

EXISTENCE – PART 2, THE ANTITHESIS:


Oneness/Isness = Zero Point = energy = pure light (pure consciousness?) = vibration/motion = explosion = physical light = energy/information (and with WATER) = life/pliable consciousness/conscious mind (awareness of self) = intellect = ego. Is this not as relevant as process?

The above is based upon the Inner journey and therefore the ‘experiential’ connection with Isness – or the Living Light of Creation as I call it. While Math is crucial and important, is it not also important that the correct meaning is attributed to the Math? Math is an observational and analytical perception/actuation and thereby a valuable explanation of creation, but do we also need the ‘experiential’ model as well? Therefore, in my opinion, and I’m not saying I am right, but do we need to be able to marry the two together in some way?

In the equations; $R=0$, $R>0$ and $R\geq 0$ if we replace the word ‘mind’ with ‘Spirit’ or Isness/Oneness then this makes perfect sense as it describes the Implosion and Explosion of Creation perfectly (the In and Out breath of the Universe if you like) and life as we know it.


Does this then bring into question the concept of ‘reincarnation’ of the ‘mind’ and the interpretation applied to the Math in this sense? Simply because the ‘Spirit’, Isness/Oneness, does not reincarnate, in the sense that it is ever present? Yes, it animates all new life, so symbolically we could say this is so (it reincarnates), but further, it has no perception/conception of self, it just IS, constantly working to maintain equilibrium. It is pure energy, or pure consciousness (energy/information) if you like.

Oneness/Isness is what we could term the Zero Point Energy; the NO-THING, yet EVERY-THING in perfect balance! Oneness/Isness cannot be anything other than this, perfect balance, pure harmony. The whole of creation works tirelessly to maintain balance (equilibrium, health, purity of consciousness etc) and it does this through imploding energy (information/consciousness), purifying it and then exploding this purity back out into the Universe. It is how all life works to maintain balance (health), there being no difference between how large or small an entity or process may be, everything works in the same simple way: imagine a Vortical Hologram of you like, or a Russian Doll, where everything is basically a larger entity of its’ smaller inner self!



THE PHYSICAL REALITY - MATTER


Here we have the left-hand spin and the right-hand spin of the physical reality – the world of separation. .



ANTI-MATTER –IMPLOSION – THE LIGHT WE ARE

Here we have the reality of Light that we are. The triangle represents twin vortices of energy in perfect balance existing as Oneness before they become separated in the physical aspect of reality. The 99.999% of who we are.

Isness, Oneness can only ever be totally pure and held in this perfect unity of balance (the No-Thing, yet Every-Thing; the Zero and Infinity), otherwise the Universe and all life in it would have died billions of years ago would it not? If this was not so the surely the Universe would not have been able to ‘heal’ and ‘balance’ itself and as a result would no longer be here?



If we are going to place the ‘conscious mind’ in this equation of creation - above where it should be in my opinion - then are we not just replacing the Archons’ ‘God’ with something similar, some other form of intelligentsia, by using the word ‘mind’ instead of ‘God’?

Thereby repeating the same error but from a different, more intellectual perspective? I appreciate that just like our cells are part of the sub-conscious mind of the human, we too, as are all living things, are part of the sub-conscious mind of the Universe. But like the 'conscious mind' of the human is not aware of the billions of processes being carried out each and every day, is it so that the Universal conscious-mind is likewise unaware of all the zillions of processes taking place in its' sub-conscious mind?

So here we have a Thesis presented, the Math, and an Anti-Thesis presented by myself, and therefore, in my humble opinion, do we need to find a 'new' Synthesis? Or is this just being pedantic where 'words' have different meanings to different people?

Would really appreciate people's thoughts and suggestions on such a tricky subject? Thanks.