

Claus Janew

# The Reality of Free Will

## Finite Version

(All references to infinities have been omitted)

**Abstract:** *The uniqueness of each standpoint, each point of effect, can only be "overcome" by the standpoint changing to other standpoints and returning. In such alternation, which can also appear as constant change, lies the unity of the world. The entirety of an alternation, however, is a consciousness structure due to the special relationship between the circumscribing periphery and the point-like center. This process structure unites determinacy and indeterminacy also totally at every place. Therefore, we are dealing with forms of consciousness everywhere, with more or less freedom of choice and an increasingly unknown depth. We live in a world of the choosing consciousness or better: awareness. In this respect, our environment expresses a deep truth about ourselves.*

## Individuality and Reality

Your Individuality is far more than a little peculiarity. It is a view that nothing and nobody has except you. Otherwise it/he/she would be you. Also you will have changed your perspective – yourself – in the next moment and you cannot turn back time.

For convenience, we come to an agreement on "common" objects, which allegedly everyone perceives, although everyone views from his own standpoint. If you see me rolling a pen across the table to you, you may think it is the same pen I see. However, I see something *completely* different than you do. There is not the slightest match between my perception and yours. Because otherwise I would sit in your place, have your thoughts, memories and feelings and link with them a form rolling towards me.

If we both can speak of a single pen, it is because we have already agreed as children on what we wanted to consider *approximately* as a common object and more precisely as a pen. We did the same for ourselves before, changing our own perspective and noticing the relative permanence of certain shapes. Should you now realize that "someone" is rolling such an approximated object across the table, you have again briefly changed the point of view, that is, you have put yourself approximately into *his* perspective and have returned to your own. So you can *conclude* there is rolling a common object, which is seen "only" from different sides. Actually, however, you have merged *two indivisible* perceptions over several steps into one unit, which *emphasizes* a "part" of your own perception (pen) and in addition a "part" of the perception of the other, which you have just "spied out" (pen).

The unique perspectives thus create, by mutual exchange, an *approximate* commonality, a so-called real pen.

The widespread assumption of a pen *independent* of perspectives, in contrast, leads into the void if one keeps asking on "what it consists of": of molecules, these of atoms, these of elementary particles, these of fields, and these of laws of change. But change *of what?* It is an endless loop.

However, *no* concept so far is able to explain why a rolling pencil can be quite stable: Neither does it break nor does it change direction when I just think it. I have to touch it. And then it changes immediately for both of us (under the condition that we both look "there").

In the Perspective Exchange Concept, we must therefore assume still largely unknown (not conscious) processes stabilizing our perception. Their effect must be in accordance with proven physical regularities. Both conclusions are consistent.

The concept of an independent reality, on the other hand, is a crutch that is used to *project* stability into objects that are not really understood, thus largely *hiding* individual perceptions within them. This is not consistent.

I do not question macro- and microphysics. They describe what they are looking for, mainly processes of "common" objects. But one must also say: If physics is not fundamental, but everything *basically* remains individual, it must still be explained in other ways, and physics does not become superfluous, but subordinate. Psychological connections will play an important role, but they too are not fundamental enough. Rather the most abstract and simple structures of consciousness are to be considered first.

## **What is Consciousness? (I)**

Whatever consciousness "is" - it must have structure. Even emptiness can only be defined in contrast to fullness and non-duality versus duality (as the word says). Or it is simply "Mu". And that would be the end of this paper - and everything else.

I suggest we allow ourselves some time with this and try to start from a consciousness that is as concrete as possible, from a conscious object, say a water glass. We perceive something that we distinguish from ourselves. We also distinguish it from its environment (table, cupboard, room) and determine it in comparison with other known things (table, cup, plate) to what it "is". That is, we *circumscribe* its existence by comparisons. Likewise, it stabilizes itself through external and internal interactions (pouring and drinking, molecular attraction and repulsion).

We can question these interactions ever more and will never find a bottom. Biological processes, mechanical laws of motion and physical fields remain empty without a structure circumscribing them. That is, we can regard circumscription as a basic property of everything conscious and thus of consciousness.

In the center of each circumscription now something arises which is enormously underestimated up to now: the center. A single point which directly refers to the whole. In the case of the water glass, for example, it is the center of gravity and optical center or, if the two differ, the center circumscribed by them, and so on. Because only the whole as such has a center. By every division new centers (those of the splinters) arise and by every change (like a border with

handle) another one. Even if the change is symmetrical (without handle): Since the midpoint, like any other point, is *nothing in itself* and has meaning only in relation to a particular entirety, another entirety circumscribes another midpoint - even in the same "place" (here the center of a *bordered* glass). And already the point next to the center is the center of something else (a unity of glass and spoon for instance).

Thus, there is a unique relationship between the point-like center and the circumscribing entirety. To ignore the midpoint would mean to ignore the whole. In the periphery (edge zone), in turn, the outer boundary is definitive of the whole, thereby emphasizing its relation to the midpoint.

**Since this structure holds also for all partial areas of an object, as well as for their relations to the entirety, in addition *between* center and periphery and *between this* center and *its* periphery and so on, I call this totality here *point centers-structure*.**

Of course, the relationship between us (the object of our self-consciousness) and the more external object is also point centers-structured. And if we dive into an object, we find there only different point centers-structures: trembling "particles", vibrating "fields", circumscribed "laws".

So we have defined nothing less than the surface of consciousness. What we intuitively regard as the "unity of the object" thereby *condenses* symbolically around the center, that is, we perceive the unity more strongly there because at the center point it is closest to the entirety. (Even in the empty glass: If a little bit chips off, the center hardly changes, and so it is still a glass.) "Parts" are perceived more as peripheral, where they also "crumble" more easily. Since consciousness is constantly in circumscribing motion and so condenses more or less static objects, I call it *quasi-static*.

## How is Freedom of Choice Possible?

The question of whether we can freely choose between several possibilities without imagining this freedom or confusing it with chance leads us to the truth about our responsibility. Because if we had to answer for something that comes from us, but was not *decided* by us, it would be no more than the responsibility of a cloud for its rain.

To find the answer, we will consider the simple choice between two continuations of our day, for example, whether to go to the cinema or to the theater. Actually, we like both equally, though sometimes we feel more like one than the other. Today, however, we really don't care; we might as well flip a coin. But we don't - that would be too cheap. We are thinking. We put ourselves into the cinema, then into the theater, then back into the present, and so on. In this way we circumscribe the entirety of the decisive situation, the present being its center. Strictly speaking, this center is point-like, right in the middle of the whole circumscription with all its details. That is, in us.

In the periphery, in turn, our perception of the cinema influences the subsequent perception of the theater and vice versa – and, again, our present and vice versa. The *indeterminacy* between

the *determined* alternatives thereby condenses to the *determinacy* of the decisive situation up to its exact center, which on the other hand is completely neutral, thus behaves *indeterminately*. But with that, the whole situation is again indeterminate and so on.

We are not finished yet: Cinema and theater inside and outside, as well as the routes to them with all details are likewise circumscribed by the movement of our attention. Instead of letting our thoughts circle around a cinema, we might as well wander to the subway and the dance club and forget about the theater. Instead, we intentionally focus on those weighings between goals, seating, access routes. That is, the determinacy/indeterminacy structure also applies *to every detail* of the trade-off process. And thus small decisions are due everywhere. We cannot escape this decision-making structure anywhere – it is a point centers-structure.

**This process structure unites determinacy and indeterminacy *also totally at every place*. For in that both refer to each other and merge into each other towards the center of the entirety thus circumscribed, they are precisely there no longer even partially separated.**

So, where is the respective "point" of decision? Obviously *not* in the neutral center between the alternatives, but *between center and periphery*, in just that center between determinacy and indeterminacy. Wherever that is exactly. Because "that" can always only be *in-between*, otherwise it would be a side. One can only "limit" it, but never fix it. It is actually distributed throughout the whole process and *concentrates* only around central places - *altogether* in us, but in the direction of our goals and between them.

From this point centers-structured unity of the subunits not merely can, but *must* come a free decision. This is the only possibility, the only meaningful description. It does not matter that for outsiders the choice could also have been predominantly random or conditional. Coincidences and conditions such as weather and timetables naturally entered into the decision and limited its scope in the peripheral area of the process. But the periphery is just one side of the whole - one of the *non*-decisive ones.

## **What is Awareness? (I)**

The uniqueness of each standpoint, each point of view, can obviously only be "overcome" by *changing* the standpoint to other standpoints. And returning. In such alternation alone, which can also appear as constant change, lies the unity of the world.

The grasping of this dynamic unity exceeds mere consciousness because Consciousness (I) always tends to circumscribing condensation, that is, to the formation of symbolic, quasi-static objects. In contrast, the change to other standpoints – other individual attitudes – is naturally more open. The perception of this alternation I therefore call *awareness*.

Awareness, then, is never "fixed." It is always the *becoming of something else*, more precisely of many others: It is constantly *arising* from this alternating movement and consists only in it. It is thus also perception of *potential*.

But *whose* potential? No, not ours, if by "our" a quasi-static self-image is meant. For such an image would already be largely fixed. Instead, in order to change, for example, from the

individuality of an official to that of an amateur artist, the official must be "dissolved" and condensed anew into the artist. Not the official has moved, but *the alternation* between one and the other *has been differently coiled*. In the process, both the official and the artist are aware of their alternative selves. Moreover, both are aware of the potential points of view on the way from the office to the studio and back again. And they are furthermore aware of the possible attitudes in the cinema or theater. And of the different positions within the office, the studio and the home.

Awareness changes with each attitude, but it includes all potential standpoints. Sometimes one has priority - it is more real and less potential - sometimes the other. Sometimes the awareness is more limited, for example to the pages of a file, then again more open with a view into life. But even in the file the artist occasionally comes into play, and in the artist the pedant. And at home, both of them.

Mentally we alternate faster than psychically or physically, because psyche and body are more "fixed." The psychic alternation structure is more deeply convoluted, and also the body is the result of relatively stable alternations ("interactions"), which we hardly overlook. But *strictly speaking* there is no place where we can say "Now *we* have changed position", because "we" consist *exclusively* of convoluted alternations. There is basically only awareness.

But who is aware of the alternation of awareness? A nice trick question.

In reality, awareness is *always* alternation between other awareness, namely between *perspectives* of the whole alternation. Awareness, as said, changes the rank, the *hierarchy* of potential attitudes. When the "officialdom" speaks, the inspiration is mostly silent and vice versa. What the official is also aware of, however, is the subordination of his awareness in the awareness of the artist (and so on). With the awareness then also the whole nesting of descending priorities, points of view, and turns alternates.

So what are we aware of in a nutshell?

- Everything unique is contained in everything unique.
- Alternation of uniqueness is the most natural thing in the world.

## **The Reality Funnel – What is Consciousness? (II)**

In What is Consciousness? (I) we have considered the formation of point centers-structures by circumscription and in What is Awareness? (I) the alternation of perspective as such. But basically both are one and the same.

Circumscribing movement – consciousness – is of course an alternation of individual points of view. And the perception of an alternation – awareness – circumscribes also a constant center. The difference between *emphasized* circumscription and *emphasized* alternation lies in the density of the circumscribed central area. If the circumscribing alternation (for example between facades) forms an object (a house), the content-dense center symbolizes its unity ("being inside"). If the alternation is perceived more as such, the object character is thin ("Is it several houses or one?").

The maximum of the unity is in the intuitive center point, whereas the maximum of the alternation consists in the alternation itself. That is, the alternation is authoritative and the circumscription is derived. (Without facades no inside either.)

Now, however, the "trace" of the alternation (of the facade run) is more or less wound together in the memory, that condensed, and the respective awareness is only *incompletely conscious* of the entire alternation (for instance between three bare walls with corners and a few windows). The rest (more windows, attic, back wall) leads into the just-not-conscious, into a narrowing.

Awareness does include consciousness of this transition ("closer, backward"). Yet consciousness is in a sense the "upper" section of awareness, whereas awareness as such also encompasses the just-not-conscious "further down" by *alternating* with it. This is more than a pointwise transition or a coagulated potential. From the alternation between conscious and subconscious, awareness "receives", so to speak, impressions and inklings that escape the more static consciousness ("a chamber somewhere").

Altogether, consciousness resembles a funnel, the edge of which represents the circumscribing (alternating) movement, which condenses and narrows inwardly and merges with the funnel stem into the just-not-conscious. Only the center point of the whole movement always remains conscious. Awareness, in contrast, *follows* the stem to the other side ("to the back, around the corner"), that is, it changes into the consciousness there, *whose* stem leads back again.

The difference is not strict: Consciousness is always awareness! Awareness is also conscious, but points beyond that and always involves *more* than is just now conscious. Alternation cannot be fixed approximately. With consciousness we only try to ignore it, and then its own changeable nature slips away from us, the awareness, from which it "spirals out."

The connection of awareness and consciousness has also been indicated in *Individuality and Reality*: By the alternation of individual perception a common *approximation* is constructed, a conscious reality (a rolling pen, a house). Because the alternating winding is condensed during the approximation formation and the alternating standpoints "disappear" in the funnel stem, we do not overlook the reality formation. However, since consciousness *always* creates approximate commonalities, the consciousness funnel is a reality funnel. It creates reality *out of* the funnel stem by approximating individualities to *one* consciousness, but *at no point* by renouncing them. Everything remains awareness.

Some aspects may also become clear from the following figures:




Figure 1: Shown above is the circumscribing condensation in the reality funnel. Below, a possible top view shows how the alternation of perspective condenses into an apparently static object consciousness.




Figure 2: Here, Figure 1 is summarized and further simplified. This time I emphasized the overall movement of perspective and the resulting spatial object awareness.

## **That Which Is – What is Awareness? (II)**

If every perspective is individual and if structures only arise from circumscribing alternations, then alternation cannot be limited to the Awareness (I) of a human being. Rather, every standpoint, every place of effect must alternate and emerge from alternations. (Ultimately, it is the alternation of points of a point centers-structure – defined in What is Consciousness? (I).

This consequence entails others:

1. We must basically be able to put ourselves into the individual awareness of other people (and even non-human). Indeed, we empathize with others; otherwise we could not communicate with them. We at least *approximate* their standpoints repeatedly and thus converse with persons who are *similar* to them. If we were to put ourselves *completely* into their position, our consciousness would quickly be overwhelmed and would have to repress most of it into the subconscious.
2. The change of a standpoint is the change of the whole reality (a rearrangement of the Reality Funnel), namely from a foreseen, *probable* reality to an *even more probable* one, the current reality. While one reality takes precedence, the others fall into their



subordinate position. They become or remain potential, just as the one now taking precedence did. But they do not disappear: They are still aware standpoints.

A standpoint as a place of effect, as a momentary summit of reality and center of structure-forming changes, goes far beyond what we normally understand by "consciousness." Such a point can be *everywhere*, in an ant, in a star, in a vacuum. It would be meaningless if no alternation culminated in it, no circumscription determined it. There is ultimately only alternation as such – That Which Is.

## **Subconscious – Free or Not?**

If we combine the results from Consciousness I and Consciousness II as well as Awareness I and Awareness II, the following picture emerges:

- What exists for us in the circumscribing alternation of perspectives as their common approximation, we are conscious of.
- If perspectives slip away from the approximation, we can still be aware of them. They exist *as such* in constant alternation.
- Everything dynamically (i.e. alternately) existing transitions funnel-like from the most conscious "opening" via a perspectively "narrowing" stem into an awareness that we can call *subconscious*.

Subconscious things therefore exist even if we do not consciously "look." Because subconsciously we *always* look (again and again). We are "disappearingly" aware of That Which Is. That means, we are "alternately" connected to it and can also expand this awareness. But we can also dive down into this awareness with the focus of our consciousness, widen the funnel stem only in *certain* places and return richer - in knowledge, hunches and sensations.

What are we conscious of *there*? What do we discover when we dive in? Other worlds, other ways of connecting, the essence of other people? Yes, and every day – and most of all at night. We can learn to bring back more of these impressions. But even without this, we discover much of our own essence here.

Let's expand our list of insights by one more point and take into account our Freedom of Choice with the second one:

- Since consciousness and awareness only defer in the degree of emphasis of the circumscribed central area, both are a *single* point centers-structure.
- An point centers-structure *chooses* its further change – within the constraints imposed on it by "other" point centers-structures.

We seem to be surrounded by such constraints. Already what our neighbor decides can impair us, and the doorframe is not even possible to talk to. But let us remember that all awareness is a hierarchy of probable realities with the most probable here and now. So when we choose a different reality funnel, all probable realities restructure for us. However, these realities continue to exist as themselves. Even their respective top-positions exist within awareness, just not here and now for us.

We don't have to defeat our neighbor at all, then, because in another reality he has long since consented. We must only *choose* this reality. (He may well do the same with that reality in which *we* have consented.) In order to do this, our focuses in other affected areas of life should be in agreement with this choice. That is, we should harmonize in our awareness the hierarchy of our own inner choices. Then the neighbor goes where we *both* want him to go. (Even the version in which we both choose mirror-invertedly, we are aware of without contradiction, just not here and now as a priority.)

How come the doorframe is so solid? It's not: Take a sledgehammer and smash it to pieces! But I think you *want* the frame. You want the earth and the sun. You want conditions. Why just *these* conditions – that would be a question to that subconscious, in which we hope to find more of our essence.

## Probability Thinking

If we weigh between two alternatives, say between job A and job B, then we weigh between their respective *precedence*. Each job has a certain probability of realization, which can change during the weighing, whereupon the probability of the other one adjusts immediately. That is, if we prefer job B, job A becomes less probable, but remains available in the background for a while. With job B we choose an individual *probability hierarchy as such* to our reality.

What about the other applicants? They and their decisions are also part of our probability hierarchy. They are aspects of *our individual Awareness*, which *altogether* decides for a new individual reality, a new probability hierarchy. This means in reverse: The other applicants have *their own* awareness and choose *their own* probability hierarchies. In the respective awareness, we all *meet, but do not merge*.

If we now decide for job B *through and through*, the others consequently choose job A or C *in our reality*. More or less consciously. Analogous applies to the others *in their* realities. There is no contradiction, for in every individual reality, from every perspective, it is a *common* choice. Even after I get job B, I can be aware of my alternative realities in job A or C, so that the individual realities intermesh, interact. It may therefore not be easy to come to terms with oneself through and through. But once this is achieved, the corresponding reality inevitably follows.

There is also no perspective in which everyone chooses job B through and through, because in the application situation the individual preliminary decisions of all applicants (and many others) for certain working conditions already converge: Only one can have the job, not everyone for an hour or all at the same time. And so an all-want-job-B-through-and-through-situation would contain an inner contradiction that urges resolution *from the outset*: through *different* choices of the applicants. Preferably "in time", but also shortly before the contract is signed. Please observe yourself in your job application situations: I bet you basically know beforehand whether you'll get the job - and actually agree (deep down, mostly). As notorious doubters, we just like to "play hardball" and get confirmation from the hiring manager. Nevertheless: The final decision of all parties involved may, if they want it, only be made at the last moment.

*Strongly simplified* because more descriptive we can perceive all individuals as "cones" of their probable changes: We all move together like spirits (or ghosts) at a certain distance from each other under a single fabric of probabilities that adapts to our shapes and movements. The fabric shows the "visible" interweaving of our options and decisions, and hints at even more potential underneath. We have to coordinate our decisions for one or the other direction of movement at least roughly with those of all other spirits, so that we don't warp the fabric too much or get entangled in it. The priorities and thus the probability shapes adapt to each other until they predominantly *harmonize*.

The probability of developments as a fifth dimension besides space and time lets us not only see in black and white, but lets us acknowledge manifold alternatives in the background, which surround us like waves. This in turn leads to a *more conscious* cooperation with others and an expanded awareness of our possibilities.

The next illustrations show Berta's "elective relationships":




Figure 3: As Berta changes her mind from Job A to Job B, which suits her better, her perceived alternatives reshuffle in the probability hierarchy.




Figure 4: Berta's awareness is in a joint decision-making and attuning process with that of her rival Alf. If she prefers Job B, he has to choose Job A. Both are aware of their alternative existences in the respective other Job and also of their alternative rival. They form their own as well as a collective probability hierarchy, which *together* from the conscious to the subconscious decide on a *priority* new overall structure - for example, the one in which Berta has Job B and Alf has Job A. The alternative overall structure drops down just like Berta's "single" alternatives in Figure 3.

### Is There a Constant Reality?

If we can exist only in the constant change of the point of view (sensory, psychic, mental) and this must apply analogously to every place of effect (hardly has it worked, it is different), how then stability, something constant arises?

Of course, by *repeating* the alternation: of thought, of way of looking at things, of mutual confirmation, of effect. Quite exactly, the change can be repeated only for a vanishingly short moment; then it must already reach beyond the repetition in order not to cancel itself out. That is, it changes *altogether* and thereby remains open. For stabilization, *approximate* repetition is sufficient, though. So we believe approximately the same thing for a long time.

Why again do we repeat ourselves *at all*? Because otherwise everything would disappear again immediately, existing only for an indefinitely short moment. But if something has gained minimal stability and thus formed an *entirety*, this can have a further stabilizing effect, since a change *with it as such* now also contains more repetition: Each alternation *contains* its sides, after all, and thus "brings" something from each side into the other. If one of them is relatively constant, the other one is "addressed" again and again in a similar way and thus "seduced" to constancy. Or it loses the connection at some point.

In the so-called "matter" it is no different: It stabilizes itself in this way in molecular interactions thus forming mountains, table and climate. Since it is nothing but small and big alternations of the place of effect, the whole alternation can be traced in principle up to the human brain and its mind - and vice versa from the mind into its brain into its environment. We find manifold intermediate stabilizations of emotional-mental, mechanical, electromagnetic, other and unknown kind, all contributing to our relatively steady world, but never self-contained.

Now, however, the entirety of an alternation is, as described, a consciousness structure (see Consciousness I and Consciousness II). Consequently, we are dealing with forms of consciousness *everywhere* - with more or less Freedom of Choice (see there as well as Subconscious) and an increasingly unknown depth (see Awareness I and Awareness II). We live in a world of the choosing consciousness or awareness. So constancy is *willed*.

We humans, for example, create legal laws; animals, plants and bacteria form their own social rules; and the inter-actions of "matter" also fit into regularities, so-called "laws of nature." However, from the relative openness of every alternation system follows equally that it can change at any time with a certain probability. Therefore, even "laws of nature" must be relative in some way.

Their stability in experimentation is based - like that of our living world - on relatively closed "collective" interrelationships. They mean the far-reaching exclusion of alternative paths of alternation and favor mutual "dependencies." What we believe, we look for and find with higher probability, and what we mostly find, we believe. We alternate there again and again, with all others pointing us to it, and suppress the seemingly inappropriate "rest". Ultimately, what is found and what is believed are inseparable and possible deviations are aberrant. And we are even right about that: Our Reality Funnel is established.

Only of what we cannot change *despite* deliberate openness, we do not yet know *why* it resists. On the other hand, it would also be strange if we had unlimited potential with limited knowledge of the world - or if we understood our deepest intentions.

## **Truth, Harmony, and Free Will**

The stem of the Reality Funnel summarizes the alternation of the less conscious standpoints "perspectively". But if they don't only jump around there, they also have a closer effect on each other and are wound in places to cores which *connect many perspectives harmoniously*. (Without harmony they would fall apart again.)

Such a comparatively harmonious core as, for example, our inner self can hold our Awareness (I) together, and from it probably emanate *more comprehensively harmonizing* impulses for thought and action than from the adjusting roles of our little ego. On the other hand, this ego can often handle everyday situations better. Therefore, it is best that both devote themselves to their *own* subject and *benefit* only from the skill of the other. We can *feel* such a harmony like a beautiful concert. If, instead, the ego is once completely in line with the inner self, we can speak of unity, but hardly of harmony: The connection is too rigid and the duet probably short.

**Harmony can thus be translated as *meaningful correspondence* and leads to a correspondingly meaningful definition of truth: The more unity or harmony there is of a content of consciousness *with the respective more comprehensive level*, the truer it is.**

Mutually retroactive alternations (interactions) thus lead to a loose hierarchical structure in which truth is standpoint-dependent, but not too much so. The individual truths meet in a center that *is much less mobile within their convoluted awareness*. Only when their awareness expands, even deeper truths are included, which relativize the previous center *on an even more comprehensive level*.

If we imagine the reality funnel once again, inner inspirations come through the funnel stem, whether impulses, ideals or sensations (all focuses of consciousness, since there is only perceived alternation). On the other hand, the most conscious circumscription occurs at the funnel edge, and the center of the overall circumscription lies exactly on the funnel axis. And this is where it gets exciting:

As explained about Freedom of Choice, we make decisions somewhere between center and periphery. But the total circumscription now "disappears" into the funnel stem! It is condensed - "perspectively" up to a stronger convolution – and *finally coincides with the funnel axis*. Whether a decision is free or determined by an inner impulse, therefore, cannot be distinguished *in the end* anymore! Impulses we can make ourselves conscious only further above, where we then also may deviate from them.

Do we have reason to doubt our inspirations? That depends on whether they arise from our deepest essence and from our harmony with it. For truth is, as I said, unity or harmony with the respective more comprehensive level. More comprehensive interconnectedness, however, distinguishes precisely an essence from each of its appearances. Therefore, the deeper the origin of an inspiration, the more probable and the more our deepest essence is involved in it and the more trustworthy it is. And vice versa: The more authentically we express our deepest inner self, the more trustworthy we are ourselves.

Yet this means even more: If we are not conscious of having chosen certain "conditions" of our live, but these must have been chosen due to our logical conclusions, it stands to reason that this choice takes place on a more comprehensive level and is significantly determined by our innermost essence. In this respect, our environment expresses a deep truth about ourselves.