT WAS ALSO NO WORSE!

But, it did come somewhat closer to the reality of this universe than the much more sophisticated religions that followed it.

Apparently, these early peoples, being intimately connected with their environment, being, as they were, far more closely related to the natural world around them, being, as a result, far less distracted by "things" and conveniences; they were aware of the indistinct nature of the boundaries between realities.

Not knowing that "Ghosts" and "spirits" were impossible nonsense, they inter-related happily with excarnate and discarnate intelligences. In so doing, they were "right". By refusing even the possibility of such contact, modern man is "wrong".

That's what "Shamanism" is a bridging of the realities by way of consciousness. Or at least that's what it purports to be.

And that's what the representative Shamans of the extremely rare extant primitive peoples are today "spirit talkers" and "spiritual healers" they achieve astonishing results.

No matter what anthropologists like to imagine, there are almost no truly primitive peoples left on the planet to day. Some tribes are almost in their natural state. But, the first helicopter they see, the first transistor radio to which they listen, the first pair of pants they put on, the first shot of antibiotics they're given, and their true primitivity is hopelessly gone, never to be regained.

The important thing is that these early humans were apparently aware that there was a greater reality outside of their own. These early humans were aware there were consciousnesses other than their own. These early humans were aware that consciousness was not limited to humans. They took these awarenesses and, on the one hand, made their lives “fit” into their own parameters. On the other hand, they created some pretty ghastly and murderous religions based on their misunderstanding of the meanings of their apperceptions of reality.

They were them, and we are us! Thousands of years intervene. Time in which, thanks to our divorce from the environment we have developed science and philosophy and very advanced technology. “They” had technology too after all, a stone ax is technology. But we have gone from flint and stone to nuclear and quantum physics and space craft and computers. We are clearly the better off for it.

We are worse off only in that in being divorced from our environment, we are also separated from the life-force which that environment represents, and from all the other awarenesses within that life-force. It’s not exactly a “toss-up” because the greatest part of our lives are far more comfortable than theirs were, and a great deal longer too! But, at the end of life, they were far more equanimous than we!

Now what we’ve got to do is create a societal paradigm that recognizes the reality of only intelligent energy and seeks to accommodate our lives to it.

Can it be done? I think it can!

Can I do it? I’m trying!

The first thing we have to ask ourselves has nothing at all to do with greater realities or intelligent energy. The first thing we’ve got to ask ourselves is ... what do we want our lives to be like? What do we want our society to be?

Our personal reality on a day to day basis has almost nothing to do with the greater reality except in that it exists within and through the greater reality. The other aspect that is relevant is our attitude toward reality and toward life. And that is where this paradigm comes into play!

The big problem I see here is that the human race as a whole hasn’t got the vaguest idea what it really wants. It proves that to be true thousands if not millions of times per second!

I think that the human race can’t really want what it’s got!

I think that the good thing about my reality model is that it gives us a place to start, a place from which we can begin to find out what it is that we want!

The big problem, the most important problem, the major problem, is, that existing as we do, on and in two separate realities, we are, and have to be, at least a bit schizophrenic!

But it’s not craziness, it’s just that we do have two realities!

At least two!

What I find interesting is, that in one way or another, this idea has been current all throughout human history.

What makes that fact interesting is that Stephen Hawking and the quantum theorists and scientific cosmologists just came along very recently.

I believe that the basic knowledge from which we operate is the legacy of our very primitive remotest ancestors who, while they weren't "in to" abstract theories, did have what seems to be an experiential clear awareness that there was far more to life than what was visible to the human eye.

Over the years religions, seeking verisimilitude, have used that basic, age-old, handed down awareness to build theories of spirituality which also tended to support the conception of varied realities.

What's happened then is that all the scientists have done is put a factual "seal of approval" on certain ideas, and stripped those ideas of all their sectarian folderol ... and given us a simple truth (truth = fact) ... and that is; that all that is ... is ENERGY!

They have clearly proven that all that exists is energy, I suggest that energy and consciousness are, in some as yet unknowable manner, consubstantial. Does it not behoove us to find out what such an important change in our basic ideas about our universe actually means to us as individuals and as a society?

I think I've more than adequately made my point.

O.K.

Now the question is: What do we do with this?

Well, I certainly wouldn't say, "how interesting", and then promptly and completely forget about it! When I say "what do we do with it?" That's exactly what I mean!

How do we take this idea, and the scientific facts upon which it is based, and make them relevant to us on a personal level?

How do we do the same thing on a societal level?

Should we?

You can bet your life on it! And your life is exactly what you are betting on! But in a fashion you never thought about before.

Our human society isn't perfect. And that is the most colossal understatement of all times! Could it be perfect? Yes, it could.

It could be as perfect as the people that make it up, and not one drop more perfect! Could it be better than it is? Oh yes, yes indeed!

I don't think there's a soul on this planet that isn't absolutely certain of that.

But what does the nature and quality of human society have to do with acknowledging the seemingly abstract conception of the reality of only energy and through that, acknowledging the possible tri-polarity of consciousness?

Nothing and everything!

I have absolutely no way of knowing, and so I have no idea at all of the ways in which other sentient beings spend their time. But I do know that most humans spend very little time seriously thinking about all this stuff.

On the other hand though, the lives that each and everyone of us live are, whether we are aware of it or not, based upon what we think we are, and what we think reality is.

The society/societies in which we live are based upon a consensus of our corporate view of reality. The societies always lag far behind the consensus.

We have two environments with which we must be concerned. There is the natural environment, and there is the human or societal environment.

The natural environment we took as we found it. The human environment is exactly what humans have made it. At this point in time, humanity is completely responsible for and to, both environments.

There are presently four, going-on five, billion humans co-inhabiting (cohabiting) this planet. The planetary society that is the representation of the ideas, feelings, needs, and desires of that great mass of people is of necessity, cumbersome, unwieldy, unresponsive, and dreadfully disorderly. How could it be anything else?

Because of the nature of the thing itself, planetary society, and the individual disparate societies that contribute to its make-up, never accurately mirror the peoples who live in it/them. Human Society always lags far behind changes in social and philosophical attitude and scientific advances.

Our society is in the throes of experiencing it's own equivalent of a "big bang", a "cataclysmic attitudinal event" as it were! People have discovered/are discovering that our planetary society, our individual societies, our philosophies, our religions, and almost all of the other institutions upon which we depend, are no longer at all representative of them.

To this, society has at last reacted it has become enormously disorderly. Far more disorderly than is usual, disorderly and almost completely without direction. Chaotic is probably the best description. So?

There are no "quick fixes"! Especially in this situation. It's going to take a very long time for society to "settle down". It can't do anything until its components which are human beings make up their minds about the new direction in which they want to go. Until humans make up their minds about what they want, where they are, who they are, what they are, and most important of all, what they want to "do" about it.

It's pretty obvious that a new reality paradigm and its resulting world-view will be a pretty important ingredient in gaining world stability. Not order stability!

The word "order" makes me nervous! It just reeks of "orderer" and "orderee"! It really stinks badly of someone setting everyone else to "rights"! It stinks of imposition and authority! I'd far prefer the chaos we're experiencing, to any kind of imposed order.

No one has the right to impose anything on anybody! We don't need a "new order"! We need a new understanding of ourselves and our needs.

People like Stephen Hawking, Albert Einstein, and Werner Heisenberg; things like "Black Holes", the Red Shift, the uncertainty principle, quantum theory, and infra-red and radio telescoping are in the process of effecting the human race with a new cosmological view. A view, moreover, that to a great degree is entirely contradictory to everything we've ever thought about ourselves and our world.

It's not entirely original however. I don't have the vaguest idea how, or why, but all that quantum theory is saying about our universe echoes, in a far less poetic mode, the Vedas. It shocks the scientists as much as it does me.

What do we do now?

I think that we really need to start from scratch. Socially and philosophically. Religion though, should not be replaced or renewed, it needs to be completely left by the wayside jettisoned placed carefully on the dust heap of history. Humanity doesn't need religion anymore. IT DID ONCE, IT DOESN'T NOW! The word "God", and the concept of fear of death and of absolute subservience and obedience to authority that the word embodies, must be banished from the hearts, minds and lexicons of the human race! Humanity invented "God" and religion because it needed an anchor in a sea of ignorance. It needed a trail blazer in an unknowable universe. It needed reassurance against primal fears. IT DID ONCE, IT DOESN'T NOW.

The human race no longer needs be adrift on a sea of ignorance. It has blazed its own trails into a no longer unknowable universe. It no longer need fall prey to atavistic primal fears.

THE HUMAN RACE NEEDS TO REALIZE THAT IT HAS GROWN UP.

I don't think it's at all an exaggeration to say that planet-wide the human race is in a far worse mess than usual. But I do think that the worse the mess gets the more hopeful a sign it is. The mess is a sign that our individual societies, on a planet-wide scale, are beginning to overcome their integral inertia and are actually beginning to react to the confusion and uncertainty that has long been a part of individual life.

Looking at our world, it is pretty obvious that the main problem we all of us face, is clearly a problem of our own making. We live in a world that is based entirely on subservience to authority of various kinds. We live in such a world because that's what our ancestors wanted. I think it's safe to assume that most of us don't want that anymore!

Our societies have, for the longest time, been based upon religion as the keystone of their structures. Our religions are based entirely on a fear paradigm. They are utterly authoritarian. Their structures are based entirely upon obedience, and that obedience is enforced entirely by fear. Our other societal structures are built upon that foundation and have identical natures.

The main ingredient of all that fear and all that authoritarianism is an absolute misperception of the nature of life and death, a total misperception of the nature of reality, and, as a result, a complete misunderstanding of the nature of the human condition.

People no longer will accept such parameters and, as a result, our societies are in turmoil. Good! Yes, I said good! The more turmoil, the sooner people will begin demanding and getting the changes we all need.

How does all this relate to my cosmic paradigm, my model of reality?

Clearly the most important thing humans need is not to be afraid any more! Frightened people are far too easy to manipulate! A person who is frightened is a slave of their fears! A person who is the slave of their own fears inevitably becomes the slave of other things! A person who, as a result of their own fears, has become the slave of other things, always ends up at someone else's mercy! The most destructive of all addictions is the addiction to fear!

NO ONE CAN EVER BE TOO FREE!!!

PART 8: HUMAN LIBERATION

The moment we become fully aware of the amount, quality, and meaning, of the new scientific evidence that people like Stephen Hawking are giving us as to how all things came to be, and what all things are, will eventually prove to be the greatest of all the different liberating moments humanity has ever known.

I think that the world-view which each of us, as an individual human being, can attain for themselves through the medium of thinking about these discoveries, and comparing them with all that we thought we already knew and understood, is a tremendously positive step forward for each of us.

I think too, that the new understanding of the nature of the human condition that proceeds to develop itself within ourselves from the new model of reality that grows automatically from our comprehensive exposure to this new scientific expansion, is enormously productive of the growth of our understanding of, and awareness of, the universe in which we live.

Knowledge and comprehension are, of all possible things, the most liberating!

That is how it happened with me.

But it's a quiet liberation. No glory, no parades, no bloodshed, no bull-shit!

Do I think humankind really needs liberating?

That, at least, should be obvious, of course I do!

Do I think most people would like to be "liberated"?

After years and years of working with troubled people, I don't think that most people need liberating, I know that they do! But whether they would like it or not, is another question altogether.

There are far too many people who view responsibility as an imposition. There are far too many people who view the attainment of adult status as a very oppressive thing.

There are an awful lot of people who don't want to be responsible for their own decisions. There are a lot of people who don't want to have to bother making any decisions.

There are far too many people who think so little of themselves, that real freedom frightens them. Low self-esteem guarantees that true freedom will be daunting.

There are a lot of people who think they like being subservient. There are some folks who actually do like it.

Even within the new paradigm, because self-esteem has nothing to do with quantum theory and with cosmic paradigms, I have to admit that this kind of person will find someone, or something, to which they can be subservient.

But the rest of us will be free!

NO ONE CAN EVER BE TOO FREE!

How will this world-view/cosmic paradigm be liberating?

Well, it seems to me that finally being completely freed from the overwhelming and completely debilitating discipline, terror, thought-control, "in-loco-parentis", patriarchal-matriarchal, master-servant,

authority-based anti-human social paradigm that has been the ruling philosophy on this planet for the last few thousand years is liberating.

I think that having our view of reality based upon science, and higher mathematics, and logic, rather than on myths, and legends, and fear, is liberating.

I think getting “god” out from under our beds will be very liberating!

It is certainly infinitely preferable to the tyranny of religion, and the lunatic despotism of theocracies. It is clearly to be preferred to the strong authoritarianism of secular governments. It is surely to be preferred to those governments which are not simply temporal, but are officially atheistic governments, but whose political roots nevertheless lie in religious values, and whose social parameters are delineated from within value systems based entirely upon the myths, legends, and fears of religion.

It is entirely clear that altogether too much of our social paradigm is entirely reactive either to the fear of death, and to the fear of “what comes after that”, and, of equal importance, to the fear of human sexuality.

Our laws are “sin” based, which means that they are based upon theoretically established “morality”, far more than they are upon valid human ethics, or upon pragmatic responses to social realities.

It is absolutely clear to me that by far the greatest source of trouble in human society is caused by the fear of death, and also because of the revulsion toward death taught by our religions.

Death, after all, is one of the few things that completely frees people from the tyranny of religion.

Because death is absolutely inevitable, because it is the only really “sure thing”, the mindless terror of death is irrational, no matter what parameters you accept.

Humans fear death almost as much as they are fascinated by it, but not quite.

Because humans fear death so very much they make use of it as the control-factor in their social paradigms. Because humans fear death so much they kill each other with chilling regularity. Because human beings fear death so much they find ever more terrible ways of killing one another.

Human society, for the most part, is not life affirming, rather it is death avoiding. Usually at almost any cost. This is proven by the phobic attitude of our religion-based societies to any discussion of euthanasia. This is proven by the phobic attitude of our religion-based societies to abortion. This is proven by the infinitude of euphemisms humans have invented to avoid saying the words death, dead, dying! “Slumber Rooms” indeed!

The fear most people have of death is easy to comprehend and therefore very easy to forgive. People are always afraid of change, even minor change, the more complete the change, the more afraid people are. Given our present reality model, it is not surprising that people view “death” as the most drastic of all changes.

People also fear the unknown, and far more so the unknowable, and in our present reality model death is a human being’s greatest unknown.

A person who does not acknowledge death, can hardly acknowledge life. For death is an intrinsic part of life. A person who does not accept death, can hardly accept life, for life’s gift to us, is death! Death completes life.

OUR SOCIETY HAS CHOSEN TO DENY LIFE RATHER THAN ACCEPT DEATH.

The basically irrational life denying aspect of our contemporary human societies is also proven by the entirely phobic attitude of our religion-based societies to free human sexuality, which should be absolutely the opposite of death, but is seen as worse than death by our religions and those inspired by them.

Why sex and mortality are equated by our present reality models is a complete mystery to me.

Sexuality, no matter what form it takes; and by that I very definitely mean to say all those things other than simply pro-creative sex, as long as the sexual activity isn't imposed upon one party by another, as long as it is entirely consensual; is entirely life-affirming.

Sex is fun! People need to have fun! Sex makes people happy! People need to be happy! Sex makes people feel good! People need to feel good! Sex is enjoyable! People really require enjoyment! Sex, the thing itself, is absolutely not harmful! It is the peripheral nonsense that society has applied to the sexual act that is harmful!

It is the absolutely unnecessary guilt's and prohibitions imposed by human society on the sex act that are harmful.

Regarding sexual expression as "dirty" is the act of a truly sick society! Declaring sexual expression to be "dirty" is the act of a truly sick society and its only effect is to produce an even sicker society!

Human religions, however, tend to regard sexual liberation with the same kind of fear and loathing with which they regard death. Could it be that sexuality frees people from the tyranny of religion too?

Human religions however, tend to regard sexual liberation with the same kind of fear and loathing with which they regard their own dis-empowerment.

Perhaps because the two things are, in fact, intimately connected in a cause and effect relationship.

Why this irrational, in fact insane attitude exists, I really have no idea at all other than that most religions are subject to the whims of either celibates or those who are, at best, mindlessly squeamish and/or entirely abstemious. Other than that, it's completely crazy!

Celibacy, not masturbation, makes folks crazy!

I mean to say that it's very clear that it cannot be because "God" ordered humans to be anti-sexual there isn't any "God", so it can't have "forbidden" sexual expression.

There's really no valid ethical reason to be sexiphobic, and only one pragmatic reason, and so I am forced to conclude that, as usual, it's a matter of the continuous need of the Priestly classes to be controlling the people. Control the sex-life of people, and you're really controlling every aspect of their entire life.

Sex, as I see it, has only one possible negative after-effect. That after effect is not sickness, nor anything remotely like physical damage. That after-effect is guilt and that is the result of society's religion based entirely negative attitude towards sex.

Sexually contracted illnesses are NOT an "after-effect of sexual expression". They are simply illnesses, like any other. It is only the kind of illness that is contracted sexually that society regards as negative. That is because the sexuality itself, is seen as an entirely negative thing!

Sexually contracted illness is not the effect of sexual activity, it is the effect of stupidity and carelessness. Were we to execute everyone who is ever stupid or careless, the planet would be bare of human life!

Secular human society is based completely upon a paradigm that is entirely materialistic even though it masquerades as religion. All contemporary religions are entirely focused on material values, physical values. Anyone who doesn't realize that the phrase "Believe on me and ye shall have eternal life" is totally physically oriented, just hasn't been paying attention.

These religions are a methodology for the assumption and the usurpation of political control. They are a focus for the acquisition of power.

Reality, on the other hand, isn't material at all, it is only apparently material.

The world upon which we presently place such tragically desperate emphasis is a place which, while it is entirely real to us, it is nevertheless only a projection of virtual reality.

What I'm trying to do at this point is invent, or discover, a reality based paradigm for human society. My model of reality as it concerns cosmic reality is valid.

Now, based upon that paradigm, I'm trying to create a set of parameters which are at once more comfortable, and more healthy, and truly life-affirming, to use as boundaries for our lives rather than those confining parameters within which we now suffer.

I didn't really start out with this end in mind, but it seems logical. But then, I didn't really "start out" with any of this "in mind"! Like Topsy it just sort of grew!

What are our basics?

PART 9: THE HUMAN CONDITION - 2

The Universe exists. That we know. It exists in the form of energy. That too, we know. There is nothing at all which exists which has as its basic or intrinsic reality, anything other than energy. That too, we know.

We exist. That we know. We are Conscious. That too, we know. We are intrinsically energy fields. That too, we can now say we know, thanks to science. We are, therefore, conscious energy fields. That we know.

We are part of the unified energy field. We are intrinsically part of the energy tapestry that is our visible/invisible multiverse. That's obvious.

Not physically, or personally, but as a continuum of a conscious energy stream, we are, in a way, immortal. And in those certain cases which I talked about earlier, (the "Enlightened") actually so. No matter what sort of life we lead, led, or aspired to, and no matter what sort of "sins" we committed.

Think about it all human beings are, far more so than they are physical creatures, individual intelligent energy patterns on the levels of virtual realities.

They are also the secondary shadow projections of individual intelligent energy patterns or intrinsic intelligences which are permanently extant on the levels of the intrinsic realities.

For many millennia, all human beings have misled themselves through ignorance, and at the same time, they have been both ignorantly and purposefully misled by others, as to their actual state-of-being.

The human condition is a thing that is entirely different than we have thought it to be for all that time.

Our most remote ancestors knew better, experientially, by way of their Shamans, and also by way of their own individual paranormal abilities. Paranormal or extra-sensory abilities are a thing which I believe to be latent in all humans and totally dormant in most of them. These are abilities which relate entirely to the tri-polar reality of each human.

Our most remote ancestors had valid experiential awareness of the greater realities, but, being as primitive as they were, their language as unfinished as it was, they were unable to pass that experience along in a clear way, to their descendants. Their descendants were people who had been almost completely sundered from their formerly intimate relationships with nature by ever increasing sophistication, urbanity, and technology/science.

The "sundering" of people from reality, was also accomplished very carefully and with much forethought by the developing theocratic bureaucracies, including the Shamans themselves. There's always been a lot of profit involved in being a "middle-man".

The priestly classes were the first "bottom-liners"! As Voltaire said: "The first priest came into being when the first rogue met the first fool!" ...

Considering the nature of our remotest ancestors relationship with what they correctly believed was the "spirit world", and the activities which grew out of those beliefs, perhaps this loss wasn't as bad a thing as it sometimes seems.

Our ancient cousins were pretty ferocious and extremely ignorant, and their relationships with the world of spirit mirrored both that ferocity and that ignorance. Primitive humanity was ferocious, bru-

tal, greedy, in a word, they were what we tend to call very animalistic. And that definitely insults the animals.

However, now is now, and then was then! Let's talk about now!

Here we all are up to our eyeballs in physical reality! Not virtual reality, that's still largely hypothetical, but physical reality which isn't hypothetical at all! Or at least it doesn't seem to be!

Even though we know intellectually that it isn't as real as energy is, it's still very real to us because we're just as unreal/real as it is!

We have headaches, toothaches, back pains, and pains-in-the-ass. We have friends and family members who die from AIDS, Cancer, Alzheimer's disease, accident, war, and just plain old age! That's not really so terrible for them, once it's accomplished.

But for us ah yes for us! "There's the rub!" Their deaths really hurt us!

These individuals were important ingredients in our lives, and so those lives will sometimes be the poorer for losing them.

But most of all, because they were close to us, their death makes each of us clearly realize that our death too, is just over the horizon. And that, because of our society's insane view of death and dying, scares the shit out of us!

We are sometimes happy, sometimes miserable, sometimes angry, sometimes glad, etcetera, and so forth! We certainly do experience "all the ills that flesh is heir to"!

How the hell do we relate our experience to the state-of-being which is indicated by the intellectual acknowledgment that only energy is truly "real"?

It's really something we've got to do because our present social and religious paradigms are literally destroying us!

Physically "killing", according to this new paradigm is, though momentarily unpleasant, no really big deal but what our social and religious paradigms are doing is destroying us intellectually, we all know far too many functionally illiterate and sub-literate college graduates! Because of the effect our contemporary social paradigm has on our educational systems, our population is best described as culturally and intellectually disadvantaged!

Still worse in my mind, our contemporary social paradigms are destroying us emotionally, and aside from that, and very much the worst of all, they are stifling and totally inhibiting our creative abilities and that is a big problem!

They are also physically killing us in greater and greater numbers as their efficiency improves due to technology.

It's far from easy to begin to live your life entirely within the parameters of this new worldview. I know, I have trouble remembering to do so myself, and I made the model! But then nobody ever said everything had to be easy!

After all, we've all got some fifty thousand years of strong conditioning to overcome! And that's supposing I'm right about the awareness levels of our remotest ancestors.

For all that time, and that represents the entire scope of our written history, religions, and governments, and philosophers, have worked assiduously to encapsulate us within the world-view which they represent. That's not going to be easy to over-come!

Where does one start?

Each one of us has to do this almost entirely on their own behalf! As I did. If one doesn't "do it on their own", by which I mean to say that they must go through the entire thinking-out process; it's all pretty meaningless.

This model of mine is meaningful to me because I did the work. While what I say may be plausible to you, while what I say may, in fact, be very meaningful to you, it won't be as strongly meaningful as I think it should be, if you too, don't do the work! You can't just read this book either for entertainment or intellectual curiosity and leave it at that. What I hope you will do is really make this model your own by carefully thinking it all out as I did using this model as a "road map". Then it will become as much your model as it is mine and it will be meaningful to you.

I hope that this evolving paradigm will rid us of Priests, Mullahs, Rabbis, "Ministers", Bonzes, etcetera. In other words, get rid of all the "middle-men".

I'm not saying that they're "bad people"; oh, some few of them clearly are very "bad people" indeed; but I'm sure most of them probably aren't either "bad" themselves, or of malign intention. Despite the teachings of religion, there's no such thing as "evil", so the "professionally religious" can't be evil.

The priestly classes are thoroughly ignorant though, they make others ignorant too, and they really get in the way! Because of their ignorance, and the actions which result from that ignorance, many things which could easily be perceived and described as having "evil" results, come into being.

Intentions are relatively meaningless, it is results and results alone, that are meaningful. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that the "professionally religious", the priestly classes, certainly don't make the world a better place.

What we, each of us, really need to be, is a person who has the same level of conscious awareness as those ancient natural psychics, but none of their ferocity, fears, and superstitions.

I think it really starts off with emotions one becomes very unhappy with the status quo, very unhappy indeed, with stagnation, very unhappy with "things as they are", very angry at the causes of "things as they are", very angry at the obvious unfairness of "things as they are", very angry at irrational inequalities, very angry with having to deal with primal fears, and repression, and oppression, and meaningless guilt.

Some people go through this process, and then they go out and throw bombs and shoot people. But that's reacting to the status quo with its own methods! It's just as wrong as the things it's reacting to! Far more wrong in fact! It's far more wrong because these folks actually know better.

I think that when a person decides that "things" are all wrong, the right thing to do is sit down and figure out exactly what is wrong, exactly how and why it is wrong, and what to do about making it right without exacerbating the situation! And that process is basically intellectual.

That's what this is all about.

Perhaps I can help you by being anecdotal, by telling you what happened to me.

The first thing was, I decided that the status quo stank! I started very early in my life knowing that religion stank. I'm not sure how, but I really knew that religion did far more harm than good when I was quite a young kid. My family, they tell me, were continually horrified by my words and actions (they still are). I know I made a real pain-in-the-ass of myself to all of the members of the Priestly classes with whom I came into contact.

Why? Maybe it's because I instinctively reject undeserved guilt. Because I instinctively reject baseless fear. Because I instinctively reject all coercion. Because I instinctively reject being oppressed. Because I really reject and resent other people telling me what to think and do. Because I really I reject and resent other people being oppressed. Because I really reject and resent other people telling other people what to think and do. So I rejected religion.

To be comfortable in this new scientific based paradigm of reality, I think that you too, will have to reject all the old religions too. I know it's hard to do, because it's scary.

I'm sorry for you, but religions just don't "fit" into this new world-view. There's no room for fairy tales in a scientifically based paradigm. There should be no room for coercion and oppression in any world-view. Religions are coercive, oppressive fairy tales! In other words, religions are total bull-shit!

I am responsible for, and to, me ... you are responsible for, and to, you; neither of us has any right or business palming off those responsibilities on some non-existent deity. It is my responsibility to be at least as caring of you, as I am of myself, and very likely even more so.

It is my responsibility to harm no sentient creature in any conscious way. It is my responsibility to conduct my life and actions in such a manner as to be unable to unconsciously harm any sentient creature.

It is my responsibility to nurture and tend the non-sentient creatures among us as best I possibly can. I do not think that really means we have to be vegetarians. We can be so if we want to be, but not out of guilt I really reject the concept that I (or anyone else) "have to" do something in order to be a truly "good" person. That kind of thing is oppressive and it really borders on the religious approach.

I think that a person should be a vegetarian if they feel a deep inner compunction to be a vegetarian. I do not think a person should be a vegetarian, or anything else, just because they, or worse yet, someone else, may think it's "right" ... each person must know clearly that it's "right" for them.

It is my responsibility to tend and nurture the physical environment as best I possibly can.

It is my responsibility to ask myself ... "Is it true?" ... "Is it kind?" ... "Is it helpful?" ... "Is it necessary?" ... before I say anything that will effect others in an important way.

It is my responsibility to ask myself ... "Is it kind?", "Is it helpful?", "Is it needful?", before I do anything that isn't trivial.

It is my responsibility to make of the physical world as good a place as I possibly can.

It is my responsibility to make sure that the physical world is at least a little better place, not at all a worse place, for my having passed through it.

NO ONE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ME BUT ME!

It is my responsibility never to be fatuous, shallow, banal, and/or saccharine!

On the other hand:

It is not my responsibility to “return evil with good”!

It is not my responsibility to “turn the other cheek”!

It is not my responsibility to “speak only good” of those I deem not to be “good”.

It is not my responsibility to “expect only good from others” or to “seek out only the good in others”, cynical as it may sound; if you don’t have false expectations you cannot be disappointed.

The last four items in the foregoing litany are what I call “reverse or negative responsibilities”. Turn them around and you’ve got the fatuous, saccharine, shallow, totally false notions of a religion that has always preached love and clearly demonstrated hate!

To “return evil with good” is an entire disservice to the person, persons, or thing which perpetrated the “evil”. To “turn the other cheek” has only one result you get smitten on that cheek too! And the “smiter”? Learns nothing at all about the inevitability of “cause and effect”.

TO “SPEAK ONLY GOOD” OF THOSE YOU DEEM NOT TO BE GOOD IS SIMPLY HYPOCRISY!

To “expect only good from others” is pure masochism! To “seek out only the good in others” is foolish ... one really has to seek out the reality of what is “in others” without evaluating it in a judgmental manner.

It is not my responsibility to “love” anyone or anything except myself!

I think these statements should be equally true of all of us. I think this is just common sense and has nothing at all to do with my cosmic paradigm.

Common sense, unfortunately, is the least common of all the senses!

Up above, I used the word “kind”. What does that word mean? I really don’t think it means saccharine-sweet. I really don’t think it means telling people only what they wish to hear.

Euthanasia is a kindness!

If I had pancreatic cancer or some other such painful dysfunction, and if I had six weeks or so (or six months or so) to “live” ... and would perforce, spend that time doped entirely into insensibility to keep the pain at threshold levels of what I could bear. Why then, putting me out of my misery would be the only possible kindness anyone could do me!

The same is true of Alzheimer’s Disease. When a person has lost all sense of individual personhood, all awareness of who, what, and where they are, then they are already “dead”!

Being light sensitive, pain sensitive, and having a beating heart and an even breathing cycle isn’t “living”. Life is far more than motor functions!

Sometimes “kind” is telling people the truth. Sometimes “kind” is telling people what they don’t want to hear! Sometimes “kind” is shouting that “the sky is falling”, when and if it is!

A physical human being is born, lives a while, and dies. That’s true of all physical living things. What we’ve all got to do is make sure that the place into which people are born, where they live their lives out, is absolutely the best, most hospitable, most joyful place it can possibly be.

Physical life must not be a “vale of suffering”! It certainly needn’t be! Claiming that life is, and that life should be, “a vale of tears” is religion’s next-to-worst crime! Making it actually a “Vale of Tears”, and they have, is their worst crime! I won’t ever forgive them for it.

Like Voltaire, my primary goal is to “ecrassez l’enzyme” or “stamp out the infamy”. Voltaire limited himself to “crushing out the infamy” of Christianity I am nowhere near so limited!

It is religion, in its entirety, which is “the infamy”.

O.K.

So, I decided that “the Status Quo stank”, I decided that “religion stank”. I decided that many, if not most, of our social institutions also stank. So I started to look for something that would be better. Something that didn’t stink!

I didn’t find it!

But I did find a method! A very good method! And, as credit is surely due to its developer I will duly give that credit. I am no fan of Eastern religions, nor of most Eastern philosophy, even though I stand in awe of the scientific knowledge, of totally unknowable origin, displayed in the Vedas. However, I am honor bound to mention an Indian religious teacher who was named Ramana Maharshi. He developed a really fine methodology to use in any kind of search for truth.

It’s called “Not this ... Not that” or “Nehti - Nehti” and it worked for me. I didn’t come to exactly the same conclusions which he did because he was encapsulated in Indian religion and philosophy whilst I wasn’t encapsulated in any religion or philosophy. But the method worked for me, and I think it can work for you.

So then, the first thing to do is look at the status quo from the point of view that asks: “Is it this thing that is true?”, “Is it that thing which is true?”, and then if neither “this” nor “that” seems to you to be true you go on your way.

O.K.

Having done that in regard to all religions, and to most philosophies, and then to our societies and societal systems I gave up on them.

You may very well do so too! I hope so.

When I encountered the results that were being attained by Stephen Hawking and his like, I realized that any social or other philosophy that did not have their scientific discoveries as its basic foundation, would be invalid.

And so I thought, and I thought, and I thought, and I thought. I ran merrily up one wrong way street after another. I made an absolute art form out of running my head into stone walls! I made an ass out of myself over, and over, and over! I made a veritable hobby out of contradicting myself! I had a lot of fun. I was embarrassed to tears! I was totally frustrated. I gave up. I figured it out!

It took me thirty years. But finally I sort of just stumbled on what this is in the process of becoming. I’m far from sure what that is. But it’s completely honest, and it’s completely 100% me!

Because it’s so much a product of myself that means it won’t be 100% you! That’s how it’s supposed to work. When you’ve worked all this out for yourself, what you’ll have will be yours alone.

Each person's end-product will be a little bit different because they are a little bit different. It's the differences and the total acceptance of those differences that will make our society wonderful!

I haven't got the vaguest idea how long it will take you to get fairly comfortable with it. I think I am beginning to be "comfortable with it" though. Not totally cocksure, but comfortable.

I'm presenting this to you for you to ask yourself "Is this it?" Then, if it is, you can take it from there.

I have no "authorities" to which I can refer you. I have no intention of referring you to "authorities" even if I did have any. I have no intention, no qualifications, and no desire, to be an authority of any kind. Nor am I.

The premise I'm working with is this: "This works for me, maybe it'll work for others too".

The big question, as I see it, is: "What kind of society, what kind of world, will we get from basing our world-view on this paradigm of reality?"

The follow-up question is: "How can I relate to this paradigm?"

It's not easy! How could challenging, and then totally changing every single thing in which you believe be easy?

I am not really real. You are not really real. We are not really real. But we are! But we aren't! Well, we sort of are, and sort of aren't! Crazy isn't it? Sort of, but not entirely! Really? Not really!

I, you, we, all of us together are human beings ... but we're not human beings really, cause we're far more than just that! We're everything ... but not really! We're nothing at all but not really!

The more confused and disoriented you get the better off you are because in the midst of all that mental chaos you forget all the things you don't really know but think you do know.

That's my anecdotal parable if you're really serious about all this that's what'll happen to you too!

Life is purely a Zen Koan, a paradox, multitudes of radical irrationals which lead to understanding.

Where do we go from here?

I'll quote myself: "Think about it all human beings are far more so than they are physical creatures, individual intelligent energy patterns on the levels of virtual realities. They are also the shadow projections of individual intelligent energy patterns or intrinsic intelligences which are permanently extant on the levels of the intrinsic realities."

What is a world-view suitable to that definition of human beings?

What view of the physical world is appropriate to intelligences whose physicality is only putative? How shall we plan life for something which is intrinsically immortal? But which dies anyway! It's a bitch!

That all the old bull-shit is precisely that, is clearly obvious, and everyone kind of knows it. Especially those who are defending it the most fiercely!

O.K.

The so-called "real world", the physical world, isn't really real, but as it's all we've got right now, it is!

I have come to think that the way to make a paradigm for human society that works, we kind of have to agree to almost completely ignore the new reality we've discovered, because it has very little relevance on the physical planes of realities.

We have to make a brand-new, totally different (not revised) “Social Contract” one that really works! The “process” goes on, infinity infinitely creating itself out of itself; what it is, is basic awareness, and it is also the full consciousness of that awareness, continually expanding and reaching toward infinity. And here we all are!

So what?

I’m going to be called an atheist, and that’s not a false judgment call at all, because it’s clear that I certainly do not believe that a “God” exists; unless one equates my identification of the abstract reality itself, with the unified field of consciousness and energy, and accepts that as a kind of synonym for “God”, and therefore invalidates that judgment, but then, abstract reality, or even absolute reality, is hardly equivalent to that Cosmic Busybody!

I’m going to be called an anarchist. That’s not entirely untrue either.

There’s not a single government on this planet that doesn’t stink!

So what?

Here we all are, all living things, all other things too! Up to our eyeballs (where appropriate) in physicality. I think we ought to leave the non-physical aspects of reality totally alone for the time being. They really don’t have any immediate impact on human or other beings and their lives and fortunes. They just are!

We don’t have to worry about death it happens! Life is a terminal condition! A person is born but to die! There’s nothing anyone can do to prevent it from happening! So why worry? Yes, I know it’s a hell of a lot easier to say than do! But death comes for us no matter what we do, so I repeat why worry about the absolutely inevitable?

This reality model should make that easier to do.

We don’t have to give a single thought to “eternal damnation” or “eternal reward” there isn’t any such thing! Never was, never will be!

Nothing that we do, here on the physical levels of the virtual realities impacts in any way other than informational on the levels of intrinsic realities. There is no such thing as sin! Never was, never will be!

Crime, or criminal behavior, is a real thing. It’s anything one person does which actually harms another person or sentient being in any way. But crime is not “sin”! There’s no such thing as “sin”. Never was, never will be!

The concepts of “sin”, and of “intrinsic evil warring against intrinsic good”, which is essential to the concept of “sin”, are simply more of religion’s little power ploys. They have no other validity. Never did, never will!

What matters is how we treat each other and how we treat the planet we live on!

The intrinsic reality’s elemental intelligence casts its “shadow” on to the virtual realities in search of experiential data. That virtually real expression of the intrinsic elemental intelligence, in its turn, casts its shadow on the physical plane in the form of a sentient creature. Sentient creatures, in turn, cast their shadows on the ground!

PART 10: TRIPOLARITY - 2

“Tripolarity” again? Yes again, it’s far too complicated and abstract a subject for one “pass by”. An awful lot of my view of reality and the human condition is, while not contained in the idea of Tripolarity, at the least, explained or exemplified by that idea. I don’t believe it will ever be a concept which will be easily available. It takes an awful lot of concentrated thinking to get comfortable with it. It took thirty years of concentrated study and thought to develop it.

What “tripolarity” really means to say, or rather what I mean it to say by it, is once again, this: Here we all are we, each one singly, and all of us together, all of the fully sentient beings, all of the semi-sentient life forms, and all of the multitude of utterly non-aware physical objects as well, all exist simultaneously, on three separate “levels” of existence.

Those three levels are:

FIRST: “The Intrinsic Reality”, or “The Essential Reality”, this is the basic, and in fact, the “only” true reality, it is totally non-physical, it is never-physical, its duration is that of the Unified Energy Field itself. It IS the Unified Energy Field itself. The field of expanding energy brought into play by the “Big Bang” or Cataclysmic Energy Event. It is that original Unified Field of Energy in its later, “mature”, or rather, its stabilized format. The Unified Field of Energy is “unified”, that is clear. But it is also clear that it is hardly monolithic in its nature. By which I mean it’s not all the same! It contains within itself individual nexii of varying degrees of intensity and density that are evolving energy fields extant within the context of the unified field. It is here that what I call “The Intrinsic Intelligence” exists, and only here.

SECOND: “Virtual Reality”, this is an intermediary and mediating or interlocutory “reality” that acts as a kind of linkage or liaison between the very intense levels of energy which are the true reality of the Essential Reality, and the significantly less intense energies which are inherent to the various physical levels of reality. Its duration is apparently not equivalent to the Unified Field’s duration, but, compared to the physical realities, it is a thing which is certainly of long duration. The greatest majority by far of sentient entities extant in our manifested universe exist on this level of reality. It is, because it’s the very least monolithic in nature of those “three levels”, also the most confusing of the three levels that make up reality. The virtual reality intelligence is the “mind” and the true reality of all physical plane or extrinsic intelligences.

THIRD: “The Un-Real” or “Physical Reality”, here we all are! We are the extrinsic intelligences. This is the “reality” that is real to us. It is clearly composed of an almost infinite number of physical realities. But, unfortunately this is the level of reality that has the least relevance in respect to the unified field of essential energies.

That’s all very well to say but what does it really mean to a physical sentient being?

Unreal?

Hogwash!

You know you’re real, and you know that your dog is real and your cat too! And your building where you live? Surely that’s real! Your furniture, and horses in the field, and whales in the ocean? Surely they’re real; you can both see and touch them!

But most of all you really know you're real don't you?

But do you? You know by now that science says you're just an energy field. Of course that's a kind of reality. But you know that you're a sentient physical being a person.

What does being a physical sentient being actually mean to say? Well, obviously it means a "being" that possesses a physical body, that's easy! It also means that the individual or "being" involved is aware of its own individuality, aware of its surroundings, and fully conscious of being so aware! It also means a being who is aware of the immanency of its death.

Sentience, because it manifests in various ways; has absolutely nothing to do with reading, or speech, or opposing thumbs, or using tools, or intelligence per se, although some of these things are, at least to some degree, clear indications of a kind of sentience. What it really means is that the sentient being possesses, in and of themselves, a truly clear awareness of their awareness of self-hood, and an equally clear consciousness of the impermanence of that self-hood! In order to be truly sentient a being must know that it is going to die.

It's certainly safe to assume that most physical sentient beings can truthfully say they have experienced only the physical state-of-being.

I think it's also very safe to assume that there clearly are some few people (and other sentiences as well) who have also had some experience of the state-of-being I call the "Near Real" or the virtually real. "Shamans" and "psychics" for instance!

But how many of these "extra-sensory" experiences which we have on record, have been either totally hallucinatory, or else at least partially so, and perhaps, but not invariably, the result of insanity, or sickness, or drugs, or alcohol, or self-induction?

Personally, I think that: in all likelihood, most of humankind's experiences of virtual reality have been of that nature. Most, but not all. Some of those shamanic, psychic, or extrasensory experiences of virtual reality were totally valid, and they were the result of what some philosophies misleadingly call "spiritual evolution", or what I call the expansion and intensification of individual consciousness.

Despite what I have to admit initially was great reluctance on my part, over time, it has become clear to me, that the historical accounts we possess of many of the drug or alcohol induced "visions" people have experienced, and perhaps even some of the "insanity induced" visions; while they were clearly primarily hallucinations, they may not have been entirely invalid.

This is probably equally true of those "visions" which were the product of dysfunction of either the body or the psyche.

It is also clear to me however, that these kind of partially valid "experiences", while not entirely either valid or invalid, were nevertheless, in most cases, whether valid or invalid, entirely harmful to the intelligence perceiving them.

I use the word "harmful" in the sense that these partially valid but vivid experiences are distinctly misleading to the individuals who are involved in them, and they lead to delusions and errors that are truly harmful.

Infinitely few sentient beings of any type at all, have ever had any experience at all of “The Real” or rather, the essential or intrinsic reality. Of those who have had such an experience, very few indeed have survived the experience because of the interplay of the drastically different energy fields involved. But I say that all things participate in all three realities, and they certainly exist in all three realities. This is something about which I am absolutely certain. All things are, and must of necessity be, composed of an energy field which, itself, is of a tri-polar nature.

This is clearly so, because:

Firstly: Here “we” are ... and there “it” (The Unified Field) is! If it is real, and it is, and if we are real, and we certainly feel ourselves to be so, then there has to be some intermediary medium.

Secondly: The conception that there is a spectrum of energy levels is the only way that all the absolutely stunning things which science has been discovering in regard to basic realities can be translated into terms relevant to human existence.

What I mean to say by “a spectrum of energy levels” is this: thanks to the complimentary sciences of particle physics and quantum theory, we are beginning to understand that “matter” is composed of ever smaller and smaller particles, and that the energy of which those particles are composed is carried upon sine-curve waves of varying intensities of oscillation rates. It is the variation in oscillation rates that I call “a spectrum of energy levels”.

Thanks to modern speculative science, the nature of reality is infinitely less certain than we thought it was in the past, when we knew far less than we do now about so many aspects of scientific reality.

Werner Heisenberg has, by the simple expedient of making everything terribly uncertain, made it clear for all times; and Particle Physics, Quantum Mechanics, Chaos Theory, & etcetera (by which I mean to include all other contemporary, entirely non-religious, scientific, cosmological research), have proved his premise, and my paraphrase of his premise is, that: The Universe, as we are coming to understand how little we really know of it, is simply one vast field of energy, it is also not at all the physical, rational, reasonable, linearly logical place that humanity once imagined/deemed/dreamed/wished it to be.

That is not to say that it’s a place entirely of meaningless chaos, with no logic in its makeup whatsoever. It is, I think, more like saying that it is a place in which there is clearly a kind of logic but it is clearly not logic which is of a linear nature.

That is what I said about contemporary cosmology in an earlier part of this continuing conversation and it is equally apt at this point in that conversation.

One of the most important things modern science has been learning is exactly how much of what it had thought was so, isn’t so at all!

About all we are sure that we know now, is that all that truly exists, all that “came into existence” after that “Big Bang” is, was and always will be ENERGY! The field of expanding energy which can be defined as our Cosmos is the unified field of all that is!

Now, if “all that is” is energy, all things that are a part of that unified energy field, are also simply energy fields. That obviously includes sentient physical life!

So then, it is necessary for us each to relate ourselves to the reality of being nothing more or less than a self-aware energy field within the over-all energy field of the unified field of cosmic energy.

We know this is true, because science has clearly demonstrated that nothing at all exists but energy, and also because it is absolutely experientially clear to all of us, that each of us, and, by extension, every other sentient being, is self-aware, as we know, and do not imagine, our own clear self-consciousness, and our simultaneous full awareness of that self-consciousness.

It then becomes necessary to describe the process by which each thing goes from being an integral part of the unified field to being an individual being, or “thing”, while, at the same time, it remains an integral part of the Unified Field. That process, as I see it, is the basis of what I call “Tripolarity”.

The main question with which we are confronted is how does an individual person relate to all this?

It's certainly not easy to do!

Here we all are here I am and there you are! You look in the mirror and the face you've come to recognize as “you”, looks back at you, and you slap your knee and it smarts you bang your fist on a table ... and it (the fist, not the table) smarts too! Though maybe the table “smarts” too! We really have no way of knowing! It's not likely to be identical to sentient reactions but then it's not entirely impossible given that THE NATURE OF REALITY IS UNCERTAINTY.

On the other hand science tells us that there's nothing but energy fields, that includes you, and the mirror, and the table, and everything else, and it can really prove it!

How can one rationally relate to that information?

Should one attempt to relate to that information in a rational manner? Of course, one not only “should”, one has to do so! It is always a waste of time and energy and resources to relate to anything in an irrational manner! The only result of relating to reality in an irrational manner is either insanity or religion! They are synonyms, and they produce equally negative results! As Sigmund Freud is said to have said: “Religion is a universal obsessive paranoid delusion”.

And so, let's try to “relate rationally” to the information that we possess.

There is nothing now, there never was anything, and there never will be anything but energy! We, each of us, then, are nothing but an energy field. We are also conscious and totally aware that we are conscious. It is not wrong then, to say that we, each of us, is a conscious energy field. Therefore, I don't believe it is entirely wrong to assume that energy clearly possesses at least the potential for consciousness. Far more than merely “possess the potential”, if the human race, an intrinsic part of that energy field, is any example.

Now, while we may know many things and assume many other things, there are also many things we cannot ever know. The unified field is an exemplar of, and product of, a continuous process of creation and destruction. That's clear! What isn't clear is why that process takes place and here speculation and assumption must enter into our effort to understand the nature of the human condition.

O.K. then we are what we are ... and here we are ... that we are pretty well sure of. We also know that we weren't always as we are today. Religion set aside as the irrational state of mind it is, we know that we, and all other living things have been slowly evolving from the relatively simple to the extremely complex. Evolution is not a theory but is empirically a proven fact.

O.K. then, we are what we are ... and here we are ... and we got "here" by way of evolutionary development. The Evolutionary development of form. But what about the evolution of intellect? Well, that's clearly been happening too.

Now if we are physical beings who have gotten where they presently are through the processes of the evolution of form and intellect and yet we surely know that we are also simply and intrinsically energy fields have those fields and that energy not also evolved?

Does the evolution of part not have some relationship to the whole of which it is part? Does that evolution of a part not at least imply that the Unified Field of Energy or rather "the whole", may also go through some kind of evolutionary process.

Could not the provable consciousness of some of that energy at least imply the eventual consciousness of all the energy in the unified field?

I think the implication is unavoidable and I also think we must at least think that there is a strong possibility that the purpose (if, in fact, there is one) of the obviously continuous process of creation/destruction of which the unified field is a product, is the evolution of unconscious energy into fully conscious energy.

Based upon what clearly exists, the spectrum of manifestation going from raw energy to physical sentient beings, I am assuming the existence of a translation medium, a trans locutory agency which spans the gap between the raw energy and the sentient being, and that agency, or rather, "process", is what I call "Tripolarity".

The process I call "Tripolarity" is, I fully admit, the result of both speculation and assumption on my part but, it is a way to visualize how we came to be here!

Walk with me, if you will, through the mental processes which gave rise to this conception. I warn you, it's a labyrinthine pathway, and its logic is anything but linear!

For Here we all are! That is the foundation of all our speculations. Here we all are! We know that ... but the whence, how, and whither of that we only speculate about. Here we all are and ... there the unified field is the big question is how did "it" get from "there" to "here" and how do we ... did we ... get from "here" to "there"?

O.K. we have our starting equation: "The Big Bang" produces the expanding Unified Field of Energy ... and, some fifteen or so billion years later: Here we all are!

Into this equation, we must introduce various bits of information, knowledge, and understanding and many questions about those "bits of information", which either experience, or science, or both combined, have shown to be valid and which bear upon our speculations.

There is Quantum Theory, there is Chaos Theory, there is The Theory of Relativity, there are Euclidian Physics, and Newtonian Physics, there is Heisenbergian Uncertainty, in addition, there are Quasars, and Black Holes, and Pulsars, and Quarks, and Energons, and Gravitrons. There is also a thing called: "The Law of Conservation of Energy" (i.e., energy once created is never lost). The question is in general or in specific?

When is the energy "created" ... by the "Big Bang"? Or does the cataclysmic energy event merely utilize existing energy to produce the "Big Bang"? If it does actually utilize "existing energy" ... what energy?

If energy pre-existed “The Big Bang” what energy was it? Where did it originate? If, as we are presently being informed, there are “Stars” that pre-date the “Big Bang”, where did their energy come from, what “created” them; and if they do pre-date our “Big Bang”, what of the supposed “nothingness” that was the context in which the “Big Bang” occurred?

What about the multitude of individual energy fields which we know exist within the Unified Field of Energy, are they too, once created “never lost”? We know that there are individual energy fields within the Unified Field of Energy because there are galaxies, and stars, and planets, and comets, and asteroids, and most of all Here we all are!

Is energy which demonstrates consciousness different than/from energy which is relatively or entirely unconscious? Do we have enough knowledge to state with certainty that any energy is unconscious?

Is consciousness limited to the physical levels of realities? Is consciousness separate from the physical levels of realities? Or are both statements true? Is a sentient being merely a consciousness aware because of its own physicality, or is it more, or other, than that? Is sentience perhaps external to the physical being through whom it functions?

What about the new information we have now amassed from alternative sources? What relationship does the information we are getting as to what they call “Dream-time” from the Australian Aborigines bear on our equation? What relationship to our question does the mass of information which we are obtaining from various Shamanic cultures have? What relationship to our question does our new and broader understanding of the sentience of various other creatures such as whales and dolphins and elephants have?

Out of all the great mass of fantasy, fable, and undeniable garbage, both written and spoken on the subject. What about the not at all insignificant, and not-to-be-ignored, very well documented, and completely empirical, information regarding the conscious survival by the personality of physical “death” have to our question?

What relationship to our “reality equation” does the knowledge we’ve obtained now that we’ve opened ourselves to the experience in healing and in ontology and epistemology of cultures other than Western European? The Vedas of the Aryans, for instance?

What relationship does the clearly obvious functionality of acupuncture, which does not operate on the physical body, have to the reality of only energy?

I think, if you all go very slowly and carefully through that list of “additional bits”, and if you add to it those others which you personally will surely think of, and ask yourselves each of the questions, and, to the best of your abilities, answer them then there’s one sure result and that result is that you will be aware that there’s a great deal more to reality and to the human condition than meets the eye and also that there’s even more to the human condition than can be felt with your fingertips.

I went through that questioning process for some thirty years and this is the result my speculations and assumptions have obtained: Because we exist and because we know that “The Big Bang” (or, as I deem far more likely, a series of them) existed here we are all of us all sentient beings, all semi-sentient beings, and all non-sentient “things”, we are, all of us, a part of an on-going process.

That “process” seems to be the evolution of energy from a state of relative unconsciousness, by which I mean to say a state-of-consciousness which is both totally unconscious of self, and also totally unconscious of other-than-self, to a state of fully developed consciousness, or omni-consciousness.

By “omni-consciousness” I mean to say a state of consciousness which is totally self-aware and totally other-aware, and which, at the same time, is not fettered to a physical form but is a consciousness that is complete and absolutely functional in its own nature and state.

In order for this change in nature, or evolution of consciousness to take place, the energy which is extant on the intrinsic or essential level of realities at the time of the cataclysmic energy event or “Big Bang”, somehow is changed in its basic nature so that we can exist. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT SENTIENT BEINGS EXIST SO THAT ENERGY CAN CHANGE INTO CONSCIOUSNESS.

Now the energies extant after the “Cataclysmic Energy Event” are the basic matrix of all matter ... but that unified field of energy is not of itself matter, nor does it possess the ability to become so. The energies extant at the intrinsic or essential level of reality manifest sine-wave curves that cannot carry particles sufficiently large to become matter. Particles extant on the intrinsic levels of realities are infinitely too small to combine to build forms. The carrier waves on which these particles are carried oscillate infinitely too rapidly to be in any way compatible with even the most elemental forms. The energies extant upon the intrinsic levels of the realities are pure energy and I believe that because of their projectable effects on matter, which are utterly catastrophic, they may also be reasonably described accurately as anti-matter.

At the other end of the spectrum are the infinite levels of the physical realities. Now we must remember that while we all experience, both visually and tactilely, what we call “physical reality”, the actual truth of the matter is that physical reality too, is simply a state-of-energy. But here we have atoms and molecules that are immense in comparison to those particles extant upon the Intrinsic levels of realities, and those “immense particles” are carried on sine-curve waves which are infinitely slower in their oscillation rates than those which are extant on the intrinsic levels of realities.

The physical levels of realities and the intrinsic levels of realities are mutually contradictory, their energies are totally uncomplimentary, and they are, or at least they would be, were it conceivable to bring them into contact, mutually absolutely destructive.

Therefore, in between intrinsic reality and physical reality there has simply got to be a mediator, and I see that intermediary agency as what I call “Virtual Reality”.

Intrinsic Reality is the locus of potential omni-consciousness, but it is still only potential, only consciousness-in-becoming. Physical reality is the locus of physical consciousness, or the awareness of the here-and-now.

And there we have three locii. One of these loci is simply physical and personal consciousness, the other is simply infinitely potential never-physical consciousness, in between them is something that can be described but not entirely defined as: other-than-physical consciousness; and that “other” locus is the virtual realities.

While in my reality paradigm the “Virtual Reality” is posited as the intermediary medium between the Unified Field and Personal Reality, I need to establish a viable need for such a bridge by making

clear the relationship which exists between the expanding energy cloud that is brought into being by the cataclysmic energy event and something which is extant on the physical planes of existence.

If I don't clearly establish such a need, what is there to prevent us from saying: "There's the Unified Field of energy and here we are there's no need for a connection".

But I think there is such a connection required, and remember, this is strictly an intellectual or conceptual "connection" rather than an actual "connection", simply because there is clearly no real separation between anyone of us and the Unified Field, or between any thing and the unified field.

The biggest difficulty in defining or describing "Tripolar Reality" and therefore the biggest obstacle to comprehending the thing-in-itself, is that this is not a instance in which we can actually separate one thing we are defining from the other. Oh sure, we can say "intrinsic reality is this", "virtual reality is that", and "physical reality is this, that, and the other thing". It's easy to do, but the trouble is that these "things" are not at all separate, and that's what makes the whole process so difficult to describe and define.

For instance, the human mind thrives upon compartmentalization and enumeration; "Tripolarity" is in no way amenable to such processes. It would be much easier to be able to say "The Cosmos is divided into 25% Intrinsic Reality, 50% Virtual Reality, and 25% physical reality". But that would be total nonsense! What's closer to the truth however, is the following non-sequitur: "The Cosmos is composed 100% of Intrinsic Reality, 99.5% of Virtual Reality, and .05% of Physical Reality". I won't even swear that isn't also nonsense!

The Cosmos is composed entirely of energy, which possesses, I believe, the potential for consciousness, and the potential for an almost incomprehensibly vast expansion of the capacity for awareness which is inherent in consciousness. Here we all are!

If this wasn't so, we wouldn't be "here" or anywhere else! We just wouldn't be!

Consciousness is the prime component of "life", without consciousness of being a thing is not alive, it is "not"!

The Cosmos, or The Unified Field of Intrinsic Energy, is a field of energy that can become, but is not originally, consciously aware of itself and of all of its components. As such, it is, in its own inconceivable way, also a being because it fulfills all the qualifications of beingness. Physical life-forms are a part of that process of evolution of conscious awareness. A limited, terribly finite "part of the process".

What I call "The Virtual Reality" is the medium for the process.

"The Process" is the infinite expansion of consciousness and the infinite intensification of awareness.

When the Cataclysmic Energy Event takes place a maelstrom of violently unstable energy expands from the center of that event. It is an energy field that is unified only by its furiously expanding perimeter! That "perimeter" separates that furious maelstrom of expanding energies from what? NOTHING is the best answer we can at present give! But it can't really be nothing because if it were how could such a thing as "separation" be demarcated? The energy within that field is composed of immeasurably small particles carried on particle carrier wave sine-curves oscillating at immeasurably rapid speeds.

As time passes that energy field “matures” or “settles down” into a far less unstable format, and eventually, as I have said before, “precisely as cream clots”, various more individual energy fields coalesce within the over-all unified field to form what is best defined as a “tapestry of energies”.

As I also said earlier: these “clots” are galaxies, planets, suns, asteroids, comets, space dust, elephants, whales, mice, and: Here we all are!

By some methodology, the nature of which is both unknown and totally unknowable, that non-physical, non-visible “energy tapestry” makes itself visible in terms of light, and eventually makes itself physical and experiential. It seems to me that a way to describe this eventuality is to say that “the intrinsic reality projects from its ‘mind’ an image of its nature”. The first manifestation of that “image” is, as I see it, the virtual reality.

Now there has to be some intermediary agency upon/through which consciousness can evolve and manifest itself, if the physical levels of the realities are far too finite for any real evolution to occur upon them. That “intermediary agency” is, as I see it, the virtual reality.

Think of a color spectrum let us agree to interpret the Intrinsic Reality as the Ultra-violet band, and the physical reality as the ultra-crimson band, the visible spectrum between those two invisible bands is the Virtual Reality.

The Intrinsic Reality projects a more slowly oscillating, coarser particled, “shadow” or “projection” of itself, and that is “The Virtual Reality”. The Virtual Reality in its turn, also projects a more slowly oscillating, coarser particled, “shadow” or “projection” of itself, and here we are!

But, once again, as I said earlier, it is vital to remember that we, as physical beings, in some ways exist simultaneously on all three levels of the realities within the unified field, and in other ways we don't. Therefore we have some aspects within us that are physical and aspects too, that are very much other-than-physical.

It is my personal belief that self-conscious intelligence, or “the mind” is a thing which is intrinsically other-than-physical and which exists almost entirely on the Virtual Reality with aspects on the other two realities as well.

Science (anthropology) sometimes defines humankind as “a tool using animal”, but as I see it, the “animal” is itself, a “tool” used by the mind in the course of its evolutionary growth.

That statement gives rise to the following question: If the “mind” uses the physical being as a “tool” in its own evolution of consciousness and awareness, is the “mind” a thing which is different/separate than/from the physical being? Could what we call “the mind” not be a thing on the virtual reality of which the physical being is simply a sensory projection?

I think so.

Could the “mind” not be the equivalent of what religions and some philosophies call the soul?

I think so.

As I have said earlier, I think that it is clear that the brain and “the mind” are not at all the same thing. To me the “brain” is the equivalent of a C.P.U., While “The Mind” is equivalent to the operator of that computer. The brain is a physical organ while the “mind” is an extraphysical entity. It is the mind

which survives physical death. It is the “mind” which evolves in consciousness and awareness. It is “the mind” which is the true, and non-physical reality, of each and every sentient being.

The mind is intrinsic to the virtual reality. It needs to be so because it is there that the basic evolution of energy into consciousness takes place. The “mind”, at least in its ultimate potential, is almost equally intrinsic to the intrinsic reality. It needs to be so because it is there that the final evolution of energy into consciousness takes place.

The “mind” is NOT intrinsic to physical reality because it is there that the evolution of energy into form and through form, takes place, and the “mind” has nothing at all in common with form.

While the “mind” has nothing at all in common with form, form is, however, the medium through which the “mind” passes in its quest for self-knowledge and evolution of consciousness and awareness.

It would probably not be incorrect to say that: The universe, or Cosmos, is intrinsically “A MIND”, which manifests, is composed of projects, is the result of; a multiplicity of subsidiary yet independent minds, through whose evolution, by way of whose growth, through whose experience, the “Cosmic Mind” or Universal Unified Field, itself evolves and grows in consciousness and awareness until, having experienced all experiences, learned all knowledge, felt all feelings, seen all sights it becomes both omni-conscious and omni-aware.

As a result, Universal Unified Field mind is its own intrinsic reality it projects subsidiary awarenesses upon the intermediary and inter-locutory virtual reality. These intermediary awarenesses manifest and evolve by way of emotionally-sensory and physically experiential extensions or “remotes” of themselves on the physical planes of existence ... and THAT’S “Tripolarity”!

What does “tripolarity” mean to you? What indeed! It means everything and nothing! In your day-to-day life it means absolutely nothing. In your attitude to life, and to its problems and griefs, it means absolutely everything!

“Life”, when it is viewed as an infinitely on-going process, is an entirely different thing than is life when it is viewed as an end in itself. It is to help you develop that “view-point” that I have written this.

How much of that is experiential to you? How much of that are you actually aware of? How much of that interlocking reality are you actually conscious of? To the greatest majority of you the answer is “probably very little”. Should you worry about that? No.

Worry about what you know! Worry about that interlocking reality to the extent it is meaningful to you. Worry about it to the extent that it’s real to you. Worry about it to the extent that you’re real to it!

I have a question: If that interlocking reality is truly reality, and I am sure it is, why worry about it? How can you, who are not very real, effect it? In this paradigm the greater reality’s effects on you personally, are, as we know, in most cases, likely to be only peripheral.

Here we all are all living things all other things too worry about that!

It’s a lot to worry about, and it’s really worth worrying about!

It’s all we’ve got!

Seems silly doesn't it? First I tell you that this new cosmic paradigm/reality model will be a great liberating factor and then I apparently say that you should sort of ignore it! First I tell you that you aren't real and then I say you might as well be!

Paradoxical isn't it? It is! ... And yet ... it isn't!

What I am saying is: "worry about things you can do something about"!

Don't worry about anything which is beyond your capacity to effect in any way. Reality is such a thing, you cannot effect it in any way! Human society however, is not such a thing, you certainly can effect it.

An ancient Greek philosopher (Protagoras of Abdera fl. 5th cent. B.C.E.) said that: "Man is the measure of all things; of those which are, that they are; of those which are not, that they are not". He meant "man" as a race of beings not a particular sex.

I think that the "proper study" of human beings is human beings!

I guess that makes me a "Humanist", but as you know I am passionate about the Unified Field, Relativity Theory, and Quantum Theory and the greater reality which they reveal, so I'd have to assume I'm a "Transcendental Humanist" then.

I believe that the proper goal of human beings is the improvement of the quality of life on the physical plane. Life is not some kind of punishment, some kind of ordeal. There is no reason at all why life shouldn't be enjoyable. Anyone who says there is a reason why life shouldn't be fun is a sick unit!

In other words, reality will take care of itself. We need to take care of ourselves. We need to, when asked to do so by the recipient, take care of one another. We need to take care of our physical environment and all those living things which share it with us.

Here we all are lots of us probably far too many of us how do we go about making our situation comfortable, joyful, healthful, happy, and productive. Reciprocally!

I don't think I've met anyone lately who couldn't "go on" for just few days about "what's wrong" with the world!

PART 11: THE WORLD WE LIVE IN

But, what's "right" with the world?

Well, the world itself is a place of almost perfect beauty, a truly wonderful, splendid and marvelous thing.

For your own good, for the sake of your own inner-nature, really look around you; don't just look ... try to really see!

See that the world is beautiful, for it is! Just really notice it for once instead of taking it for granted as so many people do!

The world, as it is, is so beautiful that the reality of its beauty beggars all descriptive powers. Truly there is there is no thing, nor place, nor form of life in the world which is naturally "ugly". Everything is beautiful within its own proper setting.

For instance, can one say, or truly believe, that the serene, sere, subtle desert, is less beautiful than the jungle, or that the green and teeming jungle is less or more a place of beauty than the severe but shimmering arctic snows gleaming in the multicolored reflections of the northern lights?

No, each one of us can state a preference based entirely upon our own natures, but not upon nature itself!

This world, the planet called by its inhabitants "Earth", and all that lives and moves within it, and upon it, and above it, is a feast for all of the senses with which one is born. It is a source of never-ending delight and wonder and joy and instruction to the mind which dwells behind the seeing eye!

This sapphire and golden and emerald world, the place in which people find themselves, and in which, for better or worse, they must remain, is truly the "Garden of Eden", the "Paradise", out of which, we are told in religion's silly myths, the original parents of humankind were cast.

Like all of religions myths, that tale is utterly untrue. This world is paradise still, and it always was, and it always will be, unless humanity in a fit of madness destroys it.

What I think is truly unfortunate, truly tragic, is that so many people wander about in the midst of all that beauty and they might as well be blind! They cannot, or will not, see the world in which they live for the place of glory and wonder that it truly is!

If you don't believe me go to Alaska, or British Columbia, or New Zealand, or the Mojave desert and see for yourself!

But what else?

Well, people, for one. If you leave them alone. Well, most of them anyway. The institutions which I despise are, of course, both composed of people and created by people. But I'm not talking about people in wholesale lots, I'm talking about people as individual human beings. For the most part, get them alone, away from institutional contexts, and people are largely O.K.

If they weren't "largely O.K." this whole thing would be an entire waste of time and effort. People aren't as bad as other people would really like them to be. Portraying other people as "bad" or "evil", especially in the sense that they are intrinsically so, makes for a good excuse to do unconscionable things to them under the pretext of "helping" or "saving" them.

An ordinary human being is acquisitive, greedy, grasping, egocentric, disorderly, hot tempered, arrogant, self-centered, demanding, uncaring, careless, cruel, stupid, unthinking, thoughtless, mean (in both senses of the word), even absolutely vicious; and then in a flash that same ordinary person can be generous, loving, compassionate, caring, thoughtful, out-going, gentle, sweet, and on occasion very wise and utterly selfless. People are a compendium of all those things. They are surely “worth the effort” just because of what they are now, and not only because of what they could or might be.

Any species that can produce a Stephen Hawking is well worth bothering with! And then there's Bacon (both of them, Roger and Francis), Mozart, Beethoven, Rembrandt, Raphael, Gilbert and Sullivan, Shakespeare (whoever he was), Jonas Salk, Albert Einstein, Leonardo da Vinci and on, and on, and on, and on, and on, page after page.

That's not a bad record! And that's in a basically negative social situation! What will a totally liberated, absolutely free human race produce?

What would you be if you were totally liberated from all of our irrational social constraints?

What kind of music would Shostakovich, Prokofieff, and Katchaturian have written had they not lived in Stalin's Soviet Union? We'll never know what kind of a loss that may have been, will we?

We'll also never know if it was a loss, will we?

It's our job to provide a proper womb for the gestation of such creativity. Creativity, remember, is the reason for which all things exist.

People are basically wonderful; it's our job to nurture and encourage that wonderfulness!

I think that human beings are entirely capable of making the levels of reality upon which they exist a really great place for the growth of consciousness.

I think that human beings are entirely capable of making the levels of reality upon which they exist a really great place! For them, and for all other sentient beings!

Call me an optimist! Call me a fool! Call me crazy!

I'd far rather be a crazy optimistic fool ... with his feet firmly planted, knees locked, on scientific reality and reality itself, than anything I've ever imagined being!

With apologies to Charles Dickens: Today we, all of us, live in a period of which I say: It is the best of times, it is the worst of times!

We are, and it's world-wide, in the midst of an absolute frenzy of collapsing forms. That's all to the good.

We are, and it too is world-wide, in the midst of an absolute storm of de-crystallizing conceptions. That too is beneficial.

This planet and its inhabitants are in the midst of a tornado of dissatisfaction with the status-quo. That's also all to the good.

Almost every existing human developed structure, social, religious, political, and philosophical, is in the process of confusion, rejection, and collapse! I'll be surprised if there are eventually any exceptions.

There's going to be a lot of confusion, fear, pain, suffering, starvation, and, as usual, far too many murders, that's not good, not good at all! In fact, it's just plain terrible! But, I really don't see any way around it. You can't put your finger in this collapsing dike!

It is absolutely impossible to build a new structure without tearing down the old one. Humanity has been repairing its old social structures piecemeal and expeditiously for a long, long, time now that patchwork structure is collapsing around our ears. No one's knocking it down, it's falling because it's rotten, it's collapsing because it wasn't built correctly in the first place.

It'll take a while for the dust to settle and an even longer time to clean up the mess. But, for those who survive, then what?

We cannot, and we must not, try to re-build the old structure. In that direction only catastrophe lies, and I'm a registered optimist!

This isn't just rhetoric, this isn't just words, this isn't just an intellectual exercise!

This isn't what might happen, this is what very clearly IS happening! It's happening right now, while we speak, so to speak!

This isn't hypothesis, the planet is being raped, the rain forests are being destroyed, the ozone layer is being destroyed, the atmosphere that we breath is being hopelessly polluted, people are dying for all kinds of unnecessary reasons, children and animals are starving all over the planet, people are mindlessly killing each other, some in the course of working out centuries-old antagonisms, others for far less reason than that, which may not be a big deal in terms of this reality paradigm, but it sure as hell is a bitch for people who don't know that! Quite frankly it's also a bitch for those who do! Most people want to see how their story works out, they don't really enjoy having it stopped "in the middle". Living things should become excorporate only for natural causes and because their tale has wended its way to its end. Violent excorporation when other than accidental is not the most positive experience.

Now is time to prepare to do! Not to do, for it is not yet time for that. But it is clearly time to get prepared to do something creative with the societies on this planet.

Do I know what to do and when? Who knows? Do I have ideas about what ought to be done? I sure as hell do! I can present a tentative blueprint for what I think will assure a better future ... but only a universal consensus can make anything valid happen.

Of course I'm going to say what I think needs doing after all this babble; I'm hardly likely not to, but then it's distinctly up to you.

The most truly creative thing that can happen to our human societies is already in the process of happening, they're all falling like nine-pins! They're collapsing around our heads. When they've all collapsed all the way, then will be the time to have something preferable to put in place. But not before!

PART 12: NATIONALISM

The human race lives in what are clearly almost entirely artificial social groupings.

That's a thing which is entirely negative. Our nation-states are almost all the result of a process of continuous conquest and aggression. Next to religion with which it cohabits, nationalism is the most negative factor operating in our societies today. Nationalism, if such a thing is at all possible, is even more ridiculous than religion! Nationalism and religion have always marched together in lock-step! So-called "Patriotism" is an essentially irrational emotional orgasm that makes Nationalism into a truly criminal thing! The harm this "co-habitation" has caused to individual humans is utterly incalculable!

I think that this planet is currently going through a process in which it's experiencing some kind of centrifugal social force which is breaking our societies down into their natural components. This is happening because most, if not all, of the artificial constraints to such a process are either broken down completely or in the process of so doing. This process is going to be immeasurably painful. But, in spite of all the horror and bloodshed it entails, nonetheless, it's a positive thing in the long run.

Let's see why ...

The first reason why I think it's a positive thing, is that it is my best guess that eventually, all of these splinter groups, these ethnic and/or special interest groups (Kurds, Chechens, Welch, Scots, Bretons etc.) that need a time to develop a true sense of their own worth, will also realize that these small groupings that seem so important to them, are, no matter what else they are, also not viable either economically or socially.

Too small a group always gets conceptually, intellectually, and genetically incestuous. In other words it's destructive to the gene pool. It's the kind of thing that produces things like "Tay-Sachs Disease". Not simply physically and socially, but psychically as well.

As a result of this realization, coupled with a renewed sense of self-worth, there will be a realization of their commonality with the rest of humanity. Commonality however, is in no way at all incompatible with the illimitable liberties of absolute individual freedom.

As a result of that realization our global society will experience a centripetal movement, a synergy, that will eventually produce a global community. But it must be a naturally occurring process! Synergy cannot be forced! Forced centripetality is potentially explosively centrifugal!

But, if left to occur naturally, as an inexorable synergistic process, it will be a benign global community; one based upon amity, respect for the differences of others, and mutual self-interest. That is, of course, infinitely preferable to the community we have now, one based largely, if not entirely on political and military coercion.

What do I think we want to end up with as our social paradigm?

Well, given the nature of my model of reality, I want us to end up with a set of social parameters which is conducive to human creativity. Why I want that is obvious. Of course there remains a question as to what kind of creativity is needed.

In the course of human history there has sadly been far more creativity, of a kind, in situations that are very much other than peaceful. Creativity with harm as its goal. They say that "necessity is the

Mother of invention”, but really, speaking historically, war is the father of invention, and the exigencies of war are the mother. That stinks!

During the period called the “Renaissance”, there was a great deal of artistic and intellectual creativity, which is distinctly a positive thing. But while it produced a legacy which enriched the human race, it was far less positive than it could or should have been because most of that creativity was circumscribed and limited by the power of religion which ruled society in that time. The few who dared to create something which was outside of those parameters paid dearly for their temerity.

Creativity, far more than any other thing, does not flourish in a limiting environment! Creativity, especially abstract creativity, requires a condition of absolute liberty in which to truly flourish! I believe that no one can ever be too free, but it is absolutely clear to me that creative people need that freedom more desperately than most.

There was a vast creative surge during the latter part of the 18th century and during most of the 19th, but most of that creativity was inspired by, and served, various nationalisms, and other “isms” of a political and/or philosophic nature.

The vast scientific and technological “creative surge” of the 19th century was as useful as it was valid, it was very valuable indeed, but it basically served the same masters as did the arts in the same period. When all is said and done, they were the same masters that had ruled during the renaissance.

There was some improvement in the human condition but not enough.

The engendering of abstract creativity is, of course, one of the major reasons for the existence of our universe. At least it is according to my reality model. That’s why I’m going to be concentrating on creativity.

It’s my most basic belief that the more liberty people actually have, the happier and more productive they will be. Free people are happy people, and happy people are far more creative than unhappy people.

It’s just that simple.

So the societal parameters I’d really like to see come into place are those that will produce just that ... free, happy, creative people.

As I said before, they’re going to call me an anarchist, and I won’t deny it. In my heart of hearts, I truly do believe: “That government governs best which governs least” and by logical extension, no government at all is even better. But I know it’s no longer even a remote possibility.

PART 13: THE IMPOSSIBLE GOAL!

If our most remote ancestors had chosen to govern themselves, and to be responsible for themselves; rather than choose to have others rule them and be responsible for them, it might have been a wonderful thing. But then again I have to ask what sort of society would we have had if any? What would we possess today in the way of technology and science, what would we now have in the way of art, architecture, literature, and music?

Where would the race be today? I have absolutely no idea. The road we took was very much akin to the opening of "Pandora's Box", but I think that we might actually miss some of the things our lack of liberty has bought us. But, enough's quite enough. Now we really need to be free.

In any case, it's far too late for any kind of truly anarchic society. There's just too many of us in the first place. In the second place, today there are certain things that an individual cannot provide for themselves, and so, as late 20th century people, there are certain "givens" within which we must develop our new societal parameters.

People must be as free as free can be, but that freedom cannot become an impediment to their other needs. Now that's a paradox isn't it? It is, and I doubt very highly if it admits of a perfect solution.

People need food, they need clothing, they need a roof over their head that they can securely call their own, they need far better than merely "adequate" medical care, they need the security that comes from knowing that they, and their children, and their friends and relatives, can go out into the street and come home again safely. They also require a modicum of pleasure and joy. They also need not to have to worry about what the future is going to bring.

In other words, "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"!

I think that as we are no longer primitives, these things are not privileges, they are now part of our interlocking network of mutual responsibility. In other words, the basic necessities of life itself are a basic human right. We are far too prosperous as a whole, to let parts of that whole suffer!

The followers of Marx and Lenin claimed to have a society based upon the premise "from each according to their abilities, to each according to their needs".

It's a shame that Marxism/Leninism was all a fraud and a sham. It's a shame that Communism produced a society that was inept, inefficient, and incompetent in everything but the exercise of police powers. It's a shame that it produced one of the most grindingly oppressive societies in the history of mankind. It's a shame that it didn't work, because that premise, "from each according to their abilities, to each according to their needs" wasn't the worst idea human beings have ever had.

That's why I say that anarchy, or rather true anarchy, is no longer a feasibility. For the bunch of us to take care of each other, and for us all to take care of our environment, requires cooperation or communality.

On the other hand, supplying people with the basic necessities for a dignified and pleasant existence does not mean that we have to get in there and supervise their lives!

We have to create a world-wide society with just enough centripetality to provide a good environment for everyone. But not one iota more! But first the centrifugal forces within our societies must play themselves out! People have got to get to know who they are, they have to respect who they are, they

have to be comfortable with who they are. By that I mean in the sense of the relationships which prevail in the physical world.

The encouragement of benign self-esteem is one of the most important things we have to do. It's a truism that perception of reality is far more important than reality itself. And true it is! If people in some certain area consider themselves to be an oppressed and imposed upon minority, it doesn't matter whether it's true or not!

People who consider themselves oppressed, are oppressed, even if that oppression is of themselves by themselves! When you're dealing with human beings the perception of reality is far more important than the actuality of it.

If people in a certain area really believe themselves to be a nation, and because of that belief, aspire to the reality of that state, then no matter how impractical it may be, they really need to have the experience of the reality of their dreams. It doesn't matter a bit if they've never, ever, at any time or place in history, had the reality of their dream, if they perceive their dream to be a reality, they will never be a peaceful part of any community until they have met their aspirations, and seen for themselves how unviable they are!

We will never free human society from the evils and constant dangers of nationalism until all the peoples of the world have worked out all their dreams and found them to be nightmares.

Every single human being has the absolute right to do stupid things for emotional reasons. Bottle them up, and you're sitting on a powder keg on top of a volcano!

Which is precisely where we're sitting today!

People need! Not all of the things they need are good for them but who has the right to insist that they never fulfill these needs? No one at all! But there's one hell of a difference between "want" and "need" and we have to learn how to distinguish between the two things. I think that what people need they have a right to have, but what they want may not necessarily be theirs to possess.

It's when we find ourselves in a situation in which what someone says they need, rightfully belongs to someone else, that we have a really big problem. Palestine/Israel is a terrible case-in-point!

Maybe it would be best were I to speak my mind about that "case-in-point". What I just said is clearly ambiguous. The Palestinian people had occupancy, they had some 500 to 1200 years of possession, that possession was based upon both original occupancy and military conquest, first in the 7th century, and then the re-conquest after the Crusades in the 12th and 13th centuries. The Jewish people who, for the most part, are the politically dominant population of the State of Israel, are, with the Sephardic exception, entirely of European descent. Their religion had long claimed Palestine as its place of origin, and dreamed of a return. To those long term religious and nationalist aspirations, was added desperation born out of the holocaust. That desperation turned "want" into a perceived "need". The world community, which was rightly filled with guilt for permitting the holocaust, gave what they wanted to the survivors of the holocaust, and to all other Jews, by way of reparations.

It is my firm belief that two wrongs don't make a right. Ever!

In righting a wrong done to the Jews, we very badly wronged the Palestinians.

It has created a situation whose end I cannot foresee but I worry about it a lot!

PART 14: CHILDISH THINGS

We're never going to get anywhere in our search for a benign commonality on this planet until people's own self-esteem has reached such a level that they no longer need "things" or places to bolster that self-esteem.

"When I was a child, I THOUGHT AS A CHILD", but we are no longer children in any conceivable sense of the term. Now we must start to put away our "childish things"! Religion is a "childish thing", so too is nationalism, and patriotism, and hostile racial or ethnic pride. Mindless hostility to those who are different from us is a terribly "childish thing". Negative egocentricity is a "childish thing", so too, are greed and acquisitiveness. Conceit is also a "childish thing". Fear of death is basically a "childish thing", as is fear of sexuality. Fear itself is a really "childish thing".

The time has come to grow up.

Well now, how shall we "put away our childish things" then? Almost every single factor in our societies is a "childish thing", therefore we really do have to "start from scratch" as it were.

PART 15: ADULT THINGS

So what is “scratch”?

For us, it means we start all over again. We need to change everything and that means that “everything” needs defining. I really hate to “compartmentalize” things because I really hate to be “compartmentalized”. But I can’t see how we’re going to define and delineate our vast needs without somehow breaking them down into manageable proportions.

Let’s see, we really need to talk about the nature of the kind of governmental structures we’ll accept, and exactly how much power and authority we’ll permit them to borrow from us. We need to talk about how those governmental structures will be financed.

The only legitimate excuse for the existence of governmental structures is to insure that people’s rights are protected, and to insure that their various needs, some of which are also inherent rights, shall be met.

“Laws” are essentially oppressive things, but we’ll need to discuss how we are going to manage to prevent those who are irresponsible from harming those who are not.

In this connection we’ll most urgently need to discover something to replace our ghastly and iniquitous “criminal justice systems”. They are certainly criminal, but they have absolutely nothing to do with justice!

Here in the United States they’re building more jails than they are either schools or hospitals. They’re spending infinitely more money on the punishment of so-called “crime” than on the education that would surely prevent it. What does that say about that society? It says its psychotic, and it is. It says it stinks!

We’ll need to discuss the ways we can develop some non-coercive and socially positive mechanism for satisfactorily mediating the natural disputes that all humans are “heir to”.

We’ll certainly need to have a long discussion about human sexuality and all the complicated human relationships that are involved in that subject.

We’ll need to think about the kind of educational system that needs to be “in place” to insure the most creative development of all people.

We’ll need to really get involved in deciding what exactly is our responsibility to our environment and those living things, both sentient and otherwise, that share it with us.

We really need to think deeply about the kind of niche it’s appropriate and productive for humanity to occupy on this planet.

Mostly, we really need to meditate upon the kind of people we really want to be. We need to figure out what our character is, and what it would be better being. We surely can never be perfect, but I do think it’s not foolish to try to be so.

The human race has accomplished truly great things in the arts and in the sciences and the academic fields, and most of all, in technology. All that accomplishment in an oppressive society that was and is totally counter-productive of true greatness what can it accomplish in a more perfect society?

(I do not consider military or political prominence to be indicative of true greatness, usually they are simply the result of ruthless ambition and cleverness coupled with a great lack of scruples, but not invariably so. In my experience, nothing is ever invariably so!

“Nothing is ever invariably so”; that is a truth which makes life extremely interesting to me. But it also makes planning a much more difficult task because we are trying to plan a better world for individuals to live in. Individuals, not either “classes” or otherwise homogeneous masses of people. We’ve had far too much of that kind of planning, it’s almost entirely oppressive/repressive no matter how well intended it is.

What we want/need/require is a society planned around disparate individuals, because disparate individuals are what we are! Disparate individuals are what we really must be, for when a person allows herself to be crammed into a mold to match some imaginary “peer group”, that person has, to a degree, committed a kind of suicide.

We’ll have to find the best possible ways to encourage and support people like Stephen Hawking and Vaclav Havel. Especially those who, unlike Hawking and Havel, are totally unknown. Creativity and intelligence are humanity’s greatest and most important resource.

But then, individualism can be, and very frequently is, a very destructive thing. How then, do we encourage non-destructive individualism?

You can’t make anybody be, or do, anything at all, no matter how “good” it may be for them. When dealing with humans, or any sentient thing, you have to make your omelet without breaking any eggs! Because the “eggs” involved are human lives, dreams, and hopes!

What is normally passed off in human societies as “pragmatism” is, as I see it, really something which people use as an excuse for doing as they wish instead of as they ought. What do I mean by “ought”?

Well, I refer you to that litany of responsibilities I outlined a while back. Don’t bother flipping backwards, here they are:

“I am responsible for, and to, me ... you are responsible for, and to you; neither of us has any right or business palming off those responsibilities on some non-existent deity.

It is my responsibility to be at least as caring of you, as I am of myself, and very likely even more so.

It is my responsibility to harm no sentient creature in any conscious way.

It is my responsibility to conduct my life and actions in such a manner as to be unable to unconsciously harm any sentient creature.

It is my responsibility to nurture and tend the non-sentient creatures among us as best I possibly can. I do not think that really means we have to be vegetarians. We can be if we want to be but I really reject the concept that I (or anyone else) “have to” do something in order to be a truly “good” person. That kind of thing is oppressive and if one really thinks about that premise, it really is no different than the religious approach.

I think that a person should be a vegetarian if they feel a deep inner compunction to be a vegetarian. I do not think a person should be a vegetarian, or anything else, just because they, or worse yet, someone else, may think it’s “right” ... each person must know clearly that it’s “right” for them.

It is my responsibility to tend and nurture the physical environment as best I possibly can.

It is my responsibility to ask myself ... "Is it true?" ... "Is it kind?" ... "Is it helpful?" ... "Is it necessary?" ... before I say anything that will effect others in an important way.

It is my responsibility to ask myself ... "Is it kind?" ... "Is it helpful?" ... "Is it needful?" before I do anything that isn't trivial.

It is my responsibility to make of the physical world as good a place as I possibly can.

It is my responsibility to make sure that the physical world is at least a little better place, not at all a worse place, for my having passed through it.

No one is responsible for me but me!

It is my responsibility not to be fatuous, shallow, and saccharine!

On the other hand:

It is not my responsibility to "return evil with good"!

It is not my responsibility to "turn the other cheek"!

It is not my responsibility to "speak only good" of those I deem not to be "good".

It is not my responsibility to "expect only good from others" or to "seek out only the good in others" ... cynical as it may sound, if you don't have false expectations you cannot be disappointed.

It is not my responsibility to "love" anyone ... except ... myself!"

Because if I cannot love myself, I cannot love anyone or anything! To paraphrase "The Bard" (whoever he was): If I cannot be true to myself, I cannot be true to anyone!

One could make a worse start than that in "doing what one ought"!

Our society passes "doing as one ought" off as hopeless idealism.

But you know what? It's the "pragmatism" that is a hallucination, a dream, a false hood, a lie. It may sound crazy but I really think that what human society always calls "idealism" is the only true pragmatism because it's the only thing, which in the long run, has any hope of working.

Now that sounds totally contradictory to my preaching of individualism, doesn't it? Is it possible to have a communality of independent individualists?

It had better be possible! I think it is. Difficult? Yes! Impossible? No!

"Enlightened self-interest" is what I'm talking about. Sounds terrible doesn't it? But you know, I don't think it's as awful as they'd like us to think.

It is precisely "enlightened self-interest" that is the only thing that will make possible a communality of individualists. In fact, it is "enlightened self-interest" that made possible the "social contract" upon which our societies have depended for the last fifty thousand years or so. Enlightened self-interest is what permits individuals to co-exist in any social grouping.

Ethics are not based on any absolutes. They aren't because except in certain technological/scientific instances, such as "absolute zero", there are no social or philosophical absolutes!

PART 16: ABSOLUTES

I must now repeat something I said some pages back: Werner Heisenberg has, by the simple expedient of making everything terribly uncertain, made it clear for all times; and Quantum Mechanics, Chaos Theory, and etcetera, by which I mean to say all other contemporary, entirely non-religious, scientific, cosmological research have proved his premise, that: The Universe, as we are coming to understand how little we really know of it, is not at all the rational, reasonable, linearly logical place that humanity once imagined/deemed/dreamed/wished it to be.

That is not to say that it's a place entirely of meaningless chaos, with no logic in its makeup whatsoever. It is, I think, more like saying that it is a place in which there is clearly a kind of logic but it is clearly not logic which is of a linear nature.

What kind of logic there is is hardly entirely clear, but I think, based upon my personal experience of it, and upon the results of my studies of the experiences of others, that it would perhaps be best described as "spherical", not necessarily in its nature, for its nature is unknowable, but in its function. What I mean to say by that is this: Linear logic goes from "a" to "b" to "c", etcetera, carefully and sequentially.

"Spherical Logic" starts out everywhere and nowhere at all "a" and "z" at once and the same time. Like the universe itself, its center is everywhere, and its perimeter is nowhere at all. Perhaps it would be more clear and more accurate to say that the "center of the universe" is wherever a percipient of that universe may happen to be.

That is why I describe the logic I find in our Universe as "spherical". In addition, it is not progressive logic, but rather instantaneous logic. "Spherical Logic" is the logic of creation, linear logic is the logic of the created. In other words, "spherical logic" is rational, reasonable, and logical, but only on its own terms, and perhaps upon those of metasapiency as well, but not on those of humanity.

Quantum Mechanics, Chaos Theory, and The Uncertainty Principle have also very clearly demonstrated that some of humanity's more irrational notions as to reality and the nature of the human condition are just that ... totally irrational! This irrationality is equally as true of science as it is of philosophy and religion.

Of course, the Universe itself would appear to be a thing which is rather more "anti-rational" than it is simply "irrational". Only one thing can be assumed to be certain, our contemporary science has certainly made out of all certainties total uncertainties! The words "absolute" and "Ultimate" really don't mean all that much any more. In fact, they aren't the only concepts and ideas which don't mean anything any more.

In the words of Yogi Berra: "Most of what we know for sure just ain't so ..."

To which Werner Heisenberg has added the notion that most of what we are learning is both uncertain and confusing.

Nor, in many ways, is there any meaning left to the terms "rational" and "irrational", except when their use occurs in references to human inter/intra-personal behavior!

The work of Heisenberg, Schrodinger, Bohr, Einstein, Hawking, and all their colleagues, have made of reality, or rather of what are clearly multiple realities entirely relative things.

Sometimes, in fact, I think it's most of the time, the Human Race gets itself into a position which very much resembles that of a squirrel on a treadmill! Or perhaps Sisyphus laboring on his mountain, is the better metaphor. People spend both an awful lot of time, and almost immeasurable amounts of energy, engaged in seeking knowledge of things that most likely do not exist.

Almost as much time and energy as they spend fearing things that surely don't exist! "God" for instance!

Almost as much time and energy as they spend fearing things which, while they do exist, do not exist as humans imagine them to exist! "Death" for instance!

Almost as much time and energy as they spend fearing things that they can do nothing about! "Death" and the "unknown-unknowable", which are in so many ways very nearly absolutely identical, for instance!

The search for various abstract philosophical absolutes, things such as: Absolute Reality, Absolute Truth, Absolute Good, Absolute Evil, Absolute Beauty, Absolute Perfection, etcetera; is at once the most chimerical and the most futile and wasteful of all Human endeavors. Say rather, "philosophical absurdities", for it is clear that is exactly what they are, and what they have always been!

But upon considerably expanding that line of thought, while the objects of the search are manifestly absurd, and the search itself, is clearly futile, maybe it's NOT entirely wasteful. While the search for human understanding and mastery of philosophical absolutes is clearly chimerical and hopeless; perhaps, in the long view, the quest for knowledge and understanding of certain absolutes is not totally useless. Perhaps "The Search" is its own best reward!

While philosophical absolutes are totally non-existent as things in and of themselves in human terms, it is clear that the experience and the intellectual growth which are gained in the oh-so frustrating process of seeking such things as "absolutes", are valuable things in and of themselves.

The exercise of the individual mind, and the individual human intellect, is always valuable if as I am certain is true, intelligence, or consciousness, or awareness, or whatever one chooses to call it, is ultimately the only reality.

Whatever "reality" may actually be, I am personally comfortable with the idea that its "purpose", if that's the relevant word, is clearly the evolution, extension, expansion, and intensification of awareness and consciousness.

In other words, if energy, which we can, and do, not only measure, but also utilize, and personally clearly experience, is, as I am sure it is, only an expression of consciousness, which itself is clearly another thing which we can, and do, experience on a continuous basis, and consciousness itself, is clearly simply an expression of energy, then it seems obvious to me that anything which intensifies and expands human awareness, human consciousness, and/or human intelligence, also increases the intensity of the energy field which is the essential reality of the human condition.

Energy is a form of awareness, awareness is a form of energy; our universe is a constantly changing environment for that energy/consciousness; our universe, which is an extension/expression of ourselves and of which we are an extension/expression, evolves through the intensification of the unified field of aware energy.

I would like to posit that it is perhaps equally true that the unity which is energy and consciousness is a thing which, while it is clearly other than our own personal realities, nevertheless is not entirely external to our own personal realities, but something which we can effect, at least in relation to its effect on us, by our own efforts.

Stretching the mind to reach far beyond itself, forcing the mind to reach out far beyond its own realities, encouraging the mind to attempt to encompass the infinite, making the mind perform the mental equivalent of gymnastics, is, I think, the best way to produce a thing I prefer to call creative intelligence, or “The Creator Spirit”, a being which possesses the capacity for originating, or rather, “new-creative” creativity, rather than the far more common “re-creative” creativity.

Originating, or new-creative creativity, needless to say has nothing to do with the procreation of life, but is the end product of intellectual growth and stimulation. It is the capacity to create something literally out of “nothingness”. The capacity to create something which is entirely original, something which is utterly unique, something which is truly individual; to create something entirely by the use of the mind and intelligence.

It is an ability which is very rare among humans while distinctly indicative of metasapiency. It is, I believe, the eventual enablement of all consciousness, both that of humans and that of other sentiences, in this fashion, which is ultimately the purpose and goal of the evolving universe. In other words, to expand consciousness and intensify awareness, until the possessor of both becomes abstractly creative, i.e., Metasapient.

Intellectual exercise is also the only way to gain the capability which enables humans to deal effectively with abstractions, a capacity which is the ultimate key to the kind of creativity which I am talking about.

I think that humans seek absolute answers, which do not exist at any level they can encompass, because they are rendered both uneasy and fearful by abstractions, which do exist, and which they can reach.

People seek what they call philosophical absolutes for the simple reason that they do not wish to deal with reality itself for reality is anything but absolute. What I’m talking about here is not intrinsic reality itself, which is the true reality of human-defined “Absolute Reality”, but that human-defined but otherwise non-existent thing “absoluteness”. Reality itself, is entirely abstract, which makes “absoluteness” impossible. Reality itself, is entirely relative, which makes “absoluteness” absurd.

The search for philosophical absolutes however, helps to anchor individual, or rather personal reality, in a stormy abstract sea of relative realities!

Reality, being both relative and totally abstract, is utterly inimical to any kind of existential status quo. People tend to prefer the status quo, whether personal, societal, or existential.

It’s so very reassuring! The only trouble is that stasis, which is another, and far more accurate name for the “status quo”, is the only reality of actual “death”. Stasis is the only thing which prevents growth. In fact, stasis, were the state itself at all possible to attain, would also prevent entropy.

Think about it!

Entropy too, means change and change and growth are synonyms.

Static means unchanging but change and growth are synonyms.

You cannot have growth without change. You cannot have “life” without “death”. You cannot have evolution without entropy. Intrinsic reality cannot be what humans call “absolute” because it is constantly changing.

But stasis, or at least the idea of stasis among humans, is oh, so comfortable. Stasis is oh, so analgesic. Stasis is oh, so easy. Even if it’s only “pretended stasis”.

It has to be “pretended stasis”, because true stasis, or absolute inactivity, or absolute passivity, or absolute motionlessness, or the null-energy state, or non-existence, is, like all human-defined “absolutes”, an impossibility.

Now, speaking in line with the “cutting edge” of science, we know that energy, which is all that truly seems to exist, is always in motion. There is clearly no such thing as physical stasis, for the simple reason that physicality is the lowest level of any of the relative realities. By “lowest” I mean to say both the least real in relation to the reality of energy, and the state-of-being which represents the least intense energy field.

Physical living things change more quickly and continuously than any other things. Therefore, because of its absolute lack of continuity, physicality is, of all states-of-being, the least “real”. Things physical, we now know, are simply energy fields, or individual force- fields, which are themselves constantly in motion. Therefore there is no such thing as physical stasis, nor can there be such a thing.

Lucretius, the Roman Poet/philosopher, said this beautifully so long ago, in his poem “On Life and Death”, here paraphrased rather than translated from the Latin, by Mallock in the late 19th Century:

“No single thing abides, but all things flow, fragment to fragment clings the things thus grow until we know them and name them. By degrees they melt, and are no more the things we know. Globed from the atoms, falling slow ... or swift I see the suns, I see the systems lift their forms; and even the systems and their suns shall go back slowly to their eternal drift. Thou too, oh Earth thine empires, lands and seas, Least with thy stars, of all the galaxies, globed from the drift like these, like these thou too shalt go, thou art going, hour by hour, like these. Nothing abides. Thy seas in delicate haze go off; these mooned sands forsake their place; and where they are, other seas in turn mow, with their scythes of whiteness, other bays.”

What I find totally fascinating about that quote from that old Roman is the question: “How did he know that?”

In those days, even the barest seed of the ideas we now lump under the descriptions “Quantum Theory” and “Chaos Theory”, didn’t exist in any form or shape cosmology incarnated only in a religious context astronomy, as a science, barely existed and in any case, it was primarily concerned with astrological fantasies higher physics wasn’t even an imaginary science so how did Lucretius know about field theory? I have no answer. It’s a source of total amazement and awe to me. So are the Vedas, which contain much material of a scientific nature, material which is clearly anachronistic in view of their undoubted antiquity.

With all due respect to whoever it was who wrote the “Shakespearean Plays” whom I will now paraphrase it’s true: “There’s far more to life and to reality than we can know, there’s far more to life and to reality than we can imagine!”

There is no kind of knowledge and understanding that is “forbidden” or denied to humanity! There is no “secret knowledge”. But this is equally true ... WE CANNOT KNOW THAT WHICH IS NOT THERE TO KNOW! This is also true no one can understand that which is beyond the capacity of their intelligence to encompass.

That is why some things seem to be “hidden”; they are completely or partially obscured or occulted by the percipient individual’s capacity for understanding.

Abstractions, to the majority of people, are clearly one of these so-called “hidden” things. But they only seem, or appear, to be hidden. They are not!

Abstractions simply wait for people to expand their consciousnesses sufficiently to see that abstractions are really not at all that difficult to understand.

Reality is what it is but it is constantly changing it is constantly undergoing flux and flow how then can we ever define or describe something that is never the same in absolute terms? When something is defined, it is held still by that definition; “pinned- down”, as it were. To “pin-down” reality, one would have to end it. A definition holds something “still” so that it always fits its definition but reality itself cannot “hold still”!

When one uses the term “Absolute Reality”, what one is doing is trying to describe “The Ultimate Reality”. By which is meant to say: a reality beyond which there is no other level of reality. Now, that ultimate level of reality is a thing which may perhaps exist at some unimaginable level of the relative realities. But it is entirely unknowable to human minds, for it clearly does not exist in any context applicable to human minds.

What do we really KNOW about reality?

Well, we know without question that all things which we can see and touch, are simply fields of energy held in apparent stasis by networks of force. That, of course, is true of ourselves as well. Human beings are not separate from the universe in which they exist.

That’s painfully obvious. But human beings constantly act as if it weren’t so as if they were in some way “other” than the field on which they play!

Even so energy is everything.

That ENERGY, or rather the over-all context of that energy which is the Unified Field, may in fact, BE the “absolute” or “ultimate” reality. It seems to be so, or at least it seems so from our perspective. But is it?

We don’t know. We cannot possibly know. No one may ever know.

It is clear that the best we can do is assume energy to be the most basic form of reality which we can grasp. The Universe shows itself to us both as a playing field for energies, and as a unified field of energy. But, an Absolute Reality or Ultimate Reality, would be required to be a thing which encompassed both our universe and that which contains it.

An Absolute or ultimate reality must encompass both the universe and that which contains it, unless we agree to define our universe itself, as “all that is, was, and may ever be”. In that case, of course, our universe becomes a much larger thing than any of our sciences is presently capable of positing.

From our physical/intellectual perspective, it is quite clear that reality may only be considered to be a totally relative thing. At the present time it is almost inconceivable that a perspective can be attained from which reality would change from relativity to absoluteness.

Then too, there is the possibility that as all that exists is simply energy, or varying forms of energy; then perhaps “Absolute Reality” or “Ultimate Reality” could be something which is other than energy, something which pre-exists energy or even something which produces energy something which would perforce exist entirely outside of, or entirely beyond, the context of the process which I call the “Big Bang Cycles” of cataclysmic energy event expanding chaotic energy cloud, the relative ordering of that chaotic energy field, eventual entropic decay of the energy field, collapse of the energy field cataclysmic energy event ... etcetera.

But we can know nothing of anything which exists foreign to that cycle of energy realities.

Surely it is at least superficially clear that IF such a “thing” existed, it would be entirely outside of the paradigms of reality, and therefore as something irrelevant to reality, it could perhaps fulfill the design parameters of what the religions delight in calling “God”!

But, it could just as easily be no such thing! Or no thing at all!

We don't know! No one knows! Probably no one will ever know!

It would hardly be likely, in any case, for the source of the unified field of energy, were we to consider it to be the actuality of what has been called “God”, to fulfill it's religiously advertised character of “cosmic busy body” and/or “cosmic tyrant”!

Any absolute reality, no matter what it might be, is so far removed from our own level of the relative realities that we and it are utterly irrelevant to one another.

In any case, when all is said and done, we know that we exist, we do not know, but we merely surmise (I think “hope” is the more accurate term), that the condition or state which we presume to call Absolute Reality may exist. As Heisenberg might have said: “It's all very uncertain!”

There are clearly more comprehensive realities than the reality in which we find ourselves enmeshed. Those may fairly accurately be named “Greater Realities”. But Absolute or Ultimate Reality? That is a state of unknowable character. And it will always be so! The more consciousness and awareness are extended and intensified, the further away the borders of “Absolute Reality” will move!

As far as I am concerned, “Absolute Reality” is a dream. Human beings have a dream which shields them from the uncertainties of a reality whose only true nature is never-ending change. A reality whose only reality is the never ending flux and flow of energy, changing itself as its intensity increases. A reality which is, by its nature, entirely antistasis. A reality which is almost entirely “observer driven”. A reality which is entirely relative, to itself, and to everything else.

At least the search for “Absolute Reality” is basically harmless and, as I indicated earlier, productive of intellectual growth and maturity.

There's another search in which the human race engages however, which is not nearly so benign. In fact, it is actively harmful to human life, growth, and development.

That is the search for “Absolute Good” and, obviously, for its mirror-image “Absolute Evil”.

PART 17: DUALISM

What could possibly be harmful about seeking a definition of “absolute good” and then striving to attain it? What could be detrimental about seeking a definition of “absolute evil” and then eschewing it or combating it?

LOTS!

Because of the definitions utilized in the search! Because of activities engendered BY the search!

If humans were to seek to understand the dichotomy of “good and evil” in an abstract sense ONLY, it would probably be intellectually rewarding.

But we all of us know that, in practice, the search for “good and evil” is not abstract at all, but an entirely concrete thing!

Too many lives, both human and otherwise, have been destroyed because of the obsessive human pre-occupation with “good” and “evil”!

As there are no “absolutes” at all, the search for them is a particularly futile and frustrating “dead end street”.

The basic problem involved in humanity’s search for the ultimate definition of “good” and “evil” is that there exist absolutely no definitions for either “good” or “evil”, that do not come out of religion, which is mankind’s worst “dead end street”.

There is almost nothing more relative and less sure than a definition of “good” and “evil”. The notions of “good” and “evil” took form in mankind’s distant and primitive past. These notions are, all of them, entirely dualistic in nature, which completely contradicts the monistic identity of the unified field of energy which is the essential reality of our universe and all that it contains.

Most of humanity’s ideas about this subject, and as a result, most of humanity’s conceptions regarding “absolute good” and “absolute evil” are today, as they always were, originally rooted in the Mazdazdian/Babylonian/Chaldean/Judeo/Christian dualistic religion based upon the dichotomy of “Light and Darkness”, “Good and Evil”. “Ormuzd” (Ahura Mazda), who represents the creative force and “Light”, and “Ahriman”, who represents entropy and “Darkness”.

But upon what were these notions of the eternal warfare between “Light and Darkness” really based? They were entirely based upon ancient animal-man’s fears and terrors. The daylight was safe and secure and warm. The night was full of terrors and insecurity and cold. Animal-man could go about its business hunting and gathering in the daylight in relative security. To venture forth after darkness had descended was to risk being one’s self “hunted and gathered” rather than eater eaten! Ergo the Day was “Good” and the Night was “Bad” or “Evil”!

It is not really a very big step from that notion to the idea that the “day” was presided over by a deity which was absolutely “Good”, whilst the night was the province of an adversarial deity which was abso. lutely “Evil”; and that the alternation of day and night was symptomatic of an eternal struggle between the two equal but adversarial deities.

I think it’s very easy to see how in parts of the world where such is appropriate, it was very easy for animal-man to make the same mis-suppositions about summer and winter, seeing in the progression of the seasons further evidence of the war between “Light” and “darkness”, “Good” and “Evil”. Animal

man's religions surely are evidentiary of this. All of humanity's religions are obsolete and anachronistic relics of animal-man! Religions of course, took this conception ... and ran amok with it!

"The Prince of Darkness" and "The Lord of Light" ... are both of them entirely imaginary. They are, and were, simply the products of primitive fears and insecurities.

There are very few things in this world that are more percipient driven than "good" and "evil". There are very few things that are more relative than "good" and "evil". "Good" and "evil" really have nothing at all to do with the effects of human behavior. They have even less to do with natural occurrences.

ONE PERSON'S "GOOD" CAN OH-SO-EASILY BE ANOTHER PERSON'S "EVIL".

Things which are perceived to be either "good" and "evil" are not at all inherently so. It is only the effects of either actions, or some kind of beingness, that are perceived to be the one or the other. There is nothing at all which is either "good" and "evil" in it's inherent state-of- being.

I don't intend to deal with the harm religions have done in this portion of our conversation. I intend to deal with that subject exclusively in another place. So I won't develop those ideas further at his time. What I want to talk about now, is the damage done by the search for "Absolute Good" and "Absolute Evil".

The most deeply harmful aspect of the search for "Absolute Good and Evil" is the basic conception that either of those states can possibly exist, and the actions people take towards other people as a result of that concept.

There are far too many areas of natural human behavior that have come to be seen as "inherently evil" when the entire conception of either "good" and "evil" is irrelevant to the subject.

Humans are terribly afraid of death humans are far too afraid of sexuality worse still, and most common of all humans are very much afraid of each other!

The concept that permits the belief in the existence of "Absolute Good and Evil" is the sole source of almost all of those fears, and I definitely include the fear of death.

There is positively no such thing as either "good" and "evil", "absolute" or otherwise!

Things happen to people that they perceive as "good" (here others may not agree) things happen to people that they perceive as "not good" or "evil" (here too, others may not agree) there are natural disasters that are perceived as negative by those experiencing them ... but the disasters are utterly neutral no matter how they are perceived by their victims.

What is harmful in this area is the simple fact that when human beings believe themselves to be participants in an eternal battle between "good" and "evil" they develop an adversarial mind-set and begin to live within the confines of a "siege mentality". They begin to try to identify "friends" and "foes". That is a mind-set which is distinctly harmful to all concerned. People who divide things and other people into "good" and "bad", create an environment in which everything is divided. To the great detriment of all.

People who are seeking to avoid "evil" and attain "good", as a result of that quest, DO things that are neither "good" anor "evil", but are terribly harmful to all concerned. People caught up in a passionate crusade to eschew "evil" and enforce the "good", or at least what they perceive to be "good" HARM other people!

Forcing anyone or anything to be other than that person or thing is, both physically and emotionally harms that person or thing! It is clearly demonstrable HARM rather than either “good” and “evil” that we would be best to eschew! Viewed honestly, and as much without emotion as may be possible, what exactly are “good” and “evil”?

Well now, to answer that question the first thing we’ve got to do is extract from the equation anything, of any category whatsoever, which is perceived as either “good” and “evil”; ONLY because it is either pleasing or irritating to “Divinity”!

WE CAN’T BASE HUMAN LIFE UPON MYTHS, LEGENDS, FAIRY TALES, AND TOTAL UN-TRUTHS ANY LONGER!

Our having done so in the past has wrecked incalculable amounts of clearly measurable harm on all living things! The worst thing that has ever happened to humankind is its invention of “God”!

“Sin”, or rather the concept that produced the word: which is that there are actions, or thoughts, or conditions-of-being, which are inherently “offensive” or even “hurtful” to “God”; were they not so dreadfully harmful, would be the silliest thing humanity has ever created!

Even if there were such a monstrosity as a “God” (or Goddess), there’s really nothing anything physical could do that would effect it in any way!

So then, “Good” and “Evil”, or rather things one can easily live with (good) and things one can very easily live without (evil) are entirely variable, extremely short-term definitions having to do with the effects of actions and events on human life, happiness, and comfort, and that’s all that they are!

If we’re ever going to make this planet an acceptable and positive milieu for sentient growth and development a happy place for sentient beings to live, then we’ve got to rid ourselves of all our primitive superstitions and fear, and go on to plan our societies from a level playing field based upon our rationally/empirically based understandings of reality.

We’ve got to stop talking and worrying about so-called “good” and “evil”, and start thinking in terms of things and actions which are socially constructive and/or socially destructive. We’ve got to begin describing human behavior in terms which define individual human actions in categories that define what is “acceptable”, and “less than acceptable”, and “not at all acceptable”.

“Acceptability”, or at least the parameters which go into deciding levels of acceptability must be based upon practical effects of actions and attitudes and NOT upon any kind of “morality” based paradigm. Morality is the most absurd of all abstractions because it is based entirely upon religious parameters. Ethics is a valid conception, morality is not! Ethics are pragmatic, morality is absolute!

What are we really dealing with here?

Hurricanes, and Tornados, and Earthquakes certainly have less than happy effects upon human beings themselves, and upon their possessions, no one can deny that. But, while the effects may range from uncomfortable to absolutely deadly, the causes themselves are natural and neutral. The concepts of “Good” and “Evil” really have nothing at all to do with natural geophysical occurrences. So, it is clearly true that, while having a meteor land on your house will surely ruin your day, it has no connection at all with “Good” and “Evil”, it just happened.

Most things which effect human beings “just happen”!

Ask not “for whom the cookie crumbles”, it crumbles for thee!

Basically when people talk, or think, about the subject of “Good” and “Evil”, they’re really only dealing with the subject of human actions and attitudes and the effects of those actions and attitudes on other humans.

I think that it’s vitally important for us to understand that the greatest part by far of individual human activity has little or no important effect upon other people, and so it’s very safe to say that the greatest portion by far of human speech and action has no connection at all with the concepts of “Good” and “Evil”.

Cleared of all the rubbish introduced by religion, what we’re dealing with is the basic human social contract which enables us to live together peacefully and productively.

All of our laws and regulations claim to be based upon this premise, but that is not at all true, most of them are primarily based upon religious dogma and only a far distant second place can be claimed by pragmatic social necessity.

It is necessary that humanity get entirely rid of the dogma, and base their ideas of “Good” and “Evil”, and the social structures they base on those ideas, ONLY on pragmatic social necessity.

“Good” is that which harms no-one, “evil” is that which does! Most things, actions, and events fall in between those two extremes. But let us be vigilant that we only talk about actual harm and not some morality based perception of harm.

We also have to much more clearly define what we mean by “harm”. Because it too, is very much a matter of perception which is based entirely upon the identity and nature of the person or thing doing the perceiving!

Human beings are conscious of ethics and they are capable of perceiving and comprehending the results of any action. That means that each individual human is required to walk a much more careful line in regards to their actions than does a Bear. This is because a Bear, as a non-socializing species, has only two imperatives: it must have food ... and it must protect its young.

If we throw out the concepts of “sin” and “things displeasing to ‘God’”, then there will be infinitely fewer things which we will have to regard as “other than good”, and NOTHING which we will have to regard as “intrinsically evil”.

There is no “intrinsic or inherent evil”; there is no such thing as “sin” and neither “Absolute Good” or “Absolute Evil”; these are conceptions which are in any way valid.

I have said that the very ideas of “Absolute Good and Evil” have been terribly harmful in the past history of the human race. They are still just as harmful today.

Have you got any idea how many of our laws are based on these primitive, infantile, conceptions? How much of what is called “crime” is simply things corresponding to religious proscriptions based upon the notion of “sin”? Altogether too much of the content of our penal codes is based entirely on such primitive, infantile, nonsense.

Human society has a clear right to protect itself, as a gestalt, and to protect its individual members singly from the violent actions of others.

Human society has no intrinsic right at all to protect individuals from themselves, or to intervene in private and personal choices and activities that are harmless and consensual.

Human Societies exercise powers over their individual members because they have assumed these rights unilaterally. They do so because people have become accustomed to the presence of governors and because governmental bodies spend a lot of energy convincing people that they really need authority over them and their lives. Governments have never come into being as a result of consultation among and between individual human beings. Except for the matter of “style” our contemporary governments are very little different from the first governments, tribal chiefs who clubbed their way to power. In our times the “clubs” are simply more subtle.

Governments are assumed to be absolutely necessary and based upon that assumption, people acquiesce in being “governed”; and “governed” means “ruled” and “ruled” implies an abdication of personal responsibility on the part of those who are “ruled”! Because of this fact, all human governments are oppressive, they differ only in the degree of oppression!

So-called “Democratic Societies” are only “Democratic” in that they permit some debate and some limited choice in individual governing individuals the necessity for any government at all, and the necessity of any particular form of government, are not topics upon which debate is ever encouraged. Individuals are presented with the fact of government-in-being, and then permitted some very small say in the particular minor details of government.

Governments as they presently exist in the world, are an evil which people permit to exist in order to protect individuals from what the proponents of government assure them are “even greater evils”. Governments as they presently exist in the world argue that their purpose is to “protect the weak from the strong”; but as that has made Governments themselves the most strong, who shall protect the sheep from the shepherd?

There is not one single government in the world which is not the representative of some religious paradigm. There is not one single government in the world which does not enforce some religion’s view of absolute good and evil.

That clearly includes Communist China and Castro’s Cuba because both of those governments exist to enforce the Judeo-Christian moral imperative. Without The Judeo-Christian system there would be no Communism at all!

Humanity is in the process of ridding itself of Communism and the process of shedding Christianity is just beginning. When humankind rids itself of both communism and Christianity, there will be a lot less harm in the world! When humankind rids itself of messianic democracy, there will be a lot less harm in the world! When humankind leaves off this fruitless search for “absolute good and evil” there will be a lot less harm in the world!

Another and equally fruitless effort which humankind makes is its search for “Absolute Truth”.

WHAT IS “TRUTH”?

This is probably the most ubiquitous question the human race asks, and asks, and asks, and asks, and asks, and asks!

The only answer they’ve ever gotten is what “truth” isn’t!

As far as I can see, it's just as futile as the quest for "Absolute Good and Evil", but one hell of a lot less harmful!

It is futile, for it is absolute truth which mankind seeks, and there is no such thing!

It is equally futile when humanity seeks abstract truth, for while abstract truth is at least a reality, it is also a chameleon which is never the same thing from moment to moment. Nothing is so protean as Abstract Truth, for as the unified field changes so too does the abstract truth which defines it.

There is only one kind of truth with any validity at all. That is "the truth" to which one swears in a court of law.

"Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole, truth, and nothing but the truth. So help you God?"

But that has absolutely nothing to do whatsoever with either abstract truth or absolute truth. "Truth" in a juridical sense is merely the reporting of one's perception of events and actions. Court-room truth is, like history, only the reportage of a perception of events.

History is separated from fiction only by that definition. The "truth" of history, like courtroom "truth", is simply individual perception occasionally supported by empirical evidence.

But truly ... it is valid to ask: WHAT IS TRUTH?

What is abstract truth what is absolute truth?

The answer to that question is NOTHING!

As usual when dealing with human preoccupations, the concept of "Absolute" or "Ultimate" Truth is simply a security blanket.

Avoiding the realization that not only is truth entirely relative, but that it is the end-product of an almost entirely in-born methodology of avoidance of reality, is almost a native human instinct. The search for "Absolute Truth" is a way, a very unfortunate way, in which the greatest number of people try to shelter themselves from recognizing and accepting their own responsibilities.

The search for a "truth beyond all truths" is a way to hide upon the knowledge that, like all things, truth is relative. Absolute Truth doesn't exist. What does exist is personal truth, and it's the only truth there is. And whether people like it or not, it differs in and to each individual human. For each human being there is an individual personal truth. There can be no other.

One of the most irrelevant of all human searches for absolutes is the search for "Absolute Perfection". As "Gods" and "Goddesses" do not exist to be the models of perfection what then is perfection?

"Perfection", as it relates to living things, is a thing which cannot be either defined or described in any way. In the eyes or minds of human beings, "perfection" is always just a step or two away ... but in common with all other mirages it is impossible to reach!

The Greeks had an idea that even seeking perfection was hubristic, as perfection, they believed, was a thing attainable only by the "Gods". They may have been wrong about "The Gods" but they were certainly right about the search for perfection.

"Perfection", as it relates to objects, simply means flawless. But an absolutely flawless emerald is far less beautiful, and far less exciting to view, than one with occlusions, or "flaws". At least I think so, and so, I understand, do most jewelers.

As I see it, the most urgent problem that humans encounter in their search for perfection, and it doesn't really matter whether we're speaking of perfection in inanimate or animate objects, is that frustration is not always a positive experience.

And "frustration" is the only possible result of any search for "perfection". Finding perfection, I believe, especially in a sentient format, would be even worse. After all, people have survived finding a "perfect" diamond. A human being who is confronted by another sentient being who demonstrates, in a clear way, the reality of "perfection", would be so overwhelmed by their own perceived inadequacy that the person would, in a better world than ours, self-destruct on the spot! In our world though, history clearly shows that a human being, confronted by a "perfected being", would probably at least attempt to destroy that being on sight.

"Perfect Beauty" is simply an aspect of "Perfection" and as such is just as impossible a concept. I have dealt with beauty at length elsewhere, but it is painfully obvious to all sentience that "Beauty is in the eye of the observer", so why bother with it?

It seems that the most positive recipe for human growth is frustration knocking one's head continually against stone walls in that case then, the quest for "absolutes" of any kind is positive as it is productive of human evolution. And evolution is not only "the name of the game", it's the only game!

The "good" and the "not-good" are entirely based upon human perception. They probably translate more accurately as "the acceptably bearable" and the "unacceptably unbearable".

There is neither an intrinsic good nor an intrinsic evil. Never was, never will be!

Our societies exist in such amity as they do, and some is far better than none, precisely because it is easier to have some standards of behavior than it is to have none at all. Because the situation rapidly becomes "unacceptably unbearable" when there are no standards of acceptable behavior.

PART 18: INDIVIDUALISM

What's the actual difference between benign individualism and malignant individualism? There is clearly a difference!

Humanity's religions, Christianity in particular, have always regarded individualism not simply as a sin, but as a heresy, which particularly in the case of Christianity, is regarded as worse than "simple sinning". Why?

Well, I like to think that answer is obvious. Individualists tend to be iconoclasts. It doesn't matter whether they are benign individualists or malignant individualists, they tend to think for themselves! Thought, and especially independent thought, is repugnant to religion! It's not at all hard to figure out why!

So why?

Well, when your entire "stock-in-trade" is "I know something that you don't know" and that claim is your exclusive base for power. You definitely don't want people doing independent thinking and that is almost the definition of an individualist ... "one who thinks for themselves".

But what is the difference between benign individualism and malignant individualism? Well it has to do with egotism versus altruism, it has to do with egocentricity versus exocentricity, it has to do with the nature of the actions resulting from the individualistic point-of-view, and it has something to do with the results of the individualism.

The basic difference between my point-of-view and that of many other people, is that I don't see all individualism as malignant, which almost everyone else does. But then I react badly to most generalities! Sure individualism, when it is coupled with egocentricity, can be a really negative thing. But I have to ask: is individualism always coupled with egocentricity? With selfishness? My answer has got to be: No, it isn't!

It is my belief that most of the really important things which led to progress for the human race, most of the things which led to an improvement of human environment, were the products of independent, iconoclastic, and highly individualistic minds!

But, it is also clearly true that some of the worst things to befall the human race have also been the results of strong independent personalities.

And yet, I am absolutely certain that without the inculcation of strong independence as a human characteristic, the human race will have a future that no one will enjoy! That is assuming it will have any future at all!

Adolph Hitler, Ignacio de Torquemada y Molinos, Idi Amin, Josef Stalin, Gilles de Rais (who may very well be simply the victim of gross calumny), Saddam Hussein, and Ted Bundy, were/are all totally independent strong individualists, but then, so too, were Gautama Siddhartha, Mohammed of Mecca, who was non-mythical, and Jesus of Nazareth, whom I think was largely myth based upon some small truth, and Winston Churchill, and Socrates, and Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Edison, and Leonardo da Vinci, and Voltaire, and Francis Bacon and immense hosts of artists, and inventors, and writers, and philosophers, and scientists, all of them very important in and to human history.

Strong independent individuality has very powerful results. It's clear from the evidence of history that those results can be either positive or negative. Jesus of Nazareth, whoever the man they built the myth around may have been, was clearly a positive person. Christianity, the religion which was constructed about the myth built around the man is almost entirely negative and harmful. As the Crusades, the inquisition, the thirty years war, the Nazi extermination camps, and the hate-filled bigotry displayed by contemporary American fundamentalists clearly demonstrate.

It is our task to create a set of social parameters that will try to create a social milieu that will usually insure that individualism takes only the positive form. I do not, for one instant, believe that it is possible to insure that strong individuality will always be positive. Some of the people I mentioned before in the negative context, were truly "crazy" and lived within a reality which was entirely their own; others of them were malignant individuals whose megalomania and egocentricity led them to do horrible things for what they perceived was their own benefit. That seems to be an intrinsic part of human life, and it's clearly impossible to predict when some malignantly insane genius will come along. There's something else I have to say about malignant egocentrics however, who really knows what they have to teach the rest of us by way of their horrible examples? Will humanity ever achieve a truly benign communality without these horrid experiences to spur us on?

PART 19: A NEW SOCIAL PARADIGM

What we really need to hope for, is that we will find a way to create a social paradigm which will be positive more frequently than it is negative, one which produces happiness significantly more frequently than it produces unhappiness, one which is productive very much more frequently than it is destructive, and most important of all, one which is always liberating and never oppressive or confining.

I think that most of the negative people and negative things which come into manifestation in our societies, are far more usually the products of the negative aspects of our society. These negative aspects are: guilt (personal and collective), inferiority, low self-esteem, envy, resentment, impatience, and inchoate anger, are they are all pretty much the result of instinctive human reactions to the nature of our society.

A positive social paradigm must liberate, it must empower, it must set free! NO ONE CAN EVER BE TOO FREE!

A society which does not engender baseless guilts will find it eventually has very little real guilt to deal with.

A society which does not engender inferiority and low-self esteem, will find that it has very little envy, resentment, and impatience with which to deal!

A strong personality, a strong individual, is like water, it takes the path of least resistance!

If society empowers all people, it is far less likely that the strong individual will find negative channels for their energies! Not impossible, of course, but far less likely!

In the effort to create a positive social paradigm, I think it is of absolutely urgent necessity that we all desperately avoid the development of unreasonable expectations! Ungratified unreasonable expectations probably are the cause of more trouble than any other element in human society. Un-kept promises, whether they are explicit or implicit, are always negative things!

In the effort to create a positive social paradigm it is absolutely imperative that we avoid any acceptance of the totally insane notion that a good, or even an ideal end, can ever justify a means to that end that is anything less than entirely positive.

NO END AT ALL, NO MATTER HOW TRANSCENDENTLY WONDERFUL IT MAY BE, JUSTIFIES ATTAINING IT BY ANY MEANS LESS GOOD THAN IT IS! NEGATIVE MEANS ALWAYS PRODUCE EVEN MORE NEGATIVE ENDS!

A totally free society cannot be imposed upon those who it is designed to liberate! Oppression cannot ever, under any circumstances, result in liberty! Which is why "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat" was always such a totally malevolent idea.

Winston Churchill, whom I truly admire, even though he was actually a terrible man, said: "Democracy is the worst form of Government, but it's better than all rest!" He was right!

Socrates, Plato tells us, said: "Every form of government falls of an excess of its own best principle". That has always proven to be true of the many democracies the human race has spawned.

Democracy was really best defined by Abe Lincoln when he called it: "Government of the people, by the people, for the people". That is what it is, no more, no less!

The basic premise of a democratic society is that all of its citizens are entitled to equal treatment under the laws of that society, and that all citizens are entitled to a “say” or vote in the management of that society. It most especially does not mean that each of the citizens is equal to each of the other citizens in the matter of intrinsic worth!

THAT IS EGALITARIANISM AND EGALITARIANISM HAS DESTROYED EVERY DEMOCRACY IN WHICH IT HAS RAISED ITS MINDLESS HEAD!

Voltaire, who had something intelligent to say about everything, had something to say about this: “Those who say all men are equal speak the greatest truth if they mean that all men have equal right to Liberty, to the possession of their goods, and to the protection of the Laws - but, equality is at once the most natural thing and the most chimerical thing in the world; natural when it is limited to rights, unnatural when it attempts to level goods and powers - not all citizens can be equally strong - nor can they be equally wise - but they can be equally free. To be free is to be subject to nothing but the Laws!”

People are definitely not of equal worth! To insist that they are of equal worth is probably the most self-defeating form of oppression/repression known to humankind!

WHEN DEMOCRACY MUTATES INTO EGALITARIANISM, IT AUTOMATICALLY SELF-DESTRUCTS!

What I’m trying to say here is: in our effort to create a better social paradigm than we have, it’s very clear that we cannot get ourselves caught up in old forms.

Democracy is an old form. It is, as Winston Churchill said, “better than all the rest”, but it’s no good in the end.

Monarchy, theocracy, autocracy, oligarchy, socialism, communism, democracy, tribalism, anarchy, they have all been tried, and every one of them has been found wanting. Socrates was obviously entirely correct, when viewed in the light of human history, each of those forms of government was destroyed by an excess of its own BEST principle.

Each of them has its own particular validity, one which is usually quite limited in time and scope. Every one of them has proven itself to be intrinsically flawed. Each of them has been given a more than adequate attempt to prove itself, and they have each of them failed miserably.

How do we create positive new social parameters without adapting or adopting elements from those failed paradigms?

Do we need to? Yes!

Can we? I think that we can, but I am also fully aware that it will be incredibly difficult to do so. I said earlier that we must really “start from scratch” and I really wasn’t kidding!

It can sound very simple all we need to do is carefully find out what people really need and give it to them after finding a way to do so that doesn’t impose anything on anyone, or oppress anyone, or repress anyone, or rob anyone, and that is entirely fair to everyone! That’s all!

Unless I am entirely wrong, I think we’ll also have to find a way to basically support our planetary society that has nothing to do with economics! Nothing to do with “legal tender” or money! The pseudoscience of “Economics” is one of the deadest weights the past has hung about our necks, and also one of the deadliest!

Based upon contemporary wisdom, can we “afford” to create this better social paradigm I’m talking about? No, of course not! No way in hell!

Does that mean we can’t do it then? No, of course not! No way in hell! It just means that we have to chuck everything we think we know about society out!

That’s why I said I thought that the imminent planet-wide societal collapse was, on the whole, not a negative thing! With nothing left to “patch”, we’ll have to build entirely anew!

Our societies are in a “sink or swim” situation, if we don’t “swim”, we’ll surely sink! Right to the bottom! That’s hopeful, for “once on the bottom” there’s only one way we can go!

Well, two there’s “up” and there’s “out”!

If this be anarchy, let’s make the most of it!

What kind of society do we want to have? What kind of people do we think we are? What kind of people would we like to be? I have frequently asked myself in the course of these musings what are we?

Well, in the context of my model of reality, we are, while we are perfectly “real”, relative both to ourselves, and to one another; we are also the physical shadows of two nonphysical intelligent energy patterns. One of those energy patterns is only virtually real, and is, itself the shadow of an intelligent energy pattern which is intrinsically real, and which shares the duration of the cosmos itself.

And yet and yet “if you prick us do we not bleed”?

We are human beings, we are un-human beings, we are!

We must learn to make these two natures complimentary. They are already so, of course, we must learn to see them as they are.

We must learn to make the period of our existence on the physical levels of the infinite reality productive and happily so.

And so, how then shall we order our lives?

If, because of the times in which we live, and because of the immense and ever growing numbers of those of us who do live, the necessities of life are a right and not a privilege, which I think is obviously true. What is the best mechanism we can develop to supply those necessities? Is it government?

Well, based upon our present experiences it would seem that governments are the worst of all providers! They are far too busy securing their own benefits to be overly concerned with doing more than paying lip-service to their duty of providing the necessities of life and health to the people over whom they are set. I think you will agree with me that the situation stinks!

But if not government what?

Something collegial then? But what?

Collegial implies something like a committee. They say: “The Camel is a horse designed by a committee”. That is considered to be a put down of committees. But, a Camel is far more efficient within its own proper environment than a horse. In all truth, while horses are beautiful, they are seldom really efficient. But, beauty is its own reward!

Our governments today are absolutely full to overflowing with collegiality committee upon committee, upon committee, upon committee, and so forth. It doesn't seem to work. No, better make that simply, it doesn't work!

Historically, our remotest ancestors created governments when they decided to allow one person to tell them what to do, when to do it, and how to do it! And that person deputized his friends to assist him and share in the benefits.

For some 49,800 years which we're aware of, that's exactly how things were done, one way or another. Some 200 years ago we decided to try to achieve collegiality on a broad scale. We have not succeeded! That idea isn't working!

Collegiality, government by committee, representative government, clearly isn't working! We are all of us fully aware that it isn't working! It is proven to us, day after day, in every conceivable way!

Here we all are then our social structures crashing around our ears, what the hell do we do about it?

Well, we could do nothing, which is a favorite ploy of human beings.

But, if we do nothing, what's to prevent the "biggest bully on the block" from setting themselves in a position of physical authority? Then we'd be right back where we started tens of thousands of years ago! Not much progress there!

I think that: if "that government governs best which governs least" is true, and I believe it is, then I'd extend that idea by saying instead: "if that government governs best which governs least, then that government which appears not to govern at all, governs even better".

In other words, maybe what we're going to find out we need is something that can only be called "subliminal government". In other words, a form of societal organization so subtle as to be almost entirely invisible.

A form of societal organization which, instead of directing peoples behavior, functions principally as a "safety net" for people in need of assistance. A form of governance which, instead of controlling people's lives, assists them to control their own lives.

A government, and by that I mean any type or form of government, exists solely and principally as an extension of the people over whom it governs. Why then should those people be placed in a position which implies inferiority to that governmental extension of themselves?

Why should people have to petition government? Why should people have to petition themselves, or rather something which is an extension of themselves, for their rights, and for the necessities of life?

What a dreadful piece of arrogance guaranteeing "the right of petition" is! It dates right back to Kings, and far before them to tribal chieftains!

Of late we all find ourselves in need of being protected from our governments. What an absurd situation that is! We need protection from something which derives its structure, it's finances, and it's very being, from us! That cannot be tolerated!

It is absolutely clear that people all over this planet hold their governing bodies in extreme contempt. Rightfully so! But it's all our own fault! Who is it who acquiesced in this development?

That which we have made, we can unmake, that which we have done, we can undo, that which we have permitted, we can now forbid! Everyone knows that all power proceeds from the people, there is no power they do not grant. There is no power to which they must not have acquiesced. There is no “gun barrel” which is big enough to negate that fact!

The political organism which we create to provide the necessities of health and life for all people, must have a sufficiency of resources and authority to perform its designed function. But not one iota more!

We must not repeat our almost continuous past mistake of creating “Frankenstein’s monster” to govern us. Aesop was right, think about the frogs and the stork! Let’s make a consensus that we don’t want another disaster!

You know, I was thinking that all of the governmental forms we have as examples on the planet, are “left-overs”, they are relics of former times, former needs, former wants. They’re all obsolete. Dead as yesterday’s champagne!

Today is today! Now is now! It’s almost the 21st century! Why not have something that isn’t “out of date”?

“When I encountered the results that were being attained by Stephen Hawking and his ilk, I realized that any social or other philosophy that did not have their discoveries as its basic foundation, would be invalid.”

Remember these lines? Well, what’s true about reality and its structures, is equally true about human society and its structures.

What I’m saying is that just as I am trying to make our world-view completely dependent on scientific method, or rather, make our world-view dependent only on what we know about reality, why can’t our social models also be dependent on what we know about reality? As a result they would naturally be more science/technology dependent, in a positive way, than they are now!

Our contemporary societies are to a great extent science/technology dependent today, it’s the motivations of that dependency which I must deplore. But those motivations are the same as the rest of society’s motivations profit “the bottom line”!

I think that situation is clearly deplorable. I think there’s a hell of a lot more to life than just “the bottom line”. There had better be! And that’s my “bottom line”!

We possess now, not tomorrow, but now, the technological capabilities to make actual government by consensus work.

Not representative government which is government of the people by their chosen representatives. But a real consensus government which is, in reality ... Government of all of the people, by all of the people themselves, for all of the people. The only thing it takes is the will that it be so!

The end results, at first, will surely be both entirely chaotic, and largely negative! But not forever.

What we probably require are small groups of technocrats to make things work in response to an electronic consensus, by way of the virtual community possible to the immense and totally inter-locking computer web (a virtual community), presently existing on this planet.

Democracy or not, some things probably shouldn't be "up for discussion", or subject to the "will" (whim) of the majority in any case. Because these things must be accepted as axiomatic! Like the provision of people's basic necessities of life, health and comfort. Like the absolute equality of all human beings under the law!

Comfort shouldn't be something the "superior" have ... and the "inferior" haven't! There's a big difference, a huge difference, between "comfort" and "luxury". "Comfort" I think, is a basic necessity of life and a right of all people. "Luxury" isn't either basic or a necessity, and so I believe those who desire luxury must earn it on their own. Once they've earned it, they have an absolute right to it.

Not everyone is so determined to possess luxury that they'll make the sacrifices required to attain it. Those who do, however, have every right to what they earn.

I want you to understand that "earning luxury" does not, and cannot, ever mean "at the expense of others"! One has no right whatsoever to luxury which is earned by the exploitation of others! One has absolutely no right to enjoy anything obtained at the involuntary or unknowing expense of others! People also, I believe, have the right to "Inherited Wealth", while they themselves didn't earn it, unless you call being sensible enough to be born into wealth "earning", their antecedents did, and quite frequently on their descendants behalf, and so there is no ethical reason why those descendants shouldn't have a right to it. We must try very hard to keep envy from being an element in our planning. Envy is as ugly as bigotry of which it is a type.

While I'm talking about "earnings" I think I ought to get myself involved in a discussion of what we're going to develop to replace our present economical structures.

PART 20: ECONOMICS

Economics is just as much of a pseudo-science as astrology is. They neither of them can make predictions with any degree of accuracy!

In our time, it's very clearly obvious that our societies have developed into things which make a "money economy" not only foolish but impossible to maintain. We absolutely cannot afford to be, and do, and have, what we need to be, and do, and have, in a "money economy".

Our past economies were not "natural structures"! They were not, and are not now, things we had to use because we found them in place. Our economical structures are things created by the needs and goals of human society. The big problem has been that these various economic and social structures and their dependent institutions became crystallized, frozen in place, as it were.

The negative thing is that they did not change in response to the changing needs, wants and values of human beings. Rather these institutions demanded that human beings change their needs, wants and values to meet the needs, wants, and values of the institutions.

"That which we made, we can unmake, that which we did, we can undo, that which no longer serves our needs, can be rejected!

Our economical structures, like the governmental structures of which they are an intrinsic part, no longer serve human needs. In fact, they are now counter-productive. They effectually deny human needs. Our economic structures are now effectively blocking human growth and human aspirations.

It's clear to me, at least, that there's no actual need for "money economies" or "barter economies" or any other kind of economy based upon tangible things.

The past seventy two years has been trumpeted, by both sides of the conflict, as the great confrontation between two totally contradictory (or so they claimed) economic systems. In actuality it's been considerably more than even 100 years.

The conflict between Free Market Economies (capitalism) and Planned Economies (Statism), and the two political systems which both fronted for these economical systems and engaged in the conflict, and their triggering event, the industrial revolution, were all of them, born together. They were "spawned of one litter", as it were. The demise of Communism, Socialism, and Fascism (all of which are equally statist) did not in any way end the intrinsic conflict.

The "conflicting economic systems" were clearly a phenomenon that could never have existed without impetus and changes provided by the industrial revolution. That is why I say the two systems were "spawned by the Industrial Revolution".

Prior to the Industrial Revolution which, because it changed the way people lived and worked, changed human society completely; economic systems, while they were very important, were not the epicenter of human society that they became during and after the Industrial revolution. Industrialization placed human societies entirely on an economic basis.

A conflict between two economic systems, which, while it only infrequently came to actual warfare, and then only by way of "surrogates", eventually proved to be literally a conflict "to the death", was not, as both sides claimed it to be, between totalitarianism and democracy, for in fact both sides claimed to be "the only true Democratic system".

It was instead, both a gradually escalated conflict and a never-ending competition between the politico-economic system that is called Free Market, or Free Enterprise, or Capitalism, and the opposing system that is called Communism, or Socialism, or Centrally-controlled State-centered economics.

Between so-called “Free Market Economies” (they are very clearly not entirely “free”), and their so-called “oppositees”, putatively “Centrally controlled Economies”.

As I see it, it ended in utter mutual self-defeat.

The “Free Marketeers” almost continually indecisively dithered back and forth between the equally invalid and ineffective total Laissez-faire of Adam Smith, and multiple incarnations of what I call Fourierist-Fenian Socialist-Marxist derived liberally oriented “Social Democracy”.

On the other hand, the “Central Controllers” fairly unswervingly followed the totalitarian oriented political, economic, and social dictates of Charles Fourier, Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin.

(As a horrible example of where socio-economic fanaticism leads, The Soviet Union was also “dedicated”, through the ignorance and insanity of Joseph Stalin, because they were supposed to be based on “Marxist Dialectic” ... to the biological insanities of Trofim Lysenko, which destroyed their agriculture far more completely than Marxism/Leninism destroyed their economies. Russia, or rather the Ukraine, had once been called “The Bread Basket of Europe”, by the time “Marxist-Leninist Dialectic” got through with it, Russia couldn’t begin to feed itself!)

It doesn’t seem to have mattered either way, for they, both of them, Communism and Capitalism alike, are ending up in ruins for the simple reason that Human Beings don’t, won’t, and can’t fit into intellectually derived socio-economic parameters!

SOCIAL STRUCTURES MUST SERVE THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE WITHIN THEM. THE PEOPLE ARE NOT THERE TO SERVE THE SOCIAL STRUCTURES!

It is very important to remember however, that the “centrally controlled, state centered-economy” is not, and has never been, identifiable solely with 19th Century Marxism-Leninism.

The France of Louis XVI in the 18th century, was every bit as much of a centrally controlled state-centered economy as was the Soviet Union of Leonid Brezhnev and his predecessors. Both of them had elements of free enterprise, the Soviet Union much less so than 18th Century France, but nonetheless it was state control, and royal monopolies, and an almost unbelievably inefficient, mindlessly arrogant bureaucracy which destroyed the French Kingdom just as their equally inefficient and equally arrogant Soviet counterparts wrecked the Soviet Union.

Communism/socialism completely destroyed itself, it died of its own contradictions and inadequacies. The Free Market “West” had almost nothing at all to do with the fall of Communism. They fell together!

The thing is, that monarchies produce state-centered centrally controlled economies because they HAVE TO in order to survive.

There is really no substantive difference between Monarchies and Socialist/Communist states. The Royalty-nobility of the one equates perfectly to the commissars and apparatchiks of the other. The only difference is in style. The nobility for the most part are graceful and elegant and occasionally monsters, while the Commissars and Apparatchiks are always cheap thugs! In either case the mass of the people are oppressed.

For all that politicians and sociologists and pollsters and economists would like them to do so, human beings never really fit into “social models”. It’s like Cinderella’s Sisters and the glass slipper!

One of the most important reasons that Capitalism, Marxism and Monarchies failed, is that the human beings involved never conformed even partially to the monarchist’s fantasies, or to Karl Marx’s fantasies, or to Adam Smith’s fantasies regarding their probable modes of behavior in certain circumstances. People never live up to other people’s fantasies regarding their behavior. People never live up to their own fantasies about themselves.

One of the most important reasons Capitalism is failing as completely as did Communism, is that the people in Capitalist societies also fail to live up to the socio-economist’s fantasies regarding their behavior patterns.

Monarchism failed utterly because neither the Monarch nor the people were what either of them thought the other was, nor were either of them what they themselves, thought they were! Communism failed completely because most human beings were both different and very much better than Marx thought Capitalism is failing because many people are both entirely different and very much worse than the prophets of capitalism believed.

“Capitalism”, by the way, has absolutely no connection at all with “Democracy”. The first is an economic system, the second is a political methodology. “Democracies” fail because they are almost never what they claim themselves to be, and because like the Ancient Athenians, people really don’t clearly comprehend the meaning of the word “Democracy”.

The Soviet Union and The Warsaw Pact Nations, and The United States and the NATO Nations all claimed to be “Democratic”. It’s clear to us all that if one set was the other set wasn’t! But were either?

Basically Democracies fall because people, after all, are not equal. They fall because they confuse equality before and under the law with basic equality. “All Men are Born Equal” does not mean that they are born the same!

Both systems are failures because of flaws inherent in the systems themselves, and in their total disregard of both human feelings and human nature! They are failures because both sides totally forgot that Governments exist for no other reason than to serve people! They are failures because both sides convinced themselves that people exist to serve their Governments. That is a very odor filled left-over from the days of monarchial Divine-Right! After all it wasn’t Louis xiv but John F. Kennedy who said “Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country”. Their attitudes were, given the differences in time and place, almost identical.

Neither “side” contributed very much at all in the basic reasons for the collapse of the other. The only connection that can be established in their mutual collapse is that their gigantic “defense” expenditures mutually bankrupted both systems.

It is not my purpose here to discuss the faults inherent in Capitalism and Communism. I will though, perhaps at another time. My purpose here is to discuss economics in general rather than specific instances.

You will notice that I do not use arguments derived from the pseudo-science of Economics in my discussion of that “science”. I do not do so because in my view it’s all a total farce! I will not discuss “Eco-

nomics” on its own terms, for to me, both those terms, and the paradigm they define, are totally invalid. I will discuss this subject in and on my own terms only.

I base all of my discussions in all my work in HUMAN terms and in human terms alone! I am totally disinterested in structure and form, I am only interested in people, in human beings. For me they are the all and end-all.

Humankind is the measure of all things which concern it! When discussing various aspects of human-life on this planet, it is the needs, wants, lives, and happiness of human, or rather sentient, beings that matters NOTHING ELSE!

The only purpose of human society is human happiness! Happy people are creative people! I believe that the primary purpose of creation IS creation! Energy, once created, must itself become creative both abstractly and physically.

Devaluation of currency, unemployment, recession, inflation, depression, these phenomenon are anything but phenomenal! They have clearly been upsetting social apple carts since well before the age of written history. We know that Hammurabi was plagued by them, and the C’hin Emperors, and the Caesars, and the Feudal Suzerains and the Holy Roman Emperors and the Czars and obviously ... our modern politicians!

What I find most interesting though, and it’s “funny-peculiar”, is that there seems to be a very limited arsenal of weapons to use against these problems and all of our societies past and present, used them. They were used in Hammurabi’s times and they still use them today; they never seem to change much and they never “work”! But for some reason that I don’t really understand, humanity just doesn’t seem to learn from these experiences!

Humanity always seems to go back to the same “tried and true” and utterly valueless “solutions”. True, they “tweak” them, they make minor changes here and there, but basically, it’s the same old thing ... and it never works! The reason that nothing “works” is because we are using the cause of the problem to try to treat the effects of the problem! Our whole approach to the problems caused by our economic paradigms are those very same paradigms.

Our view of economics is based entirely upon one model: That model was developed very many millennia ago by pre-literate, pre-urban, hunting-gathering, Paleolithic humankind. “I will give you these two fine flint hand axes and this throwing spear for that trained wolf of yours”. That’s how economics began and basically that’s all economics are today. “I will give you “this” for “that” ... or in a more modern way: “I will gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today!” is the basis of human economics.

It is the basis of human economics now, and it always has been so, at least it has been so since humankind reached that point in its development where it stopped simply forcibly taking those things that it wanted and/or needed, as its only method of acquisition!

It is my premise that it does not have to be that way! At least not any more!

The experience of all of human history clearly demonstrates that, for the most part, economic theories have either no effect at all on human society, or if they have an effect, that effect is very much more negative than anything else. The harder governmental bodies try to force people to conform to various economic models, the more negative the effect of those models will be.

The best aspect of “Free Market” economic theories is that they are, for the most part, not particularly amenable to overtly coercive activities. The very worst aspect of “Free Market Economics” is that they tend to give greed and acquisitiveness far too free a rein ... which results in far too wide a disparity between rich and poor which is, in and of itself, oppressive. That oppression works both ways, for it is the dichotomy itself which is oppressive. It oppresses the rich in one set of ways and it oppresses the poor in an entirely disparate fashion. There’s really nothing wrong with being legitimately wealthy, the condition of poverty doesn’t imply inferiority in any way. The problem is that the wealthy have far more freedom of actions and far more freedom of possibilities than do the poor. The poor are both encapsulated in their poverty and subservient to it. That is why the basic needs of people must be met by the society in which they dwell, it frees people.

Centrally controlled economies are almost entirely illusionary. It is almost impossible to intelligently “control” an economy, because most of the more important factors in any economy are basically imponderables and are therefore, totally impossible to foresee accurately, and the effort to do so tends to result in astonishing inequalities between the powerful and the powerless, even though economic “fairness”, if not total economic equality, is usually the stated goal of centrally controlled economies.

Whatever else they may accomplish, and in no matter what format of economic structure, all centrally controlled human social structures tend to result in only one thing the ruthless and callous dictatorship of the proletariat not by the visible power structure but by invisible and totally faceless bureaucracies.

This is almost as true in the United States as it was in the former Soviet Union. Anyone who does not realize that the United States has a partially concealed, partially openly demonstrated, centrally controlled economy just isn’t paying attention. What, after all, is the purpose of the Federal Reserve System? What do the Treasury and Commerce departments do? What is the purpose of the FTC, the SEC, the FCC, the OMB, etcetera? Do these things not represent open central control of really vital aspects of the economic process?

Of course, considering the population pressures, and the real needs of disparate individuals, it is clear to me that it would be utterly impossible to maintain a contemporary technological computer-age society without some element of centralized control.

The main question is: How do we create a totally benign “control system”?

The only thing “free” about the economics in the United States of America at this point in time, is that they are in free-fall. Believe me, if you don’t realize that a stock market valuation of almost 11,000 isn’t “free fall” you aren’t thinking. The United States is not at all alone, the economic structure of the entire planet is in free-fall and no one is immune.

Probably the most important thing which we must all factor into our thinking on the subject of economic matters is the basic fact that, with the advent of the fall of the Soviet Bloc, there is no longer even a vestige of any such thing as a “National Economy” for any country.

The only countries that even approach such a thing are relatively closed societies such as North Korea, China, and Cuba. China is moving away from being a closed society, at least she is doing so in an economic sense, and her political mores will eventually follow suit. For North Korea and Cuba, total collapse is an absolute surety, it is only a matter of time.

Beginning seriously, at the end of World War I, and gradually becoming more and more pervasive through and beyond World War II, with the advent of the “Computer Age”, the human race plunged headlong, almost without thought or foresight, into what can only be called a totally “Global Economy”.

When coupled with the immense population growth and the “computer revolution”, which is the most important and truly revolutionary event in millennia, this “Global Economy” renders both Communism and Capitalism themselves, and any other current economic model totally irrelevant! Karl Marx, and Adam Smith are both very dead.

There are currently, in the late 1990s, some five and one half or six Billion people living, or rather in most cases, barely existing from day-to-day, on this planet. The Demographers claim that each of us can expect to find ourselves surrounded by some ten or eleven Billion other people by 2030!

Leaving out the possible minimizing effects on those population projections of “Ethnic Cleansing” in Bosnia and Kosovo, global warming, the hole in the ozone layer, the AIDS plague (which by itself, may very well kill a Billion or so people before the governments of this world get around to dealing with it seriously), and present and potential catastrophes in Somalia, Slovakia-Hungary-Romania, Ruanda-Burundi, The Sudan, Mozambique, Liberia, Cambodia, and central Asian areas of the former soviet union, we must therefore concern ourselves with the quality of life that will be lived by ALL the people on this planet.

It is clearly the duty of everyone now living to concern themselves with assuring the quality of life of all those not yet born. If we do not, here we all are where will we be then?

The answer is NOWHERE!

Dull gray is not the color one should have to use to describe the quality of life! If it is why bother? I am not saying life has to be a fireworks display or a rainbow but why not?

People really need to be happy; in order for people to be happy people really need to be free! The impoverished are enslaved by their poverty! To be poor is to be not free! No one who is economically disadvantaged is free! As I have said before many times, and will say again frequently: NO ONE CAN EVER BE TOO FREE!

Looking at the vast sweep of human history I have concluded that the three things that oppress people the most ferociously are religion, nationalism, and economics. Therefore people need to be free of religion, nationalism, and economics.

Religion, nationalism, and static economic systems have many strong similarities; all three are harmful and oppressive, they all inescapably rule people’s lives, they all require “leaps of faith”, they all require the suspension of discriminatory judgment, they all clearly claim absolute knowledge and power that they do not, any of them, possess, they are all “sacred cows”!

So we throw out completely the entire pseudo-science which we call “Economics”, what then?

Here we all are 5 billion of us today, 11 billion of us tomorrow, what then? How then?

It is my contention that the quality of all our lives is very definitely the “business” of each and every one of us.

As we, each of us, care about the quality of our own personal life, and that of the people closest to us whom we love and care for, we must equally care about the quality of life of each and every human

being, both those we know of, and more important still, total strangers, those we don't know anything at all about.

Because the quality of life of each and every one of those billions of people is of equal importance, it is the duty of the human race as a whole to make sure that the level of that quality is a relatively high one. Our contemporary historical economic systems merely "get in the way". They lower the quality of life for most of the human race.

Therefore, we must see to the provision of a high quality life for each and every human being without any reference to the "barter system", without any reference to "quid quo pro", without any reference to money economies.

"Money", in and of itself, is the most useless and harmful thing!

Here we all are we are; what is we are society, we are the human community, we can empower, or "finance", that community in any way, or by any method, that we please! We cannot afford not to be able to afford a high quality of life for all human beings. So, if we can't "make it work" by way of a "money economy" or a "barter economy" then we'll have to just decide to do without them.

NOTHING IS EVER IMPOSSIBLE!

When you get right down to the technology of it our economy today is based upon "blips in a computer" ... and ONLY on "blips in a computer"; it's entirely up to us what those blips "stand for"; they can "stand for" anything at all that we agree to make them "stand for" the "blips" themselves, have not really got any intrinsic value. A "blip" can be the result of a very simple formula or a very complicated one, it's humanity's choice. I, for one, hope for a simple choice. The simpler the better!

People though, have definitely got "intrinsic value"!

Each and every one of the five and one half billion human beings that is alive on this planet has an equally inalienable right to self-respect, to dignity, and to a relatively decent quality of life. Each and every single human being has got to have enough to eat and I mean well beyond a bare subsistence diet; everyone needs a decent, and secure, and relatively comfortable place to live, all the medical care they need, all the dental care they need, clothes to wear well beyond just a bare minimum, and a modicum of recreation and enjoyment! Notice I said **INALIENABLE RIGHT!**

It is our responsibility and absolute duty as a community to make sure that is the case. The only question is "how"? The answer is "any way we choose". We possess the means, we certainly possess a "reason" to do so. The only thing we lack is the "motivation" or rather the "will" to do so. I am trying to provide that.

People whose lives do not adequately provide for them those basic necessities intrinsic to "quality of life", have neither dignity, nor true freedom of choice, they have neither security or self-confidence, they have neither happiness nor chance of happiness!

Will you deny it to them?

Can we, as a global society, "afford" to deny it to them?

Can we, as a global society have any claim to self-respect or dignity ourselves, if we do deny that same self-respect and dignity to others?

NO!

If we do not meet our responsibilities towards one another, we will never know either peace or stability! People who are denied their rights and their due, eventually rise up and take them. Historically viewed, we know that this always includes taking away the rights, and dignity, and all too frequently the lives of others as they do so.

Can we afford to make that unenviable future come about by inertia, by totally mindless adherence to failed systems?

If we, as a global society do NOT provide this improvement in the quality of life for all people what will happen when 11 billion people begin to rise up and “take what is theirs”?

We are a global society, and we must remove from our milieu anything at all which in any way at all, stands in the way of the amicable functioning of that society!

Money, or barter economies, religion, and nationalism are the three most vital things that the human race has to dispose of in order to enable itself to evolve further.

Nothing stands in the way of a higher quality of life for all human beings more than hatred, bigotry, racism and sexism. Religion and nationalism and their inevitable economic side-effects are the basic sources of all that hatred. This is proven day in and day out!

People may wish to deny that statement, they may wish to argue with it, but it is entirely true ... no matter what arguments are brought to bear.

Witness IRELAND what a seething mass of hatreds, bigotry, poverty, bloodshed, and misery that poor but beautiful little island is!

Centuries ago, early in the Common Era, a tribe, The Scoti, left the Irish Northern Kingdom of Dalriada and emigrated to the northern part of the Island that is today Great Britain. The Scoti settled in an area originally populated by the Picts, intermarried with them, and, over time they became the Scottish People.

During that period, having been Shamanists, they also became, first Catholics, and then with the reformation, Protestant Christian. In the Seventeenth Century, for economic reasons, many of them re-emigrated back to the northern part of Ireland, by then called Ulster.

Today Ulster is still a part of Great Britain while the rest of Ireland is the Irish Free State. This division was created by what were very limited Democratic means, i.e., the vote (but a vote only in Northern Ireland), and as a result there is a Catholic majority in Eire, and a Protestant majority in Ulster.

I don't need to go into details about the bloodshed and hatred this situation has engendered, everyone knows. What were the causes? Religion and Nationalism and Economics ... rampant and malignant!

Witness THE STATE OF ISRAEL Here is a case in which a people who werem themselves the object of mindless bigotry because of their religion, and due to the hatred preached by another religion, went through a totally mindless holocaust, the survivors of which, demanded, and got, because everyone felt guilty about what had occurred, territory which belonged to another people because of a claim to that territory which was totally religion based.

Now the State of Israel itself, subjects the displaced and subjugated Palestinian peoples to discrimination and bigotry and bloodshed, only now the cause is Israeli Nationalism rather than religious bigotry. Though religious bigotry is hardly lacking in the equation.

The Palestinians, in their turn, subject both the Israelis and also the Europeans and Americans, (whom they rightly blame for Israel's existence) to terrorism and assassination and the threat of outside intervention (Jihad) by other Muslim Peoples not for religious reasons but because of Pan-Arab Nationalism.

Then too, there's OIL, which is a vital part of the equation, and it is clearly an enormous economic factor.

Witness THE BALKAN STATES here we find the worst current manifestation of religious and nationalist horror! Yugoslavia, which was a creation of Woodrow Wilson, Georges Clemenceau, and David Lloyd-George at the end of World War I, when, to appease a Democratic furor in their home countries, those three men in an almost wholly irrational manner, dismembered the Austro-Hungarian Empire totally without either rhyme, or reason, or any valid method, understanding, or value system, and created states, all of whom are presently dissolving in rancor and bloodshed. Totally mindless rancor and hatred dating back to the time of Suleiman the Magnificent and the Turkish conquest of the area after the conquest of Constantinople. Hatred dating back to Kosovo in the 14th century, hatred harking back to the battle of Mohacs in the 14th century, the Balkan peoples are bloody handed and bloody minded. The history of their royal houses is drenched in blood, they store up injuries and insults like treasure; they gloat over past injury and insult and pay it all back threefold. Here too, we clearly find religious differences and nationalism doing their bloody work!

Yugoslavia dissolved into war, hatred, and bloodshed.

Another "creation", Czechoslovakia, just dissolved itself amidst much rancor and bitterness over economic differences between the two sections, but at least, so-far as its gone, it's been a peaceful divorce, with only name-calling at least so far. Though I am afraid that Slovak racism and resurgent fascism may lead to bloodshed over the Hungarian minority, and perhaps over the Danube River Dam as well.

There are many more witnesses I could call: Chechnya, Somalia, Mozambique, South Africa, Azerbaijan, Zimbabwe, and Georgia (That is Caucasian Georgia not the state), Ruanda-Burundi, but I don't really think it's necessary.

I have to ask ... how can we make this planet a good place to live until all of these things are done away with? We cannot begin to do anything much, until Religion, Nationalism, and our customary economic nonsense no longer exist.

This cannot be accomplished coercively! Persuasion, education, and time are the only answers. But do we have too much time left?

It is my view that we have to begin right now with those people who are ready to accept this point of view and slowly but surely add others to our core group.

What is clearly required is an entirely new approach to what used to be called economics but, I feel, is probably best described as the procurement of people's inalienable rights.

Sure, many people will ask: "How can we possibly do what you insist we must do?" "How can we give people the things you describe as "inalienable rights"?"

I can only respond HOW NOT?

If we don't make this world a better place for everyone to live in ... what will it be?

In conjunction with weaning the peoples of this planet away from their religious and nationalistic agonies, we will have to find a way to finance all the many important things that need doing. That means finding some kind of system to replace that thing we now call economics.

There is no rational reason whatsoever for us to use the failed methods of the past! A money economy, no matter how sophisticated it may pretend to be, is nevertheless a relic of the distant past. It obviously doesn't work at all in the last decade of the twentieth century. That is something which we can all clearly see every day, so it must be replaced in its entirety.

Surely a race capable of walking on the moon, and photographing the outer planets from up close, can come up with an adequate replacement.

Do I have a suggestion for how to do it?

Well, of course I do, and I think it's a very reasonable and feasible solution but then there's 5 and 11 billion people out there ... surely there's plenty of other original and creative ideas out there (Sorry if I sound like Ross Perot). We just have to get all those creative people into place, and encourage them to speak out, so they can interact and produce some results.

The very first thing I want to say is this: If we accept our responsibility for caring, as a global society (for that is what we are, or must consciously become), for all of the residents of this planet. If, as a global society we accept my premise that people have certain inalienable rights, and once again, that those rights are: "Each and every human being alive on this planet has an undeniably inalienable right to self-respect, to dignity, and to a relatively decent quality of life. Each and every single human being has got to have enough to eat well beyond bare subsistence, a decent and secure place to live, all the medical care they need, all the dental care they need, clothes to wear beyond just a bare minimum, and a modicum of recreation and enjoyment."

Notice, once again, I said **INALIENABLE RIGHT!**

If we accept this responsibility to and for ourselves, we must do so clearly understanding all that which inescapably goes along with it, and that is this: As our human population moves upward towards 11 billion, and inevitably, as technology and science progress, we will find that more and more human beings will not be able to look forward to any gainful or productive employment. This is clearly not through any lack or fault of their own, and so it is the Global Society's responsibility to see that the inalienable rights of those people are not lost!

The dream of 100% employment has passed insensibly from pleasant dream to total fantasy. Humankind will be lucky if they end up with 50% employment. As a result, our social mores will have to change greatly in order that employment will no longer be necessary for self-respect.

You cannot rationally expect "everyone" to have "a job" if there is not "a job" for everyone! There are not enough jobs for everyone now, and, as time goes by, there will be even fewer "jobs". Technology and especially computer technology is antithetic toward full employment. But, is that necessarily a negative thing?

Well, it is negative only if our society is encapsulated in our old economic paradigm. Stasis is the most negative of all things and human society is now in economic stasis. That must change.

It is not at all a negative thing if our main societal motivation is the quality of life of the population of this planet.

Most, if not all, of the jobs that have been made obsolete by technology were jobs which, in and of themselves, lowered the quality of life of those who performed them. Most of the jobs which have been lost to technology were boring, repetitive, and relatively meaningless; it is not healthy to have to spend the greatest part of one's life performing "duties" which one knows full well are meaningless it truly diminishes one's capacity for a high quality of life.

Not all the jobs that have been lost are the result of technological advances, millions of people are personally effected (or will be as time goes by) by the dismantling of the immense military machines which were made useless by the end of the "cold-war", the collapse of both economic systems, and the discovery that the human race could no longer afford such totally useless expenditures. Most of these people, I think, will find other and much more useful employment.

It seems to me that as technology continues to advance, and it will, the only actual forms of employment left will be those that are creative, useful, interesting, challenging, and also those that absolutely require human-to-human contact. It is not for nothing that these are the kind of employments that provide the most enjoyment, satisfaction, and clearly viewable results, and as a result generate the highest quality of life.

In other words, what I'm trying to say is that in the course of developing a new system to "finance" or empower our global society there will, of absolute necessity, need to be some distinct attitudinal changes. People will need to be judged not so much for what they do "for a living", but for who and what they, themselves, are. People need to be accepted as valid and valuable because of themselves and because of their potential for adding to the quality of life for all people.

The major problem people have, in this as well as in all other cases, is that being "formed" (embodied) themselves, people have a penchant for forming "things", or rather, though they are not entirely the same phenomenon, for creating structures structures that they use as tools to assist them to regulate their lives, such as religion, philosophical systems, governments, and, of course, economic systems. The problem is, that like the bodies which people inhabit, all forms are limiting!

In addition to being totally limiting, all forms and structures, are, like the human body, very limited in duration. Forms and structures, by their intrinsic nature, are at least relatively static things. No stasis is, or can be, of long duration!

Nevertheless, while humanity continues to possess physical forms, it will require physical structures to serve those forms! Clearly a totally non-structural life-style is individually both very beneficial and also the most potentially creative. I do not mean life in a wraith-like state, but life in a much less structured society. Life not so bound up in rigid social "norms".

But there are five and one half going-on eleven billion human beings on this planet and under those circumstances at least some structure is absolutely necessary. The vital thing is, the nature of those structures must at once be as completely positive and as entirely non-control oriented as is possible.

HUMAN BEINGS HAVE GOT TO STOP PUSHING ONE ANOTHER AROUND!

As I have said in other contexts: “TO THE PRECISE DEGREE THAT ANY ONE PERSON IS NOT FREE NO ONE IS FREE!”

Do you not feel diminished when you see some poor person sleeping in a doorway? Does not the sight of some poor soul starving to death make you feel very uncomfortable? Is not the hopelessness of others our own personal hopelessness as well? Is not the misery of others our personal misery as well? It should be! It must be! We ARE very clearly “our brother’s keepers”!

But being “our Brother’s keepers” means supplying comfort and support to “our brother” it means caring for “him”, it does NOT mean “bossing our ‘brother’ around” or forcing “him” into some mold of our own creation or “telling ‘him’ what’s good for ‘him’”!

But how can we get where we want to go?

“Nothing is impossible!” True, very true, but there’s another side to that statement and that is: THERE ARE VERY FEW THINGS INDEED THAT ARE EITHER AS SIMPLE AS THEY SEEM OR AS UN-COMPLICATED AS ONE WOULD WISH!

Is it really possible to get entirely away from a money based economy? Yes it is. Is it really possible to get away from an economy which has an element of “the barter system” in it?

On one level, yes it is, entirely so.

But, on a different level, as long as people are different, as long as they possess different skills and talents, and as long as they must deal with one another to maintain a high quality of life, there will be at least an element of “barter” present in society.

In fact, it can be argued that all inter-human relations are inherently based upon at least a kind of “barter”. All human relationships are based upon some level of “give-and-take” and that, in essence, is barter. And so, while it is absolutely imperative to rid ourselves of economic structures based entirely upon over-sophisticated versions of the barter system, it is clear to me that life itself, and life relationships that are an extremely important part of a high quality of life, are based upon a kind of “give-and-take” which is the basis from which barter economics grew.

What I’m saying is this: we must get rid of the terribly over-wrought sophisticated theoretical economic structures which we originally based upon “this for that”, but as it is, in its intrinsic state, a basic part of life itself we’ll never be able to dispense with elements of “give and take” in our social interactions.

Theoretical economics, nationalism, and religion however, really have to go! Every single human being has the absolute right to “life ... Liberty ... and the Pursuit of Happiness”. Nothing gets “in the way” of that right more than theoretical economics, nationalism, and religion.

So then: How do I think we can/should finance a high quality of life for all people? There’s absolutely no doubt in my mind at all that the human race is capable of providing a high quality of life for all people everywhere. All one has to do is look around at the things which the human race has already done! A race that can produce Hitchcock, Hippocrates, Hiroshige, Heisenberg, Hindemith, and Hammerstein can certainly provide a high quality of life for all the people who share the planet. They can clearly do so without all the negative by-products of our obsolete economic structures.

When an individual or a corporation goes bankrupt they are given a space to re-organize, re-think their situation, and start afresh.

Our planetary society is clearly in bankruptcy, so it's time to re-group!

Inherently, our society today is founded on credit there's no "real" wealth anymore, it's all simply entries in a computer. There is clearly no reason for that electronic aspect to change.

Given that you agree with my premise that all human beings possess certain absolutely inalienable rights, then I might not be going too far afield to suggest that each human being is born possessed, as it were, of what could be defined or described as "life-credit" - would it be so very difficult to establish a "value" for that "life-credit", which is appropriate to age and needs, and establish for each individual a "credit account"?

Why could we not start that account for each individual with a basic balance at birth, and use that "basic balance" to establish their life-credit account, adding a pre-determined amount each subsequent year.

I leave the actual technical details to those who are far better qualified than I to establish, but in addition I would suggest that each person might not simply be entitled to a certain basic amount of "life-credit" each and every year, but should also be eligible to be considered for certain "bonus" payments for varying accomplishments. The nature of the "accomplishments" needs to be determined by society as a whole.

The actual value of these "life-credits" will have to be decided by our global society itself, it will have to base its judgment on what people actually need to have.

What we laughably call "welfare payments" today, in most cases fall far short of actually providing people's most basic needs.

What the purpose of this "life-credit" may be accepted to be is to provide the basic inalienable "quality of life" in regard to food, shelter, education, clothing, and some recreation.

Now, this "credit account" would establish a basic "floor" below which our human society would not permit anyone to fall. Where individual human beings could take themselves above this "floor" would be up to each individual and their own talents, abilities, and efforts. As I would not limit people in one way, through poverty, I certainly am absolutely sure it would be oppressive and unproductive to limit people's upward mobility above the basic living standard.

I do think however, that human society would be very well served if it were to prevent what can only be called parasite classes from continuing in existence.

Do I mean those currently on welfare? No I certainly don't! Those who are presently surviving on public assistance are society's victims. The flotsam and jetsam of an uncaring society. The poor are not parasites. The disadvantaged are not parasites. The sick, and the injured, and the physically disadvantaged, and the psychologically disadvantaged, and the elderly are not parasites.

What I mean by parasitic classes are, first of all: The Clergy, who, as a class, add absolutely nothing at all positive to the quality of life on this planet. As a class they do add a great deal that is oppressive and harmful. Most of human society's fears, and guilt's, and hatreds, and bigotry, and intolerance has its roots firmly in the teachings of religion. As a class, society provides them with a quite comfortable living-standard. As a class, society provides them with a great deal of almost totally undeserved luxury, respect, and adulation.

I say “as a class”, because of course, certain individual members of the clergy are positive and productive, but they would be so in any metier. It is clear to me though, that no matter how positive their outlook, no matter how caring they may be, no matter how sincere their desire to be of service to others, a member of the clergy is always totally limited by the parameters of their calling. Their “calling” is religion, and religion is inherently negative!

Secondly: There is that class of individual known as financiers and entrepreneurs, and arbitragers; these are parasites plain and simple because they take, and take plenty, but they do not give! They use much, but do not themselves produce anything of value. “Cashflow” is not a thing of value! These people use the system for their own personal benefit. Naturally they are among the most vociferous in supporting the system they rape. If people the likes of: Michael Milken, Ivan Boesky, Carl Icahn, Charles Keating, Boone T. Pickens, Robert Maxwell, and Rupert Murdoch are not parasites, I’d really like to know what they are!

There is no excuse whatsoever for someone to make five or six hundred million dollars a year by manipulating “blips in a computer” while hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of other people are starving!

Next: There is the Military establishment. What an immense waste of human resources that is! Now that we have recognized the unavoidable potentiality of a Global Society ... militarism and militaries are both unnecessary and criminal.

They are even more criminal when one comes to realize, now that the “Iron Curtain” has fallen and truth begins to make itself obvious, that: for the last 48 years the vastest part of the human race has been hoodwinked, blackmailed, and robbed by a military-industrial complex into a totally fallacious military competition whose only real purpose was economic.

The Cold-war primarily served economies addicted to war-time expenditures and excesses! The “cold-war” served no one at all but the Cold Warriors, and it bankrupted both societies in the process.

Because of their so-called “intelligence services” (i.e., the CIA and the K.G.B. etc.) the Cold Warriors on both sides clearly knew that their pretenses of military emergency were totally false. The Cold Warriors on both sides hid these facts from the peoples they were bilking in order to keep their gainful game going. The “Cold Warriors” on both sides are completely responsible for all the bloodshed, misery and torment they caused with their little profitable scheme. They are far worse than parasites!

Obviously I am NOT speaking about the “grunts” who are the ordinary military ciphers ... I am talking about the leadership echelon ... the staff officers and their civilian counter-parts in the defense establishments on both sides of the issue. And, of course, the politicians and journalists who pandered to, and battered on, the military-industrial complex!

Lastly: There are the bureaucrats servitors of governments swollen beyond all reasonable bounds ... Governments whose only purpose is their own perpetuation, preservation, and growth.

These Governments are the creations of the economic systems they perpetuate. For the last 48 years these Governments have slavishly served the Cold War and the Cold Warriors in order to artificially “hype” their economies.

People, and people’s real needs, have been ignored, neglected, and abused, just to keep an artificial economy running. Billions for aircraft carriers, submarines, and “stealth” aircraft, while here in the

United States of America, 36 million people have no health care and 25 million people are illiterate, and some 20 million others are sub-literate, and our infant mortality rate is utterly unspeakable!

What do those numbers say or imply as to the ethics, values, and motivations of these people in the bureaucratic classes?

When I say “prevent the parasitic classes from continuing in existence” I clearly have no intention of implying that we are to even think about doing anything harmful to them. That’s the “old” way. I am trying to find a “new” way.

It is absolutely clear to me that most, not all, but most, of the individuals who are currently involved in activities I define as “parasitic” are intelligent, able, productive, capable, and probably well-meaning people ... they would hardly be successful in their chosen metiers, which are extremely competitive, were they not it is simply that our society, based as it is so very heavily upon political, social, theological, and economic fallacies, has inclined these people towards pursuits that are less than positive.

These people, where possible, simply need to be re-oriented into more positive pursuits. They have talents, they have abilities, they are usually fairly natural leaders, they simply need to put these gifts to positive instead of negative uses.

Here we all are five and a half going on eleven billion of us and all other sentient things as well ... if we don’t make this planet a happy, healthful, productive place for all of us to live on who will?

I’m asking you to take this ball ... and run with it!

In this context, let me remind you once again about what I have said thrice now about our world-view or reality paradigm? “When I encountered the results that were being attained by Stephen Hawking and his ilk, I realized that any social or other philosophy that did not have their discoveries as its basic foundation, would be invalid.”

Isn’t that equally true as regards our attitudes towards things like economics? If everything is basically intangible what follows upon that understanding?

We humans are at least relatively intangible, and speaking scientifically, we are absolutely intangible if one considers energy fields to be intangible. Why shouldn’t the economic basis of our societies not be intangible too?

In our contemporary societies today, our “money” too, is kind of an intangible. Most of it is based upon “smoke-ware” and promises. All wealth which is not based upon real property, minerals, or other tangible things, is entirely based on electronic blips in some computer.

Our money certainly isn’t based on tangibles, for the most part it’s worth only what the government and the market-place says it’s worth, and not a bit more! Our money is based upon the perceived value of the “goods and services and technical prowess” of the issuing body.

Money is an act of prestidigitation “now you see it, now you don’t”.

So then, all we have to do is stop pretending!

Our economies, for the most part, aren’t based upon any tangible things now, nor are they anything more than artificial remnants of the systems they were when they came into being. We need to do those things which need doing, and stop the pretense that our actions are “paid for” by tangible wealth.

The human race can do, and clearly should do, anything it chooses to do. Who can prevent it from doing so?

If the human race decides it's more humane, and therefore more human, to provide all of its members with their basic needs as society's duty to the people who make it up, then who can prevent it?

If the human race decides it's necessary to find cures for AIDS, Cancer, A.L.S., Alzheimer's Disease etc. and that it's not really necessary to worry about financial costs. Who's there to say them nay?

I want to make it clear that I'm not talking about "positive thinking" type nonsense. What I am saying has absolutely nothing to do with so-called "positive thinking".

What I am talking about is the simple fact that the societies on this planet, in their every detail, can only be what we permit them to be. They can only be what we want them to be!

How we live, and how we treat each other, is something that we alone can decide. It is something for which we alone are responsible!

Aren't you tired of seeing people sleeping in doorways? Aren't you tired of hearing about children starving to death in the midst of plenty? Aren't you tired of hearing about people who die from curable diseases because they couldn't afford health care?

Doesn't it make you sick, both at heart and to your stomach, that a major and significant percentage of this planet's population are going to die from AIDS because our planetary society has neither the will nor the means to cure it?

As I see it, death's no "big deal" but suffering, and misery, and sorrow, and pain sure as hell are a "big deal", a very big deal indeed!

Aren't you both sick and tired of hearing excuses such as: we could cure/fix/change/improve/repair such-and-such but we can't "afford it"?

The human race can "afford" anything that it damn well decides to afford! In the midst of vast wealth and plenty, no disease should go unchecked, no one should be permitted to go without the basic necessities of life!

We are all caught up in old parameters. We are encapsulated in an old and useless paradigm. We are trapped in our own foolishness.

There's an ugly side to this too a lot of this nonsense about being unable to afford our own humanity is based on just plain selfishness. "I've got mine ... and the hell with him/her/them!"

I think it would be very foolish of me to attempt to make a prescription of the exact details of how we're to do this. I really think it's mostly a matter of priorities and decisions.

I really want to be a "Gad Fly" as regards those priorities and decisions!

As a group, we've got to ascertain exactly what our values are, and base our priorities on those values, and then make decisions on how to accomplish what needs accomplishing!

What I'm saying is simply this. We are human beings, we are sentient beings. Sentience, and the environment which sustains sentience, are all that is really important. The care and nurturing of sentient life and the environment which sustains it must be our primary objective. It is that objective upon which we should base our priorities.

The societies upon this planet have no other reality but that reality which we give them. That which we can effect, we are totally responsible for. That which we can rule, and we can rule all things human, are ours to decide upon, ours to rule.

Human beings cannot effect virtual reality, they cannot effect the intrinsic reality, no one knows what absolute reality may really be, but physical reality is what human beings want it to be. They have that power.

The power humans possess to destroy the physical reality in which they dwell, whether for good or for ill, gives them the power to order it.

Societal reality is simply a part of physical realities, and is therefore nothing as a thing in itself, but it is entirely a human construct. Society, and its appurtenances, are whatever we want them to be!

After all that, the point, I think, is clearly made. We can afford whatever we choose to decide to afford.

Primarily then, what we need to create is an efficient and compassionate mechanism for delivering people the necessities of life, health and comfort. I don't think that represents an overwhelming challenge!

The next aspect of our lives we have to look at is the way in which we make sure that the irresponsible among us don't prey upon those others of us who are responsible for our own actions.

PART 21: THE U.S.A. TODAY

There are infinitely too many laws, there are far too many jails, infinitely too many lawyers, too many policemen, by far and far too many people who shouldn't be classed as "criminals", being made into criminals in those jails; as I see it the only true "criminal" is the system which criminalizes private behavior rather than public violence. The only true "criminal" is the system which interferes with pseudo-morality far more gladly than it does with violence; the system which is, itself, the sole cause of far too much violence and, worst of all, the system which is far too much more a "busybody" system, which protects the incomes of those involved in the business of "Law enforcement" and oppresses the people it claims to protect.

The U.S.A., which is where I live, is very much involved in the process of becoming a police state. And, I'm afraid, what's even worse, a police state which serves the agenda of religious fanaticism. I think my country is well on its way to becoming a high technology version of Oliver Cromwell's puritan England! The Christian Reconstructionist Movement proudly describes itself as "Neo-Puritan"!

Let us briefly look at "The State of the Union" in our times and see if I am unduly alarmed about the future of the democratic process in the United States.

Are people, over all, peddling their liberties away for a "mess of pottage"?

Do you know the really miserably low percentage of voters who actually exercise that very great responsibility of a free people?

True enfranchisement, that is to say the actual power to make changes democratically, is such a very rare event, that for those who actually have it, to exercise that responsibility less than 100%, is inexcusable and self-destructive.

True enfranchisement, the right to vote, to exercise a real voice in the affairs and personnel of a state, is, in the light of our past history, not only an immense responsibility, but rare good fortune.

Voting, as history records it, is not an unalienable right. With the past record of the human race in mind, it is clearly one of the most easily alienable rights. But most frequently it isn't alienated, it's merely abdicated.

When by far the greatest majority of citizens in a putatively democratic country truly believe that the electoral process is a complete fraud with the outcome of elections well-known in advance to "insiders". What kind of future do you think the electoral process in that country has?

When elected officials apparently have no opinions, ethics, or standards of their own, but trim their sails to every perceived "cats paw breath" of public opinion. When laws are passed only on the basis of "How will it play in Peoria?", and on that basis only! When superficially perceived consensus replaces reason. What is the State of the Union then?

Americans in general, and the citizens of most other so-called "Democracies" with them, have totally misunderstood the meaning of "Representative Government"!

People as a whole seem to believe that "Representative Government" operates this way: "We will send you to Washington/Paris/London/Berlin/Moscow/Prague etc., there you are to do as we tell you, when we tell you no matter how frequently we may change our minds or have them changed for us by dema-

gogues or the demagogic media ... no matter how emotional, immature, illogical or harmful our whims may be!"

Unfortunately, most politicians, being consummate "bottom-liners" who are interested only in their own career paths, have completely acquiesced to this attitude and behave accordingly.

What all the great political thinkers of this planet have really meant to say when they discuss "representative Government" is this: The citizen should say: "On the basis of your record, and based upon my understanding of your presentations to me, it is my opinion that I can trust you to go to the capitol in my place, and while you are there, I authorize you by my vote to exercise your judgment and knowledge on my behalf in the governing of our country".

This total misunderstanding of the principles involved dooms representative government.

It is a very old cliché that: "Every people gets the government it deserves!" I think that statement is completely true. Citizens of the United States, and those of all other nations, should take a long hard look at their governments, and, if they don't like what they see they should then take an even longer harder look at THEMSELVES!

When a nation "conceived in liberty" has major elected officials questioning the validity of "The Bill of Rights", what is happening to Liberty?

What are entitlement programs, farm subsidies, and depletion allowances, but a "mess of pottage"? What is the whole "welfare state" as currently manifested, but individuals willingly trading dignity, self-respect, self-reliance, responsibility, and FREEDOM for a "mess of pottage"? This is equally true of all western democracies.

When every act of government or public officials is savaged by the information media on the grounds that their function is adversarial and only adversarial. When because of the media, no individual who values their privacy, their honor, or their reputation dares run for public office because of the total hostility and irresponsibility of the media. What is the future of representative government then?

When three Presidents of the United States in a row, and various important subsidiary public officials, and many scholars of government, all clearly state, and firmly insist, that: "The country has become ungovernable", how long will that country remain self-governing?

When the population of a nation, and this is true of many nations, divide themselves into mutually antagonistic, mutually contradictory, mutually exclusive "pressure groups", all, or most of them, primarily oriented toward "one issue". When the members of these groups mostly proudly declare their status as "one issue voters", what value does the electoral process, a process which is predicated entirely upon complete understanding, and balanced evaluation of ALL of the diverse issues which face any electorate, really have?

When our educational process is so impoverished intellectually, that a monstrous percentage of College Students are functionally illiterate, or at least sub-literate ... when an advanced, and very bright, high school student of my acquaintance who is attending an expensive Preparatory School in, of all places, Lexington, Massachusetts, has never heard of Henry David Thoreau, when students of my acquaintance at a major, and very prestigious California University have never even heard of Samuel Adams, what then, of the values and goals for which these men stood?

Though there is a very good chance that this anecdote is apocryphal, the fact that the anecdote is widely believed says a very great deal about peoples feelings about their country. The anecdote tells that: A random group of United States citizens, upon being shown an otherwise unidentified copy of the “Bill of Rights” which is one of the true glories of that nation, identify the document as “obvious Communist propaganda”, what chance have those rights for long-term continuity?

All of this, remember, is not only true of the United States!

When the general public is utterly, and for the most part, correctly, convinced that their government lies to them; automatically, all of the time, in almost all circumstances, party in power notwithstanding even in circumstances when the lie is counter-productive and the truth would not be. Where is the trust upon which Democratic government must stand?

When the general public, in this case almost 100% of it, firmly believes that the taxing agency of their government, the Internal Revenue Service; is “Un-American”, tyrannical, oppressive, arrogant, and the totally enthusiastic persecutor of honest people. When that agency enthusiastically returns the compliment, in spades ... and views each and every citizen as a potential cheat if not an outright criminal and acts accordingly. When that agency firmly regards that portion of a citizen’s earnings and substance which they permit that citizen to retain as a “tax expenditure”. Where is the mutual trust, respect, confidence, and mutual support that should, indeed MUST be the hallmark of a democracy?

Without this mutual trust, respect, confidence and support, a Democratic society is doomed!

When the citizens of a Democratic society cease to regard the government as “us” ... and instead come to always regard it as “them” ... and see it as an entity which is distinctly and continually hostile and antithetic to “us”, that political entity is a Democracy no longer!

Does the shoe fit?

But, I think, there’s far worse in store for the U.S.A. than that! Why do I think so? Well ...

At the end of World War Two, for reasons which are best known to themselves, the government of the U.S.A., in concert with the “defense industry”, or rather the military-industrial complex, decided that the world would be a better place for them if we were constantly in a state of immanent war. And so, they invented the Cold War.

I do not mean to say that there was no threat to so-called Western Values from the Soviet Union under Josef Stalin. There was a threat but it was in no way the caliber of threat which the West perceived or, rather more truthfully, pretended to perceive.

There was never a time from 1945 onwards wherein the Soviet Union possessed either the means or the infra-structure to be as great a threat as portrayed. This fact was not unknown to Western Intelligence services. It was not at all ignored, it was simply kept utterly secret.

In arming themselves to meet the imagined threat rather than the real threat, they forced the Soviets to attempt to match them “gun for gun”; it bankrupted the Soviet Union and condemned her peoples to poverty and deprivation on a scale which would have been totally unacceptable to any western people, North Americans in particular.

The successors of Truman and Eisenhower and Dulles, in particular Ronald Reagan, took it far too seriously, and eventually spent “The Adversary”, which was the unfortunate Soviet Union, into catastrophe. In a word, the West spent the East “under the table”, as it were. The U.S.A. will follow its victim right under that table in short order!

In bankrupting the Soviet Union, the government of the U.S.A. set itself upon a “slippery slope” leading to its own bankruptcy. Any Nation with a four trillion dollar debt, and a four hundred billion dollar annual deficit on top of that debt, is, if only they would admit it, already bankrupt.

Fiscal bankruptcy is really not the worst aspect of the situation. The U.S.A. is today, on a far more perilous “slippery slope”; the U.S.A. is socially bankrupt. Worse still, the U.S.A., in company with the rest of “the west”, is ethically and intellectually bankrupt as well. Worst of all, the entire west, and, in fact, almost the entire planet suffers from bankruptcy of the human spirit.

To some degree, our technology has by-passed our social maturity.

But I regard all that as rather better news than not. Because, as I said earlier, there would be no hope at all for meaningful change were our present structures not collapsing around our heads in irretrievable confusion and disintegration.

People who are drowning don’t always “grasp at straws”, sometimes they actually learn how to swim! Our contemporary societies, all of them, are exactly like “Humpty Dumpty” and “all the kings horses and all the kings men, won’t put Humpty together again!”

And so, not being able to restore our present structures, it is my hope that we will prove ourselves sensible enough not to restore them but to replace them entirely!

So then, in that context, how shall we think about the provision of a secure society in which people can live and grow?

PART 22 : LAWS AND JUSTICE

One of the clearest signs of a police state in place, or of an incipient police state, is the proliferation of intrusive “busybody laws”. One of the clearest indications that a police state is either incipient or in place, is the proliferation of jails and people in those jails.

When a really significant percentile of a nations population is incarcerated something is dreadfully wrong with that society!

Far too many of our immense burden of laws are directed at minutiae which concern the unnecessary aspects of the preservation of property and wealth. Wealth, in our society is based upon the acquisition and accumulation of tangibles. The amassing of money and the things which money can and does buy is now, and has long been, one of the principle preoccupations of our society.

The trouble is that far too many of our basic resources are expended in the protection of that wealth for the benefit of a very few to the detriment of very many.

That is neither to say, nor to imply that I disapprove of personal property in any way, I very clearly do not. What I do disapprove of however, is the concentration on wealth to the exclusion of things which are far more important.

The development of a new system of support for society which is not based upon tangible assets will alleviate much of this pressure.

If our society constructs a basis for life that is dependent on something other than “wealth”, it is clear to me that we will find people less inclined to obtain tangible assets from others by duress or by stealth or by subterfuge.

There’s no tangible difference between a “strong arm mugger” and Mr. Keating of Lincoln Savings ... except that the latter stole far more money, from many more people, than an army of “muggers”.

We need to construct a system which will make life secure and free from fear, but not by barbaric means. Here too we will have to ask ourselves “Is it kind?” “Is it necessary?” “Is it useful?” Far too many of our laws are none of those things!

I think that human society will be required to maintain something which will be the equivalent of “jails”, for as much of the future as I can foresee. But who shall we keep there? We need to keep people there who impose their own needs and wants violently upon others. “JAILS” NEED TO BE PLACES WHERE VIOLENT PEOPLE ARE KEPT TO PROTECT OTHERS FROM THAT VIOLENCE.

The “jails” themselves however, really needn’t be designed right out of Dante’s Inferno. The people who “run” jails, really shouldn’t be the kind of sadist who ought to be kept in one. Unfortunately, in all too many cases, that’s exactly what they are. Concomitantly the prisoners in a jail should not have the ultimate control over one another’s fate and destiny. The prisoners in jails should not be able to form terrorist groups to control other prisoners. That the foregoing is true is, I believe, a part of the “punishment” method out by prison authorities. It’s that kind of thing that makes such a hell out of prison; and that’s the way the authorities want it to be. Our contemporary jails are, in and of themselves, a scathing indictment of the society which produced them.

WE SHOULD GET THE IDEA OF “PUNISHMENT” COMPLETELY OUT OF OUR HEADS.

“Jails” are simply warehouses in which we keep people we don’t want among us. Ideally, they should also be places of rehabilitation and re-education. “Jails” are full of sociopaths, sick people too, not necessarily simply bad ones. Sometimes the people who run the jails are far worse people than the ones who are kept there.

On the other hand, in our contemporary society, “jails” are also full of people who are neither sick nor bad, and who really have no business whatsoever being there.

How can this be?

Well, part of it is because we tend to be rather more revengeful than just. Part of it is due to the fact that as a society our priorities are totally screwed up. Part of it is due to the fact that we have a thoroughly racist and sexist society.

But most of it is due to the horrifying fact that the greatest majority of our laws are based not upon the security of people in society, not upon the rational needs of society, but entirely upon the pseudo-morality of the dominant religions of the Western world. That “morality” is the product of sick minds.

Far too many of our laws, and in this section of my thoughts I am referring to our “criminal laws” rather than our civil codes, are rooted in social values that no one has thought about seriously for centuries. Unfortunately the greatest majority by far of our “social values” are rooted deeply in religion.

No one who has not committed an act of violence should be in jail. If violence were the only criterion for incarceration, and it very clearly should be, our need for jails and their appurtenances would be immensely less than it is.

There are very many kind, necessary, and helpfully productive ways to induce behavioral changes in people who “cross the line” of socially acceptable behavior. But we have to be very careful indeed of where we draw that line. It is important to remember that the “line” has to do with inter-personal, inter-social activities. We, as a corporate body, have no intrinsic right, no derived right, no right of any kind, to interfere in intra-personal activities!

Society may only interest itself in what people do that seriously negatively impacts upon other people. What people say, what people think, what people feel, what people do that impacts upon only themselves, are all none of society’s business!

Think about it; if we succeed in changing the support of our society to a non-tangible economic basis, and we restrained from jailing all but the actually violent, can you imagine the savings in time and energy which our society could devote to more important things?

Right now, we spend infinitely too much time and energy persecuting those who do not fit into our society’s relatively warped parameters.

There are productive ways to secure our society’s peace of mind and comfort. Our society has chosen the most unproductive of all ways to do that. Draco (alt. Sp. Dracon) is still the source of our jurisprudence!

PART 23: HUMAN SEXUALITY

The first thing I think we have to do as a society is get rid of all our laws dealing with human sexual behavior ... and along with that, we really need to change the attitude of society towards sexuality.

Our society is literally insane as regards its attitude toward human sexual expression.

The only aspect of sexual behavior that society has a right to concern itself with, is when that sexuality is expressed in a violent manner. When one individual's sexual needs are imposed upon another individual without their informed consent. If you took all the people in prison for "sex crimes", except the rapists, out of prison, you'd have a "vacancy crisis".

Most human sexual expression does not negatively impact society itself, or the individuals who make up society, in any way. However, it is almost impossible to adjudicate the immense amount of real harm done to individuals within society by society's criminally irrational misperception of sexuality.

Let me make this completely clear. Rape, sexual molestation, sexual harassment, and/or any other action that is imposed, whether by actual force, threat of force, or by taking advantage of position, authority, or situation is wrong and it is inexcusable.

But that is the only aspect of sexuality that is society's business!

As long as it's mutually desirable: Who people fuck ... how people fuck what people fuck and with due respect for the sensibilities of others where people fuck, is no one's business but their own!

Society has absolutely no right at all to select and prescribe a socially acceptable sexual/affectional object. People really do get to pick their own. Remember, laws or not, they do so in any case.

Violence aside, there is clearly no such thing as "unnatural sex" were it to be, in fact, "unnatural" it would be impossible! If it's possible, it's clearly natural! If you can do it, it's OK to do it!

I won't even discuss "abominations", and, I think I've made it adequately clear what my attitude is towards the concept that something could be "prohibited by God".

I may be foolish, and I probably am, but I believe, or at least I want to believe, that violence is not natural to people. I believe that to be especially true when we're discussing personal sexuality expressed in a violent manner.

I think that when sexuality expresses itself in an impositional way, in an oppressive manner, or violently, then it is in all likelihood reacting to society's repression of sexuality and to the innate violence of that repression!

I may be wrong, I frequently am, but I don't think so in this case.

If our society were freer in its attitude toward sexuality we wouldn't have to waste so much time and energy discussing the matter.

Without going into specific details I really think I've said nearly all I want to about human sexual behavior and about our corporate responsibilities in the matter. There is however, one particularly irrational aspect of our religion-based attitude toward sexuality that I believe needs a fresh approach.

This is a subject where, as the cliché goes: "Even angels fear to tread"! Obviously I'm going to be the "fool that rushes in".

Let's talk about sex and people who are not adults (whatever that may mean).

Do you have any idea what would happen if people had to take a test to be accepted as an adult? The word "adult" is accepted to mean: "a mature, responsible human being". Maturity has nothing to do with age. Being responsible has nothing to do with age. We all know far too many people who are far beyond their twenty-first birthdays and are not at all "mature, responsible human-beings". Some of them hold high political office.

As long as there is no violence or coercion involved as long as it's clearly the expression of a mutual need and a mutual desire; if they're old enough to DO it they're old enough TO do it!

What is clearly harmful to young people, no, make that all people, is not sexual activity itself but our society's totally insane attitude on the subject!

Our society has a reluctance to allow people to grow up. Our society extends the period called "childhood" way beyond where nature does. Nature ends childhood with puberty, our society requires twenty one years. This is completely crazy!

I am convinced that the reason which our society extends childhood so unnaturally far beyond nature's clear intent, is due to our societies preoccupation with, and fear of, death!

If you remain a child for 21 years then maturity a thing which at least implies the approach of death, is staved off a little longer. That's completely crazy too!

I think it also would benefit us to remember that there are a large number of people, an entire industry in fact, whose "bottom line", whose profit margin depends entirely upon the totally unreasonable extension of childhood and the dis-empowerment of young human beings.

As long as there is absolutely no element of violence or coercion involved as long as an act of sexual expression is the expression of a mutual need and a mutual desire, if you're old enough to DO it, you're old enough TO do it!

If an individual person is old enough to want to do it, in other words perceives a need to do it, if that individual is old enough to be able to do at least something and truly wants to, then they have the right to gratify that need!

No one has any right to deny another person the right to be, have, or do anything which doesn't hurt anyone.

As far as people hurting themselves is concerned then we get on very "iffy" ground.

My feeling is that in cases in which people are likely to hurt themselves, like for instance: "Bungee Jumpers" ... education is preferable to any thing else. Repression is not acceptable.

REPRESSION IS NEVER ACCEPTABLE.

I am convinced that society does far more harm to people sexually than all the rapists that ever lived. I am even more strongly convinced that without society's insane religion-based view of human sexuality we'd have infinitely far fewer rapists.

An individual who, because of their personal sexual needs, is convinced by our tyrannical social paradigm that they are "damned for eternity", that they are "unrepentant sinners", that they are "evil", that

they are “hateful in the eyes of God”, may easily very well react to all that hopelessness by casting aside all restraints on the theory of “in for a penny ... in for a pound”!

Obviously, most people do not react this way but enough do, to make it society’s problem.

And that, I think, is all that I need or want to say about sex. It’s quite enough.

However, while I am discussing topics regarding our “busybody” legal system, and “people harming themselves”, I think I really need to discuss what are called “controlled substances”!

PART 24: CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

In our contemporary societies the most rigidly controlled of all “substances” are people themselves. The “War on Drugs” is more realistically described as a “war on people”. The “War on Drugs” provides immense profit for far too many totally unscrupulous people, both those outside of government who deal in drugs, and those within it, who, in divers ways, also “deal” in drugs. The “war on drugs” does infinitely more harm to the people of our societies than the drugs themselves could ever do.

I wish I could say that the “war on drugs” was ethically or even, though as you already know I don’t approve of the concept, morality driven, but it’s not. It’s entirely profits-driven. The evidence seems to be developing massively that there are branches of the government of the United States of America, and other governments too, whose primary mission is the importation and sale of exactly those substances they are designated to control.

I resisted this idea for a long while but I am now convinced that the CIA has it’s hands deep into the “drug business”. I believe that were the majority of laws pertaining to so-called “controlled substances” removed from the books, there would be far less usage and infinitely less crime.

In a profit driven society, where the “bottom line” is all-important, take the profit out of a business and you kill the business.

Take the thrill of being “forbidden” out of drugs and you also remove much of the motivation for their use. There will always be people who require dependency, the spectrum of dependencies is immensely broad, but that is truly the affair of the people themselves. It is only harmful when society intrudes in peoples personal affairs.

Think of the time and energy and resources we’d save if we desisted from this harmful and wasteful insanity.

Now as far as the use of narcotics and other substances being “immoral”, well you already know how much nonsense I believe “morality” to be!

This whole thing is utterly irrational. Why? Well, I think it’s irrational because if we ban narcotics etc. for being physically harmful we’d logically have to ban all other things that are physically harmful too. Cigarettes, alcohol, butter, bacon, eggs, whatever anyone says is physically harmful, we’d have to make illegal. And everyone really knows how insane that idea is. Well, banning “controlled substances” is just as insane.

Think about how many fewer jails we require if all the “drug related” inmates were released. They, or at least those not imprisoned for violent actions connected with their relation to “controlled substances”, really should be!

We’ve got to stop controlling peoples “vices”. We’ve got to stop identifying peoples personal choices as vices. **WE’VE GOT TO STOP BEING BUSYBODIES.**

I myself do not use tobacco or alcohol, not because I think using them is somehow “wrong”, but only because I don’t enjoy them, and I only experimented with a “controlled substance” once. To the extent of one puff on a marijuana cigarette, which made me immediately nauseous, so I put it out. But it seems to me that those who enjoy it, should be permitted to do so.

It's none of my business what other people do, as long as they don't do it to me without my willing and informed assent.

You know, thinking about "vice squads", "narcotics interdiction", "drug enforcement agencies", etc., etc., etc., what an immense amount of our inheritance we waste on being busybodies.

Do you have any idea of how many of our "inalienable rights" and "hard-earned liberties" have been abrogated by and through the "War on Drugs"? It is my intuition that the ultimate abrogation of liberty is the major reason for that "war", and that goal perhaps explains our government's presence in the "line of supply". Governments are inevitably envious of, and ultimately inimical to, individual liberty!

PART 25: ABORTION

The controversy regarding abortion is one of the most catastrophically divisive conflicts taking place in society today. It is at its most emphatic and divisive in the United States but to a far less divisive degree, and in a less animosity filled atmosphere, it's also going on in other countries as well.

First I want to say that this issue is a woman's issue not a male issue. Males cannot ever be faced with the question, so it's really none of their affair. No man, except a medical Doctor, has any right to input in this question at all.

Childbirth always presents an element of danger, it always presents pain and discomfort. If you can't go through the ordeal of childbirth, you have no right at all to make any decisions on the subject.

But, as usual, far too much of our society's basic attitude toward a subject that has sexual overtones, plainly has its roots in the male celibate Roman-Catholic clerical mind.

So I thought I had some right to counter that male negation with a little male positivity. Only in moderation though, because there are certain peripheral aspects of this question about which I am distinctly ambivalent. Which means I am of "two minds" about it.

Basically, it wouldn't be a problem at all, were it not for religion. It's surely no "big thing" in the eyes of my own model of reality. As I see it, abortion has nothing to do with death.

Women are not brood mares! It is not their duty to breed, it is not their primary function to breed! Maternity is an optional thing that a woman can do if she feels ready to do so, if she feels it's time. If she feels she wants to do so.

"Giving birth" and "Motherhood" are clearly cause and effect, but the ability to accomplish the one, does not automatically confer either the desire or the propensity to be the other. It also does not confer the ability to be a parent.

Being a parent is a major undertaking, a major responsibility. It is actually child-abuse to force people to be parents if they are not entirely ready and desirous of so doing.

Abortion is not only a problematical and controversial subject in the so-called Christian West. I do believe that the problem is most severe and most public in the Industrialized West. That problem is the direct result of Roman Catholic doctrine, and of dissenting Christianity's adherence to that doctrine in this one instance. Abortion however, is equally problematical wherever either Christianity, or Judaism, or Islam hold sway they are all based upon the same foundation, and that foundation is patriarchal and oppressive.

Roman Catholic-based Christian doctrine says that abortion is the murder of a human being.

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE IS UTTERLY WRONG ABOUT THAT!

Christian doctrine flies in the face of scientific reality and claims that at the instant of conception, the instant when sperm joins egg to form a zygote, a human life exists. This is nonsense! It is anti-scientific! It is anti-rational!

At that point in time, the potential for a human life exists but that human life itself is not yet realized. Human life is based entirely upon sentience, upon self-aware consciousness. There is absolutely no

indication that self-awareness exists in the womb. Pre-natal memories, if they are indeed valid and not induced, are still no evidence of pre-natal self-awareness.

Where there is no self-aware consciousness, no self-conscious awareness, there is no sentient life. A human life does not become such a thing until it is aware it is alive and at the same time aware that it is aware that it is alive.

Once again, we are unavoidably confronted by the results of the Judeo-Christian religion's paranoia regarding death. It is a religion whose only focus is death. It is a religion whose entire theological system is concerned only with death!

It is a religion which knows absolutely nothing about the reality of the subject, but like all religions claims it knows things it doesn't know. Its eschatology is simply fantasy. But then, so are its cosmology and theology. It is entirely irrational, it is totally harmful.

And here we are all of us held hostage to a fantasy!

Individuals have threatened to murder, and have now gone far beyond threat to action, and have murdered other individuals for performing abortions, which they regard as murder. Is that a rational act? But history sadly records the awful fact that religionists are always willing to murder others in the name of their religion. Once again, I must say that it seems crystal clear to me that humanity will be far better off without its old religions.

Now I did say that there were aspects of the abortion question about which I am ambivalent.

I am ambivalent about the ethicality of parents aborting a female baby when they wanted a male. But then I am entirely ambivalent about the ethicality of all attempts to pre-arrange the sexual identity of a child. Sure it's clearly a woman's absolute right to make the decision, but I must ask if that is an appropriate decision when it's only to choose sex?

A child is such a wonderful thing, who cares what's between its legs? A child may be a boy or a girl but far more importantly it is an intelligent being which a parent has the immense joy of watching develop; it is a human personality which a parent has the responsibility of making happy and secure and free. Why care what sex it is?

I am ambivalent about abortion as birth-control. There are many much better, very much less expensive, and far easier methods available.

I am ambivalent about the kind of person who has frequent abortions. Seems a little cavalier in regard to one's own body and its functions to me! It seems to me that a person who allows herself to be so imposed upon by a male or males so as to frequently require abortions, is a person who is very much lacking in self-esteem. Unless that person is always getting raped, she has abdicated her own authority over her own body and actions.

But that's all I'm ambivalent about.

Aborting a foetus to save the mother's life is clearly beneficial and positive; there's really no place for discussion on that topic. Anyone who says there is, is a sick unit!

Aborting a foetus that is clearly known to be either physically or mentally damaged or disadvantaged, in an effort to spare the eventual child the concomitant suffering and pain and sorrow, is a clearly

beneficial and positive act. Anyone who says it isn't should really have to experience the disability themselves!

Aborting a foetus when the parents or parents do not wish a child, would hate it if they had it, and would, as a result, neglect or abuse it, is clearly a favor to the child which might have gotten born. Anyone who says it isn't should have the experience of being an unwanted, resented, neglected and abused child. Where's the benefit to a child who society forces to be born only to be beaten to death before its fourth birthday?

There are better ways I think, than utilizing abortion as part of rational family planning, but it's always the woman's decision to make; a man's only, if a woman gives him the option.

Where my ambivalence most comes into play, is that I really wish that, in all possible cases where the foetus is healthy, and the mother too, some thought should be given to bearing the baby and putting it out for adoption.

There are a lot of people, myself most definitely included, who, for some reason or another, cannot have their own babies, but who would be overjoyed to have the opportunity of parenting. It would be a kindness to make this possible.

And that's all I have to say about abortion.

PART 26: DISPUTE MEDIATION

As human beings are always human beings, and there is always, no matter what the reality paradigm in force may be, the basic proclivity of human beings to disagree; we will have to develop a method of mediating such disagreements that is not so costly in terms of time, energy, wherewithal, and stress, than our present system of juridical mediation.

Our present system has only one purpose it makes lawyers rich. It has only one goal to make lawyers rich. It has only one result it makes the lawyer's clients poor!

That doesn't work out so well. We'll have to find something that's more equitable and convenient. We'll have to find something which doesn't make our dispute mediation system a get rich quick scheme.

There has to be something better than what we've got now! I really have no specific idea what it should be. The system we've got now is not simply ethically unsavory, which it is, in spades, but it is actually harmful to society in discernable and measurable ways.

Were it not for our totally adversarial system of dispute mediation we would, all of us, be saved immense amounts of wherewithal and grief! One of the reasons our medical services in this country are in the parlous state they are is due to the costs of our adversarial tort system. Perhaps the ancient Greeks were right, Lawyers bringing suit should come to court with a rope around their necks in case they lose!

If one stops to think of all the ways in which our adversarial system has cost us not simply money but vital services as well, then we must come to the conclusion that we need a new system. It must not be designed or planned by Lawyers!

But I do think John Adams had some reason on his side, when he said (clearly quoting from Shakespeare) "First hang all the lawyers!"; after all, he was a lawyer. I really think that whatever we all decide, as much as is humanly possible, the Lawyers should be kept out of the process. To accomplish that, I hope hanging won't be needed.

What do I think is the most important thing we have to work on in the new society that I hope will grow out of the total wreck of our former society?

It is, I think, important for me to point out that I am not predicting an imminent social catastrophe. It is my perception that our society is already fully engaged world-wide, in the process of collapse, and I am merely working on suggestions for a response to that collapse!

PART 27: EDUCATION

Education! Education is that “most important thing”! But first we’ll have to clearly define what we mean by the word education.

You know, in the course of this conversation, I think it’s very interesting to notice how very frequently our first job is to clearly define meanings. It is pretty clear that one of the most negative aspects of our self-destructing civilization is that it really hasn’t actually defined what it means by most of the “buzz-words” it uses.

I don’t think the society which is collapsing around us has a clue about the meaning and function of education. They can’t have had a clear definition of what they meant by “education”, because the products of what they do call education are so frequently appalling.

Our education mills turn out relatively competent technicians, but all too frequently they are completely ignorant outside of their narrow fields. Our education factories turn out lots of people who aren’t very proficient at either reading or writing. They turn out people who know next to nothing about the past or the world around them. Tragically, our schools produce very few original thinkers, and sadly, extremely few really civilized people.

People like Stephen Hawking and Albert Einstein don’t count because real genius is both rare and almost entirely immune to society’s short-comings and restrictions. A real genius is a “sport” and doesn’t really need to be educated by others they do it themselves. People like Stephen Hawking exist in spite of our educational assembly lines not because of them!

It is clear that the first thing we’ve got to do is decide what we mean by the word educate. I think it should be clear that the purpose of education is twofold.

FIRST: it must teach people how to think, not what to think! It must give people the intellectual tools needed to solve knotty problems for themselves. Education must give people the equipment required to attack abstract questions for themselves. It must give people the sense of self-confidence, the confidence of self-worth, to enable them to be unafraid of attacking any intellectual redoubt.

SECOND: it must give people the data base they require to use their minds independently. Human Beings require a basic data base of information, of facts, of tangible things. If they don’t have this basis, how can they approach the intangible?

Civilized people must have a shared data-base in order to create a mutual sense of values and priorities.

But I am talking about a data-base of fact not opinion. It is utterly futile to attempt to form an opinion without any facts upon which to base that opinion.

THE PURPOSE AND FUNCTION OF EDUCATION IS TO EXERCISE THE MIND, NOT STUFF THE BRAIN! THE PURPOSE AND FUNCTION OF EDUCATION IS TO PRODUCE CIVILIZED HUMAN BEINGS! THE PURPOSE AND FUNCTION OF EDUCATION IS TO PRODUCE INDEPENDENT THINKERS! THE PURPOSE AND FUNCTION OF EDUCATION IS TO PRODUCE PEOPLE WHO CAN CHALLENGE THEMSELVES. THE PURPOSE AND FUNCTION OF EDUCATION IS TO ENCOURAGE THOSE PEOPLE WITH THE POTENTIAL TO BE CREATIVE, TO BE SO. NO SYSTEM CAN MAKE PEOPLE BE CREATIVE, NOR SHOULD ANYONE TRY.

Our contemporary systems penchant for declaring that “everyone is equally creative in some way” is egalitarian, which is stupid, it is willfully wrong, which is malicious, and worst of all, it inculcates false and unreasonable expectations, which is cruel and harmful.

Another problem is that our contemporary schools are very much more custodial in their functions than they are educational. Schools have become a place to get our kids off the streets, and out of our hair, for several hours a day.

Our society has been sold a bill of false goods by the education establishment; as a result, it has developed a vast set of conflicting unreasonable expectations as to the possible results of education. But because education and educators are neither well-paid nor respected, our society gets exactly what it pays for, and what it deserves; lousy education!

Because educators are neither respected nor very well paid, especially in so-called higher education, they have encapsulated themselves in an intellectually incestuous cannibalistic little world where the only concerns are tenure and one-upmanship. Where and who published what and when are more important than teaching. Where the latest academic fad/fetish/obsession is more important than anything at all.

In primary education the teachers are hardly better educated than the students!

As a result, society gets exactly what it pays for and what it deserves, mis-education rather than education.

Our contemporary society, or rather an unfortunately solid majority of it, strongly resents and dislikes really cultured, humane, civilized human beings. They don't fit the foolish egalitarian model. They make boors feel uncomfortable. They make the incompetent feel inadequate. They are dismissed contemptuously as effete, elitist, and ineffectual.

It is the purpose of education to produce cultured, humane, civilized human beings who are also either technically, scientifically, or intellectually competent human beings, preferably all three of the latter qualities at once. See the problem?

It is a question of priorities.

Our society does not value the kind of people it truly needs, but it pays immense rewards in money and respect to mindless louts who, while they can't speak articulately or think rationally, can perform athletically. These people frequently earn salaries that are greater than the educational budgets of many small cities and towns. Sometimes more than the entire budgets! These over-paid but useless “athletes” add absolutely nothing to the quality of life on this planet; but then, once again, society gets exactly what it deserves.

Priorities, priorities, priorities!

Some moron with a batting average of 249 gets two and a half million a year; but there's no money for medical research, no money to house the homeless, no money for educational improvements. That's a value judgment for you! Society gets exactly what it deserves!

But because our society is fully involved in the process of getting what it so richly deserves, we get a chance to change that society for the better. We're going to have no place to go except up!

Children are individuals. They are, each of them, a different educational challenge. That is not to say they cannot be similar, but they are not the same. Children are people, and as such, they cannot, and must not, be educated in “job lots”!

Children are people, children are human beings, with all the rights and responsibilities that implies!

Education and educators cannot, and must not, patronize their students or condescend to them. No one should ever patronize children or be condescending to children ever! The children recognize either attitude immediately and both hate it and resent it.

Children are, and have every right to be, free individuals. It’s just that because of their vulnerability, which may not be as great as we believe, we are far more responsible to them than they are to us. Each child is like a blossom; teachers are there to tend that blossom not force it.

THE PURPOSE OF EDUCATION IS NOT DISCIPLINE IT IS GUIDANCE! THE PURPOSE OF EDUCATION IS SUPPLYING EACH INDIVIDUAL CHILD’S NEEDS AT THE INDIVIDUAL CHILD’S PACE.

Teachers, no matter what their level, exist only to serve the needs of their students.

Children are not at all like computer memories it is not the function of education to program children. Society has no right to “program” anyone - that’s immensely repressive!

As a society, we must, and this is really urgent, find a way to make the amassing of knowledge and understanding, the thing itself, something which is viewed positively and expectantly by children. But only when the child involved is appropriate to that pathway.

I have spent my entire life happily and joyously engaged in studying and reading all sorts of things amassing a great mass of both useful knowledge, and also a great mass of utterly useless but very interesting information. I find it fun. Some people don’t find it fun. Those who do, should, those who don’t, shouldn’t. It’s just that simple.

But an awful lot of those who presently don’t “find it fun”; those who find it a real burden, are not in that situation due to any real intention or natural quality of their own. The fault lies entirely with an educational establishment who make of learning a burden instead of a joy!

THE PURPOSE OF EDUCATION, AND A DIFFICULT PURPOSE IT IS, IS TO EDUCATE EACH INDIVIDUAL CHILD PRECISELY AS THAT CHILD, AND NO OTHER, NEEDS TO THE BEST OF EACH CHILD’S ABILITIES.

Each child has to know, not think, but know, that he or she is truly a matter of strong concern for everyone involved in the education process.

Each child has to know, not think, but know, that he or she is truly respected as an independent individual person with all the rights that status carries with it, by everyone connected with the educational system.

Each child has to know, not think, but know, that he or she is truly respected as an independent individual person with all the rights that status carries with it, by his or her parents, relatives, and, in fact, by anyone and everyone whom the child might encounter.

Each child has to know, not think, but know, that he or she truly is an independent individual person with all the rights that status carries with it.

TO THE EXACT EXTENT THAT ANYONE IS NOT FREE WE ARE ALL NOT FREE.

That includes children. To the extent that anyone denies another person their rights, they themselves have no rights. That includes denying the rights of children.

Children are not adults. That is absolutely clear. Children have special needs and requirements that adults are required to fulfill. Children need guidance that others must provide. Children, of course, need to be provided for. But, that doesn't mean or imply that children aren't independent, individual, human beings. That doesn't mean or imply that children are "inferior", or "subservient", in any way, to any adult.

CHILDREN ARE NOT, AND MUST NEVER BE, VIEWED AS "THE PROPERTY" OF THEIR PARENTS. CHILDREN ARE A VERY IMPORTANT RESPONSIBILITY, THEY ARE NOT A POSSESSION!

Parents, and society itself, have the responsibility to provide for children, and to provide gentle and positive guidance. No one at all has any right to dictate another human being's destiny.

Children are people, they are therefore equal to all other people and must receive the same respect, and a good deal more cautious care, than an older person.

It is altogether too easy to harm a child through incautious and thoughtless speech. Much easier than it is to harm an older person. A contemptuous and disrespectful attitude withers a child. It usually only annoys an older person,

Each child has to know the parameters, both educational and disciplinary, within which he or she is expected to perform. NO CHILD SHOULD EVER BE INTIMIDATED OR FORCED TO PERFORM.

I don't believe it can be sufficiently emphasized how vitally important it is that each child be permitted and encouraged to proceed through the educational process at a pace and timing that is comfortable to the individual child. As I said earlier, and this a very important thing: individual children should be treated as individual projects, not "job lots"!

The education process is not an industrial assembly line in which processes can be scheduled. It is totally unfair, and extremely unproductive, to insist that the education of an individual child be accomplished within certain specific time parameters.

Education is a process that serves only the welfare of children. It cannot and must not serve either the needs or the convenience of teachers!

Most important of all, each child has to feel totally comfortable with the entire process, school should be a joyful time of life.

Childhood must be a secure time of the life experience to the extent that childhood, and learning, is not both totally secure and very happy a society is either beneficial or harmful! A SOCIETY, LIKE THE CONTEMPORARY UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN WHICH MANY CHILDREN FIND SIMPLY "GOING TO SCHOOL" A TERRIFYING EXPERIENCE, A SOCIETY IN WHICH MANY CHILDREN GO TO SCHOOL ARMED, IS A BASICALLY MALIGNANT SOCIETY!

And changing that, begetting an entirely different educational paradigm, begetting a paradigm which is more in line with what I've been describing, is, I think, how we go about encouraging people to be creative!

It is also one of the reasons we have to discover a new economic base, otherwise we "couldn't afford it", but we can't not afford it! Our present economic systems are totally preventing human progress they must be discarded entirely!

The most important task facing any teacher is the necessity of communicating a sense of joy and wonder and total enthusiasm in and about the process of learning itself. If teachers aren't completely enthusiastic in their enjoyment of the process, what can their students assume that to mean?

As to subject matter, before we discuss the curriculum let's discuss something more important than subject matter. Let's discuss teachers.

AN UNENTHUSIASTIC TEACHER PRODUCES UNINTERESTED STUDENTS.

A teacher, of any subject, must clearly love his or her subject matter. A teacher, of any subject, must obviously be excited by his or her subject. It's that love and excitement which both communicates itself to the student as enthusiasm, and produces that enthusiasm in the student.

Far too many teachers in our educational systems are simply time servers of small qualification who chose teaching because the qualifications required were minimal.

I have to say that I have very little respect for the poorly qualified, poorly motivated, self-serving "baby sitters" that unfortunately seem to make up a majority of our teaching force today. Simply "liking" children is no qualification at all for a teacher it's a fine qualification for a baby sitter.

I don't think I want to get too involved in the discussion of specific details of the curriculum.

I really don't feel qualified to do so. There are surely enough experts to do so. What I do want to make is some general comments.

Whatever curriculum our new education system eventually decides upon, it really should devote its beginning energies on the provision of that "basic data base" I spoke about earlier. It is absolutely impossible for people to share values and develop priorities if they do not share a relatively common data base.

The single most important thing, I think, in human society is the absolute necessity for clear communication between individuals.

Without clear communication we have absolutely no basis for society. Obviously that requires a very high degree of language skills because the spoken and written word is the most important of all communication channels between individuals themselves, between them and their corporate groupings, and between disparate corporate groupings.

Basic language skills, therefore, I think are the first thing upon which we must concentrate. They are in a disastrous state in our contemporary society, much of it due to academic fetishes and obsessions. The most heinous and destructive of which is "Deconstructionism".

Without all the basic language skills, structural language, spoken language, written language, and well developed reading skills, a child's access to every other aspect of our civilization is totally blocked. I really mean every aspect!

It has also been my experience that people who do not think clearly cannot speak articulately, that those who cannot speak clearly, cannot think clearly, that people who cannot speak articulately, cannot write articulately. It is perhaps odd, but in my experience it is clear that people who can neither speak nor write articulately also have a basic lack of reading ability.

I meet too many young people who do not read. I meet too many young people who though putatively literate, really can't read. I meet far too many young people who regard the idea of reading with horror. I meet far too many young people who really haven't got a clue about why reading is so important. This is society's fault. This is education's fault. This is a parental fault. This is the communications media's fault. This is everyone's fault!

Language skills are vitally important in assisting people to formulate their thoughts and opinions to themselves. Language skills are the most important factor in the production of that cultured, civilized, creative person I discussed earlier. We live, unfortunately in an inarticulate and sub-literate society.

See the problem?

The lack of clear communication this causes is the primary reason for the hostility and anger which is so intrinsic a part of life today.

Now then, once we've established the basic necessary communications abilities, we've got to give people something to communicate with and about. This is where what I call the basic data-bank comes into our equation.

Our contemporary society, flawed as it may be, is nevertheless, the end-product of some 50,000 years of civilization plus all that went before that. If "all that" is a total mystery to you, what could the status of our present situation mean to you?

Stephen Hawking, Albert Einstein, Isaac Newton and the rest have told us what we are. It is the history of our civilizations which informs us as to who we are!

Nothing happens in a vacuum, not the "big Bang" or anything else!

As a result, it is clear that people cannot exist in a knowledge vacuum. You cannot have any idea of the meaning of the society in which you live unless you know and understand the phases that society has passed through in its development. Unless you understand the nature of your society, you cannot understand yourself.

You must understand yourself. Unless you understand yourself, you cannot arrive at an understanding of your place in society or anything else.

If an individual doesn't know anything, than anyone can tell that person anything, and the individual will have no basis for either discrimination or judgment as to the truth or value of what they're being told. IT IS VERY EASY TO LIE TO SOMEONE WITH NO BASIC INFORMATIONAL DATA-BANK FOR HOW ARE THEY TO KNOW THEY'RE BEING LIED TO?

And so, the next feature of our education system, I think, must be a thorough grounding in the history of our entire global civilization.

The most important aspect of any history of our civilization is the development of a broad spectrum image of the development of human creativity on all the fronts where that ability comes into play. No history of civilization is complete or valuable unless it is also a history of ideas, philosophies, religions, social systems, the graphic arts, music, architecture, literature, poetry, sculpture, science, and technology. Our civilization is a compendium of the sum of “all that”. With that under their belts, and with the language skills to deal with it, a person can tackle anything!

Next, and of almost equal importance, if not, in fact, of primary importance after language, and probably simultaneously with history, is a field of study that has long been neglected and ignored among us, and that is ethics.

“Good” and “evil”, at least intrinsic “good” and “evil” are completely nonsensical there; is clearly no “God” there, is clearly no “Devil” never was, never will be.

As I said earlier, “morality” is entirely based upon the ideas of intrinsic good and evil and equally upon the religious notion of “sin”; the whole business of “morality” is entirely nonsensical and invalid; always was, always will be!

But ethics, ethics are the thing which enables us to successfully live with one another.

Ethics is that which makes the human condition bearable. Ethics is the wall between civilization and chaos! Ethics, the thing in itself, is the only thing which stands between humanity and inhumanity!

If, and when, society can define ethics, can “figure out what they are”, then we should teach them to our children. We can and we will!

I think we know what “ethics” are right now!

And so when we have achieved an educational system that is capable of producing an ethical, knowledgeable, articulate, civilized person; we can go on to teach specific skills and disciplines.

Not having any specific skill or discipline, as you can see I’m a generalist, I’ll leave that discussion to those who do. I am interested in priorities, in the basic goals and purposes of education as a thing in itself, and in the results it produces.

The technology of education, the quantification and qualification of education is most appropriately developed by technicians. I am no technician! As I said earlier I am a “what” and “why” person, not a “how” person.

If we succeed, we’ll find ourselves in a society composed of ethical, capable, reasonable people.

And that will be heaven indeed!

It will be so because “ethical, capable, self-confident, reasonable people” are NOT bigots, nor are they racists, nor sexists, nor egalitarians, nor are they violent, grasping, or repressive!

PART 28: THE INFORMATION MEDIA

You know, I've noticed that I've been bad mouthing the media quite a bit in this thing I'm writing. Do I feel guilty about it? NO!

I think I want to talk about the communications/information media just about now. It's certainly connected to education and not simply for children.

The information/communications media are responsible for both educating, and keeping fully informed, the entire population! Not "entertaining" not "titillating" not "amusing", but educating and informing!

People who are ill-informed or mis-informed are, I think, probably worse off than people who are not informed at all!

If our educational systems can turn out ethical, articulate, cultured, civilized, knowledgeable people, those people, if well informed, can use their own data-bases to really understand everything that's going on in society.

As a result, the society composed of these ethical, articulate, cultured, civilized, knowledgeable, well-informed people, will be a place that is a good place to live well and prosper!

Unfortunately, we have all of us seen media personalities who can barely read, let alone comprehend, even the tiny and totally simplistic "sound bites" they are given to "read"!

That is an incipient catastrophe!

When the greatest majority by far of any given population is uninformed, ill-informed, and worst of all, mis-informed; they are regularly overtaken and overwhelmed by events. Let this occur with any degree of regularity and society becomes unstable. That is what has happened to our global society.

Why does this happen?

It happens because people become frightened by the continual element of surprise, they no longer feel that they are actually participants in the world around them. People feel that they have become merely spectators to things which effect them importantly.

Ill informed, mis-informed people are disempowered. Disempowerment is frightening and also makes people feel helpless. Helpless people historically tend to lash out in anger. But because they are not informed, the objects of their angers have a tendency to be ill chosen!

IN THESE CASES, ALL TOO FREQUENTLY, THE OBJECTS OF THEIR LASHING OUT TEND TO BE THE SUBJECTS OF THEIR BIASES AND PREJUDICES!

In our contemporary societies the informational media are practically omnipresent. They possess the technical capacity to practically smother people's awareness with whatever subject matter they may choose to saturate the airwaves. The utterly obscene fascination by the media with the "O.J. Simpson Trial" is an absolutely perfect example of what I mean. The trial, in its time, almost entirely smothered all other events.

Were the intellectual capacities and integrity of our information media even one thousandth as efficient as their technical capacities, we would be the best informed people who ever lived. As it is, we are among the worst.

In our contemporary societies we are ill served by the informational media. Our political processes are subverted by misinformation not as part of some subtle political plot but merely in search of the media's "bottom line" ratings and advertising revenue!

In search of revenue, our media are focused on the lowest common denominator of what they conceive of as the public's interest level and interest span. Our media's policies are generated by their accounting departments. There is hardly an iota of public spirit involved in motivating the media.

Wrapped in the dignity and protection of the American constitution, and internationally by the United Nations protections of a free press, our news media and information media have become little more than the intellectual equivalent of a whore house! Though that probably insults the Bordello.

When the greatest proportion of personnel involved in the public dispersion of information are chosen for their looks and "sex-appeal" rather than for their brains what can one expect?

People need to insist on being better served! They must do so by way of the only thing that can get the attention of the corporations which provide this "service"; they can hit them in the pocketbook!

What people mustn't do is demand that their legislatures write more laws there are far too many laws now and no one at all pays them any attention or has a drop of respect for them or the system they represent!

People pass laws all the time; for the most part they are at best ineffectual, at worst, harmful. The passage of legislation is simply an emotional release. Laws don't work, never have, never will!

Call it the King Canute effect!

How can people "hit the media in the pocketbook"? That's not the easiest thing to do because the people they are supposed to serve are not the people who support the media. It's the people who buy advertising, who pay for air time, that support the media industry. They support it handsomely. But, their support is based on audience and circulation, for that is what the advertising tariffs are based upon!

Don't watch the telecommunications media, don't read the print media, don't buy the products they advertise, and write letters massively, not to the media themselves, but to the advertisers who support the media, and eventually we'll be better served.

In the interim, as they really aren't worth much, if anything, ignore them. If you really want to be informed inform yourself. It's quite possible but takes a lot of work.

I think it's very clear that education and information are complimentary factors in any society. They depend upon one another implicitly. They must be balanced. Without them a society is on a terminally "slippery slope".

In our contemporary society, education and information are quite well balanced, they both stink!

PART 29: GOVERNMENTS

I think that each of us, each person, needs to be involved in the society of which we are a part, and upon which we depend for our lives. We at least need to be interested!

People who are neither involved nor interested are not actors, they are not audience, they are simply victims!

Of whom are they victims? Of themselves! Of course there are plenty of “bottom liners” out there who will happily assist in the victimization process!

Over the years I have slowly come to the realization that nothing really happens to us of which we are not the authors! We are, each of us, the source of our own disempowerment! We are, each of us, the sole source of our own frustration! We are, each of us, the only source of our own helplessness!

As all power flows to the government, or any where else, directly from the people, we have only ourselves to blame.

Governments exist only to serve the people as the people require! Over the years we, each of us, by our supine natures, by our laziness, by our fatuousness, have permitted governments to turn that truth on its head! All governments believe that the people exist to serve the governments as the governments require!

“Ask not what your country (government) can do for you, but what you can do for your country (government)!” NO, NO, NO, ... NO, NO! That concept, and the entire philosophy and world-view which is behind it, is wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, always was, always will be!

People exist! Governments exist only because people think they need them. Governments exist only to serve the corporate needs of people as a group. They have no existential validity in and of themselves!

People go into politics for much the same “bottom-line” reasons that they go into the priestly classes. What’s the “bottom-line”? Well, like the priests and rabbis, the “Governmental types” are completely control junkies, like George Bush; they have a desperate need to “be somebody”, they’re looking for personal ego-gratification, they’re looking for social advancement, and they’re looking for personal profit, which is always the basic motivation in “bottom-liners”!

We have to face reality! Society cannot be perfect as long as all the people in that society are less than perfect. Obviously society will NEVER be perfect! We have to learn to live within that truth!

I believe that it is possible to make a better social paradigm than we have now, a more nearly perfect society! People have to decide what it is they actually need, and go for it!

My social paradigm is based entirely on the premise that no one can ever be too free. I certainly wouldn’t want to suggest to others what they need! What I am trying to do, is give words to feelings, to speak out as clearly as I can about things we all of us already know and that is what we don’t need!

We don’t need to be mis-informed. We don’t need to be ill-educated. We don’t need to be ruled from above. We don’t need to be exploited by government for its own purposes. We don’t need to be exploited by religion for its own purposes. We don’t need to be exploited by anyone for any reason! We certainly don’t need to be told what we need!

Each and every one of us is a different individual. Obviously we have differing needs and requirements. We are individuals not job lots, and need to be treated individually. Whatever the “more perfect society” we eventually develop is, it will have to take human individuality strongly into account. People are not numbers, they are not “blips in a computer”!

TREAT PEOPLE LIKE BLIPS IN A COMPUTER ... AND THEY'LL SHORT CIRCUIT!

But can we form a “more perfect society”? We sure can! All we need to do is want one bad enough to make it a real need. Then, eventually we will meet our need!

“Government of all of the people, by all of the people, for all of the people”; but in our contemporary context, government should mean to administer but not to rule!

All of our governments think that they reign, they assume that they rule, and that leads inexorably to authoritarianism, which then leads only to tyranny, to despotism.

Where tyranny and despotism lead we are, all of us, only too aware!

In an effort to form “a more perfect society”, to “assure domestic tranquility”, to provide absolutely equitable “social justice”, to guarantee to each and every person the absolutely inalienable right to “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”. Everyone needs to be involved!

We definitely destroy the whole process, and alienate all of those rights, if we presume to tell people what should “make them happy”!

What is a proper, safe, and appropriate administrative structure to serve the “more perfect society” of free people?

Well, the smaller it is the better it is! That I know for sure!

People who serve society in administrative, legislative, and judicial capacities need to do so for very much other than the usual “bottom line”! We can't gratify “control junkies”. We can't reward those who seek ego-gratification! We can't make our society's administration an avenue for social advancement! We absolutely cannot allow service to the people to be a major avenue of personal enrichment!

We can't very well “sentence” people to serve society, so perhaps the best thing would be to make it a civil responsibility like jury duty or military service. Maybe we ought to take a suggestion from Robert Heinlein and make voting dependent on public service. I mentioned “military service” ... well I hope it's already clear what I think about that. Militaries are a thing our global society could clearly do entirely without! We cannot found a “more perfect society” until the militaries are no longer present to subvert those societies for their own advancement.

The “cold war” is an indictment of the entire military-industrial complex and their governmental partisans. The entire population of this planet were held hostage for over forty years simply to meet the “bottom-line” requirements of the military industrial establishments of the United States and The Soviet Union!

Forty five years of squandering our resources! Forty five years of fear and insecurity! Forty five years of paranoia and secrecy. Forty five years of perverting liberty in the name of security! Forty five years of intermittent bloodshed! Forty five years of polluting the environment in the name of various national security measures. Forty five years of imposition to artificially prop up a totally false economy! Forty five years of buying economic pseudo-stability with liberty!

IT STINKS!

I really wasn't kidding when I said that perhaps we ought to make periods of public service in the administration of our society a social responsibility. It's probably the only way to keep people's attention. It's probably the only way to get decent people to assent to public service! Maybe it should actually be the key to enfranchisement!

I really do think that public service should be a sacrifice of sorts. How else can we prevent the usurpation of public service by those who would profit from it?

If we succeed in producing the articulate, cultured, civilized, educated, fully informed citizens I feel it is possible for us to produce, then with the exception of the intellectually disadvantaged, our entire body politic would be well qualified to perform such service.

A couple of years out of one's life is a very small price to pay for living in a more perfect society!

As far as actual enfranchisement is concerned, I wasn't joking earlier. I was very serious in regard to utilizing the virtual community capacities of our computer age to create an electronically derived consensus. It's technically completely feasible in our present state-of-the-art.

If we accept the idea that the basic necessities of life, and some reasonable comforts, are a basic right, then a personal computer can be considered part of those "basic necessities". In our contemporary society a telephone is clearly already considered a basic necessity of life. That's all that is needed.

If the information/communications industry the media get to the point where, in lockstep with our education facilities, they actually produce the kind of citizen I hope for, then with about two or three hours a week time expenditure, our citizens who choose to exercise their franchise, and who prove it by way of service to society, can easily establish the consensus upon which all societal decisions are based.

It may sound entirely utopian but I think it's far better than that mess of intrigue and exploitation and disingenuousness which we call a government now!

Once again I have to say that society is what we want it to be and only what we want it to be. Nothing is really impossible! The reality of utopia isn't at all "utopian"!

We can have a "more perfect society" but we have to really want it!

Once more I'll not go into any great details. I simply want to make other people think for themselves as I have done. I want to paint a background in very broad strokes of the brush and leave the details for others to draw in as decisions are made to effect the changes I'm talking about.

I don't want to create anything, I want to irritate others into creating something in response to my challenge!

PART 30: A MORE PERFECT SOCIETY

If we truly wish to live in a “more perfect society”, and I think we all do, then we’ll really have to think about the ways we think about ourselves, and the ways we think about one another.

“A more perfect society” as viewed by all governments, by all “bottom-liners”, and by all “control-junkies”, is one which is stable, docile, passive, obedient, and malleable. The misguided person who thinks (or hopes) that people need to be “ruled” rather than served, wants what I call a “feed lot society”.

BUT THAT IS NOT WHAT THE PEOPLE OF THIS PLANET WANT!

A “Feed Lot Society” is what the human race, by and large, has had imposed upon itself for altogether too long now. Unfortunately people have forgotten what the end goal of a “feed lot” is. Most people really hate what’s been done to them, they’re just too supine to do anything about it. They’re also too misinformed and ignorant to know they can do something about it.

We all really have to make it clear to the “Bottom-liners” and “control-junkies”, that we won’t be raped, that they can’t have their “way with us” ever!

I don’t really know about you, but I am really sick and tired of being a “social unit”, of being a “statistic”, of being a “tax unit”; I am a person! I think most people feel that way too.

“A more perfect society” is, of course, a far less controlled organism, it is inherently stable rather than stabilized by force.

“A more perfect society” is also more amicable, but “amicable” does not mean “docile and passive”.

“A more perfect society” is clearly going to be a much more peaceful, more reasonable, and very much more fair society. But “reasonable” sure as hell doesn’t mean “malleable and manipulated”, and “peaceful” clearly has never meant “subdued” or “cowed”!

If that “more perfect society” is, in fact, what we really want, and I think we all rather desperately not simply “want” such a thing, but really need and require it in a very urgent way, then besides making significant changes in the way we govern ourselves and in our social values, we will also have to make some really significant changes in the ways we behave toward one another!

In a “more perfect society”, there is simply no place for mindless antagonisms rooted in imperfect understanding of the human condition.

Remember that earlier on I talked, a little, about an important and inevitable “change in attitude” that would necessarily eventually flow naturally from a significant acceptance of the cosmic model I’ve presented to you?

That is so because one cannot realize that one is intrinsically only an intelligent force-field and not change their whole world-view.

Well, I think that if one can really accept the provisional nature of their physicality, and truly accept their more intrinsic reality as intelligent force-fields there would surely have to be an accompanying complete change in attitude toward all of physical existence and toward all with whom one shares that physical existence!

One of the most important of these changes in attitude is this: if we are all of us simply the physical plane reflections of non-physical intelligence, and I believe that to be true, of what value are such

physical plane only differences like skin color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age, nationality and ethnicity?

Forget about ethics and human decency if you really wish to, but I ask you, even then, is it sane for people to hate each other over things like that to kill each other over things like that? Is it sane to get themselves and their families killed or ruined over superficialities like those?

NO, IT IS NOT AT ALL SANE!

We live today, all of us, no matter where on the planet we live, in a society that because it is so irrationally self-destructive, is definitively insane in many ways!

The way human beings treat one another on this planet, which as far as we know, is the only place humans can be found, is so far beyond shameful that there's no word bad enough for it in any of humanity's languages!

This is a very small planet, which probably has far too many inhabitants for its own good. But, unless and until the Search for Extra-terrestrial Intelligence (SETI) turns up something concrete, which it has not yet done, though I do believe that it will, the couple of billion human beings on this little planet are "all she wrote"!

Doesn't that tell you that we have far more in common than we do to separate us?

Doesn't that suggest to you that the only things keeping us separate and antagonistic are ignorance, stupidity, avarice, envy, malice, and viciousness?

If you don't believe that you personally are ignorant, stupid, avaricious, envious, malicious, and vicious and, as I've already said, I think most people aren't, then it's up to you to help solve "the problem"! It really doesn't matter at all whether up to now, you have been a victim, or a victimizer, it's up to you to help solve the problem!

While speaking of both victims and of those who are their victimizers, there is something I really have to say. Both of them are what they are consensually! No one is ever really as helpless as it seems!

I'll take an extreme example.

In 1939 - 1945, the Germans perpetrated the holocaust, one of the most barbaric actions ever committed by allegedly civilized people. And yes, I said "The Germans" and not "The Nazis" because what were the Nazis without the Germans? Who were the "Nazis", if they weren't Germans? The German people, not all of them, but a lot of them, enthusiastically supported Hitler until he began to lose! It was German soldiers who laughed as they drove men, women, and little children into the gas chambers; that is enthusiastic consent to be a victimizer!

On the other hand, the victims "went peacefully"! There's no benefit in dying like sheep in a slaughterhouse! Were not most of them kidnapped from their homes? Are there no kitchen knives? If every single person arrested had stuck a kitchen knife into the German soldier or policeman arresting them, there would be a hell of a lot less arresting. Sure, they'd have been shot ... but they were going to die anyway, and they knew it! It's better to be gunned down like a predator than slaughtered like sheep! Even naked people have teeth and nails if each victim of the holocaust had tried to take one German with them there would have been a good deal less of a holocaust. Or at least that's what I believe!

NO ONE HAS TO ACCEPT VICTIMIZATION.

Now that was a really violent paragraph to be written by someone who deeply hates violence! I wrote it because I felt it! But I wish I didn't! But I love human dignity too! There's no dignity in being a victim. There's even less dignity in being a victimizer! I suppose I also can say that, in the abstract, I truly love the human race too. The scenario of the holocaust makes my skin crawl ...it makes my blood boil it makes me angry ... it makes me weep people are better than that! They have to be better than that! If they aren't why bother with them?

Each and every single human being, individually and personally, is in and of themselves the single most important element in the production of our "more perfect society", we must, each of us neither victim nor victimizer be!

Because, truly, in the long run if it isn't all of us or at worst, the better part of us who are really fully committed to this process then there will be no "more perfect society" in that case, based on current conditions there won't be any society or any body!

If you have been a victim, or even if you are presently a victim, it doesn't help the problem one iota if you, in turn, victimize others! As a victim, you should really know better! Victims should know the cost of victimization better than anyone else!

It is a matter of shock and horror to me that in the United States there is a small percentage of Black-Americans who, rightly bitter at their status a victims, wrongly turn around and viciously victimize not White society, of whom they are the victims, but their own people as well as other minorities, their hapless, helpless, fellow victims.

I am equally horrified that the Israelis, victims or descendants of victims of the worst persecution in human history, could so callously turn about and victimize the Palestinians whom they wrongly cast from their homes!

There are many things I do understand, but I don't understand how any person who has experienced victimization can subject anyone else to the same experience. It's one of those things that makes me wonder if I'm right about people's essential goodness. Of course, most people don't victimize others but I have to ask would they if they could?

I don't know. I'll probably never know. But I think that what I'll do is act as though my original opinion of essential human goodness were the correct choice! I do think it is!

There's a really appropriate cliché, but like all such, it's perfectly apt: "If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem".

Tell me that's not entirely true!

SETI hasn't contacted anyone or anything, anyone or anything hasn't contacted us! While it may be entirely logical to assume that there is a very strong probability that in a universe as enormous as the one we're in, there's got to be some other physical life-forms, it's still only a hypothetical assumption.

As of now, all we know is: here we all are and there's only us! Us humans, and the other things that share this world with us, we have each other, but that's all we have! If we don't take care of ourselves there's nothing at all out there which is going to take care of us!

Those elemental intelligences which I talk about, those energy beings, those independent intelligent force-fields, both those on the virtual reality levels, and those on the levels of intrinsic realities; they will not, and they can not, and, in fact, they should not “take care of us”!

There is not now, nor has there ever been, any “Deus ex machina” to save us ... never was, never will be! We must “take care” of ourselves while non-physical intelligence learns, or gains experience, from our activities!

If you want to live in a world in which you can be secure, comfortable, and happy it's entirely up to you to make it that way!

It's time to grow up folks!

Now I don't think that everyone has to love and accept everyone and everything else. That's both impossible and irrational given the complexity of life itself, and the complexity of the human personality.

Each person does have to respect everyone else though. Not for their position or status, or because of anything they've done or may do; I don't mean that kind of “respect”. That is “earned respect”. I mean intrinsic respect!

I mean that each of us must accept the right of each of us to expect respect both of, and for, their humanness, their individuality, their feelings, their needs, and most important of all: their right to be!

In order to be able to respect others though, one must first respect themselves! In order to be able to accept others, one must first accept one's self! In order to like others, one must first learn to like one's self! It's truly horrifying how very many people are disadvantaged in their relationship with the world by the terrible fact that they are able neither to accept themselves, nor respect themselves, nor, and this is worst of all, like themselves!

The greatest portion, by far, of these self-esteem problems can be laid directly at the door of our ridiculous religions who all inculcate a personal paradigm that nothing human can match and remain sane!

If you don't have a productive relationship with your self, how can you have a productive relationship with anything else?

There's a secret to having good relationships. It is just as valid applied to yourself as it is applied to others. Never expect from either yourself or others, more than you or they have to give!

I know that I personally don't “like”, and/or accept, everyone and everything, nor can I rationally expect everyone and everything to like and accept me. Though it would be nice. But hate?

Hate and envy and fear are truly synonyms. People hate what they envy! People hate what they fear, and fear what they hate!

Over the course of my life thus far, I have yet to meet someone (myself included) who didn't have at least some kind of bias, at least some kind of prejudice, some or another hatred, or irrational dislike, of some or another “otherness”, some or another fear of something they didn't relate to. And I've met some truly remarkable and wonderful people!

Who or what is it that you fear/hate? ...

The Past? Jews? People of African ancestry? People of Northern European Ancestry? Dead White Guys? Homosexuals? Arabs? Koreans? Roman Catholics? Shiites or any Iranian? Protestants? Asians? Caucasians? Reptiles? Sharks? Horses? Tomorrow?

WHY? WHY? WHY? WHY? WHY?

Why do we do this to ourselves?

You know that it is my belief that most of us are intrinsically decent, caring people. Why do we act as if that wasn't true?

Could I be wrong? Could people really be as awful as our religions portray them? I know it's possible for me to be wrong. I am frequently very wrong indeed, and it seems to me that I am most wrong when it comes to misjudging people favorably, but I hope I'm not altogether "out in left field" on this one!

"Intrinsically decent caring folk" ought to be very uncomfortable with themselves when they find themselves indulging in irrational prejudices. Most especially so when they find that mindless indulgence in unthinking bias is always leading them toward actions they know full well aren't the way people should act toward one another!

They are uncomfortable! They are embarrassed! But, and I think it's totally crazy because they are so very uncomfortable and embarrassed they resent the very people against whom they are prejudiced for causing them to behave in a fashion they know is not desirable!

Come on folks it's really time to grow up!

This is a really great planet; it would be so easy to really enjoy our lives here; it would be so easy to make this a really happy place humanity can make it to be anything they want. I don't think people like being miserable and unhappy.

Having biases, prejudices, and hatreds, makes the person who has them, miserable and unhappy. Are there that many masochists?

One of the things that makes this world such a great place is that it's so very interesting. Why is it interesting? Because of its absolutely incredible diversity, that's why! If everyone looked, acted, thought, and felt the same do you have any idea how boring it would be?

If every place looked like Camden, New Jersey would you like it here? If every place looked like Paris, or New York, or Rio de Janeiro, or Beijing, or Moscow, or The Vale of Kashmir for that matter, it would be just as dull as if it looked like Camden, New Jersey! Sameness is stultifying!

I really don't think I need to go into the messy details of all this, we all know how badly various groups are treated. Think about it, think about the various objects of hatred in this world ... Are you one of them? If not, would you like to be one of them? The terrible thing is, you probably are. I can't think of a person on this planet who for some reason or another, doesn't "push somebody's button"! Think about it!

Think about it; is there someone out there who hates you like poison just because of something you can't possibly help being?

It's a scary feeling isn't it? Think about it is there someone out there you hate because they're something they can't possibly help being? It's a scary feeling isn't it?

TIME TO GROW UP FOLKS!

I'm not suggesting you "love" everyone; I don't either! I don't even have the gall to say I "like" everyone! I sure as hell don't! You and I both have run into lots of people we just can't stand! I am saying that you really don't have any reason to "hate" anyone! And as to envy, envy is completely infantile!

Remember how I talked about "fear" earlier on? Well, all of the things I'm talking about now are the result of fears. Not all of these fears are identifiable. Not all of these fears are either quantifiable or qualifiable.

Most people won't admit to most of them. But basically fear is humanity's worst enemy. It's a totally irrational and childish thing. It's really time to stop being afraid of one another. It's a completely childish thing, and as I keep saying it's really time to grow up!

We have to tear up the old social contract and draw up a new one. One which will be based only on amity, and consideration, good will, and compassion, and most of all on a complete willingness to be open to, and accepting of, other peoples differences!

I don't think I need to inflict a really long lecture upon you as to the improprieties of bias. I am not going to deliver myself of a long diatribe on the way the U.S.A. treats it's various racial minorities and under-classes. Or the way Israel treats its Palestinians. Or the way South Africa treated its Kaffirs when the Boers ruled. Or the way the Iraqis and Turks treat the Kurds. Or the way the Australians treat the Abos. Or the way the French treat their "Pied Noires" (Algerians). Or the way the Japanese treat Koreans or Etas. Or the way "Great Russians" treat Uzbeks or Ukrainians. Or the history of Scandinavian treatment of the Lapps. Or the way the Thais and Vietnamese treat the mixed blood children of American Soldiers. Or the way the Catholics and Protestants treat each other in Northern Ireland. Or the way the Chinese treat the Hakkas and the Tibetans. Or the way Iranians treat anyone who isn't a Shiite or who recognizes that they live in the 20th Century! Or the way almost everyone treats their homosexuals! Etc., etc., etc., etc., it's quite planet-wide, it's all ugly, it's all unnecessary, and we all know it!

There is not one nation or society on this planet with any right at all to "point fingers" or "cast the first stone"! Because there is not one nation or society on this planet who can claim innocence!

If the anthropologists and paleontologists are right, all of us are descended from a couple of Ramepithicus Erectus wandering the plains of ancient Africa. What price prejudice then folks?

If the anthropologists and paleontologists are right ... we are simply affinity groups!

There's only one race the Human Race everything else is simply affinity and climate!

But over a million years or so, natural selection of certain survival traits takes place and that can make for surface differences that seem important.

THEY ARE NOT IMPORTANT!

We make them important because they make us feel important!

I really think we're better than that! I really think we can do better than that! I know we'd better do better than that!

It's really time to grow up folks!

Here we all are, so?

Here we all are at the beginning of this little whatever you call it; I used that phrase as “home base”; it was the foundation I used in dealing with cosmic existentialities; it was the only thing we all really were absolutely sure of to anchor us in dealing with things that we were only trying to understand. I think it helped. But now?

Well folks, here we all are! A whole pack of us on a little ellipsoid made of earth, air, water, and various forms of energy, crawling around on that little ball, while it circles a middle sized star, out at the thin end of one of the arms of a spiral nebula of stars, that is only one among myriads such, in a universe whose size is so vast even Quantum theorists can't relate to it personally.

Here we all are and here we all stay unless SETI comes up with some spectacular results or ETI comes to us, there's only us!

I think that we're not alone in the universe as physical beings, but I can't prove it. If it turns out we're alone, and I really don't expect to stay physical long enough to see acceptable proof that we are. I'll be very surprised!

If there isn't anyone else “out there” there probably isn't any place “out there” for us either. But right now, today, all we know is here we all are!

In that case, the provision of a “more perfect society” isn't simply an intellectual exercise. We really need a more favorable social contract.

PART 31: A NEW SOCIAL CONTRACT

The primary function of our present social contract is to protect us from one another. It's been necessary that it do so ever since the Social Contract came into being.

But, in a truly "more perfect society" should we really require "protection from one another"?

I don't really think we should.

It's the 21st century, or nearly so, at this point in time, there's very little we need "protection" from! Especially physical protection!

Priorities! Priorities! Priorities!

Aside from the basic existential discussion which started this thing I've discussed various aspects of our society which I felt would need changing as a result of this new paradigm it was a fairly general discussion about fears, and death, and religion, and laws, and government, and economies, and sex ... and biases because I really didn't want to get all encapsulated in details.

I still don't, but now I want to talk about priorities.

If any of this is going to "work", if we are going to develop a "more perfect society", if we're going to "re-write" our social contract, we're finally going to have to bring ourselves to admit that on this planet there is one race, the Human Race, and within the context of it's marvelous diversity, there is only one society on this planet.

Let's assume that, as a race, we come to our senses and find another method than money to support our society.

Money based upon tangible assets isn't the only thing that's finite on this planet. "Man-hours", energy, and resources are themselves very finite things. We must conserve those things too in establishing our priorities!

There are things we need and things we most clearly do not need! There are things which we require and things which we merely want! There are things which it might be nice to have and there are things without which we cannot do!

We and our resources are quite finite. Humanity too is a relatively "endangered species"! It is humanity, and humanity alone, which is responsible for both it's own survival, and for the survival of all living things that share this planet with us!

Humanity really needs to prioritize it's use of the resources available to it!

This prioritization of goals and resource management is something which has to be accomplished while the parameters for the "more perfect society" are being established.

I'd like to start off by saying that as far as I'm concerned, there's one thing we can very easily save our resources on. To me, at least, there is absolutely no room in a "more perfect society" for armies, navies, air forces, marines, defense departments, national security agencies, military intelligence (is that as much of an oxymoron as I think it is?), counter-intelligence, etc., etc., etc., these things are totally wasteful of our inheritance, and more than any other thing, they are themselves intrinsically immensely threatening to our very survival, both as a society and as a species.

I'm not saying we need less of these things; I'm saying we don't need these things at all! Mind you though, I am saying that: "We don't need these things" in a more perfect society. I am not saying we do not, unfortunately, need them right now. The occurrences in the former Yugoslavia over the last few years show that sadly we do.

But, in that "More Perfect Society" we wish to attain, we will not need to waste our resources in any way manufacturing the means of destruction. We need to stop manufacturing weapons of any kind! Hunting is only marginally acceptable human behavior in those very rare cases when it is for subsistence! In the case of so-called "subsistence hunting", those very few individuals whose life-styles truly require this, those who must, literally, hunt to live; really don't need anything more technical than a bow and arrows after all subsistence hunters did perfectly well with the bow and arrow for more years than are easily counted more technical than that and "subsistence hunting" probably is more of a ritual than a necessity!

Killing for subsistence, for food, is one thing it seems to be how nature works it's certainly optional for humans. But KILLING ANY LIVING THING IS NOT, AND MUST NOT, BE A "SPORT"!

How many living creatures must end up on the "endangered species list" for the amusement of cretins for whom their guns are penis reinforcement? A more perfect society will never be developed by ferocious brutes who think killing any living thing is "fun"! A more perfect society is no context for dealers in death!

Death is inevitable for all living things it cannot be staved off by killing things!

The human race really is far beyond that barbaric stage in its evolutionary development. If it isn't, it needs to get that way! FAST!

Our goal in establishing a "more perfect society" on this planet is to make people happier, more secure, more comfortable our primary purpose is the removal of threat from society.

I'm not terribly sympathetic with people for whom the means for threatening others are a need. I'm not in any way sympathetic with those who are made happier, more secure, or more comfortable by killing animals or having a house full of weapons.

There are many people who claim that the possession of weapons is the "last line of defense against tyranny". But that claim is puerile and inane. Given the technological state of weaponry today, and given that Governments possess all the truly deadly weaponry and an immense balance of the power conferred by professional militaries, the individual with his so very limited arsenal has no chance at all. The "Minute Man" or citizen's militia may have been a valid concept in 1776 but "then days is gone forever"! As George Washington would probably gladly attest, the "Militia" concept was not at all efficient compared with professional military.

Weapons, of any kind and type are harmful! To say that weapons in and of themselves, are harmless, is a lie! Weapons are not, and never were, designed for defense! To say they are is a lie! There is absolutely no such thing as a "defensive weapon"; a shield is defensive, a sword has only one purpose kill or be killed!

The Sword is humanity's archetypal weapon! Our society has moved beyond swords to ever more efficient killing tools. Now we need to turn our minds away from ferocity and towards amity!

Considering the real state of the world today, with one super-power already collapsed and the other collapsing, what real purpose do armies and “defense forces” serve? In most of our world, especially Central and South America, Africa, and Asia their only purpose is rape, murder, and the oppression of the masses. In those areas where rape, murder, and oppression are not the purpose of the military due to more stringent civilian control, they are nonetheless of no purpose but the meaningless waste of resources that could be far better utilized elsewhere. How, in all conscience can a government justify the spending of four billion dollars apiece for unneeded and unwanted submarines and fifty three million dollars apiece for unneeded bombers when there are people in that country going to bed hungry, people unable to afford medical care, and people dying like flies from various epidemics?

For me, THE TOTAL DISARMAMENT OF HUMANITY is a very important concept.

For humanity, I think, it’s going to be the “litmus test” of their desire for change! If they cannot grow beyond this, how can they do more difficult things? If humanity cannot rid itself of something which it clearly knows threatens its survival as a species, how can it move on and improve life in areas that are perhaps more ambivalent?

Let’s talk about the survival of life on this planet.

PART 32: PLANETARY ENVIRONMENT

When I get a puppy the very first thing I do is house-break him or her. The human race needs house training!

The resources which this planet contains and produces are distinctly finite. The ability of the planet to heal itself from traumas like Chernobyl are finite indeed.

We humans really have to live on this planet whether we like it or not, there's no place else for us to go; our planet is not simply our environment, it's not simply "someplace that we live", it's the womb that bore us, it can and should sustain us and all other living things.

But there are limits, there are clearly limits!

Building a "more perfect society" is kind of like building a "perfect house", if you build it, move into it, and burn it down around you; what in hell have you gained?

Our environment is the home for our hoped-for "perfect society". It is absolutely our responsibility to keep it healthy; if we do that, it will keep the race healthy too!

One priority we must recognize is our total responsibility for and to our environment. One priority we must establish is the goal of recognizing our proper niche in the ecology of that environment.

A society, no matter how near perfection it may come, has little or no future if the environment it must inhabit is entirely untenable. If we agree, and I hope we do, that the basic necessities of life, dignity, and some comfort, are an inherent human right; then as a race, we must husband our environment and our resources so that this goal is possible to attain.

The actual intricacies of the inter-relationships and balances which go into the ecological system which our environment represents are things we understand far too little. This really needs to be addressed.

Ecology and the care of the environment are almost entirely hard sciences. The human race is very good at hard science. Maybe too good. But in this case even too good will be barely sufficient.

We really need to know all the effects, those which are negative, those which are neutral, and those which are positive, which we, as a species, have on our environment, and upon the individual ecological systems that make up that over-all environment. We also need to know far more about the environment's effects on us!

As I understand the subject, the environment is composed of various ecological sub-systems which in turn contribute to the over-all environment. The balances between those sub-systems are sometimes very fragile indeed. In other cases they are quite sturdy. We need to really make a science out of our understanding of those balances. We need to really understand and know the place, the relationship, and the function of each of the ecological sub-systems within the whole. We need to ascertain, understand, and know our place, relationship, and function within the whole.

I think that as regards our environment, sometimes stopping what ever we are doing that we know is actually harmful and then "freezing in place" for a time while we really make serious efforts at gaining knowledge and understanding is a far safer policy than is "fixing what ain't broke" and perhaps in the process breaking something we can't fix!

Humans tend, sometimes, in fact, far too often, to act like overly enthusiastic puppies. Our environment is a compendium of terribly delicate balances; a house of cards, as it were, is a very good description what can an over-enthusiastic puppy do to a house of cards?

It might also be a good idea if we made very sure that in assuming guilt towards our environment, we don't usurp responsibilities which are not ours, that we do not take to ourselves credit or blame that we do not deserve, we are not the only actors on this stage and for some things and effects we may not be responsible.

That is why I make a strong point about the vital importance of stop first ... study second ... act third! I definitely do not mean, as our governments usually do "study" as a replacement for or postponement of action! I mean really serious study with a strong desire to learn from that study!

Of course there are things we already know about. Places in and on the chains of ecological systems which we already know, at least enough about to know that we have really contributed to a problem, the ozone layer and global warming, for instance. Some of "Global Warming" may indeed be cyclical and perfectly natural in nature, but some of it is not, that is the part we have to try to "fix".

There, in those clear and very present dangers, we must act at once but not over-react!

We've got to be absolutely certain that the antidote is not worse than the poison!

By the way I am not talking economic effects here. I am talking about dangers to living things not corporations! In dealing with our environment and the future of all living things within that environment costs, profits, and jobs too, are our least important consideration. This year's profits are hardly worth "next year's" extinction of life on earth!

The environment, I think, is one of those rare cases in which positive inaction is, or can very easily be, far better than directionless activity.

Why do I think that?

Well, I think that "in the beginning" there was not one item in the planetary inventory that did not occupy precisely the ecological niche which it was fitted to occupy. But we only rarely have any idea what that niche was.

We can assume, but not know, that there was some particular balance into which each and every "inventory item" fitted. We can assume but not know that the "fit" was meaningful. But how the "fit" was "meaningful" is something I don't think we'll ever really know.

Many of these "inventory items" no longer exist. What does this mean in regard to the balance of the environment?

As is true with so very many other things, I am not sure that the entire answer to that question is, or will be, ever knowable. I think that there's much about our environment, especially knowledge about how it was, that will be forever beyond our reach. I think we can make reasonable hypotheses. I think we can take educated guesses. I think we may make reasonable assumptions. But I don't believe that we can ever really know everything about the environment and the interlocking structure of ecological balances that make it up.

Once the great reptiles were de facto "Masters of the Planet" though as they were entirely lacking any form of technology, they obviously hadn't the power over their environment that humans do. They

became extinct long, long ago their ecological niche was emptied ... what effect did that have on the balance of nature?

We don't know!

Of course their departure may have given mammals a chance to develop into humans sounds reasonable but we don't really know that! Mammals may have gone ahead and developed anyway. In some other reality, that's exactly what may have happened.

If my cosmological/ontological model is at all valid, then something would have filled the ecological niche that humans do in our world something else would have provided the vehicle for the experience of sentience on the physical levels of the virtual realities which humans do. We'll never know, because here we all are!

There are many other "inventory parts" the cave bear, the giant sloth, the dire wolf, all of which departed the scene long before humans were sufficiently significant to make any effects on the environment.

There have of course, been many subsequent extinctions which could be traced to human hands but we still don't know what actual effect their loss had on the environment; we don't know what repercussion the reverberation from their loss will have on humanity.

I think this is an important thing to think about. I really believe that because it's main goal and purpose is the infinite extension of the conscious awareness of the unified field both as a whole, and in all of its constituent parts; everything that exists on the physical levels of the virtual realities evolves and changes as a vehicle for consciousness.

For that reason, it is my clear impression that perhaps certain vehicles "phase out" when their utility to abstract consciousness comes to an end. I think too, that, in time, Homo sapiens will also "phase out".

HOMO-SAPIENS IS ONLY A "STEPPING STONE" IN THE EVOLUTION OF CONSCIOUSNESS; IT IS HARDLY THE APEX OF THAT EVOLUTION.

At least I hope not!

What I'm trying to say here is that: in most cases, humanity will never really know when it is actually responsible for some extinction or only peripherally so or even not at all responsible.

There are, of course, times when there's absolutely no doubt. The passenger pigeon merely one among many. But we need to try to learn what it all means in terms of the future environment on this planet.

I think that the best thing we can all do is stop doing what ever we know is harmful; stop doing what ever we think is harmful; stop doing anything we may reasonably assume might be harmful; put an absolutely enormously intense effort into learning as much as we really can about the physical environment and as we learn new things on the basis of that learning make new decisions and alter old ones!

I am afraid that wild-eyed fanaticism will eventually do more harm than good by "fixing what ain't broke"! I don't trust those groups that some others have taken to calling Eco-fascists! I don't believe anyone who establishes a totally non-negotiable position on any subject, and who is willing to do harm to those who do not accept their position on that subject, is deserving of either my trust or any one else's either! I don't think so because the description I just gave is a good description of Lenin, and Hitler, and Torquemada!

I never trust people who are so extremely sure they are right, that they are willing to seriously harm, or even murder others in pursuit of their goals.

Sinking a steel bolt deep in a tree so that some hapless lumberman's power saw will tear itself, and him, to pieces is what I mean! The Germany that luxuriated in Hitler's racial myths is what I mean! The Roman Catholic Church is what I mean! The Islamic Jihad is what I mean!

No goal is worth attaining, if to attain it one must harm others, or ride rough shod over the rights and feelings of others. It doesn't matter what the cause is ...

EVEN SURVIVAL!

IF ONE HAS TO COMMIT MONSTROUS ACTS TO SURVIVE WHAT SURVIVES IS MONSTROUS AND ISN'T WORTH HAVING!

As you know, while I know that for humans to take less than wise actions based entirely upon emotional upheaval is a regular thing, and that it always was, always will be so; while I do it my self, I don't sympathize with it! Especially when I do it!

I know fear is childish, but nevertheless, all fanatics tend to scare me! It's a bias I'm sure. But like all people with biases, I think my bias is reasonable!

In any case, I don't think it's unreasonable to say that it's always desirable to know exactly what you're doing before you do anything!

I think that what we're trying to accomplish is to make the world a better, happier, freer place to live in. We're trying to create a "more perfect society".

You can't do that while riding rough-shod over others!

I really do think though, that as a part of rebuilding this society we live in we can and must make sure that the health of the environment, and every ecological component within it, should be one of our first concerns.

I think no make that I hope that I've already made clear what I deem our absolutely first and most important concern to be.

It is the absolutely total eradication of hate in all of its incarnations. The absolute eradication of aggression and physical conflict of all kinds, and at the same time, the eradication of the physical means for aggression and conflict arms and armaments!!

War and insurrection and riot are certainly not beneficial for our physical environment. If there were a "Mother Nature", she would despise wars, and those who cause them, more than any other thing!

Humanity must identify its proper niche in the natural scheme of things and assume that niche with modesty. We possess the ability to, if not utterly destroy, at least terribly damage, this planet and its environment. In a way, that capacity makes the human race its "masters", but it doesn't make us its owners, nor does it give us the right to assume mastery over anything but ourselves and our own natures.

I believe it was Voltaire who (In the context of "Candide" a satirical commentary on his contemporary society) said: "We must, all of us 'tend our gardens'."

What does that really mean to say?

If you do not tend a garden it dies, it goes all barren and dead; or else it reverts to chaos, a tangle of briars and weeds.

Well, the planet upon which we live, in a very important, and not entirely symbolic way, is “our garden”, although we neither planted, nor planned that garden in any way. If we do not tend that garden, it too, will either revert to chaos or go “all barren and dead”.

There are elements in the evolution and growth of that planet with which humans have absolutely no connection at all.

The universe itself, the galaxy, and the solar system, all effect our planet in ways which we are only just beginning to learn about.

We certainly don't completely understand the inter-locking mesh of forces which effect the planet. We have no effect at all on these things.

Humans cannot effect the development of the planet itself. The movement of the tectonic plates is the process of planetary evolution. The planet is not static, it is constantly changing its basic geological character. “Evolution” is exactly the right word for what is happening to the planet. It is constantly changing into something other than it was before.

Those changes are not immediately apparent to something as ephemeral as a physical being. Those changes certainly do concern us. Those changes surely effect us greatly. Earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, and climatic changes, surely effect the living things on the planet, but we cannot effect or alter those changes in any way.

What we can effect, what is, in truth, “our garden”, is the very thin “skin”, or Biosphere of that planet, its waters, and the slender film of atmosphere which surrounds it. The human race has burned, and torn, and scarred, the skin of the planet, fouled it's waters, and polluted the atmosphere.

While it would be somewhat difficult to completely physically destroy the planet itself, we can very easily destroy the envelope or biosphere, that keeps us alive. We can very easily render the planet uninhabitable to the kind of life form we represent. We are certainly in the process of so doing at this point in time!

I don't really think that is something we consciously want to do!

The human race, because of its tremendously advanced technology, has, both knowingly and unknowingly, wrecked havoc on the planet which is its only home. It is also the only home for all the many living things with whom we share it.

Because of their technology, the human race possesses the potential to destroy the planet as a habitat, for itself and for all other living things; for that reason the human race, as the technically oriented sentient species, is totally responsible for that habitat and for all the living things, themselves included, who live in~on it.

Responsible for a thing, does not mean Masters of it! Although the human race all too frequently tends to forget the responsibility it bears, and revel in the pseudo-glories of their mastery!

Secondly: In a very real way, the human race is its own “garden”.

Because of what they are, both physically and intellectually, the human race are the gardeners of the planetary environment. That environment is humanity's to preserve or to destroy.

The other living things, whether sentient or not, are not at all involved except as humanity's victims should we destroy the environment hospitable to living things!

The other sentient beings on this planet live here as we do but their path is different than ours; their path makes them intrinsic to their environment; they have no need of finding their ecological niche; they are integral to it; we are not, they do not, and can not, manipulate their physical environment. We can, and do!

And because we do, it is entirely incumbent upon us to find our proper ecological niche to come to a "modus vivendi" with the environment.

The environment, with the exceptions of various occurrences having to do with the planet itself, is never pro-active; the environment can only react to what humankind does, but that reaction can very easily wipe all life off the planet's surface. This is especially true if "the reaction" is that the environment self-destructs!

I don't mean to sound Malthusian but for such a small planet there's just too many of us.

It's not really that there's too many people, it's just that there's too little sensible planning to accommodate too many people; it's basically that there's no planning at all to accommodate the multitudes ... human expansion is all "helter-skelter", totally haphazard and because of that we harm the environment at the same time we make life totally unbearable for ever-increasing numbers of people.

According to the World Health Organization, which, as usual, is being extremely conservative about numbers, some 40 to 100 million people will eventually die from the AIDS epidemic.

But I think that we're going to be horrifically surprised! I am sure that there are cases presently incubating in Asia, South East Asia, India, the former Soviet Empire, central Europe, and South America that will push the figure ever closer to something far closer to a billion. And even that may be too conservative. It's not only the poor Africans who are going to be decimated!

That's not a good method of population control! While we very obviously do have to exert some kind of limits on the unchecked spread of population, it's far more important that we exert ourselves in regard to how that population spreads and where.

We certainly don't want or need too many more developments like Egypt, whose population approaches an untenable 100 million, or Mexico City type situations, where more than 30 million inhabitants have produced an environment inhospitable to human life, or that of New York City, or Los Angeles, or Calcutta, or London, or Tokyo. Too many people in one place drive each other crazy!

We need to weave people and their environment (and that environment clearly includes the need for vast wilderness areas, if for no other reason than so we can all breathe), into a tapestry that serves both. That's going to take both knowledge and incredible finesse. But ... we can't afford not to do it!

The environment is our garden and we we ourselves, are also our garden and it clearly is the same garden!

The results of tending or not tending this particular garden will be their own object lesson.

There is no one, there is no-thing, which either “rewards” or “punishes”. The effect of any action is its own “reward”. Both “rewards” and “punishments” are simply object lessons!

If our planet is “the garden” in which all living things grow and evolve, and it clearly is, then human society is “the garden” in which human beings grow and evolve.

Never think, for one moment, that human society is not an immensely important component in planetary ecology! It is! It is the only component that can destroy the rest! Only the planet itself has greater potential for destruction.

The nature of human society is perhaps more important to the environment in which we must live than any other factor!

Human society is only what humans make it, no more no less; in it they “grow and evolve”, emotionally, culturally, intellectually, and ethically.

Human society is presently an almost totally untended garden. It is full of briars and brambles and weeds. The Gardeners are fighting among themselves, robbing one another, and seeking only immediate profits. If that doesn't stop the garden will die.

Lastly: each and every living thing is its own “garden”. But in sentient things the responsibility is in direct proportion to the degree of awareness.

I keep talking about responsibilities. To whom or what are we responsible then? To ourselves and only to ourselves, that's who!

Each and every human being is the supreme and only judge of their own thoughts and actions! Each and every human being is the sole judge and jury of their actions while in life.

There is nothing at all extrinsic to ourselves which has any authority over us. If we have no authority over ourselves, if we have no inner discipline, then there is no authority or discipline, there is only chaos. We came out of chaos, but I do not think that the purpose for which we came out of chaos, is to remain permanently in that state!

If people are in a state of inner disharmony, if they are in a state of personal chaos, then their societies will mirror those personal conditions. A society is a gestalt composed of its individual inhabitants. How can its character be any different than theirs?

I talked earlier about the complexity of the human personality and the many very strong intrinsic and extrinsic pressures to which it is subjected in the course of its development.

But, it is still a fact that, each one of us is our very own “garden” for the reason that, despite everything else, we, each of us, as regards extrinsic pressures, are only what we allow ourselves to become, and therefore to be.

We are what we choose to make ourselves, within the parameters of our relatively unalterable intrinsic pressures, and what we permit the very malleable extrinsic pressures to make of us!

Nobody weeds and feeds our personal “garden” but us! That garden can be lush and full of beauty, it can be a chaos of weeds and brambles, or it can be dry and barren it's entirely up to the gardener!

If each and every human being weeds racism, sexism, and all other bias and hate out of themselves, then society, which is our communal “garden” will no longer have those problems.

Gardens don't, won't, and can't tend themselves!

Each and every human being has got to completely realize that, as far as their own personal garden is concerned there's no one else to tend it for them. This isn't a thing someone can be hired to do for someone else! ... Inaction equals neglect, it equals an abdication of responsibility.

As I constantly keep saying: stasis is disaster! When a thing stops growing it dies! When a thing stops changing ... it is already dead!

Each and every human being must work at tending their garden every moment of their existence. It's not an imposition. It's not, because each and every one of us is our own private garden tending that private garden is an act of enlightened self-interest.

If each and every single human being, weeds out of their own personal garden, all of those things which they themselves know, and feel, are detrimental to a "more perfect society", all of those things which are detrimental to societal harmony, all of those things which are detrimental to the human ecology, then society will be that much better off.

We must, each of us, look at our society. If we see something there we do not like, look for its roots in ourselves. Society is nothing we are not!

If each and every human being makes as sure as they can that they don't contribute to planetary pollution and environmental degradation in any way then society, which is just an organism composed of independent individuals will hardly be able to do, as a gestalt, what its individual members won't "do" as individuals.

If each and every human being makes his or her primary demands of themselves, if each and every human being has enough self-respect to be at least relatively sufficient unto themselves, then a social gestalt of such people will be a productive and positive place.

If each and every human being constantly remembers that there is so very much more we all have in common, that there's so very much more we share, that there's so very much more we have to unite us than there is to keep us separate, then all this bias and hatred will seem idiotic to all of us rather than just some of us!

If each and every human being constantly remembers that this little planet is all we've all got, that there's no where to go to escape from it, then care of the environment and of our own niche within it will not just seem important, but be important, to all of us and not just some of us!

Does it seem strange to you that I've sort of melded discussions of the environment with discussions of bias and prejudice? I don't think so though. Our industrial effluents pollute our physical environment. Bias and prejudice of any kind, are our emotional and physical effluents, and they hopelessly pollute what is actually our most important ecological niche. Our intellectual and emotional environment.

Our foolish religions describe masturbation as "self-pollution" which is one of religion's most egregious pieces of nonsense. But it sure would not be stretching credulity to define bias and prejudice and hatred as "self-pollution"!

If, as I believe to be true, we are essentially simply intelligent force-fields, then our minds are far more important to our basic reality than our bodies are. In that case then, our emotional and intellectual environments are not things which it is productive for us to ignore!

I started this “thing” with a strongly abstract discussion of the nature of reality, I then sort of “wandered” on into a pragmatic discussion of things necessary to consider in an effort to “create a more perfect society”, or the nature of our corporate condition, or, if you like, our social gestalt. I think I want to finish thus part of my effort with some thoughts for us all as to the Nature of the Human Condition.

PART 33: HUMAN CONDITION REVIEWED

What it is, intrinsically, we've already thought about, but there's some more to be said what we can make of it as a social milieu, is what I just finished addressing, though I have some more to say in that context too but, what the nature of the human condition may become in the future is what I want to consider now.

The unified field of energy IS science has made it absolutely certain that there's no question at all about that! "God" isn't!

Common sense makes it clear that there's no question at all about that! All Religions identify "God" as something extrinsic to the unified field of energy. There is nothing at all extrinsic to the unified field of energy!

We could assume that the unified field of energy is the only reality there is, and that it is therefore the only possible "absolute reality" and that therefore the "absolute reality" is something that, at least, very superficially corresponds to something that could be called "God", but we don't know enough about it to make such an assumption!

The unified field of energy, if my model of reality is correct, is also an unimaginably immense "center-of-consciousness and awareness". That's true, at least in my model. But, if that consciousness is growing, and evolving, and expanding, and I think it must be, then how could it be related to a concept that is of the nature that people consider "God"?

On this planet, however, the mass consciousnesses of all sentience which inhabits the planet, may very well be a thing, which in its potential for action, corresponds to something that could be described as a kind of "God"!

The Hindu or Brahminical religion, which claims to be the oldest religion on the planet, and in fact, may actually be so, for all that; probably due entirely to decadence, most of its practices are incredibly foolish; nevertheless, teaches and believes that every single thing that exists animate and inanimate alike is alive, is "spirit".

If "spirit" can be defined as conscious or aware energy; I can hardly argue with that premise. Every single thing that exists is composed of energy and only of energy, that has been clearly demonstrated. So neither the Brahmins nor I are entirely crazy!

I think that the proven fact that we living things are all simply energy fields, coupled with our very clear and very much inarguable experience that we are conscious beings, and that this coincidence of fact and experience, makes us nothing but intrinsically conscious energy fields; while it is hardly completely scientifically provable at this point, is nevertheless, a very reasonable hypothesis.

In fact, I feel relatively secure in assuming that the coincidence is so very strong that "hypothesis" is not a strong enough word. I think we may reasonably accept that the coincidence is so very strong that we may assume the connection to be axiomatic if not yet provable.

On that basis then, I want to build my discussion of the "Nature of the Human Condition".

Let's, as usual, begin with defining exactly what I'm going to be talking about when I use the expression "The Human Condition". It's one of those expressions that gets all too frequently used in any context the user chooses. How do I choose to use it?

To me, “The Human Condition” is at once the context of humanness, and the description of what it means to be human. Now it clearly has nothing at all to do with sentience alone, because there are many fully-sentient beings, and some far more than fully-sentient beings, which are not what we call human.

Are we wrong then in our definition of “Human”?

If it is sentience alone that confers humanness, then Homo-sapiens is merely one human among others. But if Homo-sapiens is the only “human” then there is more, or is it less, to being human than sentience. For sentience is a quality that is clearly shared by Homo-sapiens with other creatures.

Sentience, let me remind you, is that state in which a living-thing is aware, aware that it is aware, and most important of all, aware of being aware that it is aware. There’s another element to sentience and it’s a vital one. That element is that a fully sentient being is aware, fully aware, of its own impermanence. A sentient physical being knows that it is going to die, going to depart from its physical state.

A Homo-sapiens is a hairless, well, relatively hairless, technologically oriented, urbanized ape. “Human”, for all we know, may only be the equivalent of “us”. Non-humans therefore, would be “them”. Most primitive tribes called themselves something that signified that they are “special” and “set apart” from other living things.

Many Native-American tribes, and tribal groups elsewhere call themselves by words which signify “THE people”, “true people”, “true men”, etcetera. We have to accept the clear possibility that the word “Human” is much the same sort of exclusive and at the same time excluding noun.

For the purposes of this work, I’m going to use “The Human Condition” as a term which describes and defines what the paradigm is that human beings, “Homo-sapiens”, represent.

There are groups of people today who believe that “Human” or “True Human” is a word that implies more than just an intelligent monkey. They draw their inspiration from shamanic societies in which “true man” or “human” has another significance altogether. A significance that implies something more than simple sentience. It implies shamanic sentience.

“Shamanic sentience” is not, however, to be confused with what is called “enlightenment”.

As you know, because of what I call “Tripolarity”, and due to the fact that all humans are far more spirits than they are physical, I believe that human beings are all intrinsically at least latently or dormantly intuitive. The term “Shamanic sentience” is a specific definition and it simply a means to describe a level of highly advanced intuitiveness conjoined with a broad spectrum paranormal facility all heightened by the capacity to consciously communicate with non-physical sentiences.

The enlightened, however, are different. I think it true that the so-called “enlightened” while they look to be human, are nonetheless not Homo-sapiens. They may have been “Homo-sapiens” or human beings, but they are so no longer. They have transcended their tripolarity, and therefore they are “other-than-human”.

No one that I know of other than myself, seems to have come up with an acceptably unemotional name for them, so perhaps we could simply follow my lead and call them fully integrated personalities or “Meta-sapiens”.

If “Homo-sapiens” actually means “Homo” or “man” who is “wise”, which is the meaning of “sapiens”; then “Homo meta-sapiens” wants to say, as “meta” means “beyond”, a “man” who is “beyond ordinary wisdom”. That’s all! (In this context the “man” word is generic, not gender.)

I think we want to at least start with what makes it possible for people, for human beings, to aspire to form a “more perfect society”.

I want to talk about ordinary people and the state in which they exist which is “The Nature of the Human Condition”.

I am not really interested in “the enlightened” per se, as they are relatively irrelevant to “The Human Condition”, and so I’ve really said all, or most, of what I intend to say about them.

The only other thing I’ve got left to say about “The Enlightened” is that they are, or at least they try to be, helpful to humanity. As humanity kind of “limps along”, they give it a hand! Sometimes they kick it in the ass!

And that is all I will say on the subject. Too many others have said far too much, and it’s all bull-shit!

Let’s talk about people, ordinary people, the folks who just try to get through their lives from day-to-day without too much pain. The folks who try to support themselves and their families. The folks who try to support themselves, and couldn’t care less about their families or anyone else! The folks who try to do “what’s right”. The folks who don’t give a fuck “what’s right”! The folks who try to make life a little better for themselves. The folks who try to make life a little better for themselves, and have perhaps a little left over care for everyone else. The folks who make life better for themselves, or think they do, and don’t care who it hurts or exploits!

For all these people, life itself, is “The Human Condition”, and right now, in our contemporary society, that condition is a pretty sorry one! It looks to get worse! Maybe it will, maybe it won’t.

I think that it will, in fact, get “worse”. It has to “get worse” before it can get “better”. I don’t think people can get together and create a truly “more perfect society” until they absolutely HAVE TO!

One of the most representative truths about the Human Condition is that people will live on the slopes of a volcano and never even think about it until it erupts. Then they complain that it’s “unfair” while they flee!

What’s unfair with the volcano?

People on this planet have lived in a miasma of utterly mindless biases, hatreds, and antagonisms, since “the beginning”, but now, today, when those things are causing widespread pain and immense discomfort people are running around looking for some kind of scapegoat, somebody or something upon which they can palm off their responsibility.

Now, there’s an aspect of the human condition that’s absolutely ubiquitous! People, most of them anyway, are really allergic to taking responsibility for their own actions and/or inactions! I think you agree with me that it’s not one of the most admirable aspects of the human condition. But it’s sure common! It’s also the reason we have religions.

If there’s ever going to be a “more perfect society” on this planet people will certainly have to change that aspect of human character. Only truly responsible people can actually create a better social milieu and improve the human condition.

In fact, I think it's safe to say that none of the areas of improvement I've been talking about can be addressed without people first addressing the question of their own individuality.

Perfect trust (in one's self and in others), perfect freedom, and perfect responsibility for one's actions, all three depend on one another absolutely! Freedom, which is an absolute human need, is utterly dependent on responsibility. Responsibility cannot exist in the absence of trust.

People who are not fully-responsible human beings cannot create anything of importance or lasting value. "Creation is the name of the game"; see the problem?

The "human condition" is a sorry enough thing in our contemporary society. If we don't soon get our act together and create a more positive, productive, amicable society "The Human Condition" won't be just a "sorry one", it will be an utterly terrible condition indeed!

Or perhaps, not any kind of "condition" at all; perhaps not anything at all perhaps; nothing at all!

Spend two hours a day watching the news, read newspapers, and news magazines, and even though the information media are, for the most part, mindless, corrupt, and culpably incompetent, I think you'll soon develop the distinct feeling that it's pretty "terrible" right now!

What I'm wondering is how terrible it'll have to get before people finally get their act together and actually do something positively productive!

But obviously, there's a hell of a lot more to the "Nature of the Human Condition" than that. If what I've been saying about tripolarity is at all valid, there surely is!

Remember, "The Human Condition" is a thing which pertains only to the physical levels of the realities. In my tri-polar model it is the least real, the least valid, of all three conditions of consciousness.

The reality of the "Human Condition" is almost totally dependent on the attitude of individual human beings toward themselves and toward their perception of their state-of-being. It also depends on the over-all attitude of the great mass of human beings who are the inhabitants of this planet. In reality, "The Human Condition" is, no matter what else it may be, primarily what people perceive it to be! As I said before, in human beings, it is always true that: the perception of reality is far more important than is reality itself!

PART 34: ARE HUMANS “PERFECTIBLE”?

If a planetary society, which is what we are in spite of ourselves, is to be more perfect, people have to be more nearly “perfect”. It is easy to “create a more perfect society” if the people doing the creating are perfect or nearly so.

It is very easy for really imperfect people to imagine for themselves a “more perfect society”, it happens all the time. Our contemporary societies are a perfect example of this trend at work. Societies, unfortunately, tend to be the exact image of the people within them. Imperfect people create societies which are in their own image. If they want the one to change they must change the other.

But how perfectible are people?

What do we mean when we say perfectible? It clearly does not mean that when people are “perfected”, we will no longer require toilets!

What do we mean to say or imply when we say that a “more perfect society” can only be brought about by “more nearly perfect people”?

What’s a “perfect person”? Was there ever a “perfect person”? Can the human race itself become “more nearly perfect”?

We don’t know; do we now?

How do we find out?

For thousands of years the human race has befuddled itself with an entirely insane and irrational notion of what it was that would constitute a “perfected person”! Most of it being based on the nutty idea that:

1. They would “shoot lightning out their ass”! And ...
2. Their shit wouldn’t stink or better yet, they wouldn’t eliminate at all! And ...
- 3 They would possess no genitals at all, and not miss them! and last, and by far the worst of all ...
4. They would possess absolutely no truly human feelings or emotions whatsoever, except some kind of nebulous, saccharine, totally undefined, “love” (no sexual overtones on the “love” part).

Oh yes, I forgot, there’s another:

- 5: When dead they wouldn’t rot or stink!

Based upon that blathering stupidity, there’s never been anyone on the planet who came any where near “perfection”, never has, never will!

What the human race has always meant by “perfect” is someone who wasn’t human at all!

Because “human being” has always meant “imperfect”!

In that sense it always has and probably always will!

As far as I’m concerned however, a far better idea of what really constitutes a “more perfect person”, or rather an intellectually and emotionally and socially fully developed person, would be someone: Who both clearly recognizes and accepts their own relative lack of limitations at the same time as they recognize, accept, and respect the limitations of others; someone who both clearly recognizes and accepts the nature of their own condition of “Humanity” while at the same time, they recognize, fully

accept, and totally respect the humanity of all other people someone who tries very hard to be as much as they can be at all times and who is aware that other, but less fully developed people are probably doing, or at least, trying diligently to do, the same thing, i.e. “be as much as they can possibly be,” someone who is fully aware that they, themselves, despite their so-called “accomplishment”, are frequently mistaken, frequently dead wrong, frequently totally stupid and someone who gladly grants to others the right to be mistaken, wrong, and stupid, also!

“Misery” should love company!

If there’s any one topic about which I’m going to make a pest of myself is this: The Human Race has done itself far more harm, and built most of its barriers to personal and social improvement by the simple process of creating vast quantities of false expectations for itself creating absolutely unreasonable expectations for itself creating utterly irrational and baseless expectations for itself than it has through any other single action or combination of actions!

Look at our contemporary societies and ask yourself what’s at the root of all the many things that are so terribly wrong with them.

What do you find?

Well, I find that almost all of the problems faced by human beings today are the result of human beings, both as individuals and as groups of individuals, having false expectations, having unreasonable expectations, irrational expectations of themselves, and of everyone and every thing around them!

Humanity will never create a “more perfect society” if it makes unreasonable demands on that society and upon itself.

“Unreasonable demands” are the only possible result of unreasonable expectations!

Our contemporary society, as all of its forerunners also were, is composed of human beings who are relatively insensibly terminally imperfect perfectionists human beings who are seeking a condition whose parameters are both completely unreasonable and almost entirely unknown human beings who are trying futilely to conform to an utterly irrational paradigm.

Why do we do this to ourselves? Is the whole race masochistic?

How do we answer those questions? Well, here is an instance where we can see the undoubted utility of the kind of educational process I described earlier.

When you have a person who has self-respect, who has not been intimidated out of being a strong individualist, who has not been bullied into conformity, a person who does not confuse eccentricity with individuality, a person who does not confuse group-specific conformity with individualism, who has not been force-fed pre-fabricated opinions and attitudes and who looks with clear eyes, at our basic data-base ... the records which humanity has accumulated in the last 50,000 years ... to that person, the answer to those two questions stands out like the proverbial “sore thumb” ...

Looked at in light of humanity’s “track record”, “masochistic” is hardly the right word for it.

If one judges the human race by its past actions the only word that describes those actions is “blindly self-destructive”.

But you know that!

“When you have a person who has self-respect, who has not been intimidated out of being a strong individualist, who has not been bullied into conformity, a person who does not confuse eccentricity with individuality, a person who does not confuse group-specific conformity with individualism, who has not been force-fed pre-fabricated opinions and attitudes and who looks with clear eyes, at our basic data-base ... the records which humanity has accumulated in the last 50,000 years” ... that’s a good description of a good beginning, not a “perfect person”, but one hell of a lot more positive person!

See, it’s not all that difficult! That’s why I made such a fuss about the need for very much improved educational system, and very much improved informational channels it really gives us “a leg up” on getting to the kind of person required to produce a “more perfect society”.

Let’s face it one of society’s most insanely unreasonable expectations has always been the definition of what constitutes a “more perfect person”. To form a “more perfect society”, we really cannot and must not get all caught up in the old paradigms.

Even if they did exist, and they don’t, never have, never will, we really don’t need folks who can “shoot lightning out of their ass”! What would we do with them? Start fires?

The only possible benefit to “walking on water” is saving ferry fare and bridge tolls! And then, as the Buddhist fable points out, is the immense effort involved in learning to levitate commensurate in any way with the amount saved in ferry and bridge tolls? Couldn’t one have used the time more beneficially? I understand that there is, in fact, something whose “shit doesn’t stink”, that “something” is infant animals in the wild; their “shit doesn’t stink” so that predators can’t find them and eat them, so they don’t become something else’s shit! What could we possibly gain from people who “love everything” while they love nothing!

Come on folks that’s all “fairy tale stuff”; it’s time to grow up!

You take that well educated, well informed person I’ve described twice in a row now, and add to their specifications; that it be someone who is free of all the old antagonisms and biases (or trying to become so); that it be someone who is willing to be open to new ideas and new experiences; that it be someone who is interested in all things; that it be someone who is excited and wonder-filled by all the many marvelous things which surround them; that it be someone who is at least as full of everything else as they are of themselves; that it be someone who is at least as full of everyone else as they are of themselves (Hey! Isn’t that the true meaning of compassion?)

If we met those specifications even partially, we’d be well on our way toward a “more perfect society” filled with “better” people.

I think it’s completely clear that if everyone at least attempted to meet those specifications, “The Human Condition” would be one hell of a lot better than it is now!

I think though, that what I’ve just described are people who are “more accomplished” than most other people, and perhaps even “nicer” than many other people, but that doesn’t really fill the requirement for “more perfect” people even if it is a very good start!

As I said earlier, 21st century Homo-sapiens do not represent the apex of human evolution.

I think it is pretty obvious that I feel pretty strongly that human evolution is not a myth. But I also think I need to talk a little more about what I really think about the subject.

PART 35: HUMAN EVOLUTION

There's a lot of stuff that we really know about evolution in some pretty rarefied areas. We know quite a bit about cosmic evolution in regard to big-bangs, and red-shifts, and the formation of nebulae, galaxies, and planets.

We know quite a bit about "how things are built". We know quite a bit about energy, and particle physics, and about gravity, and about Gravitons. We know that the unified energy field evolved from a chaotic mass of seething undifferentiated energy.

We know that all living things evolved from monocellular life-forms in the sea. We think that all mammals evolved from some furry little thing. See, there's a lot of stuff we know about evolution.

Evolution is not a theory. It hasn't been a theory for a really long time now. Evolution is clearly not a tentative hypothesis!

O.K.

Human beings have evolved from a thing like a paramecium or an amoeba. It's not theoretical it's fact! Ramepithicus Erectus was far closer to the original ape/monkey than you are, isn't that obvious?

Well folks, what evidence is there that the process halted when the first human being first picked his nose!

The "name of the game" is the evolution of consciousness! It is absolutely clear that humanity is only a step in that process, just one step! It's pretty clear there's a long way to go yet! Think about it really think about it!

If human evolution is at its apex, if human evolution has gone "about as far as it can go" then as the evolution of consciousness obviously isn't complete ... if human evolution were in fact to be complete ... then humanity has gone as far as it is going to go and therefore it will have to be replaced with some other sentient entity which serves the evolution of consciousness better.

Look around if the word evolution also means or at least implies a process of "continual improvement" and it clearly does; if evolution means continual "up-grading" of various species and it very clearly does, do you think humanity has been upgraded as far as it can be?

Do you really think that human consciousness, human awareness, human intelligence, humanity's potential creativity, has gone as far as it can go? I don't!

Humanity and the cosmos are evolving together as a context of consciousness. Maybe it'll be accomplished when every living thing is the consciousness-equivalent of what our religions expect of a universal god-head, but I really doubt it! It's a process I don't think has any parameters, it just is, and it will continue to be.

I think I'd like to end this "thing" by sharing with you my ideas about the future evolutionary development of the human race.

The first thing I'd like to share is this: I believe that the human race must very soon establish a "more perfect society" as a context for its future evolution.

If it doesn't, it may not get the opportunity to evolve further!

The human race doesn't have to wait until it is perfect to begin that effort. It had best not wait, for if it prevaricates too long, it'll never happen.

For the human race to be enabled and empowered to make the important changes in its basic nature which are clearly required for further advancement, a much more peaceful and stress-less environment needs to be provided.

I'll go out on a limb and say that I think that the human race has probably done all the physical evolving its probably going to do, at least as it involves its shape and form. Humanity would only develop wings or gills as a survival factor, and most of the negative things that could happen to humanity wouldn't give them the time for natural selection to save their collective ass.

I really think that humankind has reached a very important dividing line in their evolution, a point, after which, physical evolution will not be nearly as important a factor for change as emotional/intellectual evolution.

Obviously, humans have been evolving on all three lines of development ever since those old Ramepithicus Erectus or their successors crossed the line between pure animal and animal-man. But when these "dividing lines" in development are reached there is a qualitative change in the nature of what's developing.

We have, I think, developed our "monkey minds" until we have become a race of supermonkeys. Extraordinary "takers-apart" of clocks and quarks.

We have been concentrating on "How things work" and finding out "What" things were it produced a Moon-walk, it produced Space-ships, it produced Albert Einstein, it produced Stephen Hawking. But along with the "How" and "What" minds, it also produced true "creator minds" such as Rembrandt van Rijn, and Michelangelo, and Beethoven, and Chopin, and Richard Strauss, and Brendan Behan, and Edgar Allen Poe, and, and, and, Not Bad!

Humans haven't been so great at dealing with vast abstractions. In the past humans were always perfectly willing to figure out "how things work" on their own.

It was the more abstract question of "why things are the way they are", and the existential questions about the intrinsic nature of all things, that they seemed to fear to assay alone there they wanted to defer to authority even if they had to invent the authority to do so.

There wasn't a "God", so it was necessary to invent one!

Humans aren't lacking anything, except perhaps a sense of priorities, a sense of their responsibilities toward others, and a sense of what's really important. It's just that, as well as we've done, we can do better! As good as we've become, we can be much more!

That's why a "more perfect society" is so important; emotional and intellectual evolution requires tranquility to develop in the directions which I think are both likely and possible.

That "qualitative change" I mentioned; well, what I think is happening is that humanity has come a good long way in developing itself intellectually and emotionally from the days of Ramepithicus, a long way indeed. But, I think, we've got a really long way to go yet.

Humanity has developed almost incredible levels of control over their physical needs and wants. Humanity has gained immense control over their physical circumstances, but not over their physical

environment. Humanity has gained an awesome capacity to deal with, and create things with which to make their lives easier. Homo-sapiens has proven their sapience by taking hard science to really startling heights.

Individual humans have carried art, and music, and architecture, and sculpture, and poetry, and literature, and the dance well into the realm of transcendence. But the arts have always been the province of individuals, extreme individuals, the hard sciences and technology haven't.

But you'll notice that, with certain rare exceptions in the world of art, almost everything is physically oriented. It has been the utilization and beautification of things at which mankind has excelled until now.

Now, I think, while maintaining all that we've already earned with such prodigious effort, the time has come for humanity to move away from "things". There's nothing intrinsically wrong with "things" per se; what's wrong, or at least mistaken, is the concentration on, the production of, and acquisition of, "things" to the exclusion of more urgent matters.

Remember ... "you can't take it with you", and in light of the reality-model I've developed, that's exactly true if for you "things" is all there is, then truly eventually there is nothing!

It is truly a tremendous mistake for anyone to become totally "one-pointed" in any direction or any fashion it makes one unbalanced; and unless I am totally mistaken "Balance" is one of the most important qualities a person can have. There's infinitely too much wonder in the world to focus on any one thing to the exclusion of all else.

You might think about this: There's so very much that people think they know that, in fact, just isn't so! As I've said often before, people have so many illusions, so many false expectations. The fact is that people tend to get "one pointed" about the more egregious illusions. That's why there are so many religious fanatics! Where does that lead them? Precisely no where!

First, I think, people really have to learn to accept and to appreciate where they are now. People really have to perceive the reality of their present situation. People have been evolving both as individuals, and as a society, for a very long time. People really need to be aware of the many different things that have developed over that long period of time, and to adjudicate between the positive, the negative, and the many, many things which are both-at-once!

I will never be convinced that the great majority of the human race is all that awful; I'll accept "stupid", oh yes, probably very stupid indeed and certainly ignorant, oh, very ignorant indeed but NOT "bad"!

I think that there are more crazy people who do bad things than there are really bad people who do bad things. More by far! The "crazy" people are not responsible for their acts.

Sometimes society is responsible for making people "crazy", but sometimes people are "crazy" simply because they are in fact, "crazy"! It's nobody's fault.

As far as the truly "bad" are concerned, I think each one of them is totally unique and probably very rare indeed. I really think that most of the people we perceive as truly "bad" are really only "crazy". Being a sociopath is a "craziness"!

In any case the “truly bad” are so completely unique and rare that except in cases where they become demagogues and tyrants (Hitler and Stalin), they don’t really effect society over-all. I certainly don’t believe they can effect, even peripherally, the development of a “more perfect society”.

If most “bad people” are actually only sociopaths, then our “developing more perfect society” will sure have an effect on them! It’s clearly society that causes sociopaths!

But, I was talking about “dividing lines” ... well what I really think is going to happen is that the human race, not as a whole clearly, never as a whole, but a goodly majority of it is going to slowly develop a new orientation, one that is quantitatively different than their present one.

That “new orientation” will be one which is very much more directed at “feelings/emotions”, and toward relatively abstract “thinking”, rather than at “Finding-out” and “doing”, which was the orientation of the past.

It will also be much more intellectual in its over-all tone.

I think that the key note of this new development is that humanity will seriously begin asking “why?” ... and also “what is it for?” while they continue to ask “how?”

But I think there’s more than that.

I am coming to believe that what’s got to happen and what I am sure will happen both before and as part of ... the development of a “more perfect society” is that there’s going to be a totally new relationship developing between human beings and their environment, between human beings and other sentient things, between human beings and all things between human beings and the intrinsic reality!

I hope I’m not wrong about this because if I am we’re all in very deep trouble!

There’s too much evidence that I am right though, and so I feel justified in my optimism.

I think that humanity is going to develop a different, and higher, relationship with “everything”, with the entire context in which they exist. This “new relationship” will be very loosely based upon the kind of intimate/holistic relationship our most remote ancestors had with the environment to which they were so intrinsic. The primary difference is that modern humanity has become almost entirely extrinsic to its natural environment and so a new form of relationship with the same positive results will need to be developed. The secondary difference is that the society of humankind won’t be barbaric. It won’t be savage. It would be nice to say that it won’t be cruel, but history clearly demonstrates that so-called “civilized mankind” can be far crueler than their pre-urbanized antecedents..

Our cumulative scientific data-bank is so different from what it was then that our over-all comprehension of the environment will not permit the kind of superstition and savagery that our ancestors displayed. By which I mean to say that modern humanity will not believe rocks to be “Gods” and sacrifice living beings to them. Contemporary mankind is far too aware of the causative forces of nature to attribute malevolent motivations to wind and rain. Well, at least some of us are. It is my strongest hope that the rest of mankind can be educated out of their remaining superstitions. They better be!

In other words, I think humanity is coming to a higher place in its development, a plateau, upon which each person will have a more personal inter-relationship with the life that surrounds them.

WHAT IS OUR ENVIRONMENT BUT THE “LIFE WHICH SURROUNDS US”?

The human race, I think, and for this there's some empirical proof, is coming "full circle" as it were, it's coming back to what was a totally integrational holistic experience. But humans are, in many but hardly all ways, completely different now, in the closing years of the 20th Century, than they were 20 to 50 millennia ago.

I think it's completely clear, given that "The Shamanic Experience" which is a less technical way to describe the totally integrational holistic experience of the environment, is one of the few things that is common over the entire range of the human species. "Shamanism" (which is actually a misnomer) still is alive and fairly well in many cultures on this planet and it was once the primary belief structure in every culture that has existed on this planet. The best thing about it is that it was never a faith-driven structure but was always an experience driven thing. It's one of those things that has been discarded, but not entirely so, and therefore not lost, during the past centuries when humanity was enthralled with, and by, "things".

I said "full circle" above ... and that's the easy term to use. But I didn't really mean "full circle" humanity, and all other living things, sentient and otherwise, seems to go through it's development in cycles. But, because those are developmental cycles, rather than climatic cycles or simply time-related cycles, they are rather more of a spiral upwards than they are of a circle.

Perhaps the double helix which has so much meaning in other circumstances, is also a good image for us to utilize in our ideation regarding human developmental cycles. There's a circle, sure, a spiral could easily be described as a circle extended in a third dimension, but each edge of the circle is higher than it was before. One could even describe the double helix as the prime symbol of the life force's over-all development because that development is so complicated. I do so in my own thoughts.

It doesn't really matter, these definitions and descriptions are just "mind games". What does matter is that human and social development appears to go in cycles and that progress seems to go from the simple to the more complex.

Once upon a time our most remote ancestors were simple hunter-gatherers who lived wherever things were conducive to the maintenance of their very simple life-styles. They knew a lot more than we give them credit for, they must have, they survived to become us!

They didn't have books, or schools, or much technology, or any science beyond their intimate knowledge of wind and weather and the movements of game animals. But they did have an incredibly intimate relationship with their environment ... with "the life that surrounded them".

That's what the "totally integrational holistic experience of the environment" is, an intimate relationship with the life around you; a completely conscious intimate awareness of the life which surrounds one. Our environment is more fully composed of life and consciousness than modern man has wanted to believe.

Now, "Totally integrational holistic experience of the environment" is a dreadfully ponderous term, so for convenience's sake, and because the human race has always called that "thing" something else, let's call it that "something else" and use the term "Shamanic Experience"; it's a lot easier, and it's totally valid.

Now, what makes "The Shamanic Experience" different from the usual life experience, is that it is not simply the physical life which surrounds you of which the "Shamanic Consciousness" is aware. The

problem is, of course, how does one separate experience from hallucination? Somehow, I don't think this question was one with which our remotest ancestors were overly concerned! But we must be!

In fact, I don't think there's any possibility that we could be "too concerned" in this respect, the validity of experience is all important!

This is an instance when the primitive societies still existing among us may have something very important to teach those parts of society who have forgotten that they were ever primitive!

What could "savages" possibly teach "technological - urban - civilized people"? Lots! But I am not saying that modern humanity is inferior to our remotest ancestors or to the primitives among us. I very definitely am not saying that Modern humanity has immense amounts of valid things which it can teach to the more primitive members of the human race ... ways to make life more comfortable, more convenient, more healthy, and far longer. But, the "primitives" do have some very important things they can teach us!

One of the things I personally want to impress upon everyone is the vital importance of reciprocity in human relationships; we really have to learn to listen to one another; haven't you frequently gotten totally frustrated watching some debate on television ... and realizing that all of the participants were talking, but none of them were listening?

Humans tend to talk at one another rather than to one another! It's a terrible waste of time!

"The Shamanic experience" teaches one the vital importance of listening ... but not only to other people! The "Shamanic experience" consists in listening very carefully to everything ... to the cosmos itself, to all things, both those that are physical and those which are trans-physical!

I do think, though, that the expression "Shamanic experience" is one of those phrases which "paints too many pictures". I know it once did so for me! I always saw a selfcreated image of some totally nude, painted, physically filthy, Amazonian shaman his - body painted in intricate spirals in a deep trance induced by either self-hypnosis or some narcotic "on a voyage to the underworld to retrieve the lost soul" of a terribly ill member of his tribe; but now I know that externals are irrelevant, now I know that what the Shaman was doing works! Now I know that what Shamans "do" may, in fact, be primitive, but it is anything but simple!

There's an awful lot of totally empirical evidence that these tribal people get well! And it's quite clear that they were truly ill, or wounded, or hurt in an accident or by some wild creature, and that it was not at all "only psychosomatic ills that are amenable to Shamanic cures".

There's a lot of other vivid images too, all of them equally romantic, all of them fairly equally valid but, as I keep saying that was then this is now!

The trouble with all those porcupine quills, feathers, white-buckskin, face paint, rattles, feather-wands, bead necklaces, and other antique accouterment, while they are often beautiful, and always exciting, is just that if you, yourself, are not a contemporary tribes person ... and to some degree, even if you are they are still primarily "antique accouterment". While they can be considered "mood enhancing" and the certainly assist to "set the scene", they have absolutely nothing to do with the reality of what is called "Shamanism".

These various things were once an extremely important part of a totally viable society. Today, that society is either already dead or in the process of dying; and those things are not part of the society of 21st century humanity! But the basic facts that lay beneath those accouterments should be!

Physically, humanity and the other sentient things that share this planet with them, are entirely alone in the universe. At least as far as we now know. But, extend your senses into the non-physical, and we are anything but alone!

AND THAT'S WHAT THE "SHAMANIC EXPERIENCE" IS ALL ABOUT!

So then how shall we manage to describe that experience without conjuring up overly romantic and totally misleading images?

How can a people/society that travels in space and builds super-computers and supercolliders describe or even comprehend a process that has absolutely nothing to do with either technology or science?

How can a people who basically dismiss all these things as either "primitive superstition" or "insanity" deal with the fact that while what I'm calling "The Shamanic Experience" frequently is either or both of those things, but sometimes in fact, far more often than not, it is neither of those things?

I think that "The Shamanic Experience" is quite different than what is popularly called "Extra-sensory perception" though it certainly has elements in common. Extra-sensory perception is clearly an important element in the "Shamanic Experience".

"Extend one's senses into the non-physical" - that sort of translates into ... extend one's senses out of the physical levels of realities and embrace or include the virtual realities of which physical reality is only a part.

It is absolutely clear to me that various animals can easily do this. It has long been clear to me that almost all humans possess at least the latent or dormant capability to do this. That in fact, is what intuition is, "The Dormant ability to extend one's senses into the nonphysical levels of the realities", and all human beings are capable of intuition to some degree. It is also clear to me that there are some human beings who can do it now, and whose abilities to extend their reality into the non-physical are anything but dormant. It is certainly clear to me that there always have been humans who could do this.

They are the Shamans - it's completely inaccurate to call them "psychics".

Now, I'm not going to prescribe some sort of course of action so that people can "become Shamans", that's all crap! People either are, or they aren't, that's all there is to it. I'm not saying that developing shamanic senses is something the human race "must do". It's not, the developing of the "Shamanic senses" is something that is gradually happening to humanity because of the course of human evolution. That's what I meant when I said there was a qualitative change in human nature taking place at this time. Ramepithicus may have represented a crossing of the line which divided absolute-animal from early animal-man. In due time let us say Cro-Magnon Man represented a line between animal-man and very early mental-man. Our society today may be standing at the line which divides late mental-man from earliest spiritual-man.

What the ancient shamans did was totally valid; in other words ... it worked! How they did it ... was and is ... entirely culture-dependent. That has nothing to do with how it worked, that has to do with the peoples perception of the shaman as “special”.

In the future, I don't think that the people blessed with the “shamanic consciousness” will be considered anything particularly “special” in the sense that their obvious uniqueness conferred authority or power ... I certainly hope that won't be the case. The reason I hope not is that in the course of human history “special-ness” has always carried authority with it. The only authority one with shamanic ability should have is the authority granted to any other translator or interpreter and any other healing agency.

It is this extension of human consciousness, this broadening of the scope of human awarenesses, that is absolutely an imperative requirement in the development of our “more perfect society”.

The tripolarity of the consciousness of which human life is a manifestation or shadow, is a very real thing. But until one experiences it for themselves, it's at best hypothesis. It's very difficult to base one's life-styles on a hypothesis. In fact, I believe it to be impossible!

What I think is going to gradually occur during this very difficult period of transition into which our societies have now entered, is that people will slowly, as the generations pass, develop more and more of the extension of awareness to all forms of consciousness. I think that as the generations pass, more and more people will inexorably develop more and more awareness of the awareness which surrounds them.

I'm not saying that everyone will be “enlightened”, they won't be, far from it. But, the reality of this world-view of mine, and it's really not very different from the cosmology of the Vedas, will become more and more a reality to more and more people.

And that's what's going to give us our more perfect society.

You remember what I said about attitudinal changes? Well, when people extend their awareness out beyond the simply physical, there are certain things of which they become aware. These things produce a basic change in attitude ... a basic change in point-of-view!

It is not a minor thing!

Let's look at it this way. It's one thing for me to say that, if you can accept this cosmic-paradigm or world-view of mine, your attitude toward death will change. It is another thing altogether for you to experience the truth of what I say.

Someone, no matter who it is, just claiming something to be true isn't worth the proverbial “hill of beans”, but experiencing the truth of something makes all the difference in the world to your attitude.

As you know I have done a lot of complaining about how the human race is fascinated and terrified of death. Well, if you can experience enough of the reality which surrounds you to know that there is awareness in the post physical death state ... then death has indeed “lost its sting”!

In the past, that was the primary function of the Shamanic consciousness. The word “Shaman” means the equivalent of “Spirit Talker”, and the “spirits” involved were those of both excarnate and discarnate intelligences.

The purpose of “Shamanic Consciousness” is to be a bridging agent ... to be, not build, a bridge between the various realities. A bridge which other people may use for their own growth and development. In

those tribes where it's still a reality, and not simply something with which to titillate the tourists, it still is.

Primitive peoples aren't the only people who need such a bridge, the inhabitants of the 21st century, which is only a year away from us, probably need it far more than most primitives do, because they have completely lost touch with their roots, they have completely lost touch with their inner natures, they have completely lost touch with their environments!

"White water rafting" is thrilling, but it doesn't put people in touch with "The life that surrounds them". Nor does a picture safari up the Amazon! To get in touch with "the life which surrounds you" that life has got to be more than just another "thing"! People have got to stop regarding life forms other than human as "things"!

You see, one doesn't have to have any compassion for "things"! No matter what anyone says, no one will ever be able to convince me that all living things do not have at least some kind of feelings, some kind of consciousness.

Our scientists in their effort to avoid anthropomorphizing various living things have gone altogether too far in the opposite direction.

Who loses by this? Well, the creatures lose because so many people consider them simply resources to be harvested and exploited; but then people also regularly exploit one another! The real loser though, is humanity, their lives are infinitely impoverished by their foolish exclusivity.

Do you have any idea at all what happens to you when you "extend your senses to the life around you"? Do you have any idea how very much richer and more rewarding life is when the world around you, and the life with which it throbs, ceases to be invisible to you?

I'm not talking about the world of non-physical life either. I am talking about the "real world". The trouble is far too many people are so concentrated upon things, that they "don't see the forest for the trees"!

As I said earlier, we live in a world of absolutely unbelievable glory, splendor, and beauty; do you have any idea how tragic it is that some people go through life never even getting a glimpse of what's all around them? We live in a world of incredible diversity and charm, why do so many people never know that?

Among the Aborigines of Australia, who very clearly possess the "Shamanic consciousness" that's what "Dream-time" means it's a time when a person merges in consciousness with the mass or aggregate sub-conscious not simply of the human race but of the entire planetary life-force, a time when time means absolutely nothing at all ... nor death nor the totally wrong headed divisions man has made between reality and unreality!

The Australian aborigines are undeniably primitive, but their relationship with their environment is almost perfectly intimate. Their capacity to extend their consciousnesses to the awareness which surrounds them, to the life which surrounds them, is unequalled.

They claim to be in contact with other sentient species, the great whales, Dolphins, and with many other species; who is it that knows enough to dispute them? Not I!

A time will come, and in evolutionary terms, it will come soon, when each and every human being will BE a bridge between the various realities.

The difference between the Life conscious, which I think is a more descriptive, more neutral term than “Shamanically conscious” and the “Enlightened” or “Cosmically conscious” is that the “Life Conscious” bridge the triple reality, while the “Cosmically conscious” ARE the triple reality! To the “Cosmically Conscious” there is only intrinsic reality!

There’s a difference between “bridging” and “Being”!

People as a whole, are already registering severe unhappiness with the “status quo”. People, as a whole, are already looking about for alternatives. People, as a whole, are already desperately desiring a “more perfect society”. People, as a whole, are very much engaged, I believe, in a strong effort to become better themselves.

As more and more people begin to “let go”, begin to lessen the concentration on things, begin to open their consciousness to things they hadn’t been previously aware of, such as the topics I’ve talked about in this. I really think that bit by bit our “more perfect society” will begin to occur.