

Article

Seeing the Universe from the Inside Looking Out

Steven E. Kaufman*

ABSTRACT

From the outside looking in everything appears to be different. But from the inside looking out everything appears the same, as it is all seen to be composed of the same Existential Substance that is Consciousness. Likewise, clay can be molded into an infinity of shapes, which if only seen from the outside would appear to be an infinite number of different things. But when it is known that all those things are actually molded from the same material, as it were, then the differences becomes secondary to the identity of underlying composition and content.

Key Words: Consciousness, Universe, inside looking out, existential substance.

My philosophy is very simple. The universe is actually and ultimately composed of the same thing that apprehends the universe. That is, that which apprehends the universe is that of which the universe is actually composed. What Exists at every point in the universe, and in all likelihood beyond, is the same thing that Exists directly where each Individual Exists, which is the Consciousness that apprehends experience.

Why do we not see this? Why do we think that what exists elsewhere is different than what exists where we are? There are many reasons. One is that we do not see what exists where we are as being Consciousness, rather we see a material body. And when we look around we don't see Consciousness, we see material reality, and so that is what seems or appears to be there. Yet what could we see without Consciousness, what could we see in the absence of that which Exists directly where we are?

And if one understands that Consciousness is what Exists directly where they are, why then should that not be what Exists elsewhere as well? We look at a rock and say that what is there cannot be Consciousness, cannot be apprehending experience, because it does not have a central nervous system. But that assumes that the apprehension of all experience by Consciousness requires what we apprehend as a central nervous system. It may very well be that the creation and apprehension of the majority of physical experience requires a central nervous system, requires this apparatus, which is Itself composed of Consciousness and serves the purpose of allowing Consciousness to become involved in a different level of relation with Itself and thereby create what Consciousness apprehends as physical experience, but that does not mean that in the absence of such an apparatus there is no apprehension of experience of any sort.

*Correspondence: Steven E. Kaufman, Independent Researcher. <http://www.unifiedreality.com>
E-mail: skaufman@unifiedreality.com

When we see a rock or any material reality we are looking at it from the outside looking in, and so are only apprehending its surface features. We know nothing of the content. And if we break the rock apart and examine its smaller pieces, to see what minerals it is composed of, we are still looking at it from the outside looking in, and we still know nothing of its actual content, still know nothing regarding that of which it is actually composed. And if we break it apart further and look at it at the molecular level, and then at the atomic level, and then at the subatomic level, we are still looking at it from the outside looking in, and still know nothing of its content, still know nothing regarding its actual composition, i.e., of what it is ultimately composed. In all of these endeavors we are just making an etching of what is actually there and not getting at what is actually there.

But a funny thing happens when we start to make the etchings at a very small level, in that the way the etchings appear becomes inseparable from the way they are being created. In fact, the way the etchings, i.e., physical experiences or realities, appear are always inseparable from the way they are created, it is just that at the quantum level the inseparable relation between the Observer and the apprehended reality becomes evident and unavoidable.

To understand what a rock or any material reality, or even space itself, is actually composed of, one does not need an atom smasher or supercollider, rather, one needs only logic and reason, unbiased and unmoved by what appears to be. To understand what any material reality is actually composed of one need only look at it from the inside looking out. From the inside looking out one sees material reality as an experiential reality arising within Consciousness, a Consciousness that has Itself taken on a dimension of Structure as a result of the iterative and progressive relations in which it has become involved with Itself as it continually evolves Itself toward a better feeling and more wanted experience at all levels of Existential self-relation and experiential creation, i.e., emotional, mental, and physical. Conversely, from the outside looking in material reality seems to be composed of some more fundamental material reality, which itself seems to be composed of a more fundamental material reality, and on and on and on, with this progressive material deconstruction mirroring a partial unraveling of the progressively constructed *under-Structure*, i.e., the Relational Structure composed of Existence as it is being iteratively and progressively in relation to Itself, which progressive Relational Structure underlies and so is the basis of the etching that is apprehended as material reality.

Consider your own body. From the outside looking in it appears to be nothing more than matter, whatever that is. But from the inside looking out there is Consciousness apprehending emotional, mental, and material reality.

From the outside looking in everything appears to be different. But from the inside looking out everything appears the same, as it is all seen to be composed of the same Existential Substance that is Consciousness. Likewise, clay can be molded into an infinity of shapes, which if only seen from the outside would appear to be an infinite number of different things. But when it is known that all those things are actually molded from the same material, as it were, then the differences becomes secondary to the identity of underlying composition and content.

The world you see around you is molded from Consciousness, in as much as it is ultimately composed of Consciousness that has molded and continues to mold Itself through iterative and progressive relation to Itself, like twisting a rubber band repeatedly upon itself, into an overall Relational Structure of Reality from which and within which other Relational Structures extend and arise. And all of those Relational Structures are composed of Consciousness, and when one Relational Structure comes to be in relation to another Relational Structure, a boundary arises and so is created where they meet and become oriented in relation to each other, and it is that created boundary that is apprehended as a mental or physical experience by the Consciousness of which the Relational Structures are composed.

Thus, experience rather than Consciousness seems to be what is there because experience is the etching that is created and apprehended when What Is Actually There, i.e., Consciousness, comes to be in relation to Itself. Thus, the universe is composed of an invisible Substance, because that of which the universe is composed cannot Itself be an experience. As the universe is composed of an invisible Substance there are two ways to go about examining what's there, from the outside looking in or from the inside looking out. Looking at what's there from the outside looking in always creates an etching. But the etchings, no matter how detailed, will always just be etchings, and will never be what is there directly, because the Nature of What Is There directly is different than the nature of what appears to be there experientially. Thus, the etching itself is always something different or other than, i.e., of a different nature than, What Is Actually There.

There is something there where physical experience seems to be or presents itself as being, but What Is Actually There is not any sort of physical experience. Rather, What Is Actually There is Consciousness being in relation to Itself creating Relational Structure and experience. And when Consciousness is in relation to Itself at the third level of Existential self-relation those relations create what the Consciousness involved in those relations apprehends as physical experience or physical reality. But underlying that experientially created reality, that etching, is the Reality of an under-Structure, the Reality of a Relational Structure composed of Existence as it has become and is being configured in relation to Itself through iterative and progressive relation to Itself, while simultaneously, as the product of those same relations, creating what it apprehends as the progression of emotional, mental, and physical experience.

And it is this under-Structure and its relation to experience that must be recognized in order for there to be an unraveling of the paradoxes that continue to confront quantum physics as it probes up to and beyond the limits of physically created experience, since the source of all the paradoxes confronting quantum physics have to do with trying to explain the behavior of physical reality within the context of a physical model, i.e., in the context of a model wherein physical reality is conceived as being what is actually there and so in no need of an under-Structure, rather than within the context of an experiential model, which is to say, within the context of a model that takes into account the way physical reality, as an experiential reality, is created as the product of some relation of What Is Actually There to Itself, and so takes into account the fact that experience is always Experiencer dependent and therefore must also rest upon and extend from some underlying Structure, i.e., an under-Structure, composed of What Is Actually There both being in relation to Itself and simultaneously apprehending the products of

its relations to Itself as experience. Consciousness therefore is identical to What Is Actually There insofar as one is referring to the innate ability and unavoidability of What Is Actually There to apprehend as experience the products of its relations to Itself, as a mirror that is bent back upon itself has no choice but to contain within itself the reflection created by that relation.

The physical paradoxes exist not because the behavior of the things is truly paradoxical, as things are observed to behave as they are observed to behave. Rather, it is only the failure of the observed behavior to comport with underlying conception that creates paradox. Put another way, it is the incongruity between what is experienced at the physical level and what is conceived at the mental level that is the paradox. The observations are not incorrect, rather it is the conceptual framework in which they are being analyzed that is fundamentally incorrect and is the source of the perceived/conceived paradox. When What Is Actually There behaves according to its Nature in a way that is outside the boundaries of what it is possible to create as physical experience, e.g., seeming to exist simultaneously as the opposite and mutually exclusive realities of wave and particle, the incorrect framework is the conceptual framework that demands that these observations be accounted for in the context of the assumption that the observed experiences are what is actually there. And as the experiences are not What Is Actually There, any more than a reflection on the surface of a pond is what is actually there, paradox ensues as a result of the incongruity between the way the experiences are conceived of as being able to behave and the way they are actually observed to behave. The paradox arises from trying to fit the observed behavior into a conceptual framework that is an illusion, inasmuch as the conceptual framework wherein physical reality is conceived as being what is there does not correspond to the Nature of Reality, which is to say, to any underlying Actuality. Conversely, in the experiential model, where the conceptualization of reality takes into account both the under-Structure of Reality as well as experience as something that is created within the context of that under-Structure, the seemingly paradoxical quantum observations of wave-particle duality, uncertainty, non-locality, and the collapse of the wave-function, rather than introducing paradox into the model, fit perfectly into and so strengthen that model.

In short, these paradoxes are all the result of the limitations inherent in the Individual's creation of experience, as observed and analyzed from within a context where the part the Individual plays in the creation of what they apprehend as experience is either completely unnoticed and unappreciated, or only noticed to the extent that noticing has become unavoidable. All experience requires the involvement of the Individual that is apprehending the experience is some relation, which involvement then precludes that Individual's simultaneous involvement in the mutually exclusive relations necessary to create the opposite experiences. Every experience involves an Individual in some relation and so orientation relative to an underlying Relational Structure or Actuality. Because experience is the product of a relation in which the Individual that is apprehending the experience must be involved, there are negative and positive limitations upon what it is possible for an Individual to simultaneously create and apprehend as experience, unavoidable preclusions and inclusions, relations in which an Individual cannot possibly be involved in a given moment owing to relations in which they are already involved in that same moment, and so experiences that the Individual cannot possibly create and apprehend in that moment, which negative limitation underlies the phenomena of wave-particle duality and uncertainty, and there are relations in which an Individual must be involved owing to relations in

which they are already involved, and so experiences that the Individual cannot help but create and apprehend, which positive limitation underlies the phenomenon of non-locality.

The observed paradoxical behavior is actually arising from a level of Reality, i.e., the under-Structure, that the incorrect framework precludes one from apprehending, owing to the impossibility of an Individual's simultaneous apprehension of experiential opposites, which in this case specifically refers to the fact that one cannot simultaneously conceive of both material reality and an immaterial reality as being what is actually there. Thus, the observed behavior arises from the behavior of a Reality that is all but completely hidden from Itself, from its True Nature, as it wanders about in human form. The observed behavior, e.g., wave-particle duality and uncertainty, cannot be accounted for within the physical model because these very behaviors lie at the heart of the creation of physical reality, as an experiential reality, as unavoidably being the product of a relation in which the Individual that is apprehending the experience must themselves be involved, and so has inherent limitations in its creation that extend directly from the limitations inherent in the Individual's ability or not to be involved in the relations necessary to create an experience.

Experience can be either accurately or inaccurately reflective of What Is Actually There, while like a reflection never being That directly, and so conceptions of reality can be either accurately or inaccurately reflective of What Is Actually There. When the conception does not accurately reflect What Is Actually There then the behavior of What Is Actually There will at some point diverge from the inaccurate conception, creating an experience or sets of experiences that cannot be accounted for within the confines of the inaccurate conception, which divergence and incongruity of experience is the introduction of paradox. Conversely, when the conception does accurately reflect What Is Actually There then the behavior of What Is Actually There will converge with the accurate conception, so that the experience or sets of experiences that cannot be accounted for within the confines of the inaccurate conception are now not only accounted for, but act as the well fitting pieces of a puzzle, which convergence and congruity of experience is called understanding or knowing and is the dissolution of paradox.

Paradox is coming across a piece of a puzzle that has no way of fitting into the puzzle as one has assembled it so far. If one finds a puzzle piece for which there is no place in the puzzle as it has been assembled up to that point, one can either try to cram that piece into the puzzle as already built, making the already built puzzle the focal or fixed point around which the observation-piece must revolve, or one can take the opposite approach and let the conception of reality pivot around the fixed observation-piece, not trying to fit the seemingly paradoxical observations into an already existent conception of reality, such as a physical model, rather, letting the seemingly paradoxical observations be the fixed focal point around which one pivots and rebuilds the entire puzzle of reality to seamlessly fit together what are, from the perspective of the physical model, both paradoxical and non-paradoxical observations.

We use physical experience to create an etching of what is there, and the etching is so detailed and vivid that we forget that it is just an etching, and so by its nature other than What Is Actually There. We will never get at what is directly and actually there by breaking matter down into smaller and smaller parts, into parts composed of fewer relations, because all that does is create

another etching of what is actually there, another smaller and less iterated replica pretending to be what is actually there. Through these etchings we may learn something about the way in which What Is Actually There is being in relation to Itself, we may identify some pattern or patterns of Existential relation, but that is different than getting at What Is Actually There directly, different than understanding the Nature of That which underlies the observation or experience.

The other way to go about examining what is there is from the inside looking out. The difference between looking at the universe from the outside looking in or from the inside looking out is like the difference between looking at a tree from above or below, respectively. From above most of the tree is obscured by the leaves, whereas from below one can see the relations between the different parts of the tree, as the leaves do not obscure the view of the whole. From the inside looking out the created etchings, i.e., mental and physical experiences, do not obscure the underlying Actuality, because the etchings are seen in their proper context, as etchings, as creations, and not as what is actually there, since, in order to see the world from the inside looking out one is required in one way or another to adopt the perspective of Consciousness, or whatever one wants to call that which apprehends experience, as what is actually there.

And all that is required to adopt the perspective of Consciousness as what is actually there is to understand that what Exists most directly where you are, which is that which apprehends experience, is what Exists directly everywhere else as well, regardless of what seems or appears to be there.

Experience is ever-changing because the relations in which we are involved that create what we experience as reality are ever-changing. Thus, experiences are different because the relations that create them are different. But that which is involved in the relation, that which is actually being in relation and creating and apprehending the different experiences, is not different from Itself, i.e., its Nature is everywhere the same, although its perspective is everywhere unique.