

COSMOLOGICAL DISSOCIATION: TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF HOW WE CREATE OUR OWN REALITY

Rosebridge Graduate School, Walnut Creek, California

Jon Klimo

Proceedings of 2nd International Conference on Paranormal Research

Colorado State University,

Fort Collins, Colorado

June 1989

Introduction

I wish to share with you some aspects of my current research, which is an in-depth interdisciplinary investigation into the nature of how, if at all, we may create our own reality. I have chosen to examine this topic because it appears to lie at the very heart of much of the “perennial philosophy” that has existed throughout the ages, and, especially, because it appears to be the chief, and relatively unexamined, slogan of the current “New Age” movement. Rare is the individual today who has not been told by someone, “Of course, you create your own reality,” or, “You know you chose to experience that.” Hearing such can exasperate those of us who, based on personal experience, do not think that we are creating or choosing our own reality. And even those of us who think that there may really be something to it are at a loss as to where or to whom to turn for real verification or understanding about what is really going on in the name of this creating of one’s own reality. Therefore, I felt it was time for someone to take a more serious look at the matter.

The ideas on the nature of reality creation that will be expressed in this presentation had their roots in my earlier research on the phenomenon of “channeling.” That research confirmed my own intuitive understandings of an extended view of the nature of consciousness, energy, dimensionality, and the psychological concept of dissociation in particular. I would, therefore, like to begin by briefly tracing for you the development of my thinking from the earlier channeling research to the present.

Ideas Derived from my Research on Channeling

Prior to my present preoccupation with how we create our own reality, I have spent the last few years researching the nature of what has come to be called “channeling.” This research culminated in the publication of my book *Channeling: Investigations on Receiving Information from Paranormal Sources* (Klimo, 1987). In it, I defined channeling as a kind of interdimensional communication wherein an individual—the channel—is said to receive information, guidance, or energy from some other level of reality than the physical as we currently understand it, and from some agent or agency other than the self of the physically embodied individual as we currently understand the nature of the self, person, or personal identity.

This concept of channeling, then, as defined, presupposes: 1.) A multidimensional universe, only one subset of which is the space/time matter/energy objective reality with which we are currently familiar; 2.) that other levels or dimensions of this universe are inhabited by beings with consciousness capable of communicating with us on our level of reality; or that there is

information, energy, or consciousness on at least some of these other levels or dimensions that can be tapped by us from our level; and 3.) that the traditional insular concept of the self or person—the “skin-encapsulated ego,” as Aldous Huxley called it—is in actuality part of something more open and plastic than we are used to thinking about.

According to this third presupposition, the supposedly separate, individual self and consciousness of us human beings seems at times able to expand into other identity and consciousness, or to superimpose on, or become, other self-ness. Or it can be entered into by self, energy, or consciousness from beyond either itself or other physically embodied human systems. It would seem that in at least some cases of channeling, the impermeable or semi-permeable membrane that normally seems to separate off the individual human system can become more permeable, allowing non-ordinary ingress or egress of consciousness, information, or energy. Or, from a different perspective, we could replace the limited cell-wall-type notion of a demarcating, individual-being-containing membrane with something like a dimensionally constrained or circumscribed containment vehicle into which projections are made from a locus of other or higher dimensionality.

The Traditional Psychological Concept of Dissociation

The concept of dissociation plays a central part in the explanations of channeling that have been mounted to date by mainstream psychology, psychiatry, and neuroscience. Since my present understanding about how we create our own reality is based on this concept, it needs to be examined in more detail. According to this view of dissociation, people who are said to be channeling, rather than being in communication with something or someone which or whom exists outside of them, are really operating in a dissociated state. Within this state, part of their own psychic material or unconscious mental activity—alternately interpretable as only correlated neurophysiological bioelectromagnetical-chemical firing patterns—operates separately and autonomously with respect to their usual waking consciousness and control. What becomes dissociated from the parent psyche is variously termed sub-, alter-, or secondary-, personalities, or simply hallucinated, projected, delusional, or hysterical conversion, material.

The mainstream psychological explanation of channeling is built, then, upon a process of dissociated self-generation: a creative process that is unaware of its own products, or in ignorance that it has produced them in the first place. The process is something like that of an “amnesiac ventriloquist,” who, being out of touch with or having each instant forgotten that it is his own voice that he is throwing, experiences the voice as communicating back to him from some external source other than himself and with a mind of its own. The fact that the voice was formulated within, and then “thrown” from, a portion of himself that the listening part of him was unconscious of at the time, does not, according to this mainstream view, detract from the fact that—within the context of the overall person—it is still his own voice bespeaking his own self-generated material.

In the 1988 edition of the *Review of General Psychiatry* we are told that dissociation is “characterized by ...disruption of some aspect of consciousness, identity, or motor behavior” (Purcell, 1988, p.374). Among the various kinds of dissociation identified, those most relevant to channeling are the well-known “Multiple Personality Disorder,” and the most recent addition: “Possession/Trance Disorder.”

The former is characterized by the existence of 2 or more personalities within a single individual ... Each personality is well-integrated and is a complex aggregate

of unique memories, behavior patterns, and social relationships ...The original personality usually has no knowledge of the other personality or personalities; but when there are 2 or more subpersonalities, they are usually aware of each other's existence to some degree ...Various subpersonalities may have measurably different physiologic and psychologic attributes. (Purcell, 1988, p. 376)

The latter dissociation, case, of the Possession/Trance Disorder form of dissociation, is characterized:

either by a trance (i.e., an altered state of consciousness with markedly diminished or selectively focused responsiveness to environmental stimuli) or by possession (i.e., the belief that one has been taken over by a spirit or another person). (Purcell, 1988, p. 379)

Dissociation Taken to Cosmological Proportions

My own research on channeling led me to believe that some people said to be channeling were indeed in contact with inhabited or consciousness-possessing otherworldly realms of a multidimensional cosmos, while still others were operating as creators made in the image of their Creator, generating offspring subpersonality creations out of themselves in something like the manner in which they as human beings may have been generated out of their Creator.

In order to fashion a multi-causal model for what was really going on with channeling that would include a number of kinds of actual processes at work, I needed to accommodate the prospect of endless individuated seats of consciousness spread across many levels of reality differently limited in how they could communicate with each other; and I also needed within such a model to be able to accommodate the concept of nesting systems of generative, or self-replicating, mind. As a result, I found myself drawn to the psychological model of how an individual's consciousness, cognition, or psychic material can become dissociated and compartmentalized into more than one local self-consistent seat of consciousness-possessing identity each with only limited contact with others like it or with the larger psychic material (person, being, or energy field) from which it was generated. My own explanatory model, which came at the end of Chapter 8 of my Channeling book, moved the concept of dissociation from a psychological to a cosmological scale. My conclusion was in the form of a simile, which speculated that The Universe, God, or All-That-Exists, is something like a dissociated, or multiple, personality as construed from our dissociated perspective as sub-personalities within It.

This simile has grown to lie at the heart of my current thinking about how we create our own reality as well; for each of us subpersonalities within the Universal "psychic material" or Mind experiences and creatively interacts with our own self, with each other as such selves, and with the larger surrounding existence as Universal Mind in different ways and with differing experiential results, depending on to what extent we realize our true place and nature in this overall scheme of things, and to what extent we can overcome the initial dissociated state.

Before continuing, however, I need to qualify this simile that God or the Universe is like a dissociated being, or multiple personality, from our human frame of reference. In cases of multiple personality involving a single human subject, the primary, or original, self usually experiences dissociation and amnesia with regard to the subpersonalities spawned as offspring from its own

psychic material and consciousness. Depending on the individual case, the subpersonalities, in turn, may or may not experience amnesia and dissociation with regard to the underlying personality from which they took their being; and they, once “born,” may or may not experience the same amnesia and dissociation with regard to one another. In my simile however, the Universe, or God, never experiences complete dissociation and amnesia with regard to any of us, Its own offspring, for we are the contents of Its own mind, the cognitions constructed from and held within Its own omniscience. But we, Its subpersonalities, always experience degrees of dissociation and amnesia with regard to It, our source and sustainer, depending upon our own respective constitution and level of growth and learning. And the more we learn and grow, the less dissociated we become, as I will argue.

The Human Experience Within Such Cosmological Dissociation

Due to our condition of each being relatively dissociated from our parent, primary, ground—the Universal Being or God—we each experience this dissociation in a number of ways and on a number of levels. First, each of us, as a subpersonality within the one underlying common identity, is to varying degrees self-dissociated. Aspects of each of us is split off from, and operating disconnectedly with regard to, other aspects. Taken as the perspective at the time, local self-aware consciousness is dissociated from the unconscious as that which it is currently not able to be conscious of; and it can be dissociated from consciousness operating elsewhere within the system of which it is a part. The waking everyday ego-level mind is dissociated from what has been hypothesized as the same system’s own “higher self.” And the mind experiences itself as dissociated from the apparently non-mind-like body through which it functions. Second, we respective selves, as subpersonalities within the one Universal Being, experience dissociation from each other. And third, each of us experiences dissociation with respect to the one underlying Being the identity of which we nonetheless share due to our being Its own split-off offspring.

As part of this third kind of dissociation, each individual conscious self experiences dissociation, to varying degrees, from the physical-level universe as environment within which it is embedded and with which it is used to interacting. As a result, we human beings will generally agree that we experience ourselves and each other as separate minds within, or associated with, separate bodies. We further experience ourselves as existing within a Universe that is comprised of space and time, matter and energy, that usually take the form of separated-apart bodies or perceptual objects, some of which seem also to have, or have associated with them, separate minds. Everywhere we look, in both the realm of the mind and of the material, we find separation and differentiation—including the dissociation that we experience between the realms of mind and matter themselves—and we are confronted by endless individuation of form, function, and identity. And within all of this—that from our perspective we take to be the separated-apartness of Creation—we tend to experience lack, rather than presence, of common identity and connectedness. There is, for us, an apparent dissociated quality to our place within Creation as we experience it, and a dissociated quality to the Creation within which we are having our experiences. This is our current species-specific experience of dissociation within the seeming multidimensionality of the Universe, or God.

Due to these kinds of dissociation, we human beings experience a variety of kinds of isolation, powerlessness, and ignorance or unconsciousness. Put another way, we experience limits to the degree to which we can access and manipulate consciousness, information, and energy within ourselves, from each other, and from our common ground called the Universe or God. Cases of

supposedly interdimensional communication, or channeling, and of the parapsychologically studied “psi- functions of extrasensory perception (ESP, including telepathy, clairvoyance, precognition, et al) and of “mind-over-matter” or psychokinesis (PK), levitation, and manifestation or materialization, are all examples of how some of us are apparently able to at least temporarily transcend the usual species-specific limitations to information processing, energy interaction, and intentional connectedness and causation that accompany the prevailing dissociated conditions of our own human being. Assorted psychedelic, altered-state, and peak experiences, as well as transpersonal, mystical, and miraculous episodes, are also cases of transcending, at least fleetingly, the dissociation we seem to have been given to work with.

All of what I have described is marked by the age-old paradox of the One-and-the-Many. There is an underlying identity and unity to all that exists, which is called the Universe or God, depending on one’s view; and yet all around us and within us is our experience of dissociation of that Oneness into Its endless Many. Each of us human beings is one-of-the-Many, uniquely differentiated and configured—and therein lies our usual experience of relative powerlessness and lack of control over our reality; and yet each of us is also a member of the many-out-of-the-One—and thus is of the One—and therein lie all the possibilities of “taking dominion” with awareness of one’s true identity and causal efficacy.

Why Does This Cosmological Dissociation Exist?

If this cosmological dissociation is actually what is the case—at least from our human perspective—then we need to ask: why? Why the dissociation? If, as I am supposing, we differentiated beings are essentially the same as, and therefore have the potential to access, or to even consciously operate as, the underlying Oneness from which we take our being, then why are we relegated to the degree of isolation, powerless, ignorance and unconsciousness that we continue to experience as human beings?

One answer for our experienced dissociation is that it is the purposeful design of this Universal Being—relatively unfathomable to us humans at present—that we and all other delimited beings are the endlessly various free-will-possessing individuated expressions of Its own infinite creative Being, and that we are the ways It explores Its own infinite potential forever. Therefore, it is not that we are faced with the picture of some kind of a negative, ages-past “fall” from the eternal and infinite grace of the “garden” of All-That-Exists being at one within Its own omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omnibenevolence. Rather, we are—closer than Its breath—Its own individual expressions always growing within the very heart of Itself as multidimensional garden. As it comes closer to reaching this evolutionary end-point, humankind can then ever-more-freely access the full unadulterated and undissociated flow of the One Being’s own omniscience, omnipotence, and omnibenevolence, experiencing it as its—humankind’s—own as well, yet at the same time still maintaining its (our) own differentiation out of the Universal as the way the Universal is expressing Itself through a human being, rather than through an oak, squirrel, galactic, or any other, being. Therefore, all kinds of beings appear to have their necessary place in the scheme of things. They are the One Being’s endless ways of exploring Itself, lovingly and incestuously birthing out of Itself and interacting with Itself.

But then we could ask why each of us individual expressions the Universal Mind does not therefore automatically possess the infinite repertoire of possible cognitive, energy, and behavior capacities of our parent Mind. One response is that if we could overcome the separation that is our

own being enough to draw too much on and become too interfused with the Universal, we would no longer be the individuals that we by Its own design are meant to be. That is, how could the Universal Mind experience Itself in all Its myriad constrained individuations and differentiations unless It dissociated them from Itself—and perhaps even Itself from them—enough that they could have the experience of being their own individual selves (subpersonalities), their own essential personhood, separated out from, and unflooded by, Itself as the Universal? If we are the way the Universe focuses Its attention in order to create intentional objects and behaviors out of and for Its own consciousness and experience, then it is important that Its attention remains paid in the ways that it is so Its own individuated experience-accruing expressions can play themselves out to fruition from their seeded starts. In this way, we subpersonalities and our worlds of experience are like Its own thought experiments. These thought experiments are left free to unfold uninterrupted and according to the constraints that the Universal Mind has placed upon what may occur within them, and according to the programs and constraints that operate as the creative and choiceful action of us as that Mind's own subpersonalities working within It.

A second speculation is that the current especially dissociated state that we as a species are experiencing on our planet is the result of dark forces that conspire to keep us from becoming awake and empowered so that we could act out of the realization that we share the identity and potential capacities of our Creator. According to this view, these dark, conspiratorial forces are also subpersonalities of the one Being, but they have as the goal of the free will exercise of their intention the control over subpersonalities less aware, and therefore more cosmologically dissociated, than themselves. These supposed darkly motivated beings need to try and keep us human beings unconscious of our true nature for their own selfish designs; and yet they are experience-accruing expressions of the same Creator as are we, and sooner or later they will learn from their experiences not to so stultify the growth and free expression of fellow beings less aware than themselves. Such speculated forces have gone by many names, including the power of evil, the demonic, Satan, Lucifer, the Dark Brotherhood, the evil demiurge, and totalitarian-oriented extraterrestrials from Orion and elsewhere.

The third and final speculation as to why cosmological dissociation may exist (from our human perspective) is that we have done it to ourselves. We should really be having our cake and eating it too, but we have strayed away from the Universally-intended design. According to this perspective, we possess and consciously experience our own unique free-will and individual nature, on one hand, and yet, on the other hand, we should simultaneously also be consciously experiencing ourselves as the direct-access, differentiated expressions of the Universal Being, and, as such, we should be living out our existences through all manner of experienceable realities joyfully, lovingly, harmoniously, and fulfillingly in light of this awareness. This scenario of subpersonalities consciously possessing and operating with a kind of dual citizenship and identity—both individual and Universal—may have at one time been the way it was for us human beings. It may well now be the way it is for our fellow subpersonalities in the form of more evolved extraterrestrials or higher-dimensional beings, or in the form of our own Nature spirits said to experience themselves as differentiated and yet much less dissociated than us. But, because of our free will, we have individually and as a species led ourselves through an evolutionary pattern of reality-creating experience-accruing adventures that have generally been distinguished by their tendency to render us even more dissociated than we were initially designed to be. Even though our self-chosen adventures are, according to the prior speculation, expressions of the Universe's Self-adventure and Self-exploration, and even though we may be designed to grow by way of our adventures to learn that we are, ever more consciously, expressions of this Universal Being,

nonetheless, it would seem that, paradoxically, we have become more, not less, cognitively and energetically estranged from, and unconscious of, that true “dual citizenship” identity that we have actually possessed throughout.

According to this third view, then, we, as a species on this planet, have used the free will that we were given as cosmological subpersonalities to bring about our own kind of fall from what we now only dimly and metaphorically sense as some kind of garden of differentiated yet undissociated Oneness. We were created as creators capable of choosing our own realities. However, apparently because of what we could learn from it, we have chosen realities and behaved and construed in such ways as to tender ourselves even more dissociated than we were initially created to be as individually differentiated expressions of the Universal which was choosing Its realities through, and as, us choosing ours. But why would some of us subpersonalities—the entire human species, for example—choose to exercise free will to turn away from the consciousness and causal efficacy of knowing and living our true identity as living aspects of the Mind of God? Perhaps because one cannot have heroic adventures of working through challenging circumstance to successful completion if one does not have such circumstances through which to work. One needs the adventure of being lost in order to experience what it is like to be found. One cannot have the experience of falling in love and becoming loving and loved with regard to others unless one allows oneself—or is allowed by one’s Creator—to experience the prerequisite state of not having them either to love or be loved by. One may also need the presence of the already-experienced lover and beloved aspects taken away from oneself in order to deepen one’s understanding and appreciation. It is even possible to comprehend that the ultimate lover and beloved for each of us is the Being Whose potentially loving and lovable subpersonalities we are; and all the dissociation that we have experienced thus far has been required as the path toward eventually knowing and valuing this.

How can one learn not to further dissociate oneself with self-chosen acts of estrangement, selfishness, anger, hater fear, and so on, unless one is free to experience the repercussions of such acts? How can one know what it is like to learn something unless there was a time when the thing had not yet been learned? We are ignorant so that we might gain wisdom; unconscious that we might become conscious; unloving and unloved that we might learn love. We are, perhaps, God playing hide and seek with Itself, teaching and learning from Itself. This may be a more positive view of the estranging, and yet reality- and experience- generating, nature of our dissociation. All seems destined to be a process of learning and growing. The living through of any life requires the energetic, spatiotemporal, and cognitive, dimensional separation of its own seed from its own fruit. If the goal were already achieved then there would be no need for any goal-envisioning mindfulness And goal-directed behavior or for any of the endless mediating and dimensionally constrained spatiotemporal events and cognitive contemplations, construals, compilations, and integrations needed to be moved through in order to achieve anything and everything, or to grow anything that is able to be experienced, or to experience itself, throughout such growth. And still we may ask: How long must it be until we return ourselves through all this necessary dissociation to the wonders that we intuit, and dimly remember, await us once the exacerbated dissociated states we have created for ourselves can be overcome and we have learned to exist lovingly and knowingly within the realization that all is One Being?

I do not believe that we necessarily need to think that only one of the above three perspectives must be used to explain why we are experiencing the cosmological dissociation I have been positing. Indeed, I believe that the first and third points of view equally underlie our current experience as

individuals and as a species. One can even see the tendency to superimpose the two at work in the previous paragraph. The second viewpoint, however, may be rather hard to take for many. Still, I think that it plays a certain, though more limited, role. After all, we can picture even many of our own fellow human beings motivated by their own selfish ends to maintain power and control over others by working to keep them dissociated enough with regard to their own possibilities of energetic and cognitive connection to our common Universal Being.

A Way of Looking at Reality Creation: The Kind of Dissociation Determines the Kind of Reality; Change the Dissociation and You Change the Reality

I have pictured us as subpersonalities that take our being from some kind of Universal personality-less ground for all personalities (and subpersonalities). We experience that ground as being as dissociated from us and across Its own aspects as we experience ourselves as dissociated from It. Each subpersonality is like a multidimensional inertial frame of reference and an experience-gathering containment vehicle of sorts that takes its being from the Universal and in turn serves as a perspective on the Universal and its contents (including on oneself). Each experience of what is real and true is observer-determined; it is a function of the subpersonality as frame of reference. The experienced nature of reality is always a function of the particularly differentiated identity of the one doing the experiencing. Various put, the identified is always a function of the identifier; images are a function of the imager; and personally experiencable energy and object fields are a function of the one correlating or tuning to them, or collapsing the quantum wave function representing them, or otherways being seen to objectify them for oneself by means of one's own particular energy and consciousness. In short, there are as many different kinds of reality as there are kinds of perspectives created and held by all possible reality-constitutors. Within the Universe, or God, there are innumerable such perspective-holding reality-constitutors, which/whom I have chosen to see as Its own subpersonalities.

It would seem that our normal day-to-day experience of consensual reality, with its apparent physically independent environment and events, would counter this view of personal reality creation. However, any consensual reality is produced by those contributing to it, resulting in what is commonly held to be objectively real, i.e., intersubjectively sensately validated and corroborated as apparently objectively real independent of those experiencing it. However, this experience of consensually construed objective reality occurs directly as a function of how sufficiently similar are the kinds and degrees of dissociation of the consciousnesses and vibratory energy systems of the subpersonalities involved as the conjoint constitutors of consensual reality.

In another way of putting this, all experience of which an individual, or group of individuals simultaneously, is capable is state-specific or state-dependent. That is, particular states of one's mind/consciousness and energy/body—which are always variably taking their being from the underlying Universal Being—have associated with them, available to them, discrete information and vibratory energy realms of experience with which they are coupled and co-extensive, or to which they are resonantly tuned. To the extent to which the particular configuration and constitution of any individual subpersonality as localized perspective-holding reality-constitutor is dissociated from its Source, it will to that extent render and construe for itself, in both its apparent “inner” and “outer” experiences, a resulting differentiatedness, dis-unity, and dissociation away from the united Identity of that which underlies and is responsible for all that exists. To the extent of its own dissociation, that subpersonality will experience and construe differentiation, separateness, dis-unity, and dissociation within itself (e.g., as conscious vis a vis unconscious

aspects), and between itself and other localized, dissociated beings, as well as between itself and the one underlying identity and unity from which all such individuals derive their being.

It would appear that each species of which we are currently aware (at this stage of our own development as a species) shares across its members a similar-enough kind and degree of what I'm calling cosmological dissociation that a nesting and symbiotic ecological relationship of myriad species-specific consensus realities seems to be the case, including purported consensus realities shared by individual beings on other levels or dimensions of reality than our own current physically based one. To varying degrees, species are shut off from one another as a function of the state-dependent kind of dissociation and differentiation of energy and consciousness necessary to share their reality. In order to share what it would be like to be a member of a species other than our own, we would have to somehow take on its particular individuated energy/consciousness configuration, which is its kind and degree of dissociation, in order to then experience how it experiences the energy and consciousness of itself and that which appears to it to lie relatively outside of itself. To have ultimate compassion for another dissociated being—for his, her, or its, existence—one must do, or experience by means of, the other's dissociation as the mode of its kind of being.

Within this species-specific view, there is something especially interesting about our own human species and its kind of dissociation. In contradistinction to most or all other species of which we are aware within our current level of dissociation, we appear able to a certain extent to already be, or to at least potentially become, consciously aware that we are in the particular relationship we are: that of being subpersonalities in relative cosmological dissociation with respect to the underlying Universal Being from which we take, or are given, each moment our own dissociated and individuated beings capable of such an awareness. If one happens to attain this awareness, it may be then possible to consciously experiment with our situation—like the dreamer once he or she has become lucid within the dream. Part of this experimentation can involve a form of intentional change of state of one's own system (a change of energy, of brain waves, of mind; an effort of will, a desiring, et al). This change is made not only with regard to oneself but also with respect to the Universal System within which we and all other beings are birthed and embedded. And I am suggesting that with such a change in dissociation as self-configuration and relation to one's Source, a resulting change can take place in one's experience of what is real.

Some Metaphoric Variations on the Theme

Consider the following set of inter-related variations on our theme that combine physics, philosophy, and metaphor and operate under a kind of poetic license in order to bring to light more veins of precision from the ore of rough approximation we have been working with thus far.

Reality as Text; Creator as Author and Reader

Think of the texture of our ordinary waking lives: perceived sensate objects and tremendously complex, unfolding spatiotemporal real objective events comprised of matter and energy overlaid with a final veneer of our own meaning-making systems of construal. All this texture we experience seems to maintain its existence “out there” in the environment, well beyond what most of us would consider to be the sphere of our immediate creation or influence. Now consider that this texture of the ongoing real world we are experiencing is something like the moment-to-moment “text” of our experience: the surface-structure explicitness generated from whatever deep-structure that may be at work in the form of the as-yet-unknown cosmological

“grammar” operating throughout Creation, that, in turn, may indeed be the operation of the Creator Itself.

To restate this perspective somewhat, the deepest repository and generation site of any and all meaning could be seen as an underlying unbounded semantical space—or omniscient Universal Mind—from which arise all individually bound up, syntactically arranged and spelled out, surface structure symbolic material that is lexically connected to, and lawfully deriving its truth conditions from, its own prerequisite semantical grounds. Ideally one reads a text by the light of the same meaning which had formed and informed that text into being in the first place.

Ancient sanskrit and more-recent magical notions describe how the source of the initial naming process, the name, and the named are all conjoined by, and held within, a common intentional, causal mind. Such a conjoining could also be understood in terms of a continuum of meaning and purpose that is mediated by a connecting, similarly configured vibratory consciousness/energy. It is as if the uttering of something into differentiated being generated an excitation pattern, much like a vibratory Chladni or Jenny pattern. Then any change in that something’s being, or any true knowing of it, or any so-called mental representation of it, would have to involve coded mathematical and energy relations of such patternings of the differentiating process, of the presence of the already- differentiated, and of the process of working to understand what is differentiated in an attempt to overcome dissociation within the cognition of the individual as cosmological subpersonality.

I have in the past used the term “Orphic Resonance” to refer to another aspect of this text-authoring creational process, naming it after the mythic Greek figure Orpheus who was reputed to be able to effect objects with his music, to essentially sing the world into the shape of his song. But, in order to try and explain this process more precisely, we would have to introduce something like harmonic resonant relations that would exist as a wave-mechanical-type coupling agency across the namer, the name, and the named, and between text-creating and text-construing authoring and reading processes. I have said that all that exists is interconnected operations within a single Universal Mind or Ground of Consciousness, whether one chooses to speak in terms of some kind of vibratory thought forms or patterns of differentiated, interacting energy. Many radionic, psychotronic, and other alternative psychophysical parapsysics technologies are said to operate at least somewhat in the manner I have been describing. They supposedly create, or at least somewhat effect, reality, and conjoin components of it, through interdimensional harmonic resonance and projection relations.

Faced with this endlessly detailed texture of reality seen as an incredibly dense and profound text, how on earth could we ever think ourselves to be either directly or indirectly, alone or conjointly, the author of this text, let alone an author who could “write” at will into the future a text different than that which has been written until now? Should we not in all humility, depending on our perspective, simply defer either to a dispassionate “Nature” beyond our understanding or control, or defer to our Creator as the one Author of all Creation, including being the Author of ourselves as Its deeply limited authors operating within It in turn? I think we can take the latter view without abdicating the promise of our own larger creative capacity; for we know from personal, “real” experience that we do in fact bittersweetly effect, to varying degrees, by our own authorship, the Creation we seem surrounded by, and it would appear that we take the creational capacity of this authorship from that which has authored us in the first place. And this is basically the relationship I have been attempting to present throughout: We are reality creators operating within the bosom of our Creator and Its Creation; and we can both add to and actually change the

reality we experience as a function of the degree of our awareness of ourselves as subpersonalities possessing creatorship in relation to the Creator and sustainer of us all. Specifically, the more we can overcome our dissociation, the more we as authors can access our Author's subpersonality-transcending creational efficacy.

Symmetry Breaking, Creation Operators, and Related Concepts

The specific sum and configuration of each human being's kind and degree of consciousness/energy dissociation as subpersonality is derived from the explicit formula for how it is broken from, differentiated out of, or dissociated away from, the underlying unified field symmetry of the One. As tremendously difficult, multidimensional, and detailed as it might actually turn out to be, I believe that there exists a procedure for binding complex variables up out of an unbounded ground (or of uttering them into being, as earlier suggested); that there is something like a field-differentiating generation function or a quantization generator to establish an n-dimensional array of harmonic oscillators with an excitation procedure to differentially resonate them into the particular configuration that is their mode of being within the larger Being; that there is something like a complex creation operator for, or an algorithm for assembling, the particular symmetry-breaking superposition or local space-time deformation coefficients that would amount to and account for the properties, qualities, and potentialities of each dissociated subpersonality of the Universal. Combined with earlier ways of putting it, each such subpersonality is then something like a broken-from-symmetry (i.e., dissociated) energy/consciousness vibratory wave system as an inertial frame of reference in the form of an experience-gathering, reality-constructing-and-construing containment vehicle made up out of the Universal Being in the form of one particular self-interactive configuration out of Itself.

What is crucial to realize now, I think, is that, if we could only understand this hypothesized, potentially explicitly formulatable process for how each of us individuated beings takes, or receives, our being from the Universal, then we would know how to manifest what we wish within our reality; for I believe that the process by which we have been manifested is the same process by which we can manifest in turn, if, in truth, we are subpersonalities operating within and as individuations of our own Creator.

The Metaphor of a Cosmological Genetic Code

Perhaps the specific formula for reality creation might be spelled out in something like a genetic code that says: The way that the system is dissociated is the way that it is differentiated, and the way that it is differentiated gives rise to the lawful constraints within which that system is bound to draw to itself from the larger embedding system that which it requires to evolve and grow itself to the fruition and fulfillment of its own kind of differentiation. This genetic-code-like formula or algorithm also constrains the system's repertoire of possible interactive behaviors and construals with regard to other adjacent or experienceable subpersonality systems and with regard to the embedding System of all such systems. So the members of one species of what I am calling cosmological subpersonalities—be they sheep or flowers, planets or people—take their structure, as the morphological differentiation of themselves as experience-gathering behavioral vehicles, and take their function, as their capacity for utilizing the structure of their dissociation in order to respond and behave, to be however conscious, to make whatever meanings, and to operate in interaction with regard to other such structures and their functions.

In addition, more evolved species such as the human could be seen to have a kind of secondary genetic code in operation: cognitive structures as directions and valences for event generation or attraction, as programs for action and algorithms for assembly of the object-field contents of consciousness and for the construal of the assembled, and as the particularly dissociated and configured complex creation operators that contribute to the fine tuning of what is as yet only the partially focused realities that are drawn to the individual subpersonality as a function of the primary genetic code that is its species-specific kind of dissociation.

Yet another way of looking at this genetic code metaphor is to think that any dissociated system is forever in interaction with aspects of itself, with other such systems, and with the Universal. Since all differentiated beings are as subpersonalities of the One, then the resulting interactionism of each dissociated aspect with other such aspects and with the ground from which all such dissociations arise is comprised of the endless modes of a vast ‘cosmological incestuous intercourse’ of the One Being with Itself. Then, to continue the metaphor, the “offspring” that arise from this interactionism seen as intercourse will be, for each dissociated being, the objectified contents of that being’s experience: the objects as contents of its consciousness, the ongoing seemingly surrounding or incoming texture and text of its experienced reality. A cosmological subpersonality’s metaphoric genetic code—its particular program for structural assembly, for behavioral action of the structure vis a vis other such structures, and even for meaning construal with regard to all such structures and structured events it is capable of experiencing—is derived from the specific kind and degree of dissociation of that subpersonality. That is, the nature of the dissociation gives rise to the nature of the genetic code responsible, in turn, for then tuning to, attracting, resonantly entraining or being entrained by, assembling, structuring, manifesting, collapsing the quantum wave function probability field into, or in otherways essentially creating, its own ongoing reality for itself.

A Monist Ether Dynamism in Interaction with Itself, and We as Its Expressions

A theme recurring throughout this presentation is that the Universal Being within which all of us exist as Its subpersonalities, is a single monist Being, a multidimensional vibratory matrix—called by some an “ether.” The philosopher Spinoza used the term “substance,” and Hegel used “Absolute Spirit.” This cosmic plenum contains the potentiality for all that could be the case of what we, from our current level of dissociation, think of as energy and consciousness. It is the Universal Ground which contains the possibility for all that we currently deem time and space, events and meanings, that which/who can experience and that which/who can be experienced.

Given the hypothesized monist energy/consciousness wave nature of all that exists, there would then be some kind of Fourier transform mathematics and wave mechanics to account for how tremendously multiplexed superimpositions of this wave-based “grammar” could spell into local dissociated and differentiated being individuals which/whom are then capable of spelling into further being for themselves what is real as a function of the invariances, fluctuations, and transformations that take place within their own wave systems with regard to other wave systems and with regard to the ground for all such wave grammar. All that exists, then, would be a matter of the phase relations of different aspects of a monist Being comprised of vibratory energy/consciousness waves (or living self-waveable ether) that is incestuously in interaction with Itself. Sufficiently shifting the phase relations of the superimposed wave system within a relatively dissociated cosmological subpersonality would in turn effect its phase relations with those wave

systems which lie apparently beyond itself, resulting in experiential content for the consciousness of that individual that would be different from what had been available prior to such a shift.

All experiencers and all experienced events and phenomenology would have their origin within the interference- patterning holographic self-interaction of the One. The all-coherent Light of the Universal Mind or Ground of Consciousness is seen as generating and sustaining all that exists as Its infinitude of differentiations and dissociations, Its multidimensionality, and Its subjective and objective aspects. We can understand and effect the contents of this Mind—such contents as we take to be objectively real and beyond ourselves as experienced in normal waking consciousness—only insofar as we can understand that the contents that are our own beings, and the contents of our own minds as what we experience to be real, are actually the contents of this all-containing Mind. If the content of this Mind is comprised of the countless changes of state and phase and resonance relations of Itself in Self-interaction, giving rise to all subpersonalities and their experiences, then we may be able to effect our own reality by wave-mechanically engineering those changes of state and shifts of interacting phase relations that are the raw material for all reality creation.

The possibility of wave-interactive engineering tactics brings us back to our earlier metaphor of primary and secondary kinds of genetic code: We take from our Creator an approximate domain of Its Creation to operate within as a function of our specific level of dissociation as the constraint on the possibility of what we can experience. As creators operating within our Creator, we take our being and creational processes from It. We, in turn, as unique individuals within our species, further fine tune and appear to draw our personal realities to us out of the probability field or frequency domain that is within the Universal infinitude available to us as a function of our species' dissociation. It is with respect to these personal reality structures that we then function, behave, and make our meanings in a further complexity of creative activity that, in turn, has repercussions that are the new local realities to experience. One either tunes to, or synthetically superimposes together, the complex wave systems of experientiable reality, in both species-specific and individual ways.

Now, in the earlier metaphor of author and text, we are faced with being the case of such wave systems of the one Being—ourselves as author/readers—working with other wave systems with which we are out of phase—the text—giving rise to our experience of dissociation from them. The dissociated aspect that is not yet conscious of how or why it has creationally surrounded itself with text must then learn how to read what it has already authored for itself out of a part of itself from which it remains dissociated until it learns by interaction with its own creations that which can only truly be known in the less-dissociated state it is evolving toward as it comes into complete resonance with that with which it was earlier out of phase. This admittedly rather bewildering process underlies the earlier-mentioned case of the “amnesiac ventriloquist.” There is a dissociation, or perhaps an energy/consciousness lag of sorts, such that the generator part—the “voice throwing” in this case—is sufficiently separate from the listening part—the ventriloquist hearing the voice but not recognizing it as of his own creation. As a result, we have a case of a creator in touch with his creation, i.e., able to experience it, but being not in touch with the fact that he created that which he is experiencing. To the degree to which a subpersonality remains out of phase within its dissociation between its authoring and its reading and understanding functions with regard to its own experienceable reality as text, to that degree will there be spatial, temporal, and consciousness (or cognitional information processing) removes to have to experience oneself through over time in order to know what is really going on. The nature of dissociation, as a state of

being out of phase, gives rise to the need for certain spatial and temporal Fourier transforms to generate the endlessly complex space, time, energy, and consciousness/cognitional wave events to be experienced in order to overcome that dissociation. Out-of-phase-ness is why the acorn is not already the oak; and why we, in our human lives as Its subpersonalities, are not yet (one with) God. Meanwhile, resonance is the guiding mechanism that returns us to the condition of being harmoniously in-phase.

Bohm: Reality Creation as Explicating from the Implicate Order

Another way to look at what has been speculated in the prior section is to adapt from physicist David Bohm's holographic implicate/explicate order model first popularly presented in his book *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (Bohm, 1980). What Bohm calls the explicate order is all that we know, and can know, as objective, physical reality; while the implicate order is purely a non-temporal, non-spatial, non-objective frequency domain that serves as a kind of creational ground for all things explicate as well as for all consciousness and its contents. In my all-too-brief adaption here, my notion of each cosmological subpersonality would, in Bohm's terms, have gotten its reality by having been explicated from the underlying universal implicate order, giving rise to both its structure and its possibilities of function. This process would also have given rise to the constraint system that comprises the possibilities of what it can experience as locally and personally real through time, depending on the degree of invariance versus fluctuation and transformation of its explicate-order nature, and depending on its phase relations with other aspects of the frequency domain with which it is capable of interaction.

Wedding Bohm's terms to my own, then, personal reality creation is a kind of second-order explication: Explicated into being out of the implicate order, the now relatively dissociated subpersonality in turn explicates for itself the apparently explicate-order objects and events of its experience as a function of its own particular explicateness (or, in my terms, its genetically determined differentiatedness out of its dissociation). The cosmological subpersonality does this explication of its own experienced reality in the same manner that it was explicated into being; for all is operating within and as one Universal Being, one underlying process. And as we subpersonalities take our energy and our consciousness solely from that Being, so do we take our daily "bread" of reality, apparently objective to us, even as the bread of our bodies and energy configurations have been given to us. If the Universal Being, of which we are relatively dissociated and explicated offspring subpersonalities, is the one hyper-dimensional frequency domain implicate order responsible for all that is, then we explicate from our underlying common implicate order as Being that which we each experience as real for ourselves, and we do this in the same manner in which we have been explicated. All processes of explication—or the rendering as experientially real and objective—take their power and procedure from the prerequisite and constitutive implicate order from which, according to Bohm and me, all objective and subjective, experiencing and objectively experienced, being must arise.

It will have to suffice for now only to suggest the possibility of developing a potentially rigorous generative mathematical and wave mechanical system with which to understand and even engineer the composition of the explicate subpersonalities and how they may explicate in turn their locally experienced reality from the underlying implicate-order source of all explication. Then how one chooses to take one's being—to the degree to which one can exercise conscious choice in the matter; how one may constitute oneself out of and vis and vis the underlying ground; and how one chooses to be interacting with and drawing from the implicate order in a different way than

before—would then give rise to a different experience of reality or an experience of a different reality.

Roughly speaking, and to continue to use Bohm's terms, change in self-explication out of the implicate order will predictably effect how one experiences, and therefore will effect what one may explicate as what one experiences as real for oneself from the same implicate order. Simply put, in order to change one's reality, one must change oneself. And finally, the degree to which any cosmological subpersonality has choice in the matter of changing itself so as to change its experienced reality will be the degree to which it realizes that it can differentially relate to and access the underlying universal, or implicate, order. The more awareness that one has of being a subpersonality within a Universal living Mind/Being, the more deeply and productively one can draw upon the implicate order of Its basic nature in order to explicate both self-change and change in what seems external reality as experienced and understood from that level of one's own cosmological dissociation.

How Do We Overcome Dissociation In Order to Access Differently from the Universal and Thus Change Our Own Reality?

Let me repeat my basic contention: We are each a sub-system, or subpersonality, that takes our uniquely configured being from, and maintains our being within, an all-inclusive System that is a self-interactive monist energy/consciousness. To the degree to which we can overcome our experienced dissociation from that underlying and all-maintaining Being, to that degree can we gain ever-more access to the information, consciousness, and energy of ourselves, each other, and of other sub-systems, and to that degree can we have available to us and make our own a greater degree of those traditionally pictured qualities and actualities of this underlying Being: Its omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omnibenevolence (or all-lovingness), as well as Its infinitude and eternalness. If we are truly subpersonalities within the larger Mind/Consciousness (Body, Heart, and Spirit) of God, then, given our own respective coming to terms with and slow overcoming of the dissociation, we face the potential of ever greater and more profound intercourse, integration, and cooperative and harmonious at-one-ment within our respective selves, among ourselves, and between ourselves and that from which we all take our being and from which we create our own respective experiences of what is real.

Still, the question remains: In what specific ways can we have informational and energetic access to more of that all-inclusive Being within which we have our own being, given the dissociation that we are used to experiencing with regard to It? I believe that in order to achieve such access we can utilize one or more of a number of specific inter-related concepts and processes that together comprise a set of procedures that are engineering tactics for working creationally with the material of the one monist unified field. Due to the length of this presentation, however, I will only be able to touch on them briefly here. A more detailed "How To Do It" treatment must await a separate presentation for which the current one would serve as the necessary conceptual framework.

Surrendering Vs. Exercising Personal Choice

I believe that all approaches to reality creation involve learning ways to open oneself to become less dissociated from and more connected to and able to access, the omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omnibenevolence of the Universal Being. But opening to the

underlying Universal Itself without any qualification by oneself regarding what one is doing this for, what one wishes to experience as a result, may appear too unfocused for some. It is my view, however, that it is enough simply to open to the Universal with the inward intention and wish that “I Am that I Am (or I am Thy I Am);” or “Thy Will, not mine, be done;” or “Help me to be Your worthy vehicle (or channel);” or “I ask that Your love, wisdom, guidance, and healing energies flow through me both for my own evolvment (overcoming dissociation) and for that of my fellow human beings;” or “I now ask that You flow into me with what You deem best to aid me in dealing with what I am faced with.”

While this approach may be sufficient for me, and while it may even result in empirical proof of its efficacy in the form of perceived changes in one’s reality, changes that are deemed positive, useful, integrating, healing, and so on, it may not provide enough focus or sense of personal control or predictive power for other human beings. However, I think that to seek this personal control and choicefulness, given the problematic, counterproductive present stage of our evolution as a still-deeply-dissociated species is ill-advised even though we will always continue to learn what we need to from our personally and purposefully sought reality creation. And what is it that we are forever learning? To overcome our cosmological dissociation at the same time as we retain our individuality; and to openly channel the one Being through us as a differentiated expression of Itself in loving, interaction with Its other expressions.

Primary and Secondary Assenting

I believe that the key to overcoming dissociation in order to effect one’s reality lies in a process that I call assenting, which has both primary and secondary modes of operation. Such assenting, in its primary mode, is a method of simply surrendering oneself as subpersonality to the underlying Being. This involves the inter-related concepts and processes of self-modulation; of self-effacement or surrender; of opening to the possibilities of entrainment and superconductivity through making one’s own system quiescent and transparent, rather than opaque; of coherence, and of being able to be susceptible to and in resonance with higher-octave entraining organizational fields of energy and consciousness, or being able to receive higher-dimensional projections into one’s own lower-dimensional system. The secondary mode, which requires a degree of the primary mode as its necessary prerequisite, or self-transcending interdimensional carrier wave, involves ways of specifically setting one’s own reality-creating or reality-choosing intention, either mentally, visually, or verbally.

Because our relatively local dissociated consciousness fields reside as subpersonalities within the Universal Mind/Consciousness, our thoughts, images, and objectified realities experienced by us are essentially from and always within the Universal; and the thoughts, images and objectifications residing as potentialities for us within the infinitude of the Universal are available to us to varying degrees as a function of our degree of dissociation. What we hold in mind with conscious attention and intention is being chosen, resonantly tuned to, and brought to consciousness, within the Universal Mind. Therefore, for us to assent to—to say YES within, to completely open to and accept—a particular objectification from the infinitude of possibilities, is for us to choose which reality we want to have become objectified enough to experience.

Opening to the Universal is what I choose to call the primary form of assenting-to or setting intention (the intention that one open to one’s Source.). It is the approach that I limit myself to and the one that I recommend for our species at present, due to our rather-dangerous level of

dissociation. Nonetheless, we have the possibility of assenting in a secondary way to all manner of objectifiable creations that might enter our experience. In order to focus what we wish more specifically to assent to, we must clearly hold it in mind. This is usually done by either visualizing it (i.e., mentally imaging it) or verbalizing it (whether sub-vocally or aloud), since bringing to mind a kind of pure telepathic idea or “thought form” devoid of visuo-spatial and language flesh or focus is not always possible at our stage of dissociation.

Virtually all of the perennial philosophy, magical, and current New Age, approaches to choicefully, consciously creating one’s own reality can be accounted for by one, or a combination of, these visualizing, verbalizing, and conceptualizing techniques that can only be generally alluded to here. All of the inter-related processes of secondary assenting serve to focus and objectify what it is one wishes to have as a result of the degree of primary assenting that one has necessarily had to do first in order to open to the Universal that lies beyond the possibilities that accompany one’s normal degree of dissociation. The degree of quality of such secondary-type conceptual, visual, or verbal setting of intention—of choosing and holding within oneself that which one is assenting to having be the case as experienceable—requires the best possible focus, coherence, and intensity or amplitude of the energy/consciousness wave systems involved. It also involves conviction, or the degree to which one truly believes that one’s initial apparent dissociation from the assented-to will be overcome, or—strangely—turn out to have never been the case. This is the ultimate version of what is called perceived self-efficacy. The quantity of secondary assenting simply involves the reiteration over time of the setting and focusing of one’s intention with as much quality as possible. The most efficacious results would involve a combination of quality and quantity.

Conclusion

It has not been the purpose of this presentation to focus on the range of techniques for possible reality creation, nor has there been space to do so. Such must await a companion presentation based on the present one. Rather, I have tried here to provide an overall conceptual framework for understanding the basic nature of what I have called cosmological dissociation and how it gives rise to subpersonalities who experience their reality as a function of their kind and degree of dissociation.

I believe that we human beings are capable of overcoming to an as yet unknown degree the present dissociation that we are experiencing both individually and as a species. We can do this by using the secondary and, and preferably, the primary modes of reality creation earlier described as ways of differentially programming and accessing the Universal as we operate as aspects of It. I believe that in the coming years we will be helped both from beyond and from within our human species to learn to willfully accelerate the evolutionary process that is dissociation-transcending in its nature and design.

References

- Bohm, David. (1980). *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, England.
- Klimo, Jon. (1987). *Channeling: Investigations on Receiving Information from Paranormal Sources*, Jeremy P. Tarcher, Pub., Los Angeles, California.

Purcell, Stephen D. (1988). "Dissociative States," in Goldman, Howard H., editor, *Review of General Psychiatry, Second Edition*, Appleton & Lange, Norwalk, Connecticut.