

***The Writing on the Wall #7:
“Not All That Can Be Imagined
Works In Practice”***

J. Harmon Grahn

The Writing on the Wall #7:
“Not All That Can Be Imagined Works In Practice”
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
v12, September 21, 2012

The Writing on the Wall #7:

“Not All That Can Be Imagined Works In Practice”

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

0	Introduction & Synopsis	1
1	The Beginning	8
2	“Civilization”	12
3	“Post-Civilization”	17
3.1	Transdimensional Possibilities	18
3.2	Life and Death	18
3.3	“Knowledge”	20
3.4	Tolerance	21
3.5	Wisdom	23
3.6	Love	24
4	Many Worlds	30
4.1	“Quantum Weirdness”	32
4.2	An Alternative Interpretation	37
4.3	Implications	42
4.3.1	A Remote View	45
4.3.2	Imagination and “Reality”	50
4.3.3	Alternative Time Lines	53
5	Convergences	57

0 Introduction & Synopsis

In what follows, we cover a good deal of ground in various domains, which probably do not command a great deal of attention in most people's daily lives. Perhaps these matters "should" command greater attention: for *they draw into question virtually everything "everybody knows" to be "self-evidently true" about "reality."* In summary, there seems to be a *convergence* from a number of different fields of interest upon a vision of "reality" in striking contrast to what we might term "conventional views"—not excluding the thoroughly entrenched views of "scientific orthodoxy." The contemporary residents of planet Earth, wherever, and whoever we may be, seem to be sharing an experience in which all the ways of life to which we have, collectively and individually, grown placidly accustomed, like it or not, are being "shaken up." The cards (in the "civilized house of cards") are being vigorously reshuffled; "a new game's afoot!" and the name of that game, in a single word, is *LOVE*.

But what does that one word *mean*? It has been used in so many different ways, in so many different contexts, from the sacred to the profane, that by itself it cannot be said to convey any meaning whatsoever, to anyone. Therefore, we shall here take an unhurried, meandering stroll, employing many words, to wend our way eventually to a visionary glimpse of what that one word might possibly mean for the future of humanity.

In § 1 **The Beginning**, we commence our discussion with the title observation that *not all that can be imagined works in practice*; and conclude speculatively that not even "Almighty Bob"—in this connection, supposed to be "Creator of the Heavens and the Earth"—is excluded from the rigors of this discipline. The equation, " $2 + 2 = 4$," for example, is one that *works*—for you, for me, and for "Almighty Bob." The *partial equation*, " $2 + 2 = 5$ " *does not work*, for you, for me, or for "Almighty Bob;" and unaltered, cannot be made to work, by any of us—although with various alterations, it can be *balanced*, and turned into a *whole equation*; as for example, " $2 + 2 = 5 - 1$."

In § 2 "**Civilization**"—here always enclosed in quotes, because it has never fulfilled its advertising—we underline what we have often stated in prior essays, mainly that "civilization" is a mechanism that *does not work*; and in its present and historical form, cannot be made to work. This is so for a very simple and uncompromising reason, *viz.*: "all human 'civilizations' have been established and maintained by means of the coercive power of the more powerful, exercising their will at the expense of the will of the less powerful." The "bedrock principle" upon which all "civilizations" have been founded was enunciated succinctly by the ancient Athenians to the conquered Melians during the Peloponnesian War (-431 to -404): *that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must.*

The reason this system doesn't work is "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."

If so, then we Earth-humans find ourselves in a rather "tight spot" just now: because we've been doing this "civilization" thing for at least the past *five thousand years*—or for as long you like to trace the continuity of human "civilization." "Civilization" is all we know; and *if it does not work*, what are we to do instead? This is not a question with any "easy answers."

In § 2, we also give consideration to some "transdimensional" possibilities, and note a number of ways in which "civilized" humans actually spend most of our daily time in states of consciousness significantly removed from "third dimensional reality." Thus we feel justified in suggesting here that "there is a great deal more to human life than 'third dimensional reality.'"

In § 3 "Post-Civilization", we begin to seek viable approaches to the tough questions with which we Earth-humans are now confronted: *If not "civilization," what?* Where do we go from here? *That works?*

In § 3.1 **Transdimensional Possibilities**, we note briefly that "Stepping deliberately beyond the fences of 'third dimensional reality' at once opens vast, unexplored, and mostly unimagined domains of possibility; and casts us upon uncharted seas that may be sown with hazardous reefs, and unknown dragons of the deeps—and *perhaps . . .* with unimagined blessings as well;" and warn that "these *speculations* are not anticipated to appeal to 'just anybody.'" § 3.1, like its following Subsections (with one exception) are quite brief.

§ 3.2 **Life and Death** briefly considers the mysterious transition between the status of being "alive," and being "dead;" and notes that "just as observation of the wave properties of light excludes observation of its quantum properties, so the observable differences between a living being and a lifeless corpse are *partial equations*, or *polarized thought-forms*, and 'are not the whole story.'"

§ 3.3 "**Knowledge**"—like "civilization" is enclosed in quotes—because I find, as with "civilization," reason to doubt that "knowledge" fulfills its advertising; and observe in a footnote (20) that "One may *persuade* others to share one's 'certainty;' or bludgeon them, or terrorize them, or otherwise coerce them at least to espouse one's views; but *proof*, applicable in mathematics, is a slippery term, which may not have applicability within 'third dimensional reality.' 'As far as the theorems of mathematics refer to reality, they are

not certain, and as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality.' —Albert Einstein (1879-1955)"

§ 3.4 **Tolerance** recommends that “*tolerance* for ‘alternative realities’ is an essential condition for the emergence of a ‘post-civilization’ that actually *works*,” 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. If we forfeit command of our own imaginations, we are most thoroughly and effectively enslaved. Thus uniformity among ‘realities’ authored by those who inhabit them cannot possibly be achieved without stifling human purpose, intelligence, and creativity.”

However, “uniformity among ‘realities’ has been high on every ‘civilized’ agenda since the dawn of ‘civilization;” and “If one hopes to dwell in peace within the unique ‘reality’ of his own imaginative fabrication, he is clearly obliged not to interfere with others who similarly hope to dwell within their unique ‘realities.’ The corollary, of course, is that those who are unwilling to allow their ‘realities’ to others, will surely forfeit the same liberty they deny. This plays out in ‘civilization,’ even among the strong, who ‘do what they can,’ no less than among the weak, who ‘suffer what they must.” Why this is so is discussed further in § 3.4.

§ 3.5 **Wisdom** makes a bid to gather under its wings the concerns of the prior Subsections; yet admits that “the ‘wisdom’ of one may appear as ‘unwisdom’ in the appraisal of another;” and that for the past several thousand years “‘civilization’ has been presumed among virtually all ‘civilized’ people not only to *work*, but to be the *only system of social organization that can possibly work* among humans, anywhere, ever. Yet in the midst of mounting chaos in every part of the ‘civilized world,’ we have ventured here to suggest that ‘civilization’ does not work, never has worked, other than as an ‘emergency measure’ to bridge the gestation, or infancy of the human species; and never will work on a permanent basis: because the coercive preemption by the more powerful of the choices of the less powerful runs exactly counter to all the patterns in Cosmos that manifestly do work. Is such a suggestion *wisdom*, or *folly*? Only *you* may decide that; and act accordingly.”

§ 3.6 **Love** is the exception to the rule of *brevity* that applies to the prior Subsections; and it seems to be the “heart” upon which this entire essay converges. It quotes Jesus, including *Matthew 7:12*, and *Luke 6:31*: “Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye so to them;” and continues with paraphrases to similar effect from many “transdimensional” traditions, ancient and contemporary.

All of these statements have about them the properties of *whole equations*—clearly distinguishable from the *partial equations* of the altered-ego. They might be summarized as expressions of a universal equation between *self* and *everything “else,”* or as statements of the fundamental unity, or one-

ness of all things, including the individual self. They share in common the quality of being *inclusive*, not *exclusive*. They are expressions of "Living, Loving Divinity."

They may also converge upon that illusive vision we are groping toward: the vision of a "post-civilization" *that actually works*. The statements listed above, and others like them in various forms, are quite familiar to all "civilized" people, everywhere. Yet they are often far removed from actual 'civilized' practice—which seems in general to be much more closely aligned with, "Do unto others, before others do unto you."

The later part of § 3.6 gives consideration to the astonishing *near death experience* (NDE) and recovery from terminal cancer of Anita Moorjani; who when hospitalized in a comatose state the morning of 2/2/2006, was not expected to survive the next 36 hours. Moorjani describes her vivid experience during her "comatose" state, while medical tests on her vital functions were being analyzed; how she was embraced by overwhelming love, and was *given the choice as to how her medical tests should turn out*. That is, her medical tests could either show catastrophic organ failure as the cause of her death; or could show no trace of cancer anywhere within her body. Moorjani took the second option, emerged from her coma, just in time to receive the results of her medical tests, which showed healthy organ function. Extensive follow-up tests could find no trace of malignancy anywhere within her body.

This episode raises fundamental questions about the nature of "reality;" which we begin to explore in the following Section.

§ 4 **Many Worlds** commences an extended examination, including the related Subsections, and Sub-subsections, of what is understood, or misunderstood, about some of the more esoteric and arcane aspects of "reality." Of particular interest are the implications of *quantum mechanics*, and its alternative interpretations.

Surprisingly, there was evidently little interest among advanced theoretical physicists in the implications about "reality" that follow from the startling discoveries of the pioneer quantum physicists during the period prior to, and following World War II. "A common academic policy," wrote Osnaghi, et al. in a paper cited in § 4, "was to gather theoreticians and experimentalists together in order to favour experiments and concrete applications, rather than abstract speculations. This practical attitude was further increased by the impressive development of physics between the 1930s and the 1950s, driven on the one hand by the need to apply the new quantum theory to a wide range of atomic and subatomic phenomena, and on the other hand by the pursuit of military goals."

Now this strikes me [I write] as a quite revealing commentary: because it may furnish a "real-world" example of the idea . . . that the purposeful, intelligent creativity of the "more powerful" is stifled by the exercise of coercive power, no less than is that of the "less powerful:" because the former—not excluding even the hallowed halls of advanced scientific research—are under the perpetual threat of usurpation, sooner or later, by an even greater power.

The impression I take away with me is that the leading-edge pioneers during the early days of quantum physics simply had very little interest in the philosophical implications of their own discoveries: because the technical applications to which fledgling quantum theory was applied, primarily to *victory in war*, and the probable *economic leverage* they made possible (which amounts, at bottom, to the same thing), occupied a much higher priority in their evaluation than did their discoveries' philosophical implications. Those who numbered themselves among the 'more powerful' in those days—or whose research was financed by them—simply did not have time for philosophical implications. They were all too keenly occupied with "more important" matters, such as fighting the cold war, and keeping pace with the arms race—or in sum, defending their power against the possible emergence of a greater power: the "lose/lose game" humans have been playing on Earth since the dawn of "civilization."

§ 4.1 "Quantum Weirdness" is where we get a little dirt under our fingernails by digging into some of the more accessible aspects of quantum theory—particularly in what came to be known as the Copenhagen Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. The Copenhagen Interpretation, centered around Danish physicist Niels Bohr, arrived almost reluctantly at some highly counterintuitive conclusions about the nature of "reality"—at least at the quantum scale. Without going into it in advance, suffice to say that § 4.1 provides some basic background for the following Subsection.

§ 4.2 **An Alternative Interpretation** wends its way by easy stages to consideration of . . . well, an alternative interpretation of quantum mechanics, developed by American physicist Hugh Everett III, to the effect that (quoting from § 4.2) "all so-called 'material objects,' that manifest in any way as existing, may be considered to be wave functions. Another way of saying this is that there are no 'solids:' there are only waves, or wave functions. That is simply what photons, electrons, atoms, molecules, cells, organisms, planets, solar systems, galaxies—or anything, and every thing, including you and me—are: infinitely various wave functions."

Everett called his theory *The Theory of the Universal Wave Function*. It was his doctoral thesis at Princeton University in 1956, and was later referred to as "the many-worlds in-

terpretation (MWI) of quantum physics.” At the time, it was *not* well received—in Copenhagen, or anywhere else; and after securing his Doctorate, Everett left Princeton, and theoretical physics, and never returned.

§ 4.3 **Implications**, including the following Sub-subsections, is another extended discussion, this time of implications following from, or giving consideration to, Everett’s theory of the universal wave function. In light of Everett’s theory, we return our attention to the case of Anita Moorjani, and ask, “Was this an instance of *a bifurcation in the space/time continuum*—or what? Follow-up tests were immediately and repeatedly run, none of which returned so much as a trace of cancer anywhere in Moorjani’s body. Her doctors had no satisfactory explanation for her virtually instantaneous recovery, but ‘put it down to me suddenly responding to the chemo,’ Moorjani remarked; and she lived to tell her tale to the world.”

One of the implications of “the Everettian heresy” [the § 4.3 discussion continues] is that somewhere there is an “alternate reality” in which Anita Moorjani never recovered from her coma: her organs shut down, as anticipated by her doctors, followed by a funeral attended in great sorrow by her family and friends; and the story of her “miraculous” recovery was never told. But that is not the “reality” in which you, and I, and Anita Moorjani live today. We live in a “reality” in which all this “really happened,” and a live and healthy Anita Moorjani shares the “real world” with you and me. Makes a fellow think a bit, what?

In § 4.3.1 **A Remote View**, we turn our attention to the work of Courtney Brown, PhD, Director and founder of the Farsight Institute, a nonprofit research and educational organization dedicated to the study of a phenomenon of nonlocal consciousness known as *remote viewing*.

Remote viewing involves achieving a fluid state of consciousness in which the Viewer becomes skilled at suspending the usually active conscious mentality, and taking note of subconscious content without the normally reflexive intervention of the conscious mind. This is a subtle, delicate process that requires practice and perseverance to master; yet it can be learned by anyone who focuses the necessary effort.

The precision and spectrum of results achievable through the rigorous protocols of what Brown terms Scientific Remote Viewing (SRV) are very difficult to “explain,” or even rationally comprehend, within the framework of conventional views of “reality,” or classical

epistemology. The same may be said of the NDE of Anita Moorjani. These clearly observed and unambiguously documented phenomena simply *cannot be*—if “reality” really is “like everybody thinks it is.” Evidently, it is not. So, “*What in Sam Hill’s goin’ on?*”

§ 4.3.2 **Imagination and “Reality”** makes a stab, in a highly speculative manner, at grappling with this conundrum. From the perspective of our historical and prehistoric past, we have unmistakably entered *terra incognita* here, and creative speculation is our only map.

The demonstrable and demonstrated fact that remote viewing is even possible, with any verifiable reliability at all, is a paradigm-shifting circumstance: for it suggests possibilities not imaginable from within the confines of classical epistemology. It may even be so that remote viewing itself, far from being a bizarre phenomenon beyond the experience of most “normal humans,” may be among the most common of human experiences. It is imaginable that exercise of the creative imagination consists in essence of “tuning in,” perhaps with varying fidelity, to “alternate realities” that actually *exist* “somewhere” within the universal wave function that manifests all possible “realities”—including, by the way, those that work, and those that, like ours, do not.

This is entirely speculative, and is not intended as a description of “how things really are.” How “things *really* are” may be considered in many different ways, on the basis of many different assumptions, or speculations. Under some circumstances, it may be useful to consider imagination as a facility for “tuning in” to “alternate realities” that are presumed already to exist “somewhere.” In other circumstances, this may be too passive an approach to imagination, and assigning it instead a more actively *creative* function, in which it is instrumental in bringing “alternative realities” into actuality, may be a more useful approach. These alternatives may be complementary views, either one of which, exclusive of the other, produce partial equations that “are not the whole story.”

§ 4.3.3 **Alternative Time Lines** introduces yet another element into this rich mixture of imaginable possibilities that may, for some, become extraordinary—or maybe only ordinary actualities. The source of the element under discussion in § 4.3.3 are *the Hathors*, “transdimensional” beings who are not entirely “foreign” to this essay series.

Of particular interest here is a recent Hathor communication titled *The Sphere of All Possibilities: A Hathor Planetary Message through Tom Kenyon*, dated August 18, 2012; in which is described a method of manifesting new realities by means of the Sphere of All Possibilities.

Perhaps in part because I have been thinking rather intensively in these terms for some time, I perceived in the Hathors' sphere of all possibilities elements in common with Hugh Everett's universal wave function, as I have been imagining it.

The information we are giving here in this message [the Hathors write] is meant to assist you in manifesting new realities for yourself and for humanity. This method greatly accelerates the manifesting process, and since time, as you perceive it, is speeding up we believe a method that works quickly will be of great benefit.

. . . *manifesting new realities for yourself and for humanity.* Quickly. Now on the basis of the discussion so far, this may not be regarded as just an empty phrase. In the near death experience of Anita Moorjani, the theoretical physics of Hugh Everett, and the work in remote viewing by Courtney Brown and associates, we have discussed at considerable length some pretty compelling reasons not to dismiss casually the utterances of the Hathors about "manifesting new realities."

§ 5 **Convergences** attempts to pull this assortment of thoughts and observations into a coherent vision for a human future that may have some plausibility for a self-selected few with "resonant" inclinations. Or, this essay, and its prequels and sequels, may amount to no more than a series of "school exercises" for the author, in the ongoing process of becoming his future self. They make no claims, nor have attached to them any expectations. Simply having been written, they fulfill their entire purpose.

1 The Beginning

This edition of *The Writing on the Wall* springs from a remark in the prior edition, § 4 Transdimensional Realities, in reference to a "Cosmic, Creative, Purposeful Intelligence" that may be imagined to have purposefully designed and created the Cosmos in which we find ourselves at this time. "Such a Cosmic Being," I wrote, "would have discovered early on that not all that can be imagined actually *works* in practice."¹

This raises an intriguing metaphysical question: *If* Cosmos, "All That Is," is imagined as the work of a "Cosmic, Creative, Purposeful Intelligence"—we'll call Him "Almighty

¹Grahn, *The Writing on the Wall #6: "Inquire Within"*, p. 20.
wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow06

Bob”—is He in any way bound by constraints that limit the shape or nature of His Creations? And if so, what is the origin of such constraints, assuming that “Almighty Bob” is the source and starting point from Which, or Whom, follows everything that exists, anywhere, at any time?

For example: in the Cosmos with which we have some tangential familiarity, it seems to be unequivocally “true” that $2 + 2 = 4$; or that $\bullet\bullet + \bullet\bullet = \bullet\bullet\bullet$. However, if it had suited His purposes, could “Almighty Bob” have created a Cosmos in which it is “true” instead that $2 + 2 = 5$? Or that $\bullet\bullet + \bullet\bullet = (\text{count them}) \bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet$? And if not, why not? After all, this is “Almighty Bob” we’re talking about, the “Creator of the Heavens and the Earth,” not “just anybody.”

Some years back, I ran across an item (this is supposed to be a “true story”) describing how a State Legislature somewhere attempted to write into Law a measure intended to simplify things that seemed unnecessarily complicated to the sponsor of the bill. The effect of the proposed legislation was to make it a Law in that State that π , the ratio between the circumference and the diameter of a circle, should henceforth be 3.0000 exactly, instead of the more cumbersome 3.14159265358979323846264338327950288419716939937511 . . . ,² a non-repeating irrational decimal fraction that has no theoretical final digit. Fortunately, a mathematician was in observance in the gallery during the Legislative Session in which the bill was being considered, and ventured to explain to the Legislators why such a Law should not be enacted.

However, in the interest of making Cosmos a less complicated place, could “Almighty Bob” have enacted such a Cosmic Law, when He first started creating things, and putting them in motion? Again, if not, why not? Who, or What dictates conditions to “Almighty Bob?”

The equations discussed above may be visualized as being represented by means of a mechanical balance beam, suspending at either end two identical pans. In one pan may be placed, for example, 2 + 2 identical objects: $\bullet\bullet + \bullet\bullet$; and in the opposite pan a number of the same kind of object, such as $\bullet\bullet\bullet$, or $\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet$, or $\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet$. I think you will probably expect intuitively, as I do, that if you actually perform this thought experiment in “third dimensional reality,” or I do, or “Almighty Bob” does, we will all find without exception that only when the number of identical objects in both pans is the same, will the perfectly adjusted beam balance perfectly.

If we define perfect balance of the system as “working,” and imperfect balance, or imbalance, as “not working,” our thought experiment suggests that in relation to “things that work,” and “things that don’t work,” “Almighty Bob” may be surprisingly kindred

²CRC Standard Mathematical Tables, 25th Edition, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 1978, p. 5.

with “plain ordinary Bob,” and with you, and with me. Accordingly, I speculate that, if Cosmos really is a product of purposeful design, then “Almighty Bob” (or/and Whoever, or Whatever else may have participated in its design and creation) must have devoted considerable “attention,” one way or another, to working out, in excruciating detail, exactly what works, and what does not work in practice, in order to have come up with the Cosmos in which we now find ourselves.

In this respect, I imagine “Almighty Bob” cannot be a whole lot different from “plain ordinary Bob,” who makes intricate kinetic sculpture whirligigs in his garage across the street. Except that “Almighty Bob” had a lot more “time” than may be available to “Neighbor Bob”—allowing scope to the Former for significantly more ambitious projects (such as the invention and manufacture of electrons, protons, neutrons, atoms, planets, solar systems, galaxies . . . to name only a few) than the latter may wish even to contemplate.

Among humans, the inventive/creative process is prototypically exemplified by Croatian genius-inventor Nikola Tesla, 1856-1943, who described in his autobiography³ how he routinely designed complex mechanisms entirely within his imagination, in which he perfected them without the aid of drawings or laboratory testing. He described his method of invention like this:

The moment one constructs a device to carry into practice a crude idea, he finds himself unavoidably engrossed with the details of the apparatus. As he goes on improving and reconstructing, his force of concentration diminishes and he loses sight of the great underlying principle. Results may be obtained, but always at the sacrifice of quality. My method is different. I do not rush into actual work. When I get an idea, I start at once building it up in my imagination. I change the construction, make improvements and operate the device in my mind. It is absolutely immaterial to me whether I run my turbine in thought or test it in my shop. I even note if it is out of balance. There is no difference whatever; the results are the same. In this way I am able to rapidly develop and perfect a conception without touching anything. When I have gone so far as to embody in the invention every possible improvement I can think of and see no fault anywhere, I put into concrete form this final product of my brain. Invariably my device works as I conceived that it should, and

³Tesla’s autobiography, titled *The Strange Life of Nikola Tesla*. “This text has been entered by John R.H. Penner from a small booklet found in a used bookstore for \$2.50. The only form of date identification is the name of the original purchaser, Arthua Daine (?), dated April 29, 1978.” Copyright © 1995 by John R.H. Penner. wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#tesla

the experiment comes out exactly as I planned it. In twenty years there has not been a single exception.⁴

In this way, Tesla described an inventive process very similar in principle to how I imagine "Almighty Bob" might have plausibly invented Cosmos: working out in pure imagination every detail and nuance of His Creation, possibly before "fabricating" so much as a single electron. This process, whether engaged by "Almighty Bob," Nikola Tesla, or by you, or me; and whether conducted in the laboratory, in the field, or entirely within the imagination; is in all cases one of sorting out and keeping elements that *work*, and perfecting or discarding elements that *don't work*. It is in essence an *evolutionary* process, or a process of *selection*—yet not Darwinian "natural selection," which "scientific orthodoxy" insists without compromise is entirely a "mindless" and "purposeless" process. Rather, the selection process Tesla described, and creative beings everywhere employ in countless different ways, is in essence an unambiguously conscious and purposeful process aimed at intended results—*that work*—among all the results that may be imagined, but *do not work*.

As Nikola Tesla—and as I imagine "Almighty Bob"—have employed this imaginative process, it becomes quickly evident that, for possibly mysterious reasons, "not all that can be imagined works in practice." Thus " $2 + 2 = 4$ " *works*; " $2 + 2 = 5$," although it can be imagined, *does not work*, and cannot be made to work. Similarly, " $\pi = 3.0000$ " does not work; whereas " $\pi = 3.14159265358979323846264338327950288419716939937511 . . .$ " does—although for the purposes of most projects undertaken by human hands, " $\pi = 3.14$ " works just about as well; with the advantage that it is only slightly more complicated, yet is significantly more truthful, than is " $\pi = 3.0000$." Greater precision may be achieved if required, by extending the value of π by two or three additional decimal places—or if necessary, by even more.

In any case, if an intended result is to be achieved in any endeavor, elements that do not work must be excluded, amended, or replaced by others that do—whether it is you, me, Nikola Tesla, or "Almighty Bob," seeking results. The creativity of *any* creative being consists not only in forming creative thoughts and ideas, but also in refining them by a process of purposeful selection aimed at identifying within them every element that does not work, and eliminating it, correcting it, or replacing it with elements that do work.

⁴*Ibid*, p. 5.

2 “Civilization”

Now the trend of this series of essays has taken the position that human “civilization” is a mechanism that *does not work*: for the reason that all human “civilizations” have been established and maintained by means of the coercive power of the more powerful, exercising their will at the expense of the will of the less powerful. How this may have come about is discussed at some length in *The Writing on the Wall* #5 § 2.2 Wealth and Power;⁵ and the reason it doesn’t work is quite simply “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.”⁶

We’ve been through all this before; and are left with the question, of swiftly mounting urgency: “If what we humans have been doing here on Earth for the past several thousand years *doesn’t work*, what should we do instead that *does work*?” I’ve been going round and round in circles about this, and coming up with very little in the way of a “practicable answer” to it. Yet when I step out under the stars at night, I see all around me an overwhelmingly abundant manifestation of an entire Cosmos that manifestly *does work*, flawlessly, and as far as I can tell, eternally. Even right here on Earth, there yet remains a fantastically rich cornucopia throughout the “natural world”—in distinction from the “civilized world”—filled with things that *work*, flawlessly, beautifully, exquisitely; marred and wounded only by the ham-fisted and unenlightened meddlings of “civilized” humans—by no means excluding myself.

If all humans were to vanish overnight from the face of the Earth—without further disturbance to the planet—I fancy that Earth would with amazing resiliency heal the wounds inflicted by humans, regain her equilibrium, and “live happily ever after” in uninterrupted ecological bliss—*without humans*.⁷ Why cannot such a paradisaical state be

⁵wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/wow05.html#econ02.2.0
wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow05

⁶*The Writing on the Wall* #6, p. 4. wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow06

⁷Although I must also admit that it may already be “too late” for such an outcome to develop on three-dimensional planet Earth, without the *enlightened* intervention of humans. See in *The Writing on the Wall* #5, p. 42, the sobering observation that “the ‘worst case scenario’ at Fukushima, as described above in § 4 The End, may eventuate; leaving in its wake a gray planet Earth, void of life, and dusted from pole to pole with lethal layers of cesium-137, and other long-lived radioactive isotopes—piled in heaps and drifts during succeeding years, as the no longer manned nuclear waste sites around the world decay and collapse in neglect, adding their radioactive poisons to the dead planet’s atmosphere, surface, and oceans.”
wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/wow05.html#spec06.16

achieved *with humans*? The manifest presence all around us, over our heads, and under our feet, of a world and Cosmos *that work* bears powerful testimony that it *can* be achieved. The question is: *How?* How do we get “there” from “here?”

This becomes an intensely *personal* question, as well as a collective human dilemma incumbent upon all residents of planet Earth. I regret to confess that, in my personal “dark night of the soul,” I do not have a “ready answer” to it that may be applied to the apparent situation on three-dimensional planet Earth. However, it is also intuitively apparent to me that Cosmos, Earth, and humanity (including myself), in order to exist at all, must be vastly more than “mere” three-dimensional artifacts. Whether we are consciously aware of it or not, our being must include “transdimensional” aspects beyond our obviously three-dimensional experiencing.

In *The Writing on the Wall #6* § 4 Transdimensional Realities, pp. 22-23, I wrote:

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.⁸

I believe it cannot be an exaggeration to say that most people spend most of our time “elsewhere” than within “third dimensional reality.” For consider:

- Practically everybody requires about eight hours’ sleep, more or less, out of every 24; at least a portion of which is occupied with experiences in “dreamtime,” whether recalled upon waking, or not; and all of which is by definition passed in a state of unconsciousness, during which one is oblivious to “third dimensional reality.”

⁸wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow06

- In addition to that, the average American—and this may be generally applicable to the average “civilized human”—spends four to six hours every day watching television. Most of this time is passed in a state of highly suggestible receptivity, almost entirely detached from the “third dimensional reality” in which the viewer’s three-dimensional body is situated.⁹
- In addition to the time spent daily either in sleep, or watching television, with few exceptions, everybody spends a significant part of every day performing repetitive, routine tasks, such as driving familiar routes, sorting or assembling parts, washing dishes, peeling vegetables etc., which require only a fraction of one’s conscious attention. During this time, most of one’s attention is quite “somewhere else,” which hardly interferes at all with whatever task occupies the three-dimensional body; and takes place “elsewhere” than within “third dimensional reality.”
- Additionally, growing numbers of humans are spending increasing amounts of time, probably overlapping with other items mentioned here, under the influence of intoxicants and consciousness-altering substances, including but not limited to medically prescribed drugs, that have the effect of placing them “elsewhere” than squarely within “third dimensional reality.”
- Adding all these up, and extending them over the course of human lifetimes, how much time is spent, on average, among “civilized humans,” in conscious, purposeful *presence*, “right here, right now,” within “third dimensional reality?”

My off-the-cuff guess is, “not much.” However, this may not be entirely a “bad thing.” For one, it demonstrates rather strikingly that there is a great deal more to human life than “third dimensional reality.” This alone is something worthy of pondering.

Nikola Tesla, mentioned above (pp. 10-11), evidently spent a very significant portion of his life “elsewhere” than within “third dimensional reality:” with spectacularly productive results. Tesla vividly described some of his “transdimensional” excursions—although he did not himself represent them in these terms. Yet how might the following be more appropriately described than as a “transdimensional” excursion?

. . . I instinctively commenced to make excursions beyond the limits of the small world of which I had knowledge, and I saw new scenes. These were at

⁹In this state, virtually the entire imagination of the viewer is captivated by whatever entities are responsible for the content being viewed. Hence, if I may venture a suggestion without trespassing upon the choices of others, I would suggest to those who seriously intend to become *self-governing Cosmic beings* (see #6 § 1 & 2) that they reduce—ideally to zero—their daily time spent viewing television.

first very blurred and indistinct, and would flit away when I tried to concentrate my attention upon them. They gained in strength and distinctness and finally assumed the concreteness of real things. I soon discovered that my best comfort was attained if I simply went on in my vision further and further, getting new impressions all the time, and so I began to travel; of course, in my mind. Every night, (and sometimes during the day), when alone, I would start on my journeys—see new places, cities and countries; live there, meet people and make friendships and acquaintances and, however unbelievable, it is a fact that they were just as dear to me as those in actual life, and not a bit less intense in their manifestations.¹⁰

Tesla may be an extreme example, with few parallels among humans; yet his experiences and remarkably creative accomplishments demonstrate some elements of the human potential. And of course there are other remarkable individuals who have demonstrated others. Even if these are extremes, establishing the high-water mark, beyond the achievement of “ordinary people,” still they demonstrate possibilities in principle potentially within the reach of others who are willing to stretch themselves to achieve them too, and even to surpass them. Roger Bannister was the first man to run a mile in less than four minutes (3:59.4, Oxford, England, 1954). Since then, his record has been broken many times—because, it may be argued, Bannister had first demonstrated that it could be done.

“Civilization,” even if its citizens spend relatively little time there, is wholly an artifact of “third dimensional reality”—at least inasmuch as its bedrock foundation is *victory in war*, and the prevalence of the more powerful over the less powerful. As implied in #5 § 2.2 Wealth and Power, when two expanding human populations encounter each other, for instance seeking additional territory to put under cultivation to produce the food needed to feed their expanding numbers, a corollary of the three-dimensional law that “two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time” asserts itself. In “civilized history,” the outcome of such collisions has typically been decided by war: in which the victor occupies the territory of the vanquished; the latter being either annihilated, dispossessed, or enslaved.

The Greek historian Thucydides, (approximately) -471 to -400, depicted the essence of this situation, in which the Athenian delegation dictated terms to the Melians:

For ourselves [the Athenians said], we shall not trouble you with specious pretenses—either of how we have a right to our empire because we overthrew the Mede, or are now attacking you because of wrong that you have done

¹⁰Tesla, pp. 4-5. wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#tesla

us—and make a long speech which would not be believed; and in return we hope that you, instead of thinking to influence us by saying that you did not join the Lacedaemonians, although their colonists, or that you have done us no wrong, will aim at what is feasible, holding in view the real sentiments of us both; since you know as well as we do that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must.¹¹

This is a quite “practical,” “down-to-Earth,” “three-dimensional” assessment of the situation—as well as of countless situations like it throughout preceding and succeeding “civilized history.” In historical fact, there can hardly be a more succinct and complete summing up of what “civilization,” at bottom, has always been in principle than this: *that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must.* All else is “window dressing,” or the sugar coating on a bitter pill. In contemporary “civilized” parlance, this inflexible principle bears the label, *realpolitik*.

It may be thought ironic that this principle should have been enunciated by the *Athenians*, whose “Golden Age of Pericles” (the span of but a single generation) has been held among succeeding generations to have exemplified the best that “civilization” has ever had to offer—followed by its tragic self-destruction in the Peloponnesian War.

Ironic, maybe; yet not surprising: for Periclean Athens, notwithstanding its inspiring architecture, art, drama, and philosophy, was no less a *slave state* than any that have risen or fallen, from that time to this. As in all “civilized” states, Athenian high culture was by, of, and for the privileged classes: the *free men* of Athens; not for the far more numerous women and slaves, who actually performed the mundane tasks necessary to keep the Athenian high culture functioning from one day to the next. The free men were empowered to “do what they can;” while women and slaves were forced to “suffer what they must:” the same as practiced—often in more or less disguised terms—in any “civilized society,” then and now.

As stated at the outset of this Section, and repeated variously throughout this series: in a Cosmos created and inhabited by purposeful, intelligent, creative beings, the principle enunciated by the Athenians to the Melians *does not work*, and cannot be made to work: simply and inescapably *because it stifles*—alike for the more, and for the less powerful—*purposeful, intelligent creativity*; which cannot thrive or persist, absent the *liberty* to exercise it. Full stop.

¹¹*The History of the Peloponnesian War*, Chapter XVII, Sixteenth Year of the War—The Melian Conference—Fate of Melos. Translated by Richard Crawley.
classics.mit.edu/Thucydides/pelopwar.mb.txt

3 “Post-Civilization”

So here we come round the circle once again: *If not “civilization,” what? Where do we go from here? That works?*

It seems natural that anyone coming from a “civilized” heritage—even those who might provisionally entertain the arguments proposed so far suggesting that, if humanity has a future, it must lie somewhere beyond “civilization”—would expect that future to unfold, as has the human past, upon the stage of three-dimensional planet Earth. This is the stage upon which all human events occur, is it not? today, tomorrow, and throughout human history, and prehistory. Where else, if not right here on Earth, would future human events be staged?

The answer appears to be so obvious that the question itself seems absurd. Are the pioneers of “post-civilization” to go kiting off into outer space to find another Earth-like planet somewhere to colonize? How? Where? And even supposing that a few privileged humans were somehow able to get “off planet,” and locate a biologically habitable “Virgin Earth” somewhere else among the stars: taking their “civilized” heritage with them, what assurance would “the menace from Earth”¹² have that they would not botch the venture just as thoroughly as Earth-humans have done on this planet? The notion is practically ridiculous, and cannot be taken seriously.

However, although we have acknowledged that “‘civilization’ . . . is wholly an artifact of ‘third dimensional reality,’” we have also observed how “third dimensional reality” is not, even now, where most “civilized” people spend most of our time.

Particularly, as described by Tesla above (pp. 10-11), the creative process takes place almost entirely outside of “third dimensional reality,” where some of its 3-D manifestations sometimes appear. Rather, all products of human creativity have their origin within the “transdimensional” human *imagination*. Tesla may have been exceptional in the extent to which he was able to conduct the entire creative process, beginning to end, in his imagination; relying upon “third dimensional reality” only for the conversion of his finished creation into a three-dimensional mechanism—*that worked*, he claimed, first time, every time, precisely as designed.

For most of the rest of us, the process is a more “hybrid” affair in which creative development passes through intermediary stages, often involving a succession of 3-D versions which are progressively improved in the imagination, informed by observation of their 3-D performance; then actualized in improved 3-D versions. In all cases, though, the creative process itself takes place in the imagination, beyond the fences of “third di-

¹²Robert A. Heinlein (1907-1988), *The Menace From Earth*, 1957: title of a science fiction short story by a master of the genre.

mensional reality." Tesla demonstrated that it is humanly possible to conduct the creative process entirely within the imagination, with no resort at all to "third dimensional reality." Perhaps this is a straw in the wind, hinting of future possibilities in human creativity.

3.1 Transdimensional Possibilities

Stepping deliberately beyond the fences of "third dimensional reality" at once opens vast, unexplored, and mostly unimagined domains of possibility; and casts us upon uncharted seas that may be sown with hazardous reefs, and unknown dragons of the deeps—and *perhaps* . . . with unimagined blessings as well. To the *altered-ego*,¹³ habituated to the constraints, and the illusory security, of "civilized" power, such ventures into the Unknown may be reflexively terrifying; and only the internal recognition that "civilization" *does not work* may provide sufficient motivation for such a perilous imaginary exploration. Be advised: these *speculations* are not anticipated to appeal to "just anybody."

I mentioned above (p. 13) that "I regret to confess that, in my personal 'dark night of the soul,' I do not have a 'ready answer' to [the question, How do *we* get 'there' from 'here?'] that may be applied to the apparent situation on three-dimensional planet Earth." Frankly, "the apparent situation on three-dimensional planet Earth" appears to me to be shaping up as "a global train wreck" without parallel during the entire span of "civilized history." Yet this is a thought-form I do not wish to energize further with more than the barest of minimal attention. I choose to direct my attention instead to the question itself; which may be rephrased as: How might those who so choose walk away from the "train wreck," and create "post-civilization" instead—and *what is* "post-civilization" anyway? In the concluding § 5 Convergences we arrive at some possibilities in response to these challenging questions.

Meanwhile, "civilized history" does not seem to bear within it clues any more useful for answering these questions than than does the experience of the fetus in the womb bear useful clues to the nature of human life after birth. The Earth-human future, however it may unfold—and if there is an Earth-human future—will not resemble the Earth-human past. Those who seek it will find it, if at all, only by venturing into the perilous Unknown.

3.2 Life and Death

Mention of "a global train wreck," and "the perilous Unknown," especially for the altered-ego habituated to the "civilized" past, is likely to set off reflexive alarms not unlike those

¹³See *The Writing on the Wall #6: "Inquire Within"* § 3.2 Identification, for a discussion of the altered-ego. wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow06

triggered by life-threatening contingencies within every-day "third dimensional reality." Is "life as we know it" really imperiled on planet Earth at this time, or/and in the immediate future? Is *my* life in jeopardy? Maybe. Yet these uncertainties can raise not only terrifying alarms, but stimulating questions as well.

How much is really *known*, for instance, about "life as we know it?" Is it not practically so that your life is potentially *always* in jeopardy, every moment of every day? If you get out of bed in the morning, the possibility exists that you may not survive until sundown. If you go to sleep at night, you may not awaken in the morning. Everything that lives seems to dwell under the perpetual shadow of possible death. So it is said, "Everything that has a beginning has an end."

More to the point, what *is* life, and death? Some of the differences between a living being and a lifeless corpse are obvious, and easily observed. Yet just as observation of the wave properties of light exclude observation of its quantum properties, so the observable differences between a living being and a lifeless corpse are *partial equations*, or *polarized thought-forms*,¹⁴ and "are not the whole story."

There is obviously a monumental transition that takes place between the states of what we call "alive," and what we call "dead." Yet no living being has *experienced* that transition; and none who have experienced it are "alive" to describe it—with the possible exception of those who have experienced "near death" events. Those who have not had "near death experiences" (NDE) have various opinions about the descriptions provided by those who have;¹⁵ so the transition between "life" and "death" is still a mystery to those who have not experienced it, or come close to experiencing it. Therefore, for most of us, it is *Unknown*.

To the altered-ego, the Unknown is a source of reflexive fear; yet anything that is in fact Unknown is not inherently threatening. How can it be? What it is is simply not known. It could be a blessing, or a curse, or neither; and assuming prejudicially that it is an object of fear in advance of knowing anything at all about it is, like " $2 + 2 = 5$," a partial, unbalanced equation, and not a reliable source of information about anything. Fear of the Unknown amounts in essence to a formidable *obstacle* to learning anything new—the universal plague of the altered-ego—because paradoxically, in his quest for "knowledge," the reflexive response of the altered-ego to the Unknown (the only domain from which new "knowledge" might be gleaned) is to recoil from it in fear, and seek refuge in what he already "knows."

¹⁴See *ibid.* § 3.1 Some Useful Word-Symbols, for elaboration.

¹⁵One such description that has received widespread attention is the remarkable NDE of Anita Moorjani, submitted to The Near Death Research Foundation in August 2006, is discussed at greater length below (pp. 27-30) in § 3.6 Love, and is available on the Net here: anitamoorejani.com/?page_id=159

3.3 “Knowledge”

For that matter, how much is really *known* about anything at all? Being terrified of the Unknown, the altered-ego naturally claims “knowledge” of many things. Yet upon what bases do such claims rest? This question was discussed at some length in #3 of this series: “*How Do You Know That You Know What You Know?*”¹⁶

The reason this matter keeps rising to the surface [I wrote] seems to have to do with how easy it is for practically everyone to assume by default that we *do* know many things that are obvious and apparently self-evidently true, upon which we rely in making choices in our daily lives; and extend that assumption to include *all of our beliefs* about “how things are.” However, the essays cited above all draw attention to items that were at one time or another believed to be so by “practically everyone,” or at least by “many,” and were subsequently demonstrated not to be so, or to require more penetrating understanding.¹⁷

The *principle of complementarity* has been discussed several times in this series,¹⁸ most recently in #6: “*Inquire Within*” § 3.1 Some Useful Word-Symbols; in which I observed (p. 13) 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. If so, “knowledge” of one complementary aspect of anything precludes simultaneous “knowledge” of its complement(s)—or in other words, within “third dimensional reality,” “knowledge” is always partial, never complete; and when examined impartially discloses itself to be a partial equation, or a polarized thought form that has left something out, and “is not the whole story.” “The only ‘place’ I have ever been able to find,” I wrote, “where such uncertainties may be resolved, is the oracle within myself.”¹⁹

By “inquiring within,” one *may* satisfy oneself of the certainty of something. However, such certainty is not exportable, and cannot be “proven” with certainty to anybody else.²⁰ I am certain this is so (I think), and it is applicable at all scales, including but not

¹⁶wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow03

¹⁷*Ibid.* § 1 Recapitulation.

¹⁸In #1 § 4.1 The Myth of Complementarity, #3 § 6 The “Real Reality”, #5 § 2 pp. 4-6, § 3.2.1 p. 20; and below, in § 4 Many Worlds.

¹⁹#6 § 5 “Inquire Within” p. 23.

²⁰One may *persuade* others to share one’s “certainty;” or bludgeon them, or terrorize them, or otherwise coerce them at least to espouse one’s views; but *proof*, applicable in mathematics, is a slippery term, which may not have applicability within “third dimensional reality.” “*As far as the theorems of mathematics refer to reality, they are not certain, and as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality.*” —Albert Einstein (1879-1955)

only the minute scale in which Heisenberg's Uncertainty principle was originally framed. Naturally, I cannot "prove" this to you. You may verify it (or not) only by consulting the oracle within yourself.

This may be a thoroughly unsatisfactory state of affairs for the altered-ego, terrified of the Unknown, and attached like a limpet to its own accumulated store "knowledge," and to the "authoritative certainties" of "civilization." Sorry; if it helps at all, I never insist that my "certainties" are applicable to anybody else; or that the "reality" I experience has much in common with the "realities" of others.

3.4 Tolerance

Cultivation of this kind of *tolerance* for "alternative realities" is an essential condition for the emergence of a "post-civilization" that actually *works*: because as discussed in #6 § 2 "Virtual Reality" Revisited, 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. If we forfeit command of our own imaginations, we are most thoroughly and effectively enslaved. Thus uniformity among "realities" authored by those who inhabit them cannot possibly be achieved without stifling human purpose, intelligence, and creativity.

Such uniformity among "realities," however, has been high on every "civilized" agenda since the dawn of "civilization," and has been pursued with countless variations and repetitions, impelled by the terrors of the altered-ego: because universal consensus upon the placement of the fences dividing "reality" from "unreality"—established "authoritatively" by the powerful—is essential for maintaining the power of the strong over the weak. It is now becoming clear that this strategy, although imaginable, and having its own peculiar kind of "logic," *does not work*, and cannot be made to work: because it directly opposes the fundamental nature of all humankind, and Cosmos at large.

If one hopes to dwell in peace within the unique "reality" of his own imaginative fabrication, he is clearly obliged not to interfere with others who similarly hope to dwell within their unique "realities." The corollary, of course, is that those who are unwilling to allow their "realities" to others will surely forfeit the same liberty they deny. This plays out in "civilization," even among the strong, who "do what they can," no less than among the weak, who "suffer what they must."

This is so, because *the parable of the tribes*, discussed in *The Writing on the Wall #5: "Don't Take Any Wooden Nickels" § 2.2 Wealth and Power*,²¹ was never anyone's choice;

²¹wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow05
wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/wow05.html#econ02.2.0

yet was imposed upon everyone, from Neolithic times to these, by the chain reaction set in motion when humans first resorted to coercive power to settle their differences. As noted above, (p. 16) the exercise of coercive power *does not work*, simply and inescapably *because it stifles*—alike for the more, and for the less powerful—*purposeful, intelligent creativity*; which cannot thrive or persist, absent the *liberty* to exercise it. Full stop.

The purposeful, intelligent creativity of the “more powerful” is stifled by the exercise of coercive power, no less than is that of the “less powerful:” because the former are under the perpetual threat of usurpation, sooner or later, by an even greater power. They are thereby forced, willing or no, to focus their constant attention upon the maintenance and expansion of their power—at the expense of the unfettered exercise of their purposeful, intelligent creativity. It is a “lose/lose game,” exemplified by “the fastest gun in the West,” who will surely end his days in a pool of blood, when (not if) he meets a “faster gun” than his.

The altered-ego is blindsided by this inevitability, because, ruled by fear, whether more, or less powerful, he deals in polarized thought-forms, and partial equations that “are not the whole story.” He imagines only that he will “win” in whatever partial equation he happens to be playing out, because his partial experience “so far” has confirmed to him that he “always wins.” After all, he is “the fastest gun in the West,” is he not? Yes he is—until he isn’t—and then the *latest* “fastest gun” walks away: to a similar end: on another day. This applies alike to men and nations, as confirmed without exception, sooner or later, by “civilized history.”

Only those who are able to cultivate “*inclusive*, as opposed to *exclusive*, perceiving” may evade this eventual trap for the altered-ego, who loses either way: whether he numbers himself among the strong, who “do what they can,” or among the weak, who “suffer what they must.” As described in #6:

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.²²

3.5 Wisdom

Perhaps what all this adds up to—"transdimensional" possibilities; a philosophical relationship with life, and death; a balanced assessment of "knowledge," as understood by the altered-ego, within the context of "third dimensional reality;" tolerance for the "alternative realities" of others—amounts to a kind of *wisdom*. Yet wisdom is evidently not easily attained, and may not even be easily assessed, or appreciated: for the "wisdom" of one can appear as "unwisdom" in the appraisal of another.

For the past several thousand years, for example, right up to this very day and hour, "civilization" has been presumed among virtually all "civilized" people not only to *work*, but to be the *only system of social organization that can possibly work* among humans, anywhere, ever. Yet in the midst of mounting chaos in every part of the "civilized world," we have ventured here to suggest that "civilization" *does not work*, has never worked, other than as an "emergency measure" to bridge the gestation, or infancy of the human species; and will never work on a permanent basis: because the coercive preemption by the more powerful of the choices of the less powerful runs exactly counter to all the patterns in Cosmos that manifestly do work. Is such a suggestion *wisdom*, or *folly*? Only *you* may decide that; and act accordingly.

Meanwhile, we shall venture even further, and suggest to you that a "post-civilization" that actually *works* may emerge only among people who have attained to a certain level of "wisdom." This would be characterized in part by an ability to see beyond the partial equations, and the polarized thought-forms of the altered-ego. It would also include an ability to appreciate on some level the intricately interconnected and interrelated "parts" that combine seamlessly in the "Whole," or "All That Is," or the *Macrocosm*; of which every "part," from quarks to galactic clusters, including every human, is a *microcosm*. Such "wisdom" would clearly appreciate the reciprocity whereby every "part" embodies all the essential qualities of the "Whole"—which in turn is the Source of every quality of every "part."

Every Blossom, every Bee,
 Every Leaf on every Tree,
 Every Snowflake, every Drop in every Sea,
 Every Atom, every Planet, Star, and Galaxy

²²#6 § 4 Transdimensional Realities, p. 22.

Is a Part, and has a Place
In the Whole that forms the Face
Of Living, Loving Divinity.²³

3.6 Love

Love is a word with so many different meanings, in so many different contexts, that in common usage it seems almost to have no meaning at all. Yet contemplation discloses that it also signifies something with a profundity of bottomless depth. One way it has been described—by whom I cannot say—is as a sense of satisfaction with the wellbeing of another, equal to that with one’s own wellbeing. Jesus taught that the first and greatest commandment in the law is to “love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;” and the second is to “love thy neighbour as thyself.” (*Matthew 22:36-39; Mark 12:29-34*)

He also recommended, “Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you.” (*Matthew 5:44, Luke 6:27-28*) And “Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye so to them.” (*Matthew 7:12, Luke 6:31*)

These advisements, central to Christian tradition, have resonant echoes in many other “religious,” “spiritual,” or “transdimensional” traditions as well. For examples:

- Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful.
—Buddhism, *Udana-Varga* 5:18
- Regard your neighbor’s gain as your own gain and your neighbor’s loss as your own loss.
—Taoism, *T’ai Shang Kan Ying P’ien*
- What is hateful to you, do not to your fellow man. That is the entire Law; all the rest is commentary.
—Judaism, *Talmud*, Shabbat 31a
- This is the sum of duty: Do naught unto others which would cause you pain if done to you.
—Brahmanism, *Mahabharata* 5:1517
- Surely it is the maxim of loving kindness: Do not unto others what you would not have done unto you.
—Confucianism, *Analects* 15:23

²³*The Writing on the Wall #5 § 3.2.5 The Vision*, p. 23.

- That nature alone is good which refrains from doing unto another whatsoever is not good for itself.
—Zoroastrianism, *Dadistan-i-dinik* 94:5
- No one of you is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself.
—Islam, *Sunnah*
- And harm ye none, do as ye will.
—*Wiccan Rede*
- Don't do evil to others, for if you do, you will pay for it here on earth.
—Kikuyu people of Kenya
- In happiness and suffering, in joy and grief, we should regard all creatures as we regard our own self, and should therefore refrain from inflicting upon others such injury as would appear undesirable to us if inflicted upon ourselves.
—Jainism, *Yoga-'Sastra*
- As thou deemest thyself so deem others.
—Sikhism, Guru Nānak
- Ascribe not to any soul that which thou wouldest not have ascribed to thee, and say not that which thou doest not.
—The Bahá'í Faith, Baha'u'll-ah
- You must be the change you wish to see in the world.
—Mohandās Karamchand Gandhi

All of these statements have about them the properties of *whole equations*—clearly distinguishable from the *partial equations* of the altered-ego. They might be summarized as expressions of a universal equation between *self* and *everything "else,"* or as statements of the fundamental unity, or oneness of all things, including the individual self. They share in common the quality of being *inclusive*, not *exclusive*. They are expressions of "Living, Loving Divinity."

They may also converge upon that illusive vision we are groping toward: the vision of a "post-civilization" *that actually works*. The statements listed above, and others like them in various forms, are quite familiar to all "civilized" people, everywhere. Yet they are often far removed from actual "civilized" practice—which seems in general to be much more closely aligned with, "Do unto others, before others do unto you." "Civilized" practice is guided by the fundamental axiom *that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they*

must. The “civilized” axiom is clearly not in any way an expression of “Living, Loving Divinity”—which may have something to do with why *it does not work*—do you think?

It is not difficult to find among “civilized” humans those who agree with many or all of the statements listed above, and with many comparable expressions of universal love. It is much more difficult to find people who make the effort to practice them in their daily lives. What if this were to change? Such a change is imaginable; how might it *work* in practice—or could it work at all?

Such a change could not be “made to work,” by anybody: because that would involve some form of coercion—the very thing we are trying to imagine moving away from. As discussed at considerable length in #6: “*Inquire Within*,”²⁴ such a change can only be negotiated individually by *self-governing Cosmic beings*. But it might be done. In #6 § 2 “Virtual Reality” Revisited, p. 7, we observed that taking responsibility for the content of our own imaginations about sums up what it means to be a self-governing Cosmic being. In today’s world—or for that matter, in any “civilized” time or place—this may not be easily done; but it is not impossible.

In any case, no matter what happens, and no matter what anyone does, or fails to do, “civilization” is going away from planet Earth, as was ordained from its earliest inception: because *it does not work*; and what does not work does not last. Meanwhile, although collapsing under its own unsustainable weight, or evaporating due to its self-devouring insubstantiality, “civilization” retains a lingering presence upon this planet, which is inhabited by seven thousand million mostly “civilized” humans—whose *imaginations* are almost entirely in thrall of “civilized” power. This condition renders each human so placed incapable of governing himself, and consequently reliant upon the “governance” of “civilized” power—for as long as it may yet linger.

However, although one’s imagination may be captivated by others, it nevertheless really does belong to each individual: because it is essential to what each individual *is* in Cosmos. Therefore, though lost, one’s imagination may be recovered. This requires individual effort, for there is no way it may be done by proxy. Conversely, there is no way it may be prevented by anyone, or anything.

Recovery of one’s imagination is accomplished by choice, or by a series of choices, entirely exclusive to the one making them, and without conflicting with the choices of anybody else—including even the choices of whoever or whatever may have captivated one’s imagination in the first place. Therefore, recovery of one’s own imagination is wholly compatible with the inclusive, “Living, Loving Divinity” given expression above from many diverse human traditions. It may even encourage the recommended practice to “Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully

²⁴wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow06

use you, and persecute you," without the least murmur of reluctance, resistance, or resentment.

How so? Because however you imagine It, Deity—"That" Which created and sustains your existence, and that of all else besides—is the essential Source of all that exists. Love exists: within you; within me; and therefore within "That," and within all. If you are able to apprehend this much, and appreciate it, even as a suckling infant appreciates its own mother, how then can you not *love* "That" Which gave you life? And if you love "That," how can you not love all that is loved by "That?" And how could "That" have created anything, without loving it? Even "your enemies," and "them that curse you," and "them which despitefully use you, and persecute you?" Even such as these are loved by "That"—or they would not exist: even as you would not exist, without the love of "That."

Or put another way, if "All That Is" really is unified within a "Cosmic, Creative, Purposeful—*Loving*—Intelligence," then every part, "omitting no detail, however slight," is loved by "That:" because all truly creative acts are acts of love. Therefore, the only way we, being "slight details" among "All That," can possibly *balance the equation* of love whereby we exist, and are sustained, is by *returning* the love of "All That," "omitting no detail, however slight." It may even be said that the element of *love* may function as a mysterious, "transdimensional" x-factor with the power, if exercised, to restore *balance* to partial equations and polarized thought-forms. Contemplate these things, Beloved of "All That."

Recovery of one's own imagination is recovery of the full spectrum of what is possible: for anything that can be imagined is possible, and sustainable, provided only that *it works*. Divinity has an incalculably long track record of creating things that manifestly *work*, flawlessly, timelessly, and ultimately, eventually, without exception. By the examples of the *whole equations* listed above, giving parallel expressions from diverse human sources of Divine, nonexclusive Love, we are given a common thread that when put into effect among humans has a verifiable track record of *working in practice*. In this way, *Love*, in its most expanded meaning, emerges as a plausible portal to the more agreeable "transdimensional" possibilities many of us have glimpsed through our various and frequent ventures beyond "third dimensional reality."

Perhaps the near death experience of Anita Moorjani gives further glimpses into some of the possibilities that may be available through the portal of Love. She has written, in part:

. . . Words seem to limit the experience—I was at a place where I understood how much more there is than what we are able to conceive in our 3-dimensional world. I realized what a gift life was, and that I was surrounded

by loving spiritual beings, who were always around me even when I did not know it.

The amount of love I felt was overwhelming, and from this perspective, I knew how powerful I am, and saw the amazing possibilities we as humans are capable of achieving during a physical life. I found out that my purpose now would be to live “heaven on earth” using this new understanding, and also to share this knowledge with other people. However I had the choice of whether to come back into life, or go towards death. I was made to understand that it was not my time, but I always had the choice, and if I chose death, I would not be experiencing a lot of the gifts that the rest of my life still held in store.²⁵

As she describes in an account of her near death experience, Anita Moorjani (quoting) “had end stage cancer (Hodgkin’s Lymphoma), and was being cared for at home. I was connected to an oxygen tank, and had a full time nurse. But on this morning, February 2nd 2006, I did not wake up. I had fallen into a coma. My husband called my doctor who said I needed to be rushed to hospital. The senior oncologist looked at me and told my husband that it was now the end, and that my organs were now shutting down. I would probably not make it beyond the next 36 hours.”²⁶

During her comatose state, although exhibiting no outward sign of awareness, Moorjani later wrote that “I saw and heard the conversations between my husband and the doctors taking place outside my room, about 40 feet away down a hallway. I was later able to verify this conversation to my shocked husband. Then I actually ‘crossed over’ to another dimension, where I was engulfed in a total feeling of love.”²⁷

It is evident from her account that, while “three-dimensionally comatose,” Moorjani was the whole time possessed of full awareness in a “transdimensional” state not at all subject to the limitations of “third dimensional reality.” She was at all times engulfed within a profound sense of love and wellbeing; and her choices, particularly between “life” and “death,” were not circumscribed in any way.

The near death experience of Anita Moorjani, like the inventive genius of Nikola Tesla, may be unique within common human awareness, with few or no known parallels. Yet by the Principle of Repeating Patterns, “Where there is one, it may be relied upon that there are many others of the same kind, even if none other than the one have been discovered, or observed.”²⁸

²⁵anitamoorjani.com/?page_id=159

²⁶Moorjani, *loc. cit.*

²⁷Moorjani, *loc. cit.*

²⁸*The Writing on the Wall* #5 § 3.2.2.

The “transdimensional” realms visited by Moorjani seem not to have shared with “third dimensional reality” the limitations of time and space, or of the three-dimensionally supposed chain of causation. As is written:

The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all thy Piety nor Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
Nor all thy Tears wash out a Word of it.²⁹

That principle did not seem to apply to Anita Morjani, who was given extensive tests upon her emergency hospitalization 2 February 2006; the outcome of which were self-evident to all who observed her. However, as she wrote later:

. . . I seemed to understand that, as tests had been taken for my organ functions (and the results were not out yet), that if I chose life, the results would show that my organs were functioning normally. If I chose death, the results would show organ failure as the cause of death, due to cancer. I was able to change the outcome of the tests by my choice!

I made my choice, and as I started to wake up (in a very confused state, as I could not at that time tell which side of the veil I was on), the doctors came rushing into the room with big smiles on their faces saying to my family “Good news—we got the results and her organs are functioning—we can’t believe it!! Her body really did seem like it had shut down!”

After that, I began to recover rapidly. The doctors had been waiting for me to become stable before doing a lymph node biopsy to track the type of cancer cells, and they could not even find a lymph node big enough to suggest cancer (upon entering the hospital my body was filled with swollen lymph nodes and tumors the size of lemons, from the base of my skull all the way to my lower abdomen). They did a bone marrow biopsy, again to find the cancer activity so they could adjust the chemotherapy according to the disease, and there wasn’t any in the bone marrow. The doctors were very confused, but put it down to me suddenly responding to the chemo. Because they themselves were unable to understand what was going on, they made me undergo test after test, all of which I passed with flying colors, and clearing every test empowered me even more! I had a full body scan, and because they could not find anything, they made the radiologist repeat it again!!!³⁰

²⁹Edward Fitzgerald, 1809-1893, *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám of Naishápúr*, LI

³⁰Moorjani, anitamoorjani.com/?page_id=159

You might want to read that again. In summary, Morjani was rushed to hospital the morning of 2/2/2006, where her physical condition was obvious to all who beheld her, and tests were administered to confirm the obvious. She was not expected to survive the next 36 hours.

Still in coma, yet evidently more fully aware than anyone around her, Morjani had her near death experience; during which she was given the choice to continue her three-dimensional physical life, or end it. Her choice was to continue it; and as she emerged uncertainly from her comatose state, medical staff rushed into her room with the results of the tests that had been made *before her choice to live*, indicating that all her organs were functioning normally. These are medically documented facts that remain to be understood (among many others) by the medical staff that administered the tests that morning. Now: Will the "real reality" please stand up? No? Oh, well. . . .

4 Many Worlds

In § 3.3 above, I mentioned that the *principle of complementarity* has been discussed several times in this series. As such, it has been applied much more broadly than intended when it was first articulated in 1927 by pioneer quantum physicist Werner Heisenberg (1901-1976). Heisenberg developed the *uncertainty principle*, or the *principle of indeterminacy*, in order to deal with specific difficulties encountered in making precise measurements at the unimaginably minute scale of quantum events. He showed how complementary properties of particles, such as position and momentum, cannot both be measured with precision at the quantum scale. Precise measurement of a particle's position throws its momentum into complete uncertainty; and vice versa.³¹ Heisenberg demonstrated that the product of the uncertainties in position and velocity is equal to or greater than $h/(4\pi)$, where h is Planck's constant, a very small number of joule-seconds greater than zero (6.626176×10^{-34} , if you really want to know).

Although my usage may have implied that the uncertainty principle and the principle of complementarity are interchangeable terms, there is a "back story" to their emergence in scientific discussions that is relevant to the thread being developed in this series. The principle of complementarity was an elaboration by Danish physicist Niels Bohr (1885-1962) in 1927 upon Heisenberg's then-recently published uncertainty principle;³² and

³¹britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/614029/uncertainty-principle

³²[en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Complementarity_\(physics\)#History.5B2.5D](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Complementarity_(physics)#History.5B2.5D)

it appears that Bohr's complementarity was not as well received among experimental physicists as was Heisenberg's principle.³³

In the US [Osnaghi writes], which after the Second World War became the central stage of research in physics in the West, the discussions about the interpretation of quantum mechanics had never been very popular. A common academic policy was to gather theoreticians and experimentalists together in order to favour experiments and concrete applications, rather than abstract speculations. This practical attitude was further increased by the impressive development of physics between the 1930s and the 1950s, driven on the one hand by the need to apply the new quantum theory to a wide range of atomic and subatomic phenomena, and on the other hand by the pursuit of military goals. As pointed out by Kaiser, "the pedagogical requirements entailed by the sudden exponential growth in graduate student numbers during the cold war reinforced a particular instrumentalist approach to physics." In this context, "epistemological musings or the striving for ultimate theoretical foundations—never a strong interest among American physicists even before the war—fell beyond the pale for the postwar generation and their advisors." A few textbooks, like for example David Bohm's *Quantum theory* (1951), discussed some issues of interpretation. However, as a rule, the textbooks in use in the 1950s (in America as well as elsewhere) did not reflect much concern at all about the interpretation of the theory.

A consequence of this attitude was that little attention was paid to Bohr's complementarity, which, according to Heilbron (2001), was perceived as an eminently philosophical approach, an especially obscure one indeed. Kragh has observed that "the uncertainty principle was eagerly taken up by several American physicists [. . .], but they showed almost no interest in Bohrian complementarity." According to him: "Most textbook authors, even if sympathetic to Bohr's ideas, found it difficult to include and justify a section on complementarity. Among 43 textbooks on quantum mechanics published between 1928 and 1937, 40 included a treatment of the uncertainty principle; only eight of them mentioned the complementarity principle."³⁴

Now this strikes me as a quite revealing commentary: because it may furnish a "real-world" example of the idea discussed above (pp. 21-23) that the purposeful, intelligent creativity of the "more powerful" is stifled by the exercise of coercive power, no less than

³³Osnaghi, S., et al. The origin of the Everettian heresy. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* (2009), doi:10.1016/j.shpsb.2008.10.002.

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 2; citations within the quotation have been omitted; ellipsis in the original.

is that of the "less powerful:" because the former—not excluding even the hallowed halls of advanced scientific research—are under the perpetual threat of usurpation, sooner or later, by an even greater power.

The impression I take away with me is that the leading-edge pioneers during the early days of quantum physics simply had very little interest in the philosophical implications of their own discoveries: because the technical applications to which fledgling quantum theory was applied, primarily to *victory in war*, and the probable *economic leverage* they made possible (which amounts, at bottom, to the same thing), occupied a much higher priority in their evaluation than did their discoveries' philosophical implications. Those who numbered themselves among the "more powerful" in those days—or whose research was financed by them—simply did not have time for philosophical implications. They were all too keenly occupied with "more important" matters, such as fighting the cold war, and keeping pace with the arms race—or in sum, defending their power against the possible emergence of a greater power: the "lose/lose game" humans have been playing on Earth since the dawn of "civilization."

Bohr's complementarity expanded upon Heisenberg's narrowly defined uncertainty principle, drawing attention to some of its implications about the nature of the larger context in which these remarkable discoveries were being made—that is, about the nature of the surrounding universe, and ultimately, about the nature of "reality" itself. And those who pilot the course and direction of scientific research, evidently having other fish to fry, *were not interested*. This in itself is "interesting"—because the philosophical implications of quantum theory may in historical fact be more accurately described as tumultuous, Earth-shaking, and otherwise intrinsically *fraught with interest*. Perhaps now that the cracks in crumbling "civilization" are becoming everywhere more evident, the "bizarre" implications of quantum theory that began to emerge a century ago, may capture some of the interest they deserve.

4.1 "Quantum Weirdness"

Classical epistemology, the study of the basis and nature of *knowledge*, is rooted in the presumed self-evident notions that *a) reality* is objectively whatever it is, regardless of what anyone may think about it, or whether or not it is observed or measured; and *b) what goes on in the human mind*, such as sensory stimuli, and their interpretation, is hermetically sealed from direct contact or relationship with *objective reality*. These two premises gave rise to the appearance that the *subjective* experience of living humans seems forever to be separated by an impenetrable barrier from the "objective reality" of the "real world." We can view the world "out there" through the window of our senses,

and evaluate our sensations "in here" within the recesses of our minds; yet we can never, so it seems, actually touch the "real world," or experience other than a subjective relationship with it. Consequently, *our subjective experiences have no effect upon the nature or behavior of "objective reality"*. Or in other words, in relation to "objective reality," which is presumed to be a *de facto* Cosmic "given," all humans are "innocent bystanders," and it is incumbent upon each of us to deal with it, however we find it, as best we can.

We have discussed much of this at considerable length in prior numbers of this series,³⁵ and have arrived at numerous indications that classical epistemology may not have "the whole story" about "reality." Nevertheless, classical epistemology is "bedrock" to scientific inquiry, the impulse of which has been to use our native human senses, including their extensions, such as telescopes, microscopes, and other technological instruments of amplification; combined with our rational analytical powers (and their technological extensions), to create within our imaginations *models* of "objective reality" having the verifiable property of reliable correspondence with the *actuality* of "objective reality."

Correspondences between the model and "reality" are supposed to be evaluated by means of rational analysis of carefully controlled and repeatable experiments designed to test them. A *complete* model would be one with rationally demonstrable one-to-one correspondence with every feature of the "objective reality" it is supposed to model. A successful model of this kind would bear the same relationship to "reality" that an accurate map bears to its corresponding territory. Naturally, the "Holy Grail" of classical physics was a demonstrably reliable "Theory of Everything" which could provide humans with a complete description of the "real world" we can otherwise never actually see, or touch.

Such a comprehensive theory would obviously be highly prized; and before the end of the 19th century, such a theory was thought to have been virtually within reach. Aspiring graduate physics students were being advised at the time to seek more promising opportunities for original research in other fields than were soon likely to be available in physics. The field of physics, they were told, was all but wrapped up.³⁶ However, the discovery of quantum theory threw a spanner into these optimistic (or pessimistic) expectations, by demonstrating with rational, repeatable, experimental rigor that the long-held

³⁵Particularly, in #3: "How Do You Know That You Know What You Know?" wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow03; #4: "Don't Believe Everything You Think" wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow04; #5: "Don't Take Any Wooden Nickels" wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow05; #6: "Inquire Within" wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow06.

³⁶Robert Nadeau, Menas Kafatos, *The Non-Local Universe: The New Physics and Matters of the Mind*, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 17-18.

premises upon which they were based are not supportable; and it has become evident that “reality” is not entirely as it seems.

For example: at the humanly familiar scale of people and planets, it is intuitively self-evident to us that objects like the Moon, or the many smaller satellites we humans have placed in orbit about the Earth, may potentially have their orbits changed either by gaining or losing kinetic energy. That is, by using rocket thrust to give an orbiting satellite additional energy, it is possible to boost it into a higher orbit. Conversely, if the satellite encounters drag from the upper fringes of Earth’s atmosphere, it loses energy, and descends to a lower orbit—where it encounters stiffer drag, absorbing more of its energy, its orbit decays further, and it eventually plummets to the surface; or more likely, burns up like a meteor in the atmosphere. All of these processes are apparently *continuous* and occur in smooth graduations. All this is quite familiar, and intuitively sensible to most of us.

At the *quantum* scale, however. . . . Well, in 1913 Bohr discovered something very “peculiar” about the atom; which in 1911 New Zealander Ernest Rutherford (1871-1937) had demonstrated to be a miniature analog of the Solar System, consisting of a massive nucleus surrounded by swarms of lighter particles: somewhat as Earth is today surrounded by swarms of orbiting satellites.

Only . . . what Bohr discovered was that the particles orbiting an atomic nucleus do not behave at all like the satellites orbiting Earth. Instead, when they change orbits, they do it in “quantum leaps.” That is, when a subatomic particle gains sufficient energy, say by absorbing a *photon*,³⁷ it too is boosted into a higher orbit—but in a surprisingly “peculiar” fashion. Instead of *moving* sedately and “sensibly” along a curved trajectory to join its higher orbit, as all “right thinking” people would expect, it *leaps instantaneously* from its lower orbit to its higher orbit, with *no time interval*, and *without physically traversing the intervening space* between orbits. At another time the particle may lose energy, radiate a photon, and again leap instantaneously back to its former orbit, with no lapse of time, and without traversing the space between orbits. The orbit of a subatomic particle about its atomic nucleus is invariably spaced in *instantaneous steps*, which occur in multiples related to Planck’s constant. If this is not *weird*—in relation to classical epistemology—then what is it? Never mind: it only gets “worse.” Or “better.”

In fact, the behavior of “subatomic particles” belongs to a class of physical phenomena that are difficult to visualize three-dimensionally, and can be modeled accurately only in

³⁷*Photon* is the term Albert Einstein coined in 1905 to signify a *quantum*, or a “particle” of light—which had previously been observed only as a *wave phenomenon*. Speaking of the well-established wave phenomenon of light in terms of quanta, or “packets” that behave like particles, was an early step in opening up the can of worms which became known as *quantum theory*.

purely mathematical terms. As such, a “subatomic particle” takes the form of a mathematical *wave function*—which is not a physical wave, like ripples on the surface of a pond, or sound waves. This is often described as a “probability wave,” which delineates a region in space where the “particle” is *most likely to be found* at any discrete moment. Where it is actually located may be anywhere—until and unless it is *observed* by somebody, or *detected* by an instrument. Observation is said to *collapse the wave function*, which then manifests as a discrete particle at a particular intersection in space/time. Where it “came from,” however, and where it is “going,” are then *complete unknowns*, as the “particle,” no longer under observation, immediately dissolves into its inscrutable wave function, and may again be located anywhere.

Now if observation has the experimental effect of “collapsing the wave function,” and bringing into manifestation, somehow, an observable quantum event, we seem to be entering a domain which doesn’t conform to the classical epistemological premise that a human observer can have no effect upon that which is observed in the “real world.” And this, it developed, was but the beginning of the “quantum weirdness” at intuitive odds with our most fundamental expectations about the nature of “reality.”

Just as Einstein identified in photons the *quantum properties* of light, heretofore treated exclusively as a wave phenomenon, so Louis-Victor de Broglie (1875-1960) proposed the *wave properties* of electrons, heretofore treated exclusively as particles; and was confirmed in 1927, the year of Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle, and Bohr’s principle of complementarity.

Upon closer examination at the quantum scale, it emerged that there seems to be a fundamental ambiguity between the properties of *waves* and *particles*—which may be intuitively equivalent to saying that there is a fundamental ambiguity between the properties of elephants and mice! That is, a *particle* is small and compact, and occupies a point-like locus in space; whereas a *wave* is fluid and spread out, and occupies a wide region in space: as sound waves can easily fill a concert hall; and light waves can easily fill the universe. Two more dissimilar phenomena can hardly be imagined. And making matters even worse, the implication of quantum theory is that this astounding ambiguity may be resolved (momentarily) by the *observation* of somebody standing outside the wave/particle system.

The implications of these esoteric disclosures are larger than may be immediately apparent. When elements as seemingly dissimilar, and as fundamental to “reality,” as *light*, and *electrons*, turn out *both* to display quantum *and* wave properties, which are nevertheless mutually exclusive to observation, it begins to emerge that the classical assumptions about “reality” may stand in need of re-evaluation—if not overhaul.

In sum, Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, Bohr's elaboration of complementarity, and the disclosures of quantum theory in general, touched off a powder keg under the classical views of "reality" that had been in place since the days of René Descartes (1596-1650). If quantum theory is sound, then the common-sense view of "reality" mentioned above (§ 4.1 p. 32) must be revised, somewhat along these lines: *a*) "reality" consists of an unavoidable reciprocity between observer and observed; and *b*) what goes on in the human mind has a reciprocal relationship with observed reality.

Many people, including Albert Einstein, didn't relish these implications; and some may have taken solace in the thought that, anyway, it only applies at the minute scale of quantum events, in relation to the minuscule value of Planck's constant. However, although unimaginably minute, Planck's constant is *not zero*; and that makes all the difference.

If Planck's constant were zero [write Nadeau & Kafatos], there would be no indeterminacy and we could predict both momentum and position with the utmost accuracy. A particle would have no wave properties and a wave no particle properties—the mathematical map and the corresponding physical landscape would be in perfect accord.³⁸

Albert Einstein and Niels Bohr conducted an intermittent debate between 1927 and Einstein's passing in 1955, in which Einstein proposed various thought experiments intended to define circumstances under which two complementary properties of a quantum event could be observed simultaneously. In each instance, Bohr rebutted Einstein's argument,³⁹ in accordance with what became known as the Copenhagen Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics.

As to the idea that quantum theory applies only to esoteric subatomic phenomena at the unimaginably minute quantum scale, and so may be ignored in circumstances encountered at human, planetary, and Cosmic scales: the "reality" is evidently quite the reverse. Quantum events are what Cosmos, and everything and everyone in it, seem to be made of. They constitute the ground of being, for everything. Although the Copenhagen Interpretation tended to isolate the implications of quantum mechanics to the minute scale at which Planck's constant looms large, and treat physical events at the human, planetary, and Cosmic scale in classical Cartesian/Newtonian terms, such a distinction provided an opening for dissension, and alternative interpretations. Whatever "reality" is, it can only make sense if it is "all of a piece," and not arbitrarily divided into segments in which different "ground rules" apply.

³⁸Nadeau & Kafatos, 1999, p. 32.

³⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 65-69.

4.2 An Alternative Interpretation

Here,⁴⁰ we have an animated diagram of a flux of successive quantum-wave packets. They could be photons, electrons, or a succession of any other quantum objects moving through space/time. They display obvious wave properties, as well as quantum properties: inasmuch as, being very small, they occupy point-like locations as they move.

Of course, because we are not observing an actual quantum object, such as an electron, but a symbolic representation of one, its wave, and (“fuzzy”) quantum properties, are apparent to us simultaneously. However, contemplation of this symbolic representation may suggest the possibility that the supposed complementarity between wave and quantum properties may not be necessary.

This is so, because all so-called “material objects” may be considered as manifestations of wave phenomena. Waves have the measurable properties of *frequency*, or *wavelength*, and *amplitude*. Frequency is related to the distance between wave crests, and is expressed as the interval of time required for two successive wave crests to pass a particular point. A wave whose crests are one inch apart, traveling at one inch per second, may be said to have a wavelength of one inch, and a frequency of one cycle per second (abbreviated 1 Hz, after German physicist Heinrich Rudolf Hertz (1857-1894) who in 1887 discovered the spectrum of electromagnetic waves). Amplitude is the height or depth of the wave above or below the median between crest and trough.

Another property of a wave is the *medium* through which it passes—what is actually “waving” during the passage of a wave. The medium through which ocean waves pass is the surface of the sea. Sound waves propagate through fluids, such as air or water. The medium through which the waves in our [omitted] diagram are passing is an otherwise straight red line.

In the vacuum of interstellar space, the medium through which light waves pass between astronomical objects is somewhat obscure. Philosophers and scientists have speculated upon the presence of an immaterial “ether” throughout the universe, that may be supposed to “wave” when electromagnetic radiation of various frequencies passes through it. I understand this remains an open question.

If a wave were considered to have a three-dimensional shape, such as the path Earth takes in its annual circuit of the Sun—which itself may have a complex path within the Galaxy—the wave might be shaped something like a curved corkscrew. The wave function described by Earth, orbiting at an approximate radius of 93 million miles from the Sun, would thus have a frequency of one solar year (365¼ Earth-days), and would tra-

⁴⁰In the HTML version of this file.

verse one full cycle of its corkscrew, or helical path, approximately 584,336,234 miles in length, plus the distance the Sun would have moved within the Galaxy during the year.⁴¹ By these brief examples, we may understand that wave phenomena occur under a possibly infinite variety of conditions throughout the universe, and at all scales, from the sub-quantum to the super-galactic, and perhaps beyond.

Waves also interact with one another, sometimes “constructively,” sometimes “destructively.” When two waves of the same frequency and amplitude are “in phase”—that is, when their crests and troughs coincide—they amplify each other, and their combined amplitude is the sum of their individual amplitudes. When two waves of the same frequency and amplitude are “out of phase,” they cancel each other, and their combined wave form is flat, without crests or troughs. This is so because the crest of one wave coincides with the trough of its partner, and being of the same frequency and amplitude, they exactly cancel each other, with a null result. When two such waves are partially “in,” and partially “out of phase,” they influence each other in variations between these extremes. And of course, waves of different frequencies and amplitudes may interact with each other in much more complicated ways.

A musical C major chord, for example, may be produced by playing simultaneously the three notes, C, E, and G, each with its characteristic frequency, which may be represented individually with three corresponding wave functions. The chord they produce when combined is a more complex *composite* wave function that is audibly richer in tone and texture than, by themselves, are any of its component notes, C, E, or G. A symphonic orchestra consisting of a couple of hundred instruments playing various notes at various volumes simultaneously, may produce highly complex and richly textured wave functions indeed. Yet this is only a glimpse of what is possible with composite wave functions.

As mentioned above, all so-called “material objects,” that manifest in any way as existing, may be considered to be wave functions. Another way of saying this is that there are no “solids:” there are only waves, or wave functions. That is simply what photons, elec-

⁴¹The wavelength of one annual cycle would depend upon the velocity of the Sun within the Galaxy. The Sun may describe a complex path among neighboring stars. The 584,336,234 miles figure is the approximate length of Earth’s orbital path around a “stationary” Sun, as calculated by $C = 2r \times \pi = 186,000,000 \text{ miles} \times 3.14 = \text{about } 584,336,234 \text{ miles} = \text{somewhat short of the length of a single cycle of Earth’s helical path around the moving Sun. Earth’s wavelength would then equal the distance traveled by the Sun during the interval of an Earth-year. The Milky Way on a Moonless summer night runs approximately parallel with Earth’s polar axis, inclined about } 23\frac{1}{2}^{\circ} \text{ from perpendicular to Earth’s path about the Sun. Assuming the naked-eye-visible Milky Way approximates the plane of the Galaxy, the Solar System as a whole may be moving in a direction within the Galaxy somewhat perpendicular to the plane of its planetary orbits; whose members may be describing a nested series of helical paths of widely varying wavelengths and frequencies, centered upon the path of the Sun within the Galaxy.}$

trons, atoms, molecules, cells, organisms, planets, solar systems, galaxies—or anything, and every thing, including you and me—are: infinitely various wave functions.

Hugh Everett III (1930-1982) was the American physicist who first proposed a theory to this effect. He called it *The Theory of the Universal Wave Function*. It was Everett's doctoral thesis at Princeton University in 1956, and was later referred to as "the many-worlds interpretation (MWI) of quantum physics."⁴²

Everett began by addressing some of the apparent paradoxes implied by the "collapse of the wave function" discussed above (pp. 34-36). In theory, a physical system may be completely described by a state function, designated ψ , the Greek letter *psi*; which (quoting Everett) "is thought of as objectively characterizing the physical system, i.e., at all times an isolated system is thought of as possessing a state function, independently of our state of knowledge of it."⁴³ This is classical assumption *a*, mentioned above (p. 32) that *reality* is objectively whatever it is, regardless of what anyone may think about it, or whether or not it is observed or measured.

However, according to the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum theory, ψ can be changed in two different ways, or by two different means: *a*) "Process 1: The discontinuous change brought about by the observation. . ." ("collapse of the wave function") or *b*) "Process 2: The continuous, deterministic (isolated) change of state of the system with time according to a wave equation. . ." ⁴⁴

That is, the state ψ of a *quantum system* can be changed simply by being observed (in violation of classical assumption *b*, mentioned above (p. 32)), or measured by a measuring device; whereas the state ψ of a *classical system* at a macroscopic scale may be changed only by means of well understood causal agencies, such as wind, and sun, and time, or/and by physical manipulation by humans, or other beings. Everett pointed out how apparent paradoxes emerge from insisting upon both of these alternative agencies of change in system states.

He considered the case in which an observer A is observing a system S, and that observer B is observing the composite system consisting of A observing S (A + S). He described an imaginary situation "somewhere out in space" as follows:

Isolated somewhere out in space is a room containing an observer, A, who is about to perform a measurement upon a system S. After performing

⁴²Hugh Everett III. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hugh_Everett

⁴³Everett III, H. (1973). *The Theory of the Universal Wave Function*. In B. S. DeWitt, & N. Graham (Eds.), *The many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics* (pp. 3-140). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, p. 3. pbs.org/wgbh/nova/manyworlds/pdf/dissertation.pdf
wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#mwi

⁴⁴Everett, *loc. cit.*

his measurement he will record the result in his notebook. We assume that he knows the state function of S (perhaps as a result of previous measurement), and that it is not an eigenstate⁴⁵ of the measurement he is about to perform. A, being an orthodox quantum theorist, then believes that the outcome of his measurement is undetermined and that the process is correctly described by Process 1.

In the meantime, however, there is another observer, B, outside the room, who is in possession of the state function of the entire room, including S, the measuring apparatus, and A, just prior to the measurement. B is only interested in what will be found in the notebook one week hence, so he computes the state function of the room for one week in the future according to Process 2. One week passes, and we find B still in possession of the state function of the room, which this equally orthodox quantum theorist believes to be a complete description of the room and its contents. If B's state function calculation tells beforehand exactly what is going to be in the notebook, then A is incorrect in his belief about the indeterminacy of the outcome of his measurement. We therefore assume that B's state function contains non-zero amplitudes over several of the notebook entries.

At this point, B opens the door to the room and looks at the notebook (performs his observation). Having observed the notebook entry, he turns to A and informs him in a patronizing manner that since his (B's) wave function just prior to his entry into the room, which he knows to have been a complete description of the room and its contents, had non-zero amplitude over other than the present result of the measurement, the result must have been decided only when B entered the room, so that A, his notebook entry, and his memory about what occurred one week ago had no independent objective existence until the intervention by B. In short, B implies that A owes his present objective existence to B's generous nature which compelled him to intervene on his behalf. However, to B's consternation, A does not react with anything like the respect and gratitude he should exhibit towards B, and at the end of a somewhat heated reply, in which A conveys in a colorful manner his opinion of B and his beliefs, he rudely punctures B's ego by ob-

⁴⁵“The word ‘eigenstate’ is derived from the German/Dutch word ‘eigen,’ meaning ‘inherent’ or ‘characteristic.’ An eigenstate is the measured state of some object possessing quantifiable characteristics such as position, momentum, etc. The state being measured and described must be observable (i.e. something such as position or momentum that can be experimentally measured either directly or indirectly), and must have a definite value, called an eigenvalue.”

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Introduction_to_eigenstates

serving that if B's view is correct, then he has no reason to feel complacent, since the whole present situation may have no objective existence, but may depend upon the future actions of yet another observer.⁴⁶

Everett suggested a number of possible approaches to resolving this paradox, and focused his further attention upon one of them:

To assume the universal validity of the quantum description, by the complete abandonment of Process 1. The general validity of pure wave mechanics, *without any statistical assertions*, is assumed for *all* physical systems, including observers and measuring apparatus. Observation processes are to be described completely by the state function of the composite system which includes the observer and his object-system, and which at all times obeys the wave equation (Process 2).⁴⁷

Elaborating further, Everett wrote that it is evident that this approach "is a theory of many advantages. It has the virtue of logical simplicity and it is complete in the sense that it is applicable to the entire universe. All processes are considered equally (there are no 'measurement processes' which play any preferred role), and the principle of psycho-physical parallelism⁴⁸ is fully maintained. Since the universal validity of the state function description is asserted, one can regard the state functions themselves as the fundamental entities, and one can even consider the state function of the whole universe. In this sense this theory can be called the theory of the 'universal wave function,' since all of physics is presumed to follow from this function alone. There remains, however, the question whether or not such a theory can be put into correspondence with our experience."

*The present thesis [Everett continued] is devoted to showing that this concept of a universal wave mechanics, together with the necessary correlation machinery for its interpretation, forms a logically self consistent description of a universe in which several observers are at work.*⁴⁹

Surely the most startling implication of Everett's theory of the "universal wave function" was that instead of Process 1, "collapse of the wave function" in response to observation

⁴⁶Everett, 1973, pp. 4-6.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, p. 8, Everett's emphasis.

⁴⁸*Psycho-physical parallelism* was discussed by John von Neumann, 1903-1957, in *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, 1932, quoted at some length at

www.informationphilosopher.com/solutions/scientists/neumann/.

⁴⁹Everett, 1973, pp. 8-9, Everett's emphasis.

or measurement, it substituted a *bifurcation in the space/time continuum*. That is, in effect, any time a measurement is made of anything, at the quantum scale, or at any scale, and a result is obtained: a fork in “reality” emerges, one leg of which includes the observed measurement, and the other of which does not. From that moment, these two legs of “reality” have no contact with each other, and do not influence each other in any way; yet neither of them may be said to be any more “real” than the other. The observer making the measurement may be biased in favor of the “reality” in which his measurement is clearly recorded in his notebook. But then he would be similarly biased in favor of any of the “alternate realities,” or “many worlds,” in which his measurement was not made, or recorded a result different from that recorded in “this world:” that is, in which his *choice* had been different than it was in his “actual” experience.

Everett’s thesis was read and discussed in Copenhagen, and in March 1959 Everett went there in an effort to establish a “meeting of the minds” with Bohr and his circle. The keepers of the Copenhagen Interpretation were not amused. Léon Rosenfeld, 1904-1974, who had moved to Copenhagen in 1958, recalled a few years later:

With regard to Everett neither I nor even Niels Bohr could have any patience with him, when he visited us in Copenhagen more than 12 years ago in order to sell the hopelessly wrong ideas he had been encouraged, most unwisely, by Wheeler to develop. He was undescribly stupid and could not understand the simplest things in quantum mechanics.⁵⁰

Meanwhile, after securing his PhD in Physics at Princeton in 1956, Everett took a position at the Pentagon with the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group (WSEG), managed by the Institute for Defense Analyses, and never returned to the field of theoretical physics. During the intervening years, the Copenhagen Interpretation has declined in favor, and the Many Worlds Interpretation pioneered by Everett has risen among a new generation of leading-edge physicists—and life goes on. . . .

4.3 Implications

If all this palaver over competing esoteric interpretations of theoretical physics seems entirely detached from the daily concerns encountered in the “real world,” then consider the daily concerns, for example, in the life of one Anita Moorjani, discussed above (pp. 27-30). In her case, rigorous medical tests were executed the morning of 2/2/2006 upon her comatose physical body, which “was filled with swollen lymph nodes and tumors the size of lemons, from the base of my skull all the way to my lower abdomen;” and on the basis

⁵⁰Osnaghi, S., et al., 2009, p. 17.

of visual observation, her doctors did not expect her to remain alive for more than 36 hours.

During the interval in which the tests that had been run were being analyzed in the medical lab, comatose Moorjani had a "transdimensional" near death experience in which she was given a choice to die physically, or to continue living in her healed, healthy body. She chose to continue living, and as she emerged from her coma, "the doctors came rushing into the room with big smiles on their faces saying to my family 'Good news—we got the results and her organs are functioning—we can't believe it!! Her body really did seem like it had shut down!'"

Now I ask you: Was this an instance of a *bifurcation in the space/time continuum*—or what? Follow-up tests were immediately and repeatedly run, none of which returned so much as a trace of cancer anywhere in Moorjani's body. Her doctors had no satisfactory explanation for her virtually instantaneous recovery, but "put it down to me suddenly responding to the chemo," Moorjani remarked; and she lived to tell her tale to the world.

One of the implications of "the Everettian heresy" is that *somewhere* there is an "alternate reality" in which Anita Moorjani never recovered from her coma: her organs shut down, as anticipated by her doctors, followed by a funeral attended in great sorrow by her family and friends; and the story of her "miraculous" recovery was never told. But that is not the "reality" in which you, and I, and Anita Moorjani live today. We live in a "reality" in which all this "really happened," and a live and healthy Anita Moorjani shares the "real world" with you and me. Makes a fellow think a bit, what?

In 1905 Albert Einstein came up with what is now probably the most well-known mathematical equation in the world: $E = mc^2$. In words, "energy is equivalent to mass multiplied by the speed of light squared." The core of the matter is the first part: $E = m$, "energy is equivalent to mass." The c^2 part is simply a conversion factor, specifying how much energy is equivalent to how much mass.⁵¹ Energy and mass, in other words, are

⁵¹In application, the $E = mc^2$ equation means that a physical mass (expressed in grams) contains a quantity of energy (expressed in energy units called ergs) equal to the number of grams in the mass multiplied by the speed of light (expressed in centimeters per second) "squared," or multiplied by itself. The math is not complicated, and solving for a mass of one kilogram (for example) works out like this:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The speed of light } c &= 2.998 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm/s;} \\ c^2 &= 8.988 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm/s;} \\ \times 1000\text{g (1kg)} &= 8.988 \times 10^{23} \text{ ergs;} \\ &= 8.988 \times 10^{16} \text{ joules;} \\ &= 2.497 \times 10^{10} \text{ kWh (kilowatt-hours).} \end{aligned}$$

That is, by the $E = mc^2$ equation, one kilogram, or 2.2 pounds of atoms (such as dirt) contains, in extremely dense, compact form, 24,970,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electromagnetic energy.

complementary expressions of the same thing. They are not different; they only look different—somewhat as ice and water vapor are the same stuff (H₂O), but look different.

By Everett's theory of the universal wave function, we might understand more clearly, as mentioned above, that both mass and energy are complementary expressions of wave functions; or isolated or composite frequencies, exemplified by, but not limited to, the sound created by a performing symphony orchestra. As Everett himself put it, quoted above, "Since the universal validity of the state function description is asserted, one can regard the state functions themselves as the fundamental entities, and one can even consider the state function of the whole universe."

A significant fraction, but not all of the energy in "the universe" that we share at this time takes the form of a wide range of frequencies called the *electromagnetic spectrum*⁵². All frequencies in the electromagnetic spectrum travel through a vacuum at *c*, "the speed of light," or about 186,000 miles = about 300,000 kilometers per second. Yet only a very narrow band of this vast spectrum is visible to humans is "light:" specifically, those wavelengths that lie between about 400 nm (emerging from ultraviolet at shorter wavelengths), and 700 nm (vanishing into infrared at longer wavelengths). Obviously, there is a good deal more to "reality" than is visible to human eyes.

Additionally, there is a spectrum of sound frequencies, some audible to the human ear, a great many others not, which propagate through air at sea level at about 1165 feet per second; through water faster, and farther; and through other materials at different velocities, and with varying fidelity; as may be verified by banging with a hammer, for instance, upon a length of railroad track, or a goose down pillow. Sound vibrations are not represented upon the chart of the electromagnetic spectrum—although they may be broadcast through space, and reproduced over great distances by electromagnetic means, for instance at wavelengths shorter than 10 m, and frequencies lower than 10⁹ Hz.

And who knows how many other frequency spectra there may be in "the universe" we three-dimensional Earth-humans like to call "reality?" Upon what spectrum chart may the vibrations of *love*, and *hate* be accurately represented? They have no place upon the electromagnetic chart; yet are they any less "real," or have they any less effect in human experience, than do microwaves, or X-rays? Hay, all you clever chaps who think you have a "realistic" appraisal of "how things really are:" are you *sure* you've got it all worked out? Or might you possibly have overlooked a thing or two along the way?

⁵²Illustrated in the HTML version of this file.
wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/wow07.html#many04.3.0

4.3.1 A Remote View

As mentioned above, the most startling implication of Everett's theory of the universal wave function was that, in effect, any time a measurement—or a choice of any kind is made, anywhere, by anyone—a fork in "reality" emerges, one leg of which follows the consequences of the choice, and the other of which does not; or rather, follows the consequences of the alternative choice. And none of these "alternate realities" (according to the theory) may be said to be any more "real" than any other—even though the entity making the choice experiences only one of them, to the complete exclusion of all others. Within locally experienced "realities," in other words, "you can't have it both ways." Yet what has been called the "multiverse," in distinction from the "mere" universe, not only "has it both ways," but includes "all ways," or the play-out of *every* choice ever made anywhere, by anyone, or anything.

Pretty big place, the "multiverse"—if there is such a thing. How might one go about testing the concept, instead of just idly speculating about what most people might consider to be a pretty bizarre idea? If nobody can possibly experience more than the thread of their own succession of choices (in the context of the choices of all others who share that thread)—what difference does it make?

We've had a glimpse here, maybe, of the kind of difference such an idea *might* make: in the instance of the astonishing recovery from terminal cancer made by Anita Moorjani, discussed above in § 3.6 Love, and in § 4.3 Implications. During her near death experience while in coma, Moorjani beheld what may be interpreted as "a bifurcation in the space/time continuum," during which she seemed able to peer a ways down *both* legs of two "alternative realities," and make a deliberate choice between them. At that moment, the medical tests that had been run on her comatose physical body were in the process of analysis, and she was shown two alternative ways the tests might turn out: one indicating organ failure due to runaway cancer throughout her body; the other indicating recovery, with no evidence of cancer anywhere in her body. She chose the second alternative, and as she emerged from coma, the test results were returned from the lab, indicating healthy organ function, and no evidence of cancer; and were confirmed to an incredulous medical staff by extensive subsequent testing.

On the basis of classical epistemology, all this is categorically impossible; yet it actually happened, and Moorjani did at least one impossible thing before breakfast that morning. The "three-dimensional results" are documented in her medical records.

Either that, or Moorjani made the whole thing up. Do you believe that? I don't. I find it much easier to believe that "reality" is considerably different—and far more "interesting"—than indicated by the expectations of classical epistemology. (Frankly, if I may say

so, I doubt that so-called “knowledge” among humans, as implied above, has a very solid basis at all, in non-trivial domains; and that the line between *knowledge* and *opinion* is often sketchy at best, and is itself a matter of frequently biased opinion.) That’s just me. You are welcome to believe whatever you like. Your mileage may vary.

Now there is a fellow often in residence upon this planet who has made a life work of investigating some of the implications that follow from Everett’s theory of the universal wave function. His name is Courtney Brown, PhD,⁵³ Director and founder of the Farsight Institute,⁵⁴ a nonprofit research and educational organization dedicated to the study of a phenomenon of nonlocal consciousness known as *remote viewing*.

Remote viewing is a technique that may be learned and mastered, and has been used as a means of gathering information about designated targets located remotely in time and/or space from the human viewer. This may sound at first, to borrow from Einstein, like “spooky action at a distance.” Although that description may actually apply, remote viewing has nevertheless produced information of value in the field of espionage and intelligence gathering; and its most effective adepts were trained by the U.S. military. Brown discusses this in his out-of-print book, *Cosmic Voyage*,⁵⁵ Chapter 1, A Brief History of the U.S. Military Psychic Warfare Program.

According to Brown, interest in psychic warfare was initiated in the 1970s by the CIA, and was terminated by embarrassment over covert projects when the mining of Nicaraguan harbors attracted U.S. Congressional attention. Meanwhile, U.S. Army Intelligence took an interest, particularly in the research at the Remote Viewing Lab at SRI International (formerly the Stanford Research Institute) under the direction of Dr. Harold Puthoff.⁵⁶

The progress within government agencies of low-profile and secret psychic research was complicated by the oversight of often conservatively oriented executives who were easily “spooked” by its uncanny disclosures. Brown implies that on both sides of the cold war during those years the techniques of psychic warfare did not meet their full potential, due to resistance within the agencies that sponsored the research. Meanwhile, a number of highly capable remote viewers had been trained, and have continued their researches outside the government agencies that had trained and employed them. Brown’s Farsight Institute now works with some of these government-trained remote viewers, and Brown

⁵³Curriculum Vitae March 2012 available at courtneybrown.com/socsci/cbvita.html.

⁵⁴www.farsight.org

⁵⁵Courtney Brown, PhD, *Cosmic Voyage: A Scientific Discovery of Extraterrestrials Visiting Earth*, Dutton, New York, 1996; now available only as a free download at courtneybrown.com/publications/speculativenonfictionpubs.html.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p. 13.

was himself trained in remote viewing by one such former agent. He describes his training and its antecedents in Chapter 3 of his book.

Remote viewing involves achieving a fluid state of consciousness in which the Viewer becomes skilled at suspending the usually active conscious mentality, and taking note of subconscious content without the normally reflexive intervention of the conscious mind. This is a subtle, delicate process that requires practice and perseverance to master; yet it can be learned by anyone who focuses the necessary effort. Nikola Tesla may have been describing remote viewing above (p. 14) when he used to take nocturnal "journeys" to places remote from his daily experience. It is difficult to evaluate Tesla's childhood experiences, however, because he did not practice the kind of rigorous protocols that have been developed by contemporary remote viewers—and he is no longer around to elaborate upon his childhood experiences (although that limitation may be overcome by remote viewing Nikola Tesla, wherever he may be—now, or sometime in the past, or future).

If, as Everett suggested, "one can even consider the state function of the whole universe," then the state function of *everything* may be a single, composite whole that includes the states of all matter, all energy, all space, all time . . . or in a very few words, "All That Is, Was, or Ever Shall Be." This is pretty speculative; but *if so*, then remote viewing may involve "tuning into" target frequencies anywhere, anywhen, anyhow—*somehow*, by means of the Viewer's subconscious mind. This may be, at least potentially, a native human capability: because certain individuals, such as Nikola Tesla, Anita Moorjani, Courtney Brown, and others—maybe including even you, or me, at times—seem to have had these kinds of experiences.

And if all so-called "material objects," that manifest in any way as existing, may be considered to be wave functions, then "journeying" anywhere, anywhen, anyhow, in time, or space, or among "alternate realities," may be a matter no more complicated (once you get the hang of it) than tuning a radio dial to the *frequency* of a chosen broadcast: for instance as in, "This is KFI, Los Angeles, broadcasting at 640 kHz;" or "WMAQ, Chicago, broadcasting at 670 kHz;" or "KASH, Anchorage, broadcasting at 1080 kHz."⁵⁷ Just "tune into it," whatever, wherever, whenever, however "it" is, and *Bzzzzst!* you're "there!" If the universal wave function fills the "multiverse" of all "alternate realities," then any and every part of it could be instantaneously and nonlocally accessible to *every* part of it. *If* you know how.

These are some pretty big *If*s. Even if certainty, or "knowledge," cannot be reliably achieved within non-trivial domains, is there any plausible way to verify at least a basis

⁵⁷Broadcasters and associated frequencies listed at [www.tvtower.com/Commercial Television Frequencies.html](http://www.tvtower.com/Commercial_Television_Frequencies.html).

for *belief* that some of them may be “actualities?” Dr. Brown thinks so, and the Farsight Institute is currently engaged in a global experiment, called the Multiple Universes Project,⁵⁸ aimed at developing such verification.

The Multiple Universes Project was prompted by a surprising result obtained in the course of other projects in progress in June 2008, in which a remote viewing target was selected for routine validation purposes. The target decided upon was the Los Angeles International Airport, LAX, December 2008, six months into the future at that time. Accordingly, a remote viewing session was run, targeting LAX 12/2008; the results of which clearly indicated that by that date, LAX would have meanwhile been virtually destroyed by a large-magnitude earthquake that appeared as though it would have occurred some months prior to December 2008.

On Tuesday, 29 July 2008, there was a 5.4-5.8 magnitude earthquake in Los Angeles, exactly matching the prediction’s timing, but with a lower than predicted magnitude.⁵⁹

The Viewer got something right, but not everything; and that was puzzling. Intricate analysis of the session suggested that “what happened” might be accounted for by the *order* in which the three vital components of the remote viewing session were executed. The three elements of a remote viewing session, in arbitrary order, are *a) Target Time*; *b) Tasking Time*; *c) Viewing Time*. The Target Time is the place and time that is to be remotely viewed. The Tasking Time is the time that the target is selected and assigned. The Viewing Time is the time that the assigned target is remotely viewed.

In all cases, the Viewer operates “blind.” That is, he or she is given no information about the target to be viewed, other than, at maximum, that a target (somewhere, sometime) has been selected. By the protocols in use at the Farsight Institute, targets are selected only *after* the remote viewing session has been executed: so nobody, the Viewer included, has any way of forming a preconception about the target before Viewing Time.

For viewing the future, it has been found that the greatest accuracy may be attained by the order: *a) Viewing Time*; *b) Target Time*; *c) Tasking Time*. That is, the remote viewing session is executed first; some weeks or months later, an event occurs that the Tasker, the person assigning the task, decides would be an appropriate target for the

⁵⁸Described in the video, *Courtney Brown on Multiple Universes (Full Version)*, 22:35. “Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Scientific Exploration, May 30, 2009. All research presented here was conducted at The Farsight Institute. None of this research was supported or conducted at any other institution or university.” Available at

farsight.org/demo/Multiple_Universes/Multiple_Universes_Experiment.html.

⁵⁹Brown, *Loc. cit.*

viewing session already executed; and only then is that target assigned as the task of the remote viewing session that initiated the protocol. During the interval between Viewing Time and Tasking Time, results of the session itself are encrypted, and kept secure from everybody but the Viewer who conducted the session.

The reason this particular order of operations produces the most accurate predictions of future events *may* be that *if* Everett was right about the “multiverse” of the universal wave function; and *if* “journeying” anywhere, anywhen, anyhow, in time, or space, or among “alternate realities,” is really no more complicated (for those who know how) than tuning a radio dial to the frequency of a chosen broadcast—*then* by placing the Tasker in the future of the event to be viewed, assurance is thereby secured that the selected event exists within the “reality” shared by the Tasker and the Viewer, and not in some “alternate reality.” That is, the event “really happened” in “our reality.”

However, in the case of the remote viewing session in June 2008, targeting LAX in December 2008, the task was assigned *after* the Viewing Time, but *before* the Target Time. Therefore, there was no assurance that the LAX of December 2008, viewed by the Viewer in June 2008, exists in “our reality.” It may exist in an “alternate reality,” in which the 7/29/2008 Los Angeles earthquake was of a much greater and more devastating magnitude than was experienced in “our reality” as a 5.4-5.8 magnitude “trembler.”

Accordingly, Brown made the following proposal for extended testing of the existence of “multiple universes,” as suggested by Hugh Everett’s theory of the universal wave function:

If there are multiple universes, then the accuracy of predictions based on remote-viewing data associated with an experimental design that organizes the sequence of events from first to last as (1) viewing time, (2) target event, (3) tasking time . . . will be significantly greater than the accuracy of predictions made when the tasking and viewing times precede the target time.⁶⁰

Brown concluded his presentation with the observation that “The central hypothesis affirming multiple universes is supported by these remote viewing data.” He emphasized, however, that the hypothesis is not proven, but only supported by the data. As a means of gathering more supporting (or contrary) data, the Farsight Institute have launched the Multiple Universes Project: a global experiment whose final results are scheduled to be available in mid-2013. The project is described at The Farsight Institute Website, and the global public are welcome to observe its progress. (Perhaps I should mention that I have no affiliation with the Farsight Institute; I just happen to think that their work is “interesting.”)

⁶⁰Brown, *Loc. cit.*

4.3.2 Imagination and "Reality"

As discussed above in § 1 The Beginning, and concluded in its final paragraph, "The creativity of *any* creative being consists not only in forming creative thoughts and ideas, but also in refining them by a process of purposeful selection aimed at identifying within them every element that does not work, and eliminating it, correcting it, or replacing it with elements that do work."

In the case of "Almighty Bob," an example of the "excruciating detail" to which we may imagine this creative selection process evidently was and is extended, was indicated briefly in #6 of this series, in § 4 Transdimensional Realities:

Such a Cosmic Being [I wrote] 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 = 10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 (10^{25});
- Electromagnetic: strength =
1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 (10^{36});
- Strong: strength = 100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 (10^{38}).

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?⁶¹

If the “reality” we experience is imagined at bottom to be the manifestation of a composite universal wave function, as described by Everett’s theory, in which *every possibility*, or *every choice*, is “given a try” in an “alternative reality,” then this process of selecting patterns that work, and deselecting patterns that do not work, may appear to be virtually “automatic.” Patterns, great or small, that don’t work, don’t last; whereas patterns that work persist. Given enough time, *every* “alternate reality” may be expected to wind up consisting mostly of patterns that work: because all patterns that don’t work inevitably eliminate themselves, sooner or later, leaving behind a “residue” mostly of patterns that work flawlessly. Such a Cosmic culling process might even moot the question as to whether Cosmos is “intelligently designed.” It *might* be interpreted as “mindless”—or as the Cosmic Prototype of what “mind” is.

Possibly “contrary to popular opinion,” Earth-humans are not the only beings who make choices. Everything makes choices, some of which work better than others. A dandelion seed, wafted on the breeze, lands somewhere, and thereby makes a choice: not a deliberate, self-motivated choice, but a kind of choice nevertheless, among many possible alternative choices. It may land in the middle of a busy asphalt street, and be run over almost immediately by a truck tire: a choice that doesn’t work very well, for dandelion seeds, and other living things. Alternatively, it may lodge a few yards away in a crack in a sidewalk, and sprout the next spring, as a lonely-only dandelion, surrounded by empty expanses of concrete sidewalk; yet thrive to blossom, and produce a new generation of dandelion puffs. Not ideal maybe, but better than the choice described before. It may work well enough, and maybe some of the seeds produced, in collaboration with the wind, and the rain, and the foraging bees, will make even better choices later on.

The exercise of *free choice* is the minimal prerequisite for operation of the creative imagination. Dandelion seeds make choices, but they cannot be said to be free choices,

⁶¹The Writing on the Wall #6: “Inquire Within”, pp. 20-21.
wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow06

or voluntary choices; and dandelion seeds probably do not register very high on the scale of creative imagination. Conversely, the “multiverse” imagined here makes *every possible choice*, each one manifest in an “alternate reality,” and may be regarded as standing at the apex of creative imagination. Not only is every possibility “imagined,” but is also given actualized manifestation, within its own “alternate reality,” like one of Mr. Tesla’s inventions, created and perfected entirely within his imagination, before being given manifestation in “third dimensional reality.”

The phenomenon of remote viewing, described extensively and in depth by Courtney Brown, illuminates a perhaps surprising identity between imagination and “reality.” One way of describing what happens in a remote viewing session⁶² is that the Viewer relaxes the conscious mentality—in most “civilized people” habitually dominated by the altered-ego—allowing unfettered expression of the “subconscious” creative imagination, which is able to “tune in” to any targeted frequency of the universal wave function. This is what Earth-humans, usually with highly biased selectivity, interpret as “reality.” Because the universal wave function exists outside of, not within “time” and “space,” such “tuning” is not limited by either of these; which conveniently facilitates the targeting of the session at any time, either before or after the session has been completed, aimed at any “reality” anywhere within the universal wave function. The classical epistemological chain of cause and effect does not seem to be entirely applicable within the universal wave function.

The demonstrable and demonstrated fact that remote viewing is even possible, with any verifiable reliability at all, is a paradigm-shifting circumstance: for it suggests possibilities not imaginable from within the confines of classical epistemology. It may even be so that remote viewing itself, far from being a bizarre phenomenon beyond the experience of most “normal humans,” may be among the most common of human experiences. It is imaginable that exercise of the creative imagination consists in essence of “tuning in,” perhaps with varying fidelity, to “alternate realities” that actually *exist* “somewhere” within the universal wave function that manifests all possible “realities”—including, by the way, those that work, and those that, like ours, do not.

This is entirely speculative, and is not intended as a description of “how things really are.” How “things *really* are” may be considered in many different ways, on the basis of many different assumptions, or speculations. Under some circumstances, it may be useful to consider imagination as a facility for “tuning in” to “alternate realities” that are presumed already to exist “somewhere.” In other circumstances, this may be too passive an approach to imagination, and assigning it instead a more actively *creative* function, in which it is instrumental in bringing “alternative realities” into actuality, may be a more

⁶²These are my own speculations, not necessarily in agreement with Brown, or other Viewers.

useful approach. These alternatives may be complementary views, either one of which, exclusive of the other, produce partial equations that “are not the whole story.”

The theory of the universal wave function seems to obviate the illusion that “reality” must be either “one way, or another,” but cannot be “both ways:” for the universal wave function opens the conceptual possibility that “reality” includes *all ways*, which like the quantum and wave properties of light, need not be “rationally consistent” with one another: because the “alternate realities” of the universal wave function are mutually exclusive; do not interact with one another; yet none of them may be considered to be any less or more “real” than any or all of the others.

Only . . . sometimes, “alternate realities” evidently do, or can interact with one another. The phenomenon of remote viewing implies that one “alternate reality” can at least be *viewed* from within another—as in the case in which the LAX of December 2008, viewed in June 2008, was *not the same* as the LAX of December 2008 that actually followed in the *time line* from which it was viewed. This implies that there can exist an “alternate reality” in an “alternate time line” that can at least be *viewed*—which may suggest that it might also be *experienced* in more “direct,” or “substantial” ways . . . ?

If one can tune into a radio or television broadcast, for example, there must somewhere exist the broadcasting studio from which the broadcast originates. There is surely nothing extraordinary about going physically to the studio, and joining the “studio audience” who are experiencing the program “live.” Might it then not be similarly possible to visit “live” a remotely viewed target “somewhere else” within the universal wave function? There are innumerable such stimulating questions here—which may be “good news” for those endowed with a strong speculative sense, and who are not intimidated by the Unknown.

4.3.3 Alternative Time Lines

In #4 of this series, “*Don’t Believe Everything You Think*”⁶³ § 5 Shifts Happen, and in § 5.2 Making up the Future, I quoted *the Hathors* at some length. The Hathors are “transdimensional” beings who communicate from time to time through Tom Kenyon.⁶⁴ Although I take pains in writing these explorations, I frequently have the sensation that I also receive a lot of help; and that these are richly *collaborative* works, and are not exclusively the work of an isolated individual. I had that sensation quite strongly as I reached this particular juncture: which coincided “fortuitously” with receipt from Mr. Kenyon of the latest of the Hathors’ infrequent communications, to which I subscribed last March. The

⁶³wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow04

⁶⁴Tom Kenyon, *Hathors Archives*. tomkenyon.com/hathors-archives

latest edition was titled *The Sphere of All Possibilities: A Hathor Planetary Message through Tom Kenyon*,⁶⁵ dated August 18, 2012.

Perhaps in part because I have been thinking rather intensively in these terms for some time, I perceived in the Hathors' *Sphere of All Possibilities* elements in common with Hugh Everett's *Universal Wave Function*, as I have been imagining it.

The information we are giving here in this message [the Hathors write] is meant to assist you in manifesting new realities for yourself and for humanity. This method greatly accelerates the manifesting process, and since time, as you perceive it, is speeding up we believe a method that works quickly will be of great benefit.⁶⁶

. . . *manifesting new realities for yourself and for humanity.* Quickly. Now on the basis of the discussion so far, this may not be regarded as just an empty phrase. In the near death experience of Anita Moorjani, the theoretical physics of Hugh Everett, and the work in remote viewing by Courtney Brown and associates, we have discussed at considerable length some pretty compelling reasons not to dismiss casually the utterances of the Hathors about "manifesting new realities."

The Hathors' suggested method of manifesting new realities by means of the *Sphere of All Possibilities* involves a visualization of one's future self, living in the "reality," and having attained the desired qualities of one's choice in that visualized "reality." This is something I found immediately to be a formidable, though not an unfamiliar challenge.

A question I have found to be chronically challenging is: "What do you want?" The challenge is amplified when coupled with its sobering complement: "Be careful what you wish for. You may get it." The Hathors begin with a cautionary note along similar lines:

The first thing to understand about manifesting is that for every act there is a counter-action. This is due to the nature of duality until you reach the higher dimensions of consciousness in which duality no longer exists. Since this method is for manifesting new realities in your 3-D life, duality is a factor.

Another important aspect to understand is the admonition to do no harm. This principle is to protect you from negative consequences, and the simplest way to state this is that your creations should do no harm to yourself or to another.⁶⁷

⁶⁵tomkenyon.com/the-sphere-of-all-possibilities

⁶⁶Kenyon, *loc. cit.*

⁶⁷Kenyon, *loc. cit.*

This is advice that I take *very* seriously: for I am painfully aware of how human choices made with “the best of intentions” often reap unintended negative consequences, either for the one making the choice, or for others, or for everybody. How to avoid doing likewise is by no means a trivial question; and I gave it considerable introspection before venturing further.

Do no harm to yourself or to another. How can one do *anything*—particularly in the way of making decisions in the present, intended to have an effect upon an unknown future—with the assurance of not trespassing upon that stricture? The full consequences of any action are difficult if not impossible to anticipate reliably—which seems significantly to reduce the options for one’s future self, if one is strict about insuring a positive, or at worst, a neutral outcome for oneself and others.

If this sounds like quibbling over nonessentials, then consider the track record of “civilization:” which is conspicuously characterized by vanishingly scant attention to the full consequences of human actions, from the minutely personal, to the global scale. “Civilized history” contains countless such examples, which may be the rule, rather than the exception—or are at least such common occurrences as to render “civilization” dysfunctional. Regardless how I imagine my future self, I am certain that I want him *not* to be burdened by the unintended consequences of *my* casual and poorly thought out choices.

The only “answer” I can find for this potentially paralyzing dilemma is *love*. Only love may be trusted to heal without wounding, to help without hurting, to create without destruction, or responsibly to repair any damage collateral to creativity; and to restore *balance* to the unbalanced equations, and the polarized thought forms, that are “not the whole story,” and therefore, if not “equalized,” foment conflict and chaos among humans.

Also, being paralyzed by the unintended, unknown consequences of one’s choices is itself a choice—with unintended, unknown consequences of its own. “Not choosing” is therefore not an option. Further, there is no action one can take in the present which, for weal or woe, will not have future consequences. We do it all the time, because we can do no other.

Thus my initial dilemma seemed to resolve itself spontaneously, into what I hope to be a reliably “safe choice” for me to make on behalf of my future self. I decided that I want my future self to be an embodiment of love; to be responsibly self-governing; and to have the company in his future “reality” of many other loving, self-governing beings—all otherwise at liberty to vary themselves by their own choices, without limitation. That is the kind of a future I would like to live in, and that I would wish for those among my fellow-humans whose wishes are in resonance with it.

Something that should perhaps be underlined about the Sphere of All Possibilities, or the Universal Wave Function, is that they embrace *all possibilities*, not just a single

“one-size-fits-all” possibility. Another way of saying this metaphorically is that, on the basis of one’s own choices, and their consequences, it is possible to dwell in “Heaven,” in the midst of those who live in “Hell.” Or in other words, in order to transform your own “reality,” it is not necessary to transform anybody else’s “reality.”

The difficulty in manifesting new realities [the Hathors write] is the human tendency to believe that the current reality is all there is. There is a tendency to “lock down” perception and to follow the path that has been laid out for you through your own perception and the conditioning of outside forces. By imagining a sphere of infinite possibilities you create a crack, if you will, in the egg of your perception. New possibilities and new realities become probable.⁶⁸

In further elaborating their method of manifesting new realities by means of the Sphere of All Possibilities, the Hathors draw attention to one of their prior communications, *The Art of Jumping Time Lines*,⁶⁹ in which they discuss possibilities that seem to be in close resonance with implications of Everett’s theory of the universal wave function.

Although it may seem paradoxical to some [the Hathors begin], your timeline—your life—is only one of many simultaneous possibilities. And it is quite possible, indeed it is your birthright, to alter your timeline and the potentials of your life.

Your culture, for various reasons, has hypnotized you into believing that you are limited to one timeline. In this message we shall endeavor to discuss our understanding of timelines and how you can change them.

Whenever there is an increase of chaotic events, there is a convergence of multiple timelines. Due to the fact that your planet has entered a Chaotic Node⁷⁰ and is experiencing ever-increasing levels of chaos, there is also an increase in what we call *time nodes*.

Time nodes occur when two or more timelines converge. As a result of their close proximity *oscillation effects* sometimes occur when the realities of one timeline *bleed through*, or are psychically perceived by those on a neighboring timeline. Strong timelines can also literally affect the possibilities and/or probabilities of other timelines within a time node. In other words,

⁶⁸Kenyon, *loc. cit.*

⁶⁹Tom Kenyon, *The Art of Jumping Time Lines*, The Hathors August 3, 2010. tomkenyon.com/jumping-time-lines

⁷⁰Chaotic Nodes were discussed in *The Writing on the Wall #4: "Don't Believe Everything You Think"*, § 5.2 Making Up the Future, pp. 16-18. wellspringpublishinggroup.com/wl/download.html#wow04

creative and novel effects often occur within timelines when they enter a time node (proximity to other timelines).⁷¹

Thus according to the Hathors, there seem to be abundant possibilities—particularly in the period we are passing at this time—for individuals, populations, or even the entire planet, to exit a time line on a “negative” trend, and enter an alternative time line on a more “favorable” trend. This suggests an affirmative response to my speculative question above, to the effect that if there can exist an “alternate reality” in an “alternate time line” that can be remotely viewed, might it also be experienced in more “direct,” or “substantial” ways? The Hathors seem to be saying that, at least under the unusual conditions within a Chaotic Node, in which alternative time lines come into close proximity, yes it is possible for one or more individuals to “jump time lines,” and get off a “descending” trend, in favor of an “ascending” trend; and that this possibility, contrary to our cultural consensus, is a natural birthright of Earth-humans. Moreover, they say it can happen *very quickly*, by means of the suggested exercise with the Sphere of All Possibilities.

In view of the theory of the universal wave function, this is quite plausible: because the universal wave function is by definition a dynamic composite of all possibilities, or all choices made by anybody, anywhere, anywhen, anyhow, within the “multiverse” of the universal wave function itself. Nobody, in other words, is limited only to a *smörgåsbord* of existing choices. “If you don’t see what you’re looking for, ask, and we’ll order it for you!” Or more directly—and incomparably more *quickly*—make the choice yourself, and a “bifurcation in the space/time continuum” creates an instantaneous “alternate reality” with *your latest choice* at its root. (Whether it *works*, or not, is your responsibility—which you may meet, if you will, with (creative, intelligent, *loving*) follow-on choices.

5 Convergences

Now; having said all that; and having to some extent perhaps drawn into question virtually everything that “everybody knows” to be “self-evidently true” about “reality;” and having with reasons numbered human “civilization” among the small minority of existing mechanisms in Cosmos that *do not work*—where does that leave us, here and now? And where shall we go from here? We mentioned that there seems to be a *convergence* among the diverse matters we have considered; and hinted further that *love* seems to be the “heart” upon which these considerations converge.

If we say nothing more, then we shall have hardly more than echoed (in a somewhat roundabout way) what many have said before. Even if sincerely believed by some,

⁷¹Kenyon, August 3, 2010. tomkenyon.com/jumping-time-lines

or even by “many,” such a sentiment has not to date demonstrated a significant impact upon the flood of human events during the course of “civilized history:” which exhibit no measurable deviation from the “civilized” axiom *that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must*. No amount of “wailing, and gnashing of teeth,” seems to prevail against the hard edges of *realpolitik*, as practiced throughout the “civilized world,” throughout “civilized history.”

However, it is not my intent to second a sentiment with which there is widespread *agreement* among “civilized” Earth-humans, yet very little in the way of *practice* among the same. However “nice” it might be if we all just start *loving one another*, the trend of “civilized history” offers little hope that it is likely to happen any time soon—*except* for one “minor detail” that has received virtually no attention or recognition to date: “Civilization” *does not work*; and therefore may cease to be a factor in human events, in the swiftly approaching near-future.

If so, then “sentiment,” and “high ideals,” have very little to do with the human future. What people *say* is of little moment to the flux of human events. What people *do* is the substance of human events; and mechanisms of human invention (“civilization” springs to mind) that do not work, do not go, very far, or for very long. They break down, collapse, and one way or another, cease to function: regardless of the “sentiments,” or “high ideals,” of anybody. This may be as fair a description as any of what is happening to “civilization,” everywhere on Earth, *right now*; and I suggest that a reasonable expectation is that “civilization” has no part to play in the near- or long-term future of Earth-humanity—assuming Earth-humanity have a near- or long-term future on planet Earth.

This is neither a “pessimistic” nor an “optimistic” forecast of the Earth-human future. It is simply one man’s sober appraisal of the “crossroads” at which human events seem to have arrived in the present, and swiftly moving moment. Factored into this appraisal is the gradually and firmly formed belief that “reality” is almost unimaginably *different* from what most Earth-humans believe it is, or unconsciously assume it is, on the basis of what we have “authoritatively” been told it is. However, it is not my purpose to convince anybody that their appraisal of “reality” is “wrong,” or that mine is “right.”

Each of us pilots our various lives on the basis of what we believe, accurately or mistakenly, to be “true;” and none of us, so far as I can see, can do better than that. If we are fortunate, and attentive, we are able to correct at least some of our errors when (not if) we encounter them in the play-out of their consequences. This is a process of *selection*: between choices that *work*, and choices that *don’t work*. It is a universal and perpetual process, in operation at all times, everywhere; and its eventual trend is toward

the gradual and endless *perfection of everything*. So I anticipate a "happy ending" to all of this, no matter what happens; yet instead of "ending," I imagine things will just keep on *getting better*.

Therefore, the discovery, after some five thousand years, that "civilization" is a mechanism that does not work, is emphatically *not* a catastrophe. It is a positive opportunity to move on in a timely manner to something else instead that does work—or at least works better; and then perfect it further. That "something else instead" I have been calling "post-civilization"—yet to be imagined, visualized, and brought into actuality. Whatever "post-civilization" turns out to be, I am convinced that *love will be its heart and core*—not for any "sentimental" reason, or in pursuit of some "high ideal"—but simply for the practical, down-to-Earth reason that *it works*; that it is a vital part of *everything that works*; and that *nothing that excludes love works*, or lasts.

This "magic ingredient" that is somehow a vital element of everything that works, and without which nothing works, has been discussed at some length above, in § 3.6 Love; and may be fleshed out further by others, and by further human experience. To that end, I suggest that love is *not* a reflexive, knee-jerk response to conditions favoring it; or that it is reserved only for those fortunate enough somehow to "fall into it." Rather, love is a deliberate *choice* that may be made by anybody, under any circumstances, in relation to anything. Consequently, it really is feasible to "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." Or more prosaically, to love people you don't even like—if this is your *choice*.

It is possible, for example, to love rattlesnakes. Some people actually do love rattlesnakes—which does not require that they cuddle up with them in bed at night. However, although rattlesnakes are venomous reptiles, with a real potential for injuring or killing even those who love them, they also have qualities that may plausibly inspire admiration, respect, and love for them, in those who make such choices.

"Why would I want to do that?" I can hear someone asking. "Why would I want to love a rattlesnake, or 'them which despitefully use me, and persecute me?'" The answer is very simple: because *it works*. And not-loving, or disliking, or hating, as habitual conditions of being, *do not work*. But don't take my word for it. Try it out for yourself, just to see what happens.

This is an experiment you really can perform yourself, almost effortlessly, anywhere, under any conditions in which you find yourself. Simply, within the privacy and solitude of your own thoughts and feelings, select someone you really dislike—doubtless for very persuasive reasons. You don't have to say anything, or do anything; just deliberately, intentionally, direct the thought, "I love you," to that person or persons. Every time they come into your presence, or a thought of them enters your mind, whatever else you

may think about them, add the thought, "I love you." That is all. Just try it for awhile, and notice any changes in your life, including but not limited to your relationship with the object of your experiment, and/or others. You need not report the results of your experiment to anybody else, unless you want to. Simply take note of them, for your own information.

Another factor, mentioned above, is that, in order to transform your own "reality," it is not necessary to transform anybody else's "reality." If love is a choice, then it does not rely upon anybody else's choices; and it is possible to bathe oneself in a perpetual ambiance of love, even while living in the midst of those whose lives are filled with fear, anxiety, and chaotic striving. This is an application of a principle with broader applicability.

"Jumping time lines," as recommended by the Hathors, evidently involves some form of "navigation" within the universal wave function, or the sphere of infinite possibilities. If so, then like "ordinary" navigation within "third-dimensional space/time," navigation within the universal wave function is a matter to be decided by individual navigators, independent of the navigational choices of others.

For an example, you put your car on the road, and head for an intended destination. Although you share the road with other traffic, none of which shares your, or each other's destinations, everybody eventually gets where they are going, mostly without interfering with one another along the way. (Parenthetically, driving with love, instead of with fear, anxiety, and chaotic striving, has a tendency to minimize en route interference, even if you are the only one on the road making that choice—simply, because *it works better*.)

In the contemplation and practice of the Hathors' method of manifesting new realities for my future self, I was initially encumbered by the thought that I might err, and bring into manifestation for my future self some disagreeable circumstance, for which he would not be disposed to thank me. However, further contemplation has disclosed the milder suggestion that this is what all of us are doing all the time anyway. Every moment of every day, each of us makes choices, often trivial, but often enough significant, that will surely have favorable or unfavorable consequences for our future selves. And yes, we do frequently err, and create for our future selves consequences we would, when we arrive in that future *now*, prefer to have been different. It happens all the time, to everybody.

That is why I decided, after careful contemplation, that I want my future self to be an embodiment of love; to be responsibly self-governing; and to have the company in his future "reality" of many other loving, self-governing beings—all otherwise at liberty to vary ourselves by our own choices, without limitation. If I am able to wend my way to becoming such a man, in the context of such a future, I somehow think I'll probably be able to deal with it.

Perhaps this is a sketch of what a "post-civilized" society could be: a population of loving, responsibly self-governing individuals who grant to themselves, and to one another, the liberty to make choices, and execute them, without limitation. Because each of them are *loving*, they are particularly deliberate that none of their choices cause harm to themselves, to each other, or to their world. Because they are *responsible*, they take responsibility for any damage that may inadvertently result from any of their choices, and take whatever measures are necessary to repair such damage if it occurs. And being *self-governing*, they require no other governance whatsoever.

This is not a description of any "civilized" society that has ever been, or will ever be. It is a description of a "post-civilized" society that sounds (to me) as if it could actually *work*: for the single reason that *love resides at its heart and core*. Once established, so long as that condition prevails, it would be perpetual, and perpetually improving.

"But that's an impossible dream!" someone is bound to object. "It is completely unrealistic, because people are simply not like that! Realistically, people are mostly irresponsible, vicious, mean, and destructive; and even if you were able to gather together a handful of *saints*, such as you describe, they would be stomped into the ground, and trodden underfoot by the first army, or gang of hoodlums that crossed their territory. How would they defend themselves against anyone with an impulse to plunder them?"

Ah yes, of course. That is the voice of "civilization" speaking, who naturally believes *that right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must*. And no "handful of saints" would be strong enough to defend themselves effectively against anything more formidable than a flock of children armed with wooden swords. Therefore, they must be weak, and doomed to suffer what they must; just like everybody else who isn't strong enough to stand up to coercive power with equal or greater coercive power. That is why "civilization," like it or not, all its blemishes and warts notwithstanding, is *absolutely necessary*. So sayeth the voice of "civilization."

That is also why "civilization," like it or not, *does not work*, and *will not last*. If some people are irresponsible, vicious, mean, and destructive—and some, and maybe "many" are—then they too will go the way of "civilization:" for these are all patterns that *do not work*, and *will not last*; and those who persist in them will follow time lines that return them to the repetitive cycles of war and mutual self-destruction—until they "get it" that *those patterns do not work*.

So yes, that is one "reality;" and maybe many now alive on planet Earth will follow it for another several-thousand-year turn around the Cosmic merry-go-round: because any *alternative* to "civilized" patterns is beyond their *imaginations*, and consequently beyond their spectrum of possibilities. But what about those who *can* imagine, for example, a

“post-civilized” alternative to “civilization?” Such, by their own imaginations, may *make it so*, and open the gates of possibility to realms not accessible to those who cannot imagine them.

As quoted above from *The Writing on the Wall #6 § 4 Transdimensional Realities*, “*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.”

Had we not in prior Sections explored some of the transdimensional realities that exhibit themselves in the course of “ordinary” human experience; as well as in the “extraordinary” experiences and explorations of particular individuals, such as Nikola Tesla; Anita Moorjani; Hugh Everett; Courtney Brown; and by implication many others; perhaps resort to the *human imagination* at this point might seem like placing reliance upon a slender reed indeed.

However, to the contrary: our explorations have disclosed that the human imagination is by no means a “slender reed;” but is an instrument instead of almost limitless creative power. So formidable is the human imagination that *only when tempered by love* may it be wielded without wreaking boundless havoc and self-destruction. This is the hard lesson taught by “civilized history,” and only those who learn it may “graduate” from “civilization” to “post-civilization”—which *has no need* to defend itself against those who would plunder it: because those who would plunder it cannot imagine it, and will therefore never find it—until all their fears, and consequent lust for plunder and power, too are quenched by *love*.

Actually, there is nothing preventing the emergence, *anywhere, right now*, of a “post-civilized” society, as described, consisting of loving, responsibly self-governing individuals who grant to themselves, and to one another, the liberty to make choices, and execute them, without limitation—*except* for the apparent scarcity of individuals fitting this description. Such individuals are made, not born, and the only way they can be made, is to *make themselves* so. And there are innumerable means immediately at hand, and within reach of anybody who will, perfectly suited to accomplishing this “little thing.”

Just as anyone, anywhere, can conduct the experiment described above of directing thoughts of love toward somebody he does not like; so anyone, anywhere, can at any time commence taking note of, and deliberate responsibility for, the near- and long-term consequences of his trivial and significant choices, moment to moment, day to day, and year to year. This is a project that can occupy lifetimes; yet anyone can begin it, anytime, anywhere, with anything.

Would you like to live in a world populated by loving, responsible people? Can you *imagine* living in such a world? If so, then you may *transform yourself* into such a loving, responsible person—beginning whenever, wherever, with whatever you like. As good a

place to begin as any, examining within, is with any aspect of yourself that you find to be an obstacle to becoming such a person. It doesn't have to be your biggest obstacle, which you may find so intimidating that it discourages you from beginning the project at all. For of course, if you do not begin, you will never arrive in "the world of your dreams."

"Little things" are much easier to take on than "big things;" and all "big things" are composites of many "little things" that can be dealt with fairly easily, one at a time. It is a process that can accumulate with surprising swiftness; which is always encouraging. And of course, we all need as much encouragement as we can get! Simply taking some small action that makes someone else's life just a little bit easier—even if they don't notice it, or identify you with it—can start you on your *alternative time line* toward an "alternative reality" that you can imagine for your future self.

This is not about "getting credit for good deeds." It is about transforming oneself into the kind of a person who can participate in a world populated by loving, responsible people: because that is the only kind of a world *that works* for imaginatively creative humans. And the only way this can happen *for you* is by becoming such a person yourself. If you do not find yourself in such company, you may conclude that "you're not there yet." So keep working at it. "Lasting perseverance furthers."⁷²

Actually, you may be doing something like this already, and it may not be new to you at all. If so, so much the better! Then you already know the encouragement you can receive from your own progress; and the satisfaction that comes with making habits of *patterns that work*, and gradually discarding habits that *don't work*.

It is a quiet, cumulative process, like the growing of a magnificent tree from an insignificant seedling. Nobody notices, or praises, or opposes the quiet progress of your ceaseless toil. You may not even notice it yourself—until one day, you take stock of yourself: and in all humility cannot deny that you have become, and are becoming, *an entirely different person* than you used to be! It really does happen: just as you may eventually find yourself enjoying the cool shadow cast by that magnificent shade tree you planted years before as a seedling that you were not even sure was alive, the day you put it in the ground and watered it for the first time.

This is how "post-civilization" emerges from the desert dust of "civilization:" one person at a time, dealing with one "little thing" that doesn't work, at a time . . . until by infinitesimal degrees, unnoticed, and unopposed by anyone, or anything, "the world of our most extravagant fantasies" emerges within us, and all around us; and no trace of

⁷²*The I Ching or Book of Changes*: The Richard Wilhelm Translation rendered into English by Cary F. Baynes, Bollingen Series XIX, Princeton University Press, Bollingen Foundation, Inc., New York, 1950, 1967, p. 15.

the “nightmare world,” that has been our common heritage for thousands of years, can be found, anywhere.

“Not all that can be imagined works in practice.” Yet some things that can be imagined do work; or with effort and perseverance, can be brought to working perfection. “Reality,” the “Sphere of Infinite Possibility,” or the “Universal Wave Function,” or however you prefer to contemplate it, is the crucible in which *things that work* are gradually distinguished from *things that do not work*, and selected, and brought to perfection, and multiplied. Each of us, wherever, whoever we are, and whatever choices we make in the course of our lives, are agents of this Cosmic process; and are therefore *loved* by that process itself; are entirely worthy of that love; and are consequently worthy of your love, and of mine. This is the vision of possibility that I would like to share with you, right here, right now. Thank you for taking the time to give it your attention, and consideration. I love you.