

Essay

Towards A New Paradigm of Consciousness

Michael Cecil*

ABSTRACT

The following essay postulates the existence of a non-spatial—and, thus, species non-specific—3rd dimension of consciousness beyond the consciousness of the “self” and the ‘thinker’; a dimension of consciousness within the context of which the current paradigm of the (‘classical’) “science of consciousness” is to be understood as a ‘special case’ (focusing exclusively upon the consciousness of the ‘thinker’) of a more all-inclusive description of consciousness based upon the acknowledgement of three rather than only one dimension of consciousness. This description of consciousness extends the range of applicability of the ‘classical’ “science of consciousness” to Jungian psychology and, for example, animal presentiment and telepathy.

Key Words: consciousness, self, thinker, non-spatial, non-temporal.

I. Jungian Psychology, Animal Telepathy & the “Science of Consciousness”

The original goal of classical physics was to establish the fundamental laws for describing the structure and contents of the space-time physical reality, rather than merely to maintain and preserve the paradigm of classical physics itself as the reigning paradigm for the determination of all physical theory. And it was for this reason that the classical physicists of the early-to-mid 20th century—who, interestingly enough, placed much more importance upon the development of an all-inclusive physical theory than upon merely the preservation of classical physics—widely, but not immediately, acknowledged the validity of both the Michelson-Morley experiment and the discoveries of Einstein and Heisenberg.

In other words, in order that the original goal of classical physics be achieved at all, it was eventually found to be necessary to set aside classical physics itself in favor of a much more inclusive physical theory with a much wider range of applicability; a physical theory including classical physics, relativity theory and quantum mechanics.

Similarly, the ultimate goal of science is to achieve an all-inclusive description of both the physical reality and the totality of human (and animal) consciousness and experience, rather than merely to maintain and preserve the scientific method as the unassailable and reigning paradigm for the complete and accurate description of the physical-conscious reality.

In other words, just as it eventually became necessary to acknowledge both relativity theory and quantum mechanics in order to more closely achieve the original goal of classical physics to establish a complete physical theory, it may very well also be necessary to set aside the entire paradigm (and the fundamental rules) of the scientific method itself in order to actually achieve, not merely in theory but in reality, the ultimate goal of science; that is, an all-inclusive understanding of both the physical and the conscious reality which includes information which is as different from, and outside the paradigm and conceptual boundaries

Correspondence: Michael Cecil, <http://science-of-consciousness.blogspot.com> E-mail: mececil@sbcglobal.net

of the scientific method as relativity theory and quantum mechanics are different from and beyond the frame of reference of classical physics. (In other words, it is, perhaps, the very assumptions, pre-conceptions and psychological-conceptual structures of the scientific method itself—for example, the uni-directionality of time in a forward direction, and the ‘spatiality’ of consciousness itself to only the “self”, the ‘thinker’, and the members of the human species—which are now providing the main stumbling blocks to revolutionary developments in both theoretical physics and the understanding of both human and animal consciousness.)

Thus, the existence of, in particular, the “science of consciousness” within the framework of the scientific method necessarily raises an important question crucial not only to the very development of the “science of consciousness” itself; but, also, to the very future of the scientific method as the reigning paradigm for the most complete and accurate description of both the physical and the conscious reality:

What, precisely, is the ultimate goal of any (‘classical’) “science of consciousness”?

Is that goal merely to arrive at an understanding of consciousness from strictly within the framework of the scientific method itself—that is, to maintain and preserve the status of the scientific method as the only paradigm capable of providing a complete and accurate understanding of both human and animal consciousness and experience? Or is its purpose, instead, to actually acquire a much deeper understanding of consciousness than that which can be provided by the scientific method; that is, an understanding which also includes information from outside of a rigidly scientific paradigm, but which is just as important to the understanding of the entirety of human and animal consciousness and experience as was the inclusion of relativity theory and quantum mechanics in the development of a much more inclusive physical theory?

Now, to begin with, it must be acknowledged that both the scientific method and the “science of consciousness” originate in the consciousness of the ‘thinker’, and the assumption that the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ is both the fundamental datum of human experience and the ‘inertial frame of reference’ for the complete and accurate description of both the entire physical and conscious reality; a consciousness and an assumption which, in turn, are based upon the metaphysical duality and the philosophy of Descartes. And it is on this basis that the findings of, especially, Jung and the other archetypal psychologists with regards to the consciousness of the “self” (see, for example, the opening passages of the *Second Meditation* of Descartes) are, to this day, widely trivialized, disregarded and ignored (but no less so than the findings of Reverse Speech Analysis and Parapsychology) as being ‘unscientific’; and, thus, utterly and completely irrelevant to any emergent “science of consciousness”.

In other words, it was only natural that, from its very inception from within the conceptual framework of Cartesian philosophy and the scientific method, the “science of consciousness” deny, trivialize and ignore the reality of the consciousness of the “self” (and its obvious relevance to the understanding of human consciousness, if not the establishing of, specifically, a “science” of consciousness) and focus, instead, almost exclusively on the consciousness of the ‘thinker’; the real question now being whether the scientists of consciousness will continue to “circle the wagons” (by focusing exclusively on the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ and its scientific descriptions of, exclusively, human consciousness), or whether the information with regards to the consciousness of the “self” will, instead, be acknowledged, considered, and incorporated within a more inclusive ‘science’ of consciousness as being no

less crucial to the development of a much more complete understanding of consciousness than can occur within the frame of reference of, exclusively, the ('classical') "science of consciousness" and the (human) consciousness of the "self" and the 'thinker'.

But there is, in fact, a much more serious problem (than even acknowledging the reality of the consciousness of the "self") which must be encountered by any "science of consciousness" which seriously purports to describe the entirety of both human and animal consciousness; even a 'science' of consciousness which has become more complete (even if less 'scientific' or 'classical') by acknowledging, also, the reality of the consciousness of the "self". And that has to do with those findings of Reverse Speech Analysis and Time Symmetrical Quantum Mechanics (in the context of, literally, decades of research demonstrating the validity of pre-cognition, extra-sensory perception and/or clairvoyance in humans as well as animals; see, for example:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yo0gyXZQv0o&feature=related>
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_0V6KBzIhu4&feature=related
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hYkoQ9WnwAM&feature=related>)

which clearly demonstrate the existence of information which, although of immediate relevance to the understanding of consciousness, not only flies in the face of both the fundamental assumptions of the scientific method and the "science of consciousness"; but, also, threatens the very existence of the consciousness of the "self" and the 'thinker' itself which is based upon the assumption of both the uni-directionality of time and the 'spatiality' of consciousness to only the "self", the 'thinker', and the members of the human species.

And what I have observed over the past few years is that the fundamental goal of those presently involved in the "science of consciousness" is certainly not to develop any all-inclusive understanding of human (to say nothing of animal) consciousness; but, rather, to merely preserve the scientific method itself (and, not coincidentally, to prevent their own consciousness of the "self" and the 'thinker' from collapsing into psychosis); which necessarily requires the trivialization of the reality of not only the consciousness of the "self" (which, of course, is the consciousness that experiences psychosis in the first place); but, also, a non-spatial (or 2-dimensional 'flat' space)—and, thus, species non-specific—time-independent consciousness; the existence of which is made necessary by the findings of Reverse Speech Analysis, Time Symmetrical Quantum Mechanics and Parapsychology.

In other words, the only description of consciousness which is, in any way, seriously capable of actually achieving the ultimate goal of the "science of consciousness" in the description of both human and animal consciousness is a description of consciousness which is based upon the acknowledgement that there are not merely one or two; but, in fact, three dimensions of consciousness:

1) the consciousness of the 'thinker'—symbolized by the "fig leaves" in *Genesis* 3:7 (see, also, Saying #37 in the *Gospel of Thomas*), and by the Third Seal (6:5-6) and the "beast of the earth" in *Revelations* 13:11 and Sura 27:82 of the *Quran*;

2) the consciousness of the "self"—symbolized by the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" in *Genesis* 3:3-6, and by the Second Seal (6:3-4) and the "beast of the sea" in *Revelations* 13:1 (which, together with the consciousness of the 'thinker', comprise the dualistic or 'fallen' consciousness); and,

3) a non-dualistic, 2-dimensional ‘flat’ space—and, thus, species non-specific—time-independent, “observing consciousness” Created ‘by and in the image of God’ (*Genesis* 1:27)—represented by the “Tree of Life” in *Genesis* 3:24 which symbolizes the Vision of the “Son of man”/the “Vision of Knowledge”/the “Night Journey” of Mohammed; and by the First Seal in *Revelations* 6:1-2.

II. 3-Dimensional Consciousness & 3-Dimensional Geometry

Depending upon the way in which the physicist designs the experiment, an electron sometimes has the properties of a particle and sometimes has the properties of a wave; and, for that reason, is sometimes referred to as a ‘wavicle’.

But, in fact, there is no such thing as a ‘wavicle’. There is merely a ‘something’ which has the properties of both a particle and a wave. And to say that there is a ‘wavicle’ is to say that there is a shape in plane geometry called a ‘squirele’, and which sometimes has the properties of a square and sometimes has the properties of a circle.

Now, with regards to the paradigm of the “three dimensions of consciousness” as outlined at: <http://science-of-consciousness.blogspot.com/2011/01/jungian-psychology-animal-telepathy.html>; some enterprising ‘scientist’ of consciousness may very well acknowledge that there are, in fact, three dimensions of consciousness; but then insist, nevertheless, that there must be a necessarily consciousness of the ‘thinker’-based ‘theory’ or ‘science’ of consciousness which can accomplish an explanatory and all-inclusive ‘grand unification’—in violation of ‘Einstein’s Razor’, I would argue—of even these three dimensions of consciousness.

But that would be to say that there is a shape in solid geometry called a ‘cupheramid’, and which has the properties of a cube (representing the consciousness of the ‘thinker’), a sphere (representing the consciousness of the “self”), and a pyramid (representing the “observing consciousness”).

Furthermore, if an attempt is made to visualize a mathematical point, it is generally visualized as the tiniest sphere possible—rather than, for example, the tiniest pyramid, or tetrahedron, or octahedron possible. And, if that ‘spherical’ mathematical point represents the ‘movement’ of self-reflection, the consciousness of the “self” would be represented by the sphere itself, the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ would be represented by the ‘cubing of that sphere’—that is, the ‘squaring of that circle’ in 3 dimensions (the 3-dimensional Cartesian co-ordinate system; 2 dimensions of which are represented by the background of the following dance:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WZCjgPIvBU8>

the black color of the dancers costumes representing the color of the Third Seal of the *Revelation of John* and representing the consciousness of the ‘thinker’) by adding a fourth dimension of time (notice the increasing temp of the dance)—whereas the “observing consciousness” would be represented by a pyramid, the mathematical (‘spherical’) point at the top of the pyramid representing the ‘movement’ of self-reflection that gives rise to the “self”.

Thus, the symbols of the Eastern esoteric traditions by which the genital chakra is represented by a square (the consciousness of the ‘thinker’), the heart chakra is represented by a circle (the consciousness of the “self”), and the forehead chakra is represented by an upward pointing triangle (the “observing consciousness”).

And, thus, the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ and the scientific method can be represented by a square; the consciousness of the “self” and Jungian psychology can be represented by a circle; and the “observing consciousness” and the paradigm of the “three dimensions of consciousness” can be represented by a triangle.

And, if you watch the following video:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vR_51ygQb8U&feature=related

carefully, you will observe that, near the beginning of the dance, the base of the triangle (which, in three dimensions, is a pyramid) which represents a square and the consciousness of the ‘thinker’—and, within that triangle, the dancers turn in counter-clockwise circles (which, in three dimensions, would be spheres), representing the consciousness of the “self”—is closest to the audience; whereas, with the arrival of Michael Flatley, the triangle is inverted, with the point of the triangle (or pyramid) being closest to the audience (and only Michael Flatley turns counter-clockwise, and only once, representing the ‘movement’ of self-reflection, or the ‘pirouette’ of consciousness, as is alluded to in the following song:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eMwn_hnoS5Y

And, furthermore, the intersection of the upward pointing and downward pointing triangles is also represented in the Star of David.

III. Static Vs. Dynamic Consciousness

Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity is said to have originated in a thought experiment—or, more accurately, a visualization experiment (the term “thought” experiment itself is evidence of the insistence of the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ that it is the only source of information about the physical-conscious reality)—of what a beam of light would look like to an observer who is moving at the speed of light. Similarly, after studying the nature of the carbon-carbon bonds for several years, Kekulé is said to have received a dream (the accounts vary) of six snakes in the form of a circle, each with the tail of the next snake in its mouth; from which he intuited the structure of the benzene ring. And, in each of these instances, a scientific discovery was made on the basis of information which originated from outside the frame of reference of the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ itself.

The origin of the three dimensions of consciousness paradigm, however—which, however, does not claim to be a scientific theory in the first place; but, rather, a direct observation of the reality of consciousness (and, thus, non-Popper-falsifiable)—was neither a “visualization experiment” nor a dream; but, instead, consisted of a vision I received; which, only later, was understood as signifying the opening of the sixth (or crown) chakra (which occurred precisely 2 ½ days prior to the opening of the Sixth Seal, as described in Chapter 6:12-17 of the *Revelation of John*); the relevance to the understanding of consciousness which is as follows:

Among those who are attempting to formulate an all-inclusive, ‘unified’ “science of consciousness” or over-all ‘theory’ of consciousness, there now appear to be two principal perspectives; each of which, I would argue, consists of a description of consciousness as a static rather than a dynamic entity: 1) the perspective of the “scientists of consciousness”, which occurs from within the framework of the scientific method, and in accordance with the conceptual structures and requirements of the consciousness of the ‘thinker’; and, 2) the Reichian-Jungian perspective on consciousness, which stresses the importance of including, also, the not-precisely-scientific data with regards to the ‘unconscious’, the ‘archetypes of the unconscious’, and the consciousness of the “self” in any balanced and complete understanding of consciousness.

I would argue, however, that consciousness is, instead, a dynamic process rather than a static entity; a process which cannot be adequately explained by either or both of these static descriptions of consciousness, but which involves the rapid oscillation between three dimensions of consciousness: a 3-dimensional ‘curved-spatiality’ of consciousness referred to as a consciousness of the “self”; an extension of that ‘curved-spatiality’ of consciousness through time, constituting a consciousness of the ‘thinker’; and a 2-dimensional, ‘flat’-space “observing consciousness” which exists both ‘outside of’ and ‘prior to’ the ‘curved-spatiality’ consciousness of the “self”, and that consciousness extended in time by the consciousness of the ‘thinker’.

This dynamic view of consciousness can, perhaps, be best visualized by the rapid oscillation in a 3-dimensional space of a geometric figure consisting of a cube, a sphere and a pyramid; each of which is, simultaneously, rotating in all directions: the cube representing the consciousness of the ‘thinker’, the sphere representing the consciousness of the “self”, and the pyramid representing the “observing consciousness”—all of which is a partial description of the vision I received on November 28, 1974.

IV. Self-Reflection As the Origin of Consciousness

The implications and significance of the ‘movement’ of self-reflection can be understood only if there is a very careful observation of the origin and over-all movement of consciousness, however that is defined, itself:

Assume that you are at a concert listening to Beethoven’s *Fifth Symphony*. You are completely immersed into and absorbed by the beauty of the music, to the point that you have completely lost all awareness of any “self”; and there is, in fact, no experiencer which can be at all separated from that experience. In other words, the ‘experience’ and the ‘experiencer’ still consist of a unified entity of ‘not yet experiencer’ and ‘not yet experience’.

In the very next instant, the time of which cannot be either predicted or explained—nor is this an ‘action’ which can be performed intentionally, since it is merely a reflex—you instantly become aware of yourself as being at the concert and listening to the music; something which you experience as being quite pleasurable. There is, somehow, a ‘pirouette’ of consciousness itself, or a ‘movement’ of self-reflection by which you become aware of yourself as an experiencer experiencing an experience; a realization which, however, is then immediately consumed by the pleasure of the experience itself, causing the “self” to be, once again, consumed in that pleasure. In other words, although the ‘movement’ of self-reflection has made it possible for you to acknowledge and experience the pleasure of the music; that very

pleasure causes you to forget that, immediately prior to the experience of the pleasure of that music, there had to have occurred a differentiation of that ‘not yet experiencer’ and ‘not yet experience’ into an experiencer and an experience. And this is the very first instance of pleasure taking precedence over knowledge; specifically, the knowledge of what precisely occurs with the ‘movement’ of self-reflection itself. In other words, the experience of pleasure always leads to a forgetfulness of the fact that there is a ‘spatiality’ of consciousness—that is, the “self”—which exists immediately prior to the experience of pleasure.

Now, there are a number of things that need to be understood with regards to the observation of the ‘movement’ of self-reflection.

First of all, that ‘movement’ cannot be observed by the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ because, in fact, the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ does not yet exist; there having been no (even ‘unconscious’) postulation of the thought of either a ‘thinker’, or a “self”, or an “I”; the experiencer not yet having been differentiated from the experience.

Secondly, however, this ‘movement’ of self-reflection also cannot be observed by the consciousness of the “self” either; and for precisely the same reason. That is, not even the consciousness of the “self” yet exists to observe the ‘movement’ of self-reflection; because, as already stated, there has not yet been any differentiation into an experiencer and an experience. Translation: the “self” cannot observe its own creation for the same reason that you cannot observe your own birth.

In other words, that the ‘movement’ of self-reflection can be observed at all necessarily means that there is an “observing consciousness” ‘prior to’ and ‘outside of’ the consciousness of the “self” and the ‘thinker’ to observe that ‘movement’. But, at the same time, it must also be acknowledged that this ‘movement’ of self-reflection cannot be observed as it is occurring, but only after the fact. In other words, the first piece of knowledge that is acquired by the observation of the ‘movement’ of self-reflection is that it has already occurred—and that, in each and every instance in which it occurs, it is recognized as occurring only after it has occurred—leaving, as its only vestige, the knowledge that it has occurred rather than the actual observing of that ‘movement’ as it occurs. That is, the “observing consciousness” itself is consumed by the knowledge that the ‘movement’ of self-reflection has already occurred.

But this knowledge (by the “observing consciousness”) that the ‘movement’ of self-reflection has already occurred is merely one element of the knowledge of what that ‘movement’ signifies.

What must be understood here is that this ‘movement’ of self-reflection, in fact, creates the consciousness of the “self” itself; a consciousness of a “self” which ‘performs’ the ‘movement’ of self-reflection itself. In other words, uni-directional time has not yet been created. Thus, in fact, the ‘movement’ of self-reflection must occur in bi-directional time, creating (reflexively) the “self” which ‘performs’ the ‘movement’ of self-reflection... which creates the “self” which performs the ‘movement’ of self-reflection creating the “self” which ‘performs’ that ‘movement’ etc.

And, once that “self” has been created by the ‘movement’ of self-reflection, there is additional knowledge about the implications and significance of the origin of that consciousness of the “self”.

Observing the “self” very carefully, it can then be seen that the ‘movement’ of self-reflection creates both a separation from the space-time reality itself as well as a localized ‘spatiality’ of consciousness consisting of a “self”/“not self” (more easily visualized as a sphere; with the “self” inside of that sphere and the “not self” outside of that sphere). In other words, there is a ‘spatiality’ of consciousness which can be differentiated from the physical reality (hence, the origin of the metaphysical duality—that is, the separation of matter from consciousness) which is then considered the “not self” (and not conscious) as well as other “selves”, which are also considered by the “self” as being part of the “not self”. In other words, the ‘spatiality’ of my consciousness of a “self”—which to you, however, is part of your “not self”—exists over here; while the ‘spatiality’ of the consciousness of your “self” exists over there and is part of my “not self”.

But, at the same time, it must also be acknowledged that this ‘movement’ of self-reflection is a reflex rather than an intentional behavior, there being, as yet, no “self” to have any intention. And, since all behaviors consisting of a reflex originate in neurology, the function of which is to preserve the existence and pleasure of the organism while avoiding annihilation, pain, and threats of annihilation and pain, the neurological origin of the ‘movement’ of self-reflection is in the desire for biological self-preservation and pleasure, and the fear of annihilation and pain. In other words, similar to the way in which the “self”/“not self” emerges instantaneously out of the 2-dimensional ‘flat’ space and into the 3-dimensional ‘curved’ space by means of the ‘movement’ of self-reflection; so, too, desire and fear also emerge instantaneously into that 3-dimensional ‘curved’ space; a desire and fear which is then associated with not merely biological preservation and pleasure; but, also, with the preservation and pleasure of the “self”/“not self” which has been created by the ‘movement’ of self-reflection in the first place. Thus, the ‘movement’ of self-reflection is the source of all dualities: “self”/“not self”, pleasure/pain, etc. etc....as well as “good” and “evil”; “good” being associated with the preservation and pleasure of the “self”; “evil” being associated with the annihilation of the “self” as well as anything which is painful to the “self”.

The next step in the progression of consciousness, then, is in the postulation of the thought of the “self”, or the ‘thinker’, or the “I” for the purpose of maintaining the existence of the ‘spatiality’ of the consciousness of the “self” over time (and which, thus, is the origin of uni-directional time); in which case all of the thoughts and beliefs of the ‘thinker’ perform the function of preserving the consciousness of the “self” from collapsing into psychosis. Thus, anyone who threatens the validity of the thoughts or beliefs of the ‘thinker’ is categorized as “evil”; while anyone who validates the thoughts or beliefs of the ‘thinker’—and, thus, prevents the “self” from collapsing into psychosis—is categorized as “good”.

Thus, without the ‘movement’ of self-reflection, it is crucial to understand that there would be no consciousness at all; while, at the same time, that ‘movement’ is the source of both all dualities and the “self”/“not self”; while, on the other hand, the observation of the ‘movement’ of self-reflection demonstrates the existence of that third dimension of consciousness itself, which I refer to as the “observing consciousness”.

Observing the ‘movement’ of self-reflection again, then, it becomes clear that the ‘pirouette’ of consciousness referred to as the ‘movement’ of self-reflection itself can, perhaps, be more accurately understood as an instantaneous jump from the 2-dimensional ‘flat’ space consciousness of the “observing consciousness” into the 3-dimensional ‘curved’ space consciousness of the “self” and the ‘thinker’; the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ being created

by simply the postulation of the thought of the ‘thinker’ in the same way that the “self” is created by the ‘movement’ of self-reflection.

And, finally, anyone who is capable of reading, following, and understanding the above explanation is, during that time, directly experiencing the “observing consciousness”, whereas the inability to follow and understand this explanation signifies that the reader is operating, instead, in either the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ or the consciousness of the “self”.

V. Memories of Previous Lives & the 3-Dimensional Consciousness

The receiving of the memories of previous lives is one of those aspects or experiences of consciousness which is of no interest whatsoever to the ‘classical’ scientists of consciousness (yet, for some unknown reason, they still claim to be pursuing an ‘all-inclusive explanation’ of consciousness); especially insofar as it poses a direct and lethal threat to the unsupported assumption and (often-unarticulated) dogma of the “science of consciousness” (and the scientific method in general) that the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ is, in fact, the sole and ultimate determiner of the absolute and objective truth about the physical-conscious reality; one of those ‘absolute’ and ‘objective’ ‘truths’ being, for example, that people live only one life (after all, the vast majority of people have had no memories of previous lives at all; thus, almost necessitating, from a scientific perspective, that such memories simply be ignored altogether as being nothing more than ‘anomalous’ or ‘anecdotal’). And, similarly, those with a Reichian or Jungian perspective on consciousness typically acknowledge little relevance or significance of the memories of previous lives to what Jung has referred to as the “individuation process”.

With the realization that there are, in fact, 2 additional dimensions of consciousness beyond the consciousness of the ‘thinker’, however, the receiving of memories of previous lives is readily understood to be merely additional evidence in support of the existence of that 3rd dimension of consciousness; a non-temporal, time-independent dimension of consciousness which exists ‘outside’ of, and both prior and subsequent to the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ and the consciousness of “self” in any one life. And, within the paradigm of the 3 dimensions of consciousness, it can be understood that the receiving of memories of previous lives conveys information from previous “selves” as well as ‘thinkers’.

Efforts to establish the scientific validity of the memories of previous lives are concerned primarily if not exclusively with memories of the consciousness of a ‘thinker’ with regards to those previous lives insofar as it is only memories of the consciousness of a ‘thinker’ which are capable of being validated independently and scientifically. And in this genre I would place such books as *Soul Survivor*; *Old Souls*; *Children Who Remember Previous Lives: A Question of Reincarnation*; *Unlearned Language: New Studies in Xenoglossy* and any other book or study which attempts to validate the reality of previous lives.

In addition to these scientifically-verifiable instances demonstrating the reality of previous lives, however, there are also other memories—that is, memories not primarily of a ‘thinker’, but of a “self”—which are not capable of independent validation insofar as they consist primarily of immediate sensations, perceptions and emotions (in other words, the experiences of a “self”) rather than the thoughts of a ‘thinker’.

In the monotheistic Revelations, for example, one of the elements of the Revelation of the “resurrection” includes the revelation of the memories of previous lives; memories which, however, focus either exclusively or primarily upon memories not of a ‘thinker’ but of a “self”; memories which would include, for example, not fluency in the language that was spoken in that previous life, nor memories of what people looked like in those previous lives; but, rather, for example, memories of other “selves” with whom that person had experienced close personal relationships in those previous lives, thus providing sufficient knowledge to enable him or her to recognize the identities of those people in both their past and their present lives; none of which, of course, however true it is, can be scientifically validated.

VI. Non-Dualistic/Dualistic Consciousness in the Gospel of Thomas

The fundamental assumption of the ‘classical’ “scientists of consciousness”, although it is not always plainly, loudly, or consistently articulated (but merely taken for granted as a ‘given’), is that the scientific method is, for all practical purposes, the “only game in town”; that is, the only available, viable and genuinely serious paradigm for the objective, accurate and complete explanation or description of the reality of human consciousness.

On the other hand, those adhering to a Reichian or Jungian perspective on consciousness insist that no explanation of human consciousness can be at all complete without, in addition, an understanding of the ‘unconscious’ or the consciousness of the “self”. And, with the inclusion of this psycho-analytical perspective on consciousness, it is widely, if not universally considered (by Western civilization, at least) that virtually all conscious reality has been brought well within the framework of the current understandings; in a way similar to the way in which classical physics was once considered to be a complete explanation of the physical reality.

But, in addition to the findings of the parapsychologists and Reverse Speech Analysis, there are a number of statements in the *Gospel of Thomas* which very seriously and specifically challenge this assumption; and which clearly demonstrate not only the existence of another dimension of consciousness altogether unknown to, and absolutely and completely beyond the frame of reference of both the scientific method and the archetypal psychologists (and thus, beyond, respectively, both the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ and the consciousness of the “self”); but, also, that such a third dimension of consciousness constituted a quite crucial element of the Teaching of Jesus; something which, however, is also altogether unknown to, and absolutely and completely beyond the frame of reference of Christian theology; which, similar to the “science of consciousness”, relies primarily, if not exclusively upon the consciousness of the ‘thinker’; the function of which is to preserve the consciousness of the “self” over time.

The following statements of Jesus in the *Gospel of Thomas*, then:

From Saying #11: “On the day that you were one you became two.”

From Saying #19: “Blessed is he who came into being before he came into being.”

From Saying #22: “When you make the two one, and when you make the inside like the outside, and the above like the below, and when you make the male and the female one and the same...then will you enter [the kingdom].”

From Saying #61: “I am he who exists from the undivided.”

From Saying #85: “Adam came into being from a great power and a great wealth, but he did not become worthy of you. For, had he been worthy [he would] not [have experienced] death...”

From Saying #106: “ When you make the two one you will become the ‘Son of man’.”
can be summarized as follows:

1) Man was Created ‘by and in the image of God’ (*Genesis* 1:27) with a non-dualistic consciousness which ‘came into being’ before the dualistic consciousness (of the “self” and the ‘thinker’) ‘came into being’;

2) It is not merely possible but necessary to regain the experience of that non-dualistic dimension of consciousness (beyond the dualistic consciousness of the “self” and the ‘thinker’) in which all dualities are resolved;

3) The emergence of—that is, ‘the Fall’ into—the dualistic consciousness from the non-dualistic consciousness is what is referred to in the *Gospel of Thomas* as ‘death’; and,

4) The term “Son of man” itself—and its referent: the Vision of the “Son of man”—is to be understood as a manifestation or expression of the non-dualistic consciousness with which man was Created by God.

And, in the context of this affirmation by Jesus in the *Gospel of Thomas* of the existence of a non-dualistic, third dimension of consciousness prior to the dualistic consciousness of the “self” and the ‘thinker’, it can clearly be observed that both the “scientists of consciousness” as well as the Reichian and Jungian analysts have very sharply restricted their understanding of human consciousness to an examination of, exclusively, the dualistic or ‘fallen’ consciousness (of, respectively, the ‘thinker’ or the “self”); completely ignoring, however, both the Teaching of Jesus about the non-dualistic consciousness Created ‘by and in the image of God’, as well as the teachings of the Eastern esoteric traditions with regards to the (“uncreated”—that is, without any reliance upon God) non-dualistic “observing consciousness”; at least a part of which—specifically, that the dualistic consciousness of the ‘thinker’ constitutes (if not the origin, at least) an intensification of duality, conflict and violence—for example, is to be found in the teachings of J. Krishnamurti.

Thus, as far as I have been able to determine, all current efforts to develop a new a new understanding of consciousness are and have been focused exclusively on the development of a new “science” of consciousness—or on the achievement of a rigidly “scientific” revolution in the understanding of consciousness—not only to the specific and categorical denial, however, that there is a third, non-dualistic dimension of consciousness; but also, until recently, involving the relentless censorship and exclusion of any non-dualistic perspective on consciousness as even being at all relevant to the conversation.

And the major source of this resistance to acknowledging the existence, relevance and importance of the third, non-dualistic dimension of consciousness is the ‘classical’ “scientists of consciousness”—that is, the perspective on consciousness of the consciousness of the ‘thinker’ (which also, by the way, ignores the relevance and importance of the consciousness

of the “self” to an over-all understanding of human consciousness); symbolized in the fractal Prophecy of Chapter 11 of the *Book of Daniel* as the “king of the South”, and in the fractal Prophecy of Chapter 13 of the *Revelation of John* as the “beast of the earth”.

VII. Conclusion

In this essay, I have postulated the existence of a non-spatial—and, thus, species non-specific—3rd dimension of consciousness beyond the consciousness of the “self” and the ‘thinker’; a dimension of consciousness within the context of which the current paradigm of the (‘classical’) “science of consciousness” is to be understood as a ‘special case’ (focusing exclusively upon the consciousness of the ‘thinker’) of a more all-inclusive description of consciousness based upon the acknowledgement of three rather than only one dimension of consciousness. This description of consciousness extends the range of applicability of the ‘classical’ “science of consciousness” to Jungian psychology and, for example, animal presentiment and telepathy.