

Response to Commentary

Response to Tony Bermanseder's Commentary on "Towards A New Paradigm of Consciousness"

Michael Cecil*

ABSTRACT

This is my Response to Tony Bermanseder's Commentary on my essay "Towards A New Paradigm of Consciousness" that appears in this issue.

Key Words: thinker, thought, self, consciousness, movement, self-reflection.

First, there is no such thing as a 'thinking process'. Such a term consists of a fundamental violation of Occam's Razor. In other words, there is no 'thinker' and no verb "to think". And, to assert that there is a 'thinking process' is to assert that thought is the fundamental datum of human experience. It isn't. The 'movement' of self-reflection is the fundamental datum of human experience since it gives rise to the consciousness of the "self" which exists prior to the consciousness of the 'thinker' and the existence of thoughts. And, for similar reasons, there is no such thing as a 'mind'. In other words, the 'mind', as a concept, is similar to the "ether" of classical physics. What I have written is not precisely a 'theory' of consciousness but a description of an observation of consciousness. It is no 'theory', for example, that there are three states of matter for H₂O. Steam, water and ice can all be directly observed; similarly for the three dimensions of consciousness. This is not a matter for agreement or disagreement. This is a matter of either observing or not observing the reality of consciousness.

Second, non-existence cannot become "self-aware" of its "non-existence as an eternity and a nothingness"; nor can it 'create itself as a Unity'. Self-awareness originates in self-reflection; self-reflection fractures the Unity into a 'spatial' consciousness of a "self"/"not self". That is the inescapable duality. In addition, the term "eternity" implies time. But time is thought and thought perpetuates duality (see Krishnamurti). The term "non-temporal" does not mean "eternal". It indicates that the entire concept of time simply cannot be applied to that dimension of consciousness. The word "DEFINITION" implies thought and duality. But, prior to thought and duality, there is observation; first of the 'movement' of self-reflection, then the 'movement' of thought. In other words, thought and definition are not primary.

Finally, my "rejection of the scientific approach" is not based upon any 'presumption'. That is, both the scientific approach itself and any 'presumption' originate in thought. And what I am describing here, once again, is an observation rather than any thought. To point out that the 'thinker' perpetuates the duality originating in the 'movement' of self-reflection is not to 'belittle or denigrate the Creation itself'. In fact, it is precisely the opposite. That is, the Creation is a Unity. It is the 'movement' of self-reflection which, by fragmenting that Unity into a duality, is the source of division, conflict, violence and, even plausibly, a civilization-annihilating genocide.

(For readers interested in the interpretations of scriptures and antiquity, please see my further response in the Note below)

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

Note:

First, no person can be “rather familiar” with the *Revelation of John*. One has either received or not received the Vision of the “Son of man” and the Revelation of the “resurrection”; Revelations which are crucial to the understanding of that Revelation.

Second, there is no such thing as the “visions of knowledge”. This Revelation only occurs in the singular as the “Vision of the Son of man”. And such a speculation demonstrates the lack of Knowledge of such a Vision. Even worse, I have never used the term ‘vision of the resurrection’. The term is “Revelation of the resurrection”, which consists of the Revelation of the Memory of Creation and the revelation of the memories of previous lives. This Vision and this Revelation cannot be described as any ‘individuated messages from the subconscious’. They are Revelations received from God, pure and simple. And such a speculation (or conjecture) can be made only by someone who has not received those specific Revelations. (As stated in the *Quran*: “Conjecture is no substitute for the Truth.”)

Third, self-reflection occurs in bi-directional time. This gives rise to the “self”/“not self”. Words cannot go backwards in time prior to bi-directional time; which means, in essence, that very, very few statements can be made about the Creator at all other than statements which have been specifically Revealed. That is the purpose of Revelation, the “flame of a flashing sword” guarding the “Tree of Life” (*Genesis* 3:24) and preventing any approach by either a consciousness of a “self” OR a consciousness of a ‘thinker’.

Fourth, the “mishmash of scriptural archetypes” have not been “thrown together”. Those words are immediately observed/perceived as pertaining to parallel dimensions of consciousness. Nor is there any more of an “individuated agenda” here than there was with Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity. If such things cannot be observed, they cannot be observed. But that does not mean that they originate in the thoughts of either a “self” or a ‘thinker’. Nor were those words written for the purpose of ‘supporting premises’ or ‘scriptural evidence’. In other words, there is no ‘argument to a conclusion’ here; just as there is no logical sequence in which a person either observes the *Mona Lisa* or listens to Beethoven’s *Fifth Symphony* to appreciate its beauty. These words are, again, the description of an experience of Revelation rather than thoughts originating in the consciousness of the “self” or the ‘thinker’.

Fifth, the term “alternative interpretation” implies thought. What I have written is not an interpretation in the first place, not having originated in thought. Thus, there is not any “alternative interpretation”. There is, first of all, a description of the Revelation; and there is, secondly, an interpretation of that description by either the consciousness of the “self” or the consciousness of the ‘thinker’; both of which, however, originate in duality:

Sixth, the “fig leaves” are, as a symbol, at precisely the opposite end of the spectrum from the “Tree of Life”. The “fig leaves” are the thoughts of the ‘thinker’, whose purpose is to maintain the temporal continuity of the “self” as the “tree of the knowledge of good and evil”. (This is the significance of Saying #37 in the *Gospel of Thomas*.) The “Tree of Life”, however, is a symbol for the Vision of the “Son of man”, the Knowledge of which is not the human, dualistic, thoughts of the ‘fallen’ consciousness of either the “self” or the ‘thinker’.

Finally, the “beast of the sea” and the “beast of the earth” are, as symbols, precisely at the opposite end of the spectrum from the ‘angel who puts his right foot on the sea and his left foot upon the land’ (the sequence is significant—although Mr. Bermanseder, not surprisingly, reverses the sequence); which is another symbol for the Vision of the “Son of man”. In addition, the “two witnesses” of Chapter 11 of the *Revelation of John* are the ida and pingala of kundalini (also echoed in Chapter 4 of the *Book of Zechariah*). (This Knowledge is conveyed through the Vision of the “Son of man” itself—which is also symbolized by the crucifixion of Jesus “between two thieves at the place of the skull”, as well as by the caduceus of Greek mythology—and cannot be apprehended by the ‘fallen’, dualistic consciousness of the “self” or the ‘thinker’.)