

The Writing on the Wall #6: "Inquire Within"

J. Harmon Grahn

The Writing on the Wall #6: "Inquire Within"

is set in 12 pt. Linux Libertine, available through the Libertine Open Fonts Project

linuxlibertine.sourceforge.net/Libertine-EN.html

with title and page headings set in the Komika family of fonts, developed and made
generously available through Apostrophic Labs

www.apostrophiclab.com

URLs (Universal Resource Locaters for Internet addresses)

are set in Latin Modern Mono.

Published by

The Wellspring Publishing Group

TheWellspringPublishingGroup.com

Copyright © 2012 J. Harmon Grahn

v8, July 7, 2012

The Writing on the Wall #6: “Inquire Within”

is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License. creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/

You are free:

- to share—to copy, distribute and transmit the work
- to remix—to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution—You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Noncommercial—You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- Share alike—If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under the same or similar license to this one.

Quotations and derivative works should acknowledge its Author: J. Harmon Grahn; and its source on the Net: The Wellspring Publishing Group.
TheWellspringPublishingGroup.com

Contents

1	The Question	1
2	“Virtual Reality” Revisited	5
3	The Subtle Anatomy	9
3.1	Some Useful Word-Symbols	13
3.2	Identification	15
4	Transdimensional Realities	18
5	“Inquire Within”	23

1 The Question

The question addressed in this essay is prompted by *The Writing on the Wall #5*, at the end of § 6 Speculations, where is written: “Each of us, who will, is eligible to vote in the election of Earth-humanity into the peerage of self-governing Cosmic beings—simply by *becoming* a self-governing Cosmic being.”¹ So, what is “a self-governing Cosmic being?”

Perhaps the best way to approach this question is to consider first what “a self-governing Cosmic being” is *not*. Such a being is most likely not involved in reaction, resistance, or opposition to those who attempt to govern others than themselves. To do so would be futile: because Earth-humanity, being young and immature, is mostly populated by humans who do not govern themselves: if for no other reason, because they do not know how; and do not know, and cannot imagine, what that could possibly mean. Such (practically all) humans are much more inclined to attempt to govern others—a characteristic signature among many, identifying those who do not govern themselves.

This is no more a criticism of Earth-humanity than is describing a newborn infant as “infantile.” How might an infant be more truthfully described than as “infantile?” An infant in truth is not a mature adult. An infant has the potential of becoming a mature adult; yet through no fault of its own, that potential has not been fulfilled. It takes time. There is a process involved in graduating from infancy to mature adulthood; and although guidance can be helpful, and may often be essential, it is none other than the person himself who must take ultimate responsibility for negotiating the gradual transition from his own infancy to mature adulthood.

Among contemporary and historical humans, there are many who have never fully negotiated this transition, and remain immature children throughout their adult lives. Here, we shall assume this condition constitutes “growing pains” in the course of the maturation of Earth-humanity as a species in Cosmos. It is transitory, temporary; and is nothing to worry about.

Nevertheless, like infancy, maturation of the species is not without its hazards. Some children never reach adulthood, tragically because they make fatal errors along the way, thereby interrupting the developmental process. Earth-humans could imaginably do likewise; which is not the same as an expectation that we shall.

Thus, “a self-governing Cosmic being” is not one who is in rebellion against, or at war with, those who have not achieved the maturity to penetrate the illusion that governance of anyone but themselves is possible. This illusion is ultimately a “fatal error” that un-failingly, sooner or later, ends the careers of those who persist in it. It may truthfully be said that all attempts at opposing the (alleged) “governance” of those who have empow-

¹*The Writing on the Wall #5*, p. 43. wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow05

ered themselves to “govern” others than themselves, are echoes, or mirror-images of the very thing that is being opposed: for they are futile attempts to “govern the governor,” perceived to be “governing others”—which is no less futile.

As shall become clearer as we go along, “governing others” is an impossibility, beyond the capability of any being, in relation to any other being. A being can hate, kill, or terrorize—or protect, defend, and love another being; but no being can *govern* any being, other than itself. And if it fails even in governing itself, then it is involved in anarchy, governed only by “natural law,” or by “what is”—of which the impossibility of the “governance” of one being by another is an element, but not the whole.

This is an insight that first occurred to me as a young man, in the midst of the military training known generically as “boot camp;” although I did not grasp its far-reaching implications at the time, or for many years yet to come.

Under duress of punishment for the slightest infraction of military protocol—as interpreted by the Company Commander of the company I was mustered into—I was able to observe that he—the CC—was empowered to motivate my obedience, and that of my shipmates, to his every command: by means of the duress of punishment if I (we) did not follow his orders, or meet to his satisfaction his most exacting expectations. However, I reflected, *it was my own self-discipline* which actually commanded my compliance.

Yes, I was motivated by the desire to avoid punishment, usually in the form of a number of push-up exercises, accompanied by a flogging of verbal abuse; which was a matter of course, and the lot of every member of our company. But the fine point I grasped at the time was that *my will*, not the will of the CC, was the governing agent. I could have made less effort than I did to achieve the snap and responsiveness I returned to his commands. I observed others in my company who were less responsive than I was, and who in consequence endured greater abuse than I did. I also observed those who were more responsive than I was, came closer than I did to meeting the CC’s expectations, and were more highly favored, or abused less severely, than I was. Yet all the while, I realized, the decisive factor in the situation of this most rigorous, coercive discipline, was *my will* to cooperate, and do my best—or not—to meet the expectations of another: not the CC’s will. Summing up my private analysis, I mused that “All discipline is self-discipline.”

Expanding the scope of this analysis in later years, I have realized too that *all governance is self-governance*. The nearest any so-called “governing body” can approach the “governance” of its constituency is with *coercion*, in the various forms of rewards, punishments, and persuasions employed by such institutions throughout “civilized history.” This is the exercise of coercive power;² and whether wielded “benignly,” or “tyrannically,” constitutes the full spectrum of so-called “governance” of others, A to Z, alpha to omega.

²See *Ibid.* § 2.2 Wealth and Power, pp. 11-18 for elaboration.

This is why all so-called “governments,” whatever their other policies have been, have always striven mightily to secure the loyalty, patriotism, and *esprit de corps* of their respective constituencies: because without the willful cooperation of the “governed,” the “governance” of others is impossible. (They can be exterminated; but they cannot be “governed.”) Or in other words, all “governance” of others relies upon the willful *self-governance* of the “governed;” and the “art of governance” consists entirely of the art of bending by various means the self-governance of the “governed” to the will of the “governors.”

Now we have the makings of a paradox here—or at least, a potential source of confusion: for earlier we stated that “Earth-humanity, being young and immature, is mostly populated by humans who do not govern themselves: simply because they do not know how; and do not know, and cannot imagine, what that could possibly mean.” Yet we have also said that *all governance is self-governance*; and that “all ‘governance’ of others relies upon the willful *self-governance* of the ‘governed’. . . .” Let us see if we can sort this out, so that it makes somewhat better sense.

The sequel to my “boot camp” experience, at the other end of the pipeline, or “mustered out” at the end of my term of military duty, may be illustrative. My military career during the Vietnam War was fortunately far less of a hardship upon me than was probably experienced by a great many of my peers in uniform during that era. Nevertheless, as my time grew short, there was nothing I desired more than the approaching day I would put it entirely behind me.

Being young and immature, however, I gave virtually no thought as to what I would do with myself after that day finally arrived; and when it inevitably did, I was quite unprepared for it. I was out. I was free, and no longer under the “governance” of military authority, and the chain of command. What next? I had no idea; and that day I began to flounder—until I found another institution (a religious institution, in this instance) to “govern” me, until such time, a number of years in the then-future, when I might again venture, gingerly, to govern myself. Meanwhile, I desperately needed *somebody else* to tell me what to do: because the only thing I knew for sure at the time was that I did not know how to decide for myself what I should, and should not do.

Fortunately, this world is richly populated by many who will enthusiastically tell others what to do, who are unable to figure it out for themselves. I found one of the many institutions of this kind, and still give it credit for having saved my life during that critical period. For those not able to govern themselves, even “bad governance” can be better than none.

Infants and young children can be willful, and “difficult to manage,” as confirmed by the experience of many parents. Yet children also rely upon the guidance and rearing of

their parents—which parents themselves often find challenging. With the best of intentions, it is difficult to be a “perfect parent.” Yet children desperately rely upon the best parenting their parents can provide; and parents and children alike often have reason to wish in retrospect that the parenting could have been better. Ideally, parents and their children sincerely love each other, and parents give their conscientious best to the project of child rearing—even if they have reason to regret later that “their best” may not have been “good enough.”

So here is an instance in which “governing others” cannot be avoided; for without it, children would grow up without any parental guidance at all, would be effectively orphaned, and most likely as a result would be more severely crippled, by the time they reach “majority,” than they already are.

Similarly, we have seen in *The Writing on the Wall #5 § 2.2 Wealth and Power*, how Neolithic humans shook off the natural restraints of ecological necessity, by learning how to produce their own food, instead of living in uncertainty off the bounty provided—or not—by Nature. When food was plentiful, they thrived; when it was scarce, at least some of them starved: a regime that came to a (supposed) end when humans mastered the technology of agriculture.

As described at greater length in #5 § 2.2, the Neolithic peoples had been governed, as much as they needed to be—in particular their numbers, in relation to the carrying capacity of their range—by the biophysics of their habitat. Then they overthrew the governance of Nature—and being an “infant race,” unequal to the challenge of governing themselves, found themselves bound instead by the toils of coercive power: which swiftly became a biological selection criterion, and gave rise to what we call “civilization:” universally characterized by the “governance” of the less powerful by the more powerful.

For the ensuing several thousand years, “civilization,” “governed” beginning to end by coercive power, gave infant-to-adolescent humanity “a place to stand,” and explore some, but by no means all, of the potentialities native to the nature of being human. Although “civilization” had severe blemishes, it was not “all bad;” and it has brought adolescent humanity to where we stand today, at the threshold of species maturity—those of us who choose to make the transition.

The transition from “civilization” to “something else”—“post-civilization,” for want of a more appropriate term—is necessitated by the functional termination of the regime of coercive power. Although it may have served a purpose during human adolescence and infancy, it has now run its course, and has reached a “dead end,” beyond which it cannot persist.

This is so because Cosmos—which may be considered as a purposeful, intelligent, creative entity—does not function on the basis of coercive power: because *coercive power*

is fundamentally incompatible with purposeful, intelligent creativity: the essence alike of humanity (in potential), and Cosmos (in fact): the prototype upon which humanity, and all existence, are modeled like a self-similar fractal shape. This is a truth not given recognition by “scientific orthodoxy:” because like all “civilized” institutions, before it is an instrument of human inquiry, “scientific orthodoxy” is a servant of coercive power. Those who “inquire within” themselves may find confirmation of these statements.

Thus “infant/adolescent” humanity, like human children, have possessed “from the beginning” a capacity for self-governance—in a similar way that an unborn fetus is possessed of a healthy pair of uninflated lungs, within an environment void of air. There comes a day in the fetus’s life when it is born into an air-breathing world, where lungs are essential—and behold! the unpracticed and heretofore “purposeless” lungs are ready to meet the challenge. With his first breath of air the newborn infant announces with a shout his entrance into a new dimension of being! The time is drawing swiftly near for nascent humanity to exercise our heretofore dormant capacity for self-governance: essential to us as lungs, in the dimension we are now entering.

So again: what is “a self-governing Cosmic being?”

2 “Virtual Reality” Revisited

In *The Writing on the Wall #3* § 3 “Virtual Reality” I described; and in *The Writing on the Wall #5* § 6 Speculations, I elaborated further upon:

. . . an imaginary enclosing sphere surrounding each being, upon the inner surface of which each of us projects our subjective interpretation of everything we see, hear, and sense in any way—each our own interpretive rendering, moment to moment, of how we perceive “reality.” Each of our enclosing spheres, I wrote, “is invisible to all who are not enclosed by it, and is the *only thing* visible to the consciousness within it. It is transparent to sensations originating without, which are received by the being’s organs of sense (or ‘extra-sense’); are processed by the being’s central nervous system; and are projected upon the inner surface of the enclosing sphere, producing a ‘3-D, Surround-Sound, Living Technicolor, virtual reality,’ or dynamic map of *local perceptions* of the ‘real reality,’ *as imagined* by the subject being.”³

Additionally, in *The Writing on the Wall #4* § 5 Shifts Happen, I remarked:

³*The Writing on the Wall #5* § 6 Speculations, pp. 38-39.
wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow05

. . . Rumors have been in circulation for at least the past 20 years or so that the “shift” allegedly now in progress throughout planet Earth involves a kind of metamorphosis from “third-dimensional” awareness, through a transitional “fourth-dimensional” phase, into “fifth-dimensional consciousness,” which is now anticipated by some to become global, or universal, by or about the year 2013.

What “3-D,” “4-D,” and “5-D consciousness” actually mean to those who use this terminology is far from clear to me; and ventures into these domains—particularly having to do with the not-yet-arrived future—are highly speculative. My habitual impulse is to dismiss them until such time, if ever, as they materialize in my personally experienced present. However, if as is being suggested here, the experienced present is no less imaginary than the remembered past, and the anticipated future; and if one wants to bring into manifestation a future different in quality from that of the past, then such speculations may be relevant.⁴

In *The Writing on the Wall #5* § 5.3 Back to “Reality” I quoted Sir James Jeans’s remark that “the Universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine;”⁵ from which I developed the observation:

. . . that each of us lives in a “virtual reality,” each of our own imaginative fabrication, composed almost entirely of “mind stuff:” the sensory stimuli conveyed to us through our organs of sensation, as filtered through the combined matrix of our beliefs and concepts about the nature of “reality.” Of *this* is composed the sum and substance of all human experience. Or in other words, in as real and literal a sense as may be expressed in word-symbols, *each of us is the author of our own “reality”*—than which there is no other we can in any way experience.⁶

Now this is *reasonable*, is it not? If what each of us calls “reality” is a fabric woven of sensations received through our organs of sense, interpreted through our tapestry of beliefs, which are unique to ourselves, and are not exactly—or in many cases, are not even approximately—congruent with those of anybody else: how can we avoid admitting honestly that each of us lives, moves, and has our being entirely within a “virtual reality” of our own imaginative fabrication, whose relationship with “the *real reality*” (if there is such a thing) is only to be guessed? Then, have we not arrived at a realization that,

⁴*The Writing on the Wall #4*, p. 11. wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow04

⁵*The Writing on the Wall #5*, p. 36. wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow05

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 40.

whether we imagine “reality” to be more like “a great machine,” or more like “a great thought,” in either case, *we ourselves* live perpetually and exclusively within a “virtual reality” almost entirely of our own imaginative fabrication?

For those habituated to, and comfortable with the “governance” of or by others, or both, this may not be an entirely welcome thought—the more so, if it is becoming evident that in the nature of things, such “governance” is threatened by an approaching swift and unavoidable end.

The “good news,” for those afflicted by such misgivings, is that a crucial element of this view is the essential necessity that Cosmos as a Whole is a benign, purposeful, intelligent, creative entity, in intimate and constant relationship with each of us; and is not an accidental, meaningless, purposeless mish-mash of cosmic debris. If this perception of things is “in reality” mistaken, then the entire argument detailed here, and in prior essays, is “out the window,” and amounts to no more than the wishful thinking of a hopelessly confused old man.

You’re off the hook, in other words, and there’s nothing to worry about—unless you choose to torture yourself with doubts about how you and your fellows are going to negotiate the mounting cascade of crises that seem to be bearing down upon all who happen to reside at this time upon planet Earth. Other than that, you’re “home free!” Most of us—or at least some of us—will probably muddle through, somehow, like we always have, don’t you think? And anyway, you weren’t planning on living forever, were you? Have another hit of whatever you like, to take your mind off of such “gloomy thoughts,” and lighten up. It’ll all be over, before you know it. . . .

The “good news,” for those who are able to face without blinking the prospect of being the authors of our own respective “realities,” is somewhat more challenging. It requires *taking responsibility* for the “reality” each of us are authoring, every moment of every day. This is something each of us can do: because each of us is *potentially*, and *legitimately*, in command of the entire content of our own imaginations: which is the whole cloth of which our respective “realities” are woven.

In fact, taking responsibility for the content of our own imaginations about sums up what it means to be *a self-governing Cosmic being*. We’re already Cosmic beings—by virtue of the unassailable fact that we reside within Cosmos; and by the corollary that Cosmos resides within each of us. (We shall examine this corollary at greater length below, in § 3.2 Identification.) So the only “missing factor”—for those who have not fully remedied this deficiency—is the matter of taking responsibility for our own imaginations. This is the essence of *self-governance*; and it is something that can be learned, and eventually mastered, by those who persevere in the necessary effort to do so.

However, it cannot be “bestowed” upon anybody, by anybody, or by anything “else.” Each of us must do it for ourselves. Coercive power is not within the purposeful, creative “Cosmic Repertoire:” so self-governance will never be pressed upon anyone. That would be a contradiction in terms. Thus there is no alternative path to self-governance, other than the governance of self, by self; and that, in essence, means governance of one’s own creative imagination.

Of course, just a smidgen of introspection will disclose that taking full responsibility for the content of one’s own imagination is a taller order than may be appreciated, without such introspection. And then one might wonder, “Why bother anyway? What is taking full responsibility for the content of one’s own imagination likely to accomplish, in the overall scheme of things?”

It’s a good question; possibly prompted, in part, by the thoroughly habituated cultural assumption which may be expressed along the lines of, “Hay, I’m just this guy, see, among seven thousand million other guys and gals on this planet, and a really small part of this really big machine, or whatever it is. I’ve got a lot of stuff rattling around in my head all the time, and who cares a nickel about what it is, or what it means to me? Why should I bother trying to put all that stuff into any kind of order? What difference will it make to anyone, whether I take responsibility, or not, for the content of my imagination?”

However, here we have arrived at a view of things in striking contrast to that habitual cultural assumption—which may take a little getting used to. Here, we are viewing “reality”—the “reality” we actually live in, and experience every moment of every day—not as a *de facto* “big machine out there,” that is nothing other than whatever it is; but rather, as an entirely fluid and imaginary world “in here,” consisting of hardly anything but the contents of our own imaginations. So if we do not “take charge” ourselves of that imaginary content, who will?

The list of *who will* is virtually endless; but a generic example will serve. Corporate advertisers, of every size, shape, and description, will eagerly take charge of every scrap of imaginary content that you or I allow them to: people and institutions who insist that we should “buy” whatever they have to “sell.” And they will give us the best reasons they can come up with to convince us that their products, whatever they are, will benefit us, not harm us (whether they are harmful or benign is of little concern to them, so long as we “buy” them) and if possible, that we cannot possibly live without them.

Products, of course, can be anything: commercial, political, religious. . . . You know the drill. You’re surrounded by it, and saturated by it, all the time. “Come here!” “Go there!” “Do this!” “Don’t do that!” “You better believe it!” “Don’t believe that, you fool!” “Vote for Who’s It!” “Wash your clothes with Rub-a-Dub Dub!” “Send money!” . . . and so on, *ad infinitum, ad nauseam*. In a few words, *command of your imagination* is

the primary objective of all those who seek to *govern you*—never mind that it can't be done—and “they” are everywhere, all the time; and “they” never sleep.

That's the “bad news.” The “good news” is that *you own the option* to allow it, or not; and nobody can take that option away from you, ever. However, as they say, Nature abhors a vacuum; so if you don't, “they” will: *take charge of your imagination*; and maybe, “they” already have. If you don't like that idea, it is up to nobody but *you*: to “do something about it,” or not.

3 The Subtle Anatomy

From where I stand, it appears that “conventional reality”—whatever that is, if there even is such a thing—is encountering “problems” these days; and “the way things work,” as most people are taught in school, church, by the media, etc. don't seem to be working anymore “like they're supposed to.” Maybe it's just me; but I get the impression that there is a growing consensus that something is haywire with conventional and “authoritative” perceptions of “reality.” If so, then what used to be reflexively considered “over the top,” or “beyond the pale of reason,” may be in line for reconsideration by some of those who would formerly have dismissed it without a second glance.

Anyway, I would like to introduce some material from a source I have recently encountered that maybe adds a dimension or two to the discussion here. I mentioned above, and in prior essays, the idea of a “virtual reality.” The original intent behind this image was that it should simply be a device for thinking about our relationships with “reality.” I was not suggesting that my “enclosing sphere” should be thought of as being “really there,” but was only suggesting that our experience of “reality” could be imagined *as if* each of us were enclosed within such a sphere.

I have since encountered a highly provocative discussion of, in part, what some call the “subtle anatomy” of the human body. It is a discussion with ancient roots, and there is a richly diverse corpus of material on this and related esoteric fields of interest. I have had a “casual acquaintance” with some of this material for quite a few years now, but have never before delved into it with focused or persistent attention.

The subtle anatomy is described in various sources in various ways; but there seems to be general agreement among many that its primary features consist of seven energy vortexes, called *chakras*, arranged within the physical body, approximately along the spinal axis, like a vertical string of colored beads, between the crown of the head and the

pubic region; and that the physical body is enveloped in a succession of nested energy fields, called collectively the *auric field*.⁷

This is fairly generic so far, and not particularly controversial. John J. Falone's book, however, *The Genius Frequency*,⁸ discusses the subtle anatomy in considerable detail, and creates a startling and thought-provoking picture of its multi-dimensional functioning, in relation to the "not-so-subtle" anatomy.

In the view Falone presents, the human brain is *not* the principle seat of thought, imagination, and creativity—which might bear some relevance to the often-quoted estimate that only 10% of the human brain is put to actual use. If so, this seems like an admission that the function of the remaining 90% *is not known to science*: not that it has no function at all. Why, and how, would we possibly pass from generation to generation, for many thousands of successive generations, an organ that is 90% non-functional? And what exactly, when you come right down to it, *are* thought, imagination, and creativity: those vital functions that more than anything else, seem to define us as human beings?

In Falone's view, the functions of thought, imagination, and creativity are not localized in a single organ, but are distributed among the seven chakras; each of which is a unique, independent, and interdependent *mind-center*, in relation to all the others. Each mind-center, individually and collectively, projects its content upon the auric field, producing human thought—somewhat, I gather, in the way I have described how we would project our interpretation of "reality" upon the imaginary "enclosing sphere" described above in § 2—if there were such an "enclosing sphere."

Only for Falone (and for many others as well) the auric field, although invisible to three-dimensional perception, is *really there* in fourth- and fifth-dimensional actuality; and as described by Falone, is the primary organ of human thought, in distributed relation with the seven mind centers. The auric field thus in a sense displays to the individual an accurate reflection of what he or she is, moment to moment, all the time: that is, the impression of the world "out there" that each of us fabricates "in here" out of our interpretations of, and responses to sensations received from any source.

The element of all this that particularly caught my attention, and excited my speculative interest, is the idea that the auric field is not only a passive screen, as my "enclosing sphere" was imagined to be, but is additionally an active broadcasting/receiving antenna which constantly broadcasts its content at large, and reciprocally receives complemen-

⁷Two visualizations of this may be viewed in Rev. Jeannine Grahn's New Age Awakening Visionary Art Gallery: newageawakening.com/auric01.html#image and newageawakening.com/auric02.html#image

⁸John J. Falone, *The Genius Frequency: An Owner's Manual for the Cosmic Mind*, Global Light Network, Virginia Beach, 2000.

tary content broadcast by other auric fields. Auric content reciprocally, and selectively, attracts the attention of other auric fields tuned to resonant frequencies. In this way, each of our auric fields, like a neon billboard, displays to the universe at large exactly who and what each of us is, and how we feel, moment to moment; and reciprocally attracts to us others like ourselves who are broadcasting and receiving on resonant frequencies.

Thus, not only are we the authors of our own respective “realities” in the subjective sense of surrounding ourselves with “imaginary worlds” of our own fabrication; we are also resonantly attracting to ourselves, and are similarly attracted to others, who are likewise the authors of “imaginary worlds” similar to ours—thereby reciprocally corroborating, confirming, and reinforcing our imaginative creations, whatever shape they may take.

If so, this has the obvious potential for casting each of us either into (relative) “Heaven,” or “Hell;” and it provides a compelling answer to the question, “What difference will it make to anyone, whether I take responsibility, or not, for the content of my imagination?” It may not seem to make much difference to anybody else; but it will surely make literally a world of difference to you. Those who habitually create “high-frequency” thought forms of love, light, cooperation, beauty, and bliss, are constantly broadcasting these qualities into the universe: and attracting to themselves similar responses from others who are receiving, and broadcasting, “on the same wavelength.”

Those, however, who habitually put out “low vibes,” and dark thoughts of anger, resentment, hatred, revenge, misery, and conflict, are attracting to themselves mirror images of these qualities, along with the very people who are broadcasting them “on resonant frequencies.”

In this way, the “reality” we experience is doubly a reflection of who and what we are: *a)* because whatever we imagine is what we see and experience; and *b)* it attracts to us multiple duplicates and variations of what we imagine, in the form of others like ourselves who are imagining “realities” similar to ours. If so, this is truly a “double-edged sword,” for it means two complementary things: *a)* it means we jolly well *better* take responsibility for what we imagine, if we do not wish to bring upon ourselves cascades of unnecessary misery; and *b)* it means that we are empowered with an extraordinarily potent capability to “change the world!”—simply by “being the change we would like to see:” that is, changing ourselves into beings, for instance, who put out “high vibes,” instead of “low vibes”—if this is the kind of change we would like to see. It is something anybody can do; but it is not something anybody else can do for us. We have to do it for ourselves.

There is a good deal more of this in Falone's book; yet he, like me, is not endeavoring to tell his readers "how things are." Rather, he encourages his readers, as I do mine, to "inquire within" for the "answers" to our questions and puzzlements.

As we proceed, [Falone writes] lay aside all thought-forms of limitation and confusion, so that you may learn what you seek. Lay aside the polarized thought-forms of church and state, for the truth that sets you free is everywhere about you and within you. As we proceed, we ask you to fully open the mind-center of your heart, for that is the mind-center that we shall address with emphasis. The final result is that each individual must experimentally discover the great cosmic truths that will liberate all suffering. No religion, no government, no book, no embodied or disembodied entity can do it for you; nor should this ever occur, for it would be a false enlightenment.⁹

If we are able to imagine "reality," as some have, as a "holographic universe," of which each part is a reproduction in miniature of the whole; or as a self-similar fractal shape, in which the whole implies every nuance of its parts, and each part implies all the elements of the whole—perhaps somewhat as an acorn, child of the forest, bears within it the template for a similar forest—then there is no puzzle we may encounter in "reality" whose solution cannot be found within ourselves. For each of us is a "child of Cosmos," microcosm of the Whole, and bears within us the seeds of as yet unimagined universes. Thus, "Inquire Within" is not a facetious remark. It is simply and literally the *key* to unlock all of our questions and puzzlements.

As I have, Falone has developed his own vocabulary for discussing these matters in word-symbols; yet there are correspondences among the words we have chosen to describe our respective explorations. Falone has taken pains to provide a Glossary of the terminology he uses—which helps; yet I imagine he would agree with me that there is no adequate substitute for one's own explorations, in one's own terms. Thus our writings are "footprints in the sands of time," tracing parts of, and rendering commentary upon, the paths we have followed. Part of becoming "a self-governing Cosmic being," I suggest, is venturing to leave one's own "footprints in the sands of time," which may, or may not, for awhile, follow the tracks left by others; and may, or may not, be followed in turn by other explorers who cross our paths.

The paragraphs above in this Section have introduced several terms worthy of more detailed examination; which I propose to undertake in what immediately follows.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 58.

3.1 Some Useful Word-Symbols

“Lay aside the polarized thought-forms of church and state, [Falone wrote, quoted above] for the truth that sets you free is everywhere about you and within you.”

Thought-forms are what we create, when we contemplate anything. They are alive, once they take shape, and assume an independent, interdependent life of their own. In Falone’s terms, a thought-form is:

Rarefied matter in a conceptualized state, organized through various electro-charges by desire, memory, identification, and destiny into a holographic entity, which exists on many dimensional planes. Each thought-form bears the unique magnetic signature of the individual soul through identification.¹⁰

Polarized thought-forms are related to the principle of complementarity discussed in *The Writing on the Wall* #5 § 2 pp. 4-6, § 3.2.1 p. 20, and in *The Writing on the Wall* #1 § 4.1 The Myth of Complementarity. It may not be an exaggeration to state that every thing we observe, or think about, has at minimum two complementary aspects, only one or the other of which, but not both, may be observed or thought about at any moment. The prototypical example of this, among innumerable others, are the complementary wave and quantum properties of light. Either one of these properties may be observed to the exclusion of the other; yet light is neither exclusively a wave phenomenon, nor exclusively a quantum phenomenon, but both. Yet both complementary properties of light can in no way be simultaneously observed.

Thus, when one identifies a property of anything, to the exclusion of its complement, the result in Falone’s terminology is a *partial equation* that is fundamentally unbalanced, and is incapable of informing or contributing to the evolution of a balanced system. The observation of mutually exclusive complementary properties may be resolved only if conceived in *inclusive*, not *exclusive* terms: “both and,” not “either/or.” Church and state are examples of “civilized” institutions (among innumerable others) that are seamed and honeycombed with polarized thought-forms, and partial equations.

“As we proceed, [Falone continues, quoted above] we ask you to fully open the mind-center of your heart, for that is the mind-center that we shall address with emphasis.”

In Falone’s terms, a *mind-center* is:

Nerve ganglia and energy vortex residing in seven distinct areas of the physical body, otherwise known as glands and chakras. Each is a thinking intelligence unto itself that creates bands of thought-forms in areas of the auric

¹⁰*Ibid.*, Glossary, p. 392.

field. Each has a color coded frequency and examples of these qualities may be seen in nature as various animal, plant, and mineral functions.¹¹

The mind-center of your heart, otherwise known as the fourth chakra in Eastern metaphysical traditions, is in Falone's terms the local seat, within an individual, of Universal Mind, termed the Heart of Hearts.

Each of these mind-centers are tuned to a bandwidth of frequencies streaming into them from Universal Mind. What makes the mind center of the Heart of Hearts so powerful and special is that it is tuned to the Primary Frequency, termed by you as Love. In other words, your heart has a mind of its own, composed of a seed crystal of the pure primordial Light of THE ONE. Each of the other mind-centers are specialized through certain sub-harmonics and ultra-harmonics of the octave of creation, which form your bio-organism and its other dimensional bodies of light.¹²

Falone describes the more generalized term, *mind*, as follows:

The overall field of intelligence generated by the mind-centers. This special function of soul and spirit awareness does not reside in the brain. The human mind resides outside the physical body proper and is a projection from the etheric body, and is perceived as a reflection from the interior of the auric field of awareness.¹³

So it seems that what I was imagining as an "enclosing sphere" upon whose inner surface is projected the content of one's beliefs, perceptions, and interpretations of "reality," is a fairly close approximation of the field of intelligence Falone designates as *mind*: the primary difference being that *mind* is described as a transdimensional reality, whereas mine was never intended to be more than an imaginary device for contemplating the relationship between perception and "reality."

As I understand it, the *Genius Frequency* of Falone's title is the opening of a resonance between the mind of the individual and the Mind of THE ONE, triggered by establishing resonance among the other six mind-centers within the individual, with the Primary Frequency of the Heart of Hearts; analogous to the tuning of the instruments in an orchestra to the First Violin, under the direction of the Conductor, in preparation for a symphonic performance.

¹¹*Ibid.*, Glossary, p. 390.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 60.

¹³*Ibid.*, Glossary, p. 390.

3.2 Identification

If “each of us is a ‘child of Cosmos,’ microcosm of the Whole, and bears within us the seeds of as yet unimagined universes,” as suggested above (p. 12), then “Who am I—*really*?” emerges as a quite provocative question.

As mentioned above (p. 7) “We’re already Cosmic beings—by virtue of the unassailable fact that we reside within Cosmos; and by the corollary that Cosmos resides within each of us.” That we reside within Cosmos is fairly self-evident. That Cosmos reciprocally resides within each of us may be less obvious. There are more than a couple of different ways of approaching this puzzle. In discussing the *Ego* in *The Writing on the Wall #5*, I wrote:

. . . the ego—the identity of the differentiated self—seems unavoidably to be but one complement of a vastly larger entity, in the absence of “whom” the differentiated self would have nowhere to stand, nothing to eat, or drink, or breathe, and nothing to do. For the essential complement of the individual ego is *everything else*, “excluding no detail, however slight.” Absent everything else, the individual ego could not possibly exist. This is not a mere philosophical device, or a mystical superstition. It is as close as anything I can imagine—if I may borrow a term—to an “apodictic certainty.”¹⁴

Or put another way: “The stars at night, whether we can see them or not, are as vital to our lives as our own hearts, and livers, and brains—which we also cannot see, and often neglect; often also, to our cost.”¹⁵

To *Identify*—capital I: Falone’s term—exclusively with one’s ego, as conventionally conceived in contemporary “civilized” society; *or* alternatively to Identify exclusively with Cosmos, either way is a partial equation, and a polarized thought-form: for “who I am—*really*” is neither one, nor the other; but *at least* both. Exclusive Identification with one’s ego involves what Falone calls the *altered-ego*, in distinction from the *pure ego*. Falone describes the altered-ego this way:

The use of the word “altered” is used here as a prefix to ego, which in its original connotation signifies a pure state of awareness as a unique manifestation of quality combinations of the ONE CREATOR in a separate embodiment from other quality combinations, totaling a collective embodiment or humanity. At certain periods of man’s consciousness evolution, decisions

¹⁴*The Writing on the Wall #5*, p. 9. wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow05

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 43.

were made that limited the use and function of mind to a lower frequency or vibration resulting in a mutant form and function of the original. The use of the term here is almost synonymous with what is commonly referred to as intellect, in that the intellect is to true Intelligence what the altered-ego is to true ego or "I AM" consciousness. Thus, mass consciousness sees the world through the eyes of altered-ego, which ascertains information only on the narrow frequency band of sensory feedback as manifested by the dense material plane. It is the major block to the Genius Frequency due to its self-centered dogma, proclaiming that one can know only what one knows about dense matter.¹⁶

Falone describes the ego, or pure ego, like this:

Pure ego. Originally the vertical alignment and constant "I AM" consciousness that connected the individual soul to THE ONE. Although lost, it can be regained. It is not the opposite of the altered-ego, rather, EGO encompasses all lower and limited frequencies in a triad: "I AM" the spirit of THE ONE, "I AM" the individualized soul of that spirit, "I AM" a physical body composed from the Earth by the spirit and the soul.¹⁷

Thus an Identification that excludes any aspect of who "I AM" is a partial equation that is fundamentally unbalanced, and is incapable of informing or contributing to the evolution of a balanced system—such as, in this case, a planetary ecology that includes Earth-humans at our present stage of evolutionary development. So the *balanced equation*, which does not exclude any aspect of who "I AM," is one way in which it may be said that each of us resides at once within Cosmos, while Cosmos resides within each of us. It is one way of answering the question, "Who am I—*really*?"

Another way of looking at the question is in considering the relationship between the many, and the one. As mentioned in #5 § 6 Speculations, p. 39, "We are not only beings ourselves, but are also constituents of larger beings, such as planet Earth; in the same way that we are constituted of smaller beings, such as our individual cells."¹⁸ Where should we draw the line between "I" and "not-I?" Where does one end, and the other begin?

Within our bodies are various organs, each essential to our health and well-being; and each composed in turn of cells with highly specialized functions, such as lung cells, blood cells, neurons, etc. Additionally, our digestive systems are colonized by vast numbers of

¹⁶Falone, 2000, Glossary, p. 379.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, Glossary, p. 383.

¹⁸wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow05

micro-organisms that are not even part of our cellular populations at all, yet are essential for assisting the digestion of what we eat. With these, our bodies maintain symbiotic relationships, even though they are “foreigners” among the cells “native” to our bodies.

And then, of course, there are hostile invaders, which our bodies believe must be hunted down and destroyed, or else they will make us ill, and destroy our bodies instead.

Then looking through the other end of the telescope, we can see that we have a part in the ecology of planet Earth, upon the health and balanced functioning of which we depend for our own health and livelihood. If we humans assume the role of hostile invaders, then we too must be hunted down and destroyed, if the planet itself is not to become a lifeless wasteland. If, as we are assuming here, our planet is aware, purposeful, creative, and volitional, then we have no reason to suppose that she is without recourse in dealing with beings like ourselves, if our predations exceed her tolerances. If so, then we must learn, like our own populations of intestinal microbes have done, how to form and sustain symbiotic, instead of predatory relationships, with our planet, and with the other beings she also nurtures and sustains. “As above, so below: as below, so above.”

In Identifying who we are, have we not thus by another route arrived at a necessary realization that the microcosm and the macrocosm, the many and the one, are again complementary aspects of a singular, unified Whole? That each of us resides at once within Cosmos, while Cosmos resides within each of us? And that any conception of “reality” that does not resolve this complementary unity is a partial equation that is fundamentally unbalanced, and is incapable of informing or contributing to the evolution of balanced systems?

Additionally, as mentioned a couple of pages further on, “There are approximately seven thousand million humans now inhabiting our planet—each experiencing his or her unique ‘reality,’ reflective every moment of who and what each one of us is. This view of things may be thought of as consisting of as many different ‘Earths,’ and as many different ‘Cosmoses,’ as there are beings experiencing them in our various ‘realities.’”¹⁹

In this way again, each of us, being the author of our own “reality,” is the creator of the entire Cosmos in which we dwell. We live, move, and have our being within that which springs fully formed from our brow—or maybe our heart—and lives, moves, and has its being within ourselves.

Now if you will, throw your mind back for a moment to the parting remark in the first Section above, leading into § 2, “Virtual Reality” Revisited: that “The time is drawing swiftly near for nascent humanity to exercise our heretofore dormant capacity for self-

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 41.

governance: essential to us as lungs, in the dimension we are now entering.” Followed by a repetition of the question, *what is a “self-governing Cosmic being?”*

We answered that question in the ensuing discussion by observing that “In fact, taking responsibility for the content of our own imaginations about sums up what it means to be *a self-governing Cosmic being.*” (p. 7)

Falone seems to concur:

Consider that the imagination is real! The raw material of imagination is the same substance and structure as the astral and etheric dimensions. IMAGINATION IS REALITY! Thus, there is no reason to deny yourselves the splendid anticipation of the inevitable by studying a two or three dimensional picture which eventually will transmute into fourth and fifth dimensional experience. Be patient, all will be revealed.²⁰

4 Transdimensional Realities

Above, § 2, I quoted a remark in a prior essay that “What ‘3-D,’ ‘4-D,’ and ‘5-D consciousness’ actually mean to those who use this terminology is far from clear to me. . . .” Having meanwhile read Falone, I believe I am finally glimpsing at least what this terminology means to somebody who has evidently given it a good deal of serious consideration. However, in order to discuss such matters, we must loosen our altered-egos’ tenacious grip exclusively upon our concepts of “third dimensional reality,” and allow ourselves to entertain possibilities from which our altered-egos have been vigilantly “protecting” us—or more precisely, defending themselves against the “inconvenient truths” which reveal the fabric of partial equations and polarized thought-forms upon which they precariously stand.

In his description of the altered-ego quoted above (p. 15), Falone remarked that “At certain periods of man’s consciousness evolution, decisions were made that limited the use and function of mind to a lower frequency or vibration resulting in a mutant form and function of the original.” He didn’t elaborate; yet I cannot help speculating that at least some of the “decisions . . . that limited the use and function of mind to a lower frequency or vibration” might have had something to do with the consequences of our Paleolithic ancestors’ experiments with agriculture thousands of years ago, discussed in #5 § 2.2 Wealth and power, pp. 11-18.²¹

²⁰Falone, 2000, p. 211.

²¹wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow05

In summary, when our hunter-gatherer Paleolithic ancestors discovered/invented the principles of agriculture, and learned how to produce their own food on demand, they “jumped the fence” that had previously kept their numbers, along with the populations of all other species, in balance with the ecological carrying capacity of their range. They secured for all time (so it must have seemed, in their time) all the food they would ever need; because they had learned how to cultivate crops, and husband herds of animals. These innovations brought with them many blessings, for they made possible, and even necessary, a more settled way of life than they had lived before, always on the move, following their food as hunter-gatherers. They settled into villages and towns, situated comfortably in fertile valleys, near rivers, lakes, and ocean bays; and they developed unique cultures, arts, architectures, and complex traditions.

However, one natural, and surely unanticipated consequence of all this, was that their populations expanded, and their settlements spread. And of course, in order to feed their expanding populations, they put more land under cultivation, and produced more food—which naturally supported further expansion of their populations. Inevitably, on a spherical planet of finite size, this process reached a point at which expanding populations began to encounter other expanding populations, with seemingly competing interests. Their inability to resolve these competing interests peacefully led inevitably to war: in which the interests of the victors unfailingly prevailed over the interests of the vanquished—and introduced an entirely new factor into the dynamic of human life.

Hence forward, for the entire duration of what became known as “civilized history,” whatever else any human culture may have been or become, *victorious in war* was considered to be its most essential quality; and this quality has been cultivated with keenly focused attention, by every human culture, in every possible way, ever since, from those ancient days, to these.

As discussed in the prior essay, this is the heritage of *The Parable of the Tribes*, developed at much greater length by Schmookler;²² and I am speculating that it had a profound impact upon all subsequent human cultural evolution, specifically in the way of “decisions . . . that limited the use and function of mind to a lower frequency or vibration;” and contributed significantly, if not decisively, to the emergence of what Falone has termed the altered-ego among humans.

Prior to the emergence of *coercive power* among humans, *Homo sapiens* occupied a privileged position among all living species upon the Earth: for our ancestors had no predators. Practically all that lived, or moved, or grew upon the Earth was potential food for humans, or otherwise abundantly available for human use; and humans were food

²²Andrew Bard Schmookler, *The Parable of the Tribes: The Problem of Power in Social Evolution*, Second Edition, State University of New York Press, 1995.

for nothing—with the possible exception of microbes, that preyed upon the unhealthy, and the infirm; and rarely, large predators, which represented no significant challenge to humans. During those idyllic days, before the dawn of “civilized history,” life for most humans must have been as close to unblemished paradise as it has ever been.

However, unlike all other species with whom humans shared our planet, humans alone had been given the blessing or curse of *limitless creative imagination*. Why this may have been was speculated upon too in the prior essay, #5 pp. 35-36:

. . . *What’s it all in aid of?* [I asked, rhetorically.] If purposeful action aimed at intentional results is not unique to humans, but is a property of Cosmos at large, does it not follow intuitively that high on the list of priorities for such a purposeful, intentional Cosmic Being would be the *company* of many other purposeful, intentional beings? Suppose for a moment that there actually is such a thing as “Cosmic, Creative, Purposeful Intelligence”—and that *you* are “That:” All of It: the Cosmic Awareness of “All That Is.” You have the ability to imagine *anything*; and imagining, bring it into existence—for that is what existence is: Your imaginative creativity at work, or in play.

Trouble is, there’s only one of You: because You are “All That Is.” There simply is nothing else, anywhere; and nowhere else for anything to be. You are Absolutely *It*. Full stop. Unless . . . You make something. This You can do: because You are imaginative, and creative; and anything You can imagine, thereby *exists*. “Let there be light,” You say: and there is light. What would You make?

I believe I am not entirely alone in speculating that such a “Cosmic, Creative, Purposeful Intelligence” might have had some interest in *companionship*, in some shape or form; and that beings like ourselves, on Earth, and presumably “elsewhere,” might have been intentionally created with this purpose in Mind.

If so, its realization would have been a formidable challenge, even to such a “Cosmic, Creative, Purposeful Intelligence.” Such a Cosmic Being would have discovered early on that not all that can be imagined actually *works* in practice. Our physicists and cosmologists have fortuitously illuminated a few of the obstacles such a Being would have encountered in the process of designing and engineering a Cosmos, such as what we find under our feet, and surrounding us, on clear, moonless, starlit nights, in the hemisphere over our heads.

For example, the three-dimensional universe is currently understood to be hung together by means of four fundamental forces, named in ascending order of their relative strengths:

- Gravitation: strength = 1;
- Weak: strength = 10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 (10²⁵);
- Electromagnetic: strength = 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 (10³⁶);
- Strong: strength = 100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 (10³⁸).²³

The relative strengths listed above are approximations. In “reality,” they each have extremely precise values, with most of the zeros replaced by digits, 1-9. If their real values were even minutely different from what they actually are, the ground under our feet, and the hemisphere of stars over our heads, would not exist. If Gravitation, for instance, were even slightly stronger, or weaker than it actually is, the entire mass of Cosmos would either be drawn together into a single superdense body without dimension, or would never have condensed into planetary, stellar, and galactic objects, such as Earth, the Moon, our Solar System, and Galaxy. Similarly, if the other three forces were even slightly different than they are, atoms, chemistry, molecules, and biological life would be impossible: because they *would not work*.

If Cosmos is an artifact of intelligent, purposeful design—an idea that is unconditionally and absolutely rejected without consideration by “scientific orthodoxy”—then it is more exquisitely and precisely designed than anything any human has ever imagined. I wonder how long it might have taken such a “Cosmic, Creative, Purposeful Intelligence,” in terms of Earth-years, to work out the intricate relationships among the forces, energetic fields, masses, volumes, etc. that work together in perpetual balance and harmony in such ways as to manifest, from sub-quantum to super-galactic scales, and for uncounted thousands of millions of Earth-years at least, the Cosmos in which we live, move, and have our being?

It seems like one of the most natural and obvious questions a person could ask—closely akin to every child’s question, more probably sooner than later: “Where did I come from, Mommy?” Every mother knows at least the proximate answer to this question, and can, if she will, return a sensible answer to her children. Yet “scientific orthodoxy,” following in the footsteps of “religious orthodoxy,” can neither admit that they *do not know*, nor deliver a sensible answer to the corresponding question about Cosmos. Isn’t this *strange*?

No, not really—considering the jolt humans must have sustained early in our development, when *victory in war* suddenly emerged as the decisive factor in the human

²³https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fundamental_interaction

condition upon planet Earth. Seemingly “overnight,” all humans everywhere shifted from the privileged position among beings of having no predatory threats in our lives, to being threatened by the most formidable predator that has ever stalked the Earth: our fellow humans, with competing interests. The “Fall from Paradise” was swift, unfailing, and excluded nobody.

Under these circumstances, it is not difficult to imagine, with compassion and regret, how the altered-ego, “which ascertains information only on the narrow frequency band of sensory feedback as manifested by the dense material plane,” could have, would have, emerged. In a former paradise transformed into a jungle of perpetual threat and danger, whose only options for response have become “fight, or flight;” victory, or defeat: all other human concerns would suddenly have become peripheral.

Small wonder, then, that the human mind has become so narrow, shut down, and so universally focused upon “low frequency” thought-forms of fear, loathing, enmity, and the skillful wielding of coercive power. One can easily imagine things going on like this, until “the bitter end:” down, down, down; from bad to worse; from worse to impossible—except for only one thing: *It doesn’t work!* And only things that *work* can persist in a Cosmos *designed* as ours has been.

Surely the imaginary world of the altered-ego is coming to a swift and inglorious end, simply because it doesn’t work. Yet Cosmos as a Whole works perfectly; has demonstrated over the course of at least thousands of millions of Earth-years, that it has what it takes to “go the distance;” and welcomes all who are able to work within it, in resonance and harmony with its proven patterns. It is a very large target: we can hardly miss.

The altered-ego, meanwhile, is paralyzed by innumerable fears: fear of the unknown; fear of defeat on any of numberless battlefields, real, imagined, or both; fear of weakness, uncertainty, doubt; fear of loss of command; fear of death. In order to venture into transdimensional domains, these fears must be faced; and if not overcome, at least set in abeyance, while one explores possibilities otherwise prohibited by the fears of the altered-ego.

One way of possibly setting the fears of the altered-ego in abeyance is through recognition that its partial equations and polarized thought-forms do not yield reliable predictions of the outcomes of fear-motivated choices. There is nothing mysterious or mystical about this. It is a simple and demonstrable fact that when one Identifies with anything, to the exclusion of its complement(s), one cannot avoid being led astray by a partial equation that “is not the whole story,” and can only yield unanticipated, unintended results. One, and perhaps the only way to avoid this repetitive error, and its consequences, is to expand the scope of one’s vision, and practice *inclusive*, as opposed to *exclusive*, perceiving: the fusion of complements, instead of polarized choices among them. This is

possible, because for instance, although the complementary quantum and wave properties of light cannot be simultaneously observed, one can easily grasp the idea that light must somehow be a fusion of quantum and wave properties, and not exclusively one, or the other.

Another way of approaching transdimensional possibilities, without setting off the altered-ego's reflexive alarms, is to venture forth with an entirely speculative posture. You need not Identify with your speculations, giving them the weight of belief, unless you want to. Your altered-ego has nothing to fear in this, because you are making no commitments, but only "looking around" at someone's maybe crazy ideas. If they really are crazy, they need not touch you; and you are always at liberty to pilot your speculations in other directions.

Yet another neutral approach to transdimensional realities is the simple realization that you are already experiencing them, and always have been. We have long since established (have we not?) that each of us lives, moves, and has our being in an "imaginary reality" entirely of our own making. "Or in other words," I quoted myself above (p. 6) from a prior essay, "in as real and literal a sense as may be expressed in word-symbols, *each of us is the author of our own 'reality'*—than which there is no other we can in any way experience."

Imagination is the stuff of which transdimensional realities are made; and each of us lives within multiple, partially overlapping "realities," fabricated entirely by our imaginations. This is at least "fourth dimensional," and maybe verges upon "fifth dimensional" experience. Meanwhile, we naturally live in and experience "third dimensional realities" as a matter of course. Yet if we insist that "third dimensional reality" is the only "real reality," we may be sure we have been misled, yet again, by a partial equation, or a polarized thought-form: for we have denied the "reality" of the largest part of human experience.

5 "Inquire Within"

Is that so? How do you (or I) *know*? Because somebody wrote it down in a book? Anybody can write down anything in a book. So, who do you ask, to verify whether whatever is written is "right," or "wrong?" Again, anybody can have any opinion at all about whatever is written in any book, or on any wall, or for that matter, is written, or spoken, or otherwise represented anywhere. There ought to be a place, or an oracle, or a guru, or some kind of "authority," where you can find out for sure what is "true," and what is "false," about anything. Shouldn't there be? Where is it?

The only “place” I have ever been able to find, where such uncertainties may be resolved, is the oracle within myself. However, there is a seeming circularity to this “solution,” inasmuch as if I ask myself any question, I can give myself any answer. Then, where lies the superior reliability of the answers I give myself, over the reliability of the answers I get, if I ask anybody else? Yet I can turn this question around, and ask instead, Where lies the superior reliability of the answers I get if I ask anybody else, over the reliability of the answers I give myself?

The answers I get to the alternative versions of this question are not the same: because when I question myself, I can know whether I am returning *honest answers*, or not. It is very difficult, if not impossible, for me to make this determination of the answers I receive from anybody else. So the questions, and their answers, are not symmetrical: I can get honest answers from myself—possibly mistaken, yet I can know at least whether they are honest, or whether I am only kidding myself. I cannot reliably make this distinction about the information I receive from any other source.

Conversely, being “somebody else” in relation to you, *you* cannot know for sure whether *my* opinions, however I express them, are honest, or may have some devious motive behind them. However, you may submit them, if you wish, to your own internal oracle, which may, if you are honest, return to you at least as reliable an evaluation of them as you are likely to find anywhere.

Accordingly, here is a thought-form in several parts that you may wish to submit to your own internal oracle for evaluation, more or less summing up a provisional answer, implied by the discussion so far, to the question, What is “a self-governing Cosmic being?”

1. Cosmos, Creation, “All That Is,” bearing any preferred label, is an *intelligent, purposeful, volitional, imaginative, creative* entity: prototypical Cosmic qualities potentially shared by Earth-humans.
2. Intelligence, purpose, volition, imagination, and creativity can exist only under conditions that include the *liberty* to exercise them.
3. The liberty to exercise intelligence, purpose, volition, imagination, and creativity requires the responsibility of *self-governance*; which is not “given,” but must be achieved.
4. Responsible self-governance among humans is possible; whereas “governance of others” is illusory, and unsustainable: because it conflicts with the exercise by “the governed” of intelligence, purpose, volition, imagination, and creativity—fundamental to mature human nature.

5. Because Earth-humans, at the time they liberated themselves from natural ecological limits upon their populations, were not yet mature, or capable of responsible self-governance, they fell into the anarchy of *coercive power*, which laid the foundation for human "civilization."
6. The coercive power central to human "civilization" stifled the liberty essential to the exercise of intelligence, purpose, volition, imagination, and creativity, and replaced the free and pure human *ego* with the *altered-ego* ruled by fear.
7. The altered-ego's fearful insistence upon the belief that "third dimensional reality" is the only "reality" possible is a *polarized thought-form*, and a *partial equation* that denies the "reality" of by far the greatest part of human experience.
8. The regime of coercive power, being in conflict with the exercise of intelligence, purpose, volition, imagination, and creativity, *does not work*, and therefore cannot persist indefinitely within the Cosmic Scheme.
9. The human achievement of responsible self-governance relies upon recovery of command of the human *imagination*; which in turn is the gateway to all *transdimensional realities*.
10. Conversely, command of the human imagination has become the linchpin of coercive power, and the stifling of human liberty essential to the continuance of "civilization."
11. The polarized perception of the altered-ego typically attempts resolution of these competing interests in mutually exclusive ways: such as expecting either *a*) the annihilation of Earth-humanity, and possibly all life on planet Earth; or *b*) the collapse of the regime of coercive power, coincident with vast planetary destruction, and possibly with the emergence of responsible self-governance among a few human survivors.
12. The inclusive perception of the pure ego merges such polarized thought-forms into complementary expressions of the unified human interest of thriving in Cosmos:
 - The emergence of responsible self-governance does not depend upon the collapse of "civilization," or the end of coercive "governance" of others: because it may be achieved and put into practice under any circumstances by the choice and effort of intelligent, purposeful, volitional, imaginative, and creative individuals.

- Individuals who govern themselves thereby remove themselves from the “governance” of others, which has always been an illusion anyway; and like a blue-water mariner set their sails in relation to shifting conditions at sea, and plot their courses on the basis of their own skills, and responsible intentions.
- Because thought-forms “are alive, once they take shape, and assume an independent, interdependent life of their own” (p. 13), an essential part of responsible self-governance is responsibility for one’s thought-forms.
- Because any thought-form that would affect the choice of another human constitutes a potential trespass against the exercise of intelligence, purpose, volition, imagination, and creativity, by the principle that it is against one’s interests to give what one does not wish to receive, responsible self-governance requires vigilance against the shaping of thought-forms that could trespass upon the choices of others.
- Such responsibly self-governing individuals need not “defend themselves” against the futile efforts by others to “govern” them, because having recovered command of their own imaginations, they are not subject to the influence of “governing” thought-forms.
- This is so because as discussed above (p. 11) “the ‘reality’ we experience is doubly a reflection of who and what we are: *a*) because whatever we imagine is what we see and experience; and *b*) it attracts to us multiple duplicates and variations of what we imagine, in the form of others like ourselves who are imagining ‘realities’ similar to ours.”
- Being vigilant against the shaping of thought-forms that could trespass upon the choices of others, responsibly self-governing individuals are attracted to, and attract to themselves, other responsibly self-governing individuals who are likewise vigilant against the shaping of thought-forms that could trespass upon the choices of others.
- In this way, simply by becoming a responsibly self-governing individual, each person contributes as a matter of course to the emergence of a “post-civilized” human society, without coming into conflict in any way with “civilization”—which already has many more “problems” than it can handle anyway.
- As this process gently unfolds, third dimensional reality emerges as only one of innumerable transdimensional realities available to mature and liberated human intelligence, purpose, volition, imagination, and creativity.

Again: *Is that so?* “Inquire Within.”