

September, 2007

UPDATE

# Is Reality Really Real?\*

*\*You can bet on it!*

(Consciousness  
*is a hallucination*)

(TABLING  
THE  
UNFATHOMABLE)

(REALITY IS

**A COSMIC ILLUSION)**

*(•Science becomes blinded... among the  
higher clouds  
of truth)*

*The only way to introduce a topic like this, we decided, should be to gather a selection of headlines published in a variety of scientifically oriented media, make a few word substitutions to disguise them, and treat them as a synthetic whole.*

May we first suggest that a certain mindset, widely popular among all but the analytical, be gently put aside for the few minutes of this reading. (Which, may I add, far from qualifies as an analysis of reality.) It goes "Well, (shrug), anything's possible!"

Don't worry, it will come back to you. Meanwhile let's simply give the preposterous as wide a berth as possible in order to avoid the unthinkable. Such as the thinker who comes to think that his thoughts, and he himself -- along with everything else -- is unreal. (And then, by Gemini, he waits until the final chapter of his latest superbly insightful book to drop this unreality on his readers.)



### **What is the most likely motive for questioning the "reality of reality"?**

If it comes from either a working scientist or a deep philosophical thinker, the reason for such questioning most often seems to be that a blockage has been encountered in the flow of thought. It seems impossible to go further, as the question arises: "How do I know any of this is real? Could it be that true reality exists only in heaven, or in worlds where Quantum Laws rule and allow perfect understanding?"

### **Doesn't science control the Quantum Rules here, now, and as is?**

Such control gives many signs of being clearly evident in science's successes, but not so much in the methods tried towards eliminating certain massive roadblocks that remain. It does give a few signals, however, that in fields where science has not yet amassed satisfactory evidence, one stubborn cause lies in the refusal of Quantum Theory to supply grand advances. Such as, for example, in understanding all the cosmic aspects of gravity and by establishing workable premises concerning original conditions.

### **Why does the Metaparticle Website object so regularly to "immaterial" concerns like "nothingness" and "nullism"?**

Our view of a better future for humanity is at present focused on the possibility that new entire ranges of "hyper-matter" will probably begin to be brought into scientific apprehension in 2008 and 2009 by the Large Hadron Collider. What this will mean within the strictly materialistic paradigms of physics is pretty much unguessable to non-pros. But to any serious student of what might be called "metaphysical cosmology", it will mean that a continuum of expanding life-possibilities for human beings has come within view. Metaparticles hopes this will become a defeat for the nullist mind-set, chosen as the "philosophy" of a number of influential scientists - and also the Big Crunchers, Dark Faders, and No Meaning Proclaimers.

Of course, no proof will become available at first to strengthen the position of those who will choose to see "higher ranges of matter" as also being an opening to higher ranges of life. But I predict that the Supersymmetry Theory will so greatly benefit by the new findings that it might someday push forward toward such ranges.



Taken in synthesis, what approach is most often preferred by contemplators of the world illusion option? Well, they don't seem to like it but they seem compelled to consider it. And they do this seriously without bothering to set forth for readers the consequences of their versions of Reality as a Cosmic Illusion. I will take the liberty, anonymity observed, of giving an example or two:

Reality is nothing but illusion -- in the brain, throughout the cosmos, nothing excepted. This is the most radical option. In other words, there is nothing, anywhere, that is "real"; all is an illusion. Take a drink of water...illusion. Get thirsty again...illusion. The big trouble with this approach is that it demands there never was, isn't now, and never will be, anything real. Except illusions!

According to Webster's College Dictionary, an illusion is "A misleading image presented to the vision". (I wish they had said "presented to the consciousness", because that's the truth of it. But for scientists who think it's only a fluctuation in the brain, or in quantum waves, or what-all...such over-materialism demands that consciousness not be given a primary status in the cosmos.)

But, let's say you are standing there after drinking some water which is an illusion. If you exist at all... as implied by the attitudes reviewed -- you are also an illusion. But wait; isn't it you who are having the illusion? If not, who does? Somebody or something has to. If the entire universe is "a misleading image", what is misleading everybody? If it's just your illusion, how did you get that way? Et cetera, et cetera; no wonder they never give examples. It's tough when the only realities anywhere are illusions.

Another approach appears to be more widely employed by the psychological brotherhood. It has been found convenient, however, when large numbers of people declare they are seeing the same amazing, unforgettable, "supernatural" phenomenon. This, of course, was always identified as "mass hallucination" by the beard-waggers of the middle ages. (The frockless ones naturally.)

But first, what is the biggest difference between an illusion and a hallucination? I have consulted neither Freud nor Jung on this. But Webster, in addition to "a misleading image", defines an illusion as "something that deceives or misleads intellectually". The same source says a

"completely mistaken impression", and gives its synonym as delusion. Also given is "Figment of the imagination".

If, we should say, an illusion is something that misleads you, a hallucination is something you yourself create from your own psychic supplies. Suppose you are sun-baking at a popular swimming pool, casually viewing females. Suddenly you blink twice, since you are watching a perfect duplicate of Botticelli's Venus arising from the waters, posed on a giant clam shell and all.

Now nobody would need a beard to wag in order to proclaim this event as a hallucination. But what we wish to note is that you did it. Ordinary procedures supplied the underlying reality, but wasn't it just you who provided the decoration?

While the above may be a bit extravagant, it does, I think, draw a line between illusion and hallucination. Beyond doubt it shows that although some scientists might build a case for the universe being an illusion, they could not logically call it a hallucination. However, history shows instances of doing substantially the same thing. An angelic form appears in the skies over Spain. Thousands see it as the image of the Virgin Mary. But what do the frockless wise men say?

"Hallucination! Mass Hallucination."

— — — — — — — —

Most usually the writers of these interestingly titled articles about illusion, as the alternative for other causes, are people with at least some scientific training. They don't think anything about this is funny. So they must have an important motive for publishing their articles; a scientific motive. And after putting it all together, we get the motive -- and it's a good one.

**Didn't you guess Quantum Theory would be behind this, somehow?**

Let's ask an open question. Why do science writers, science authors, and probably a lot who are just science thinkers...Why do so many of them behold quantum reality as being superior to what

could be referred to as classical reality? The realm dominated by Newton, Einstein, and many other greats up until the 20th century?

The cause seems to be a certain growing attitude, apparently dominant in fields closely related to particle physics. That outlook suggests the microscopic realm of existence depends on rules or laws which are more fundamental than those of macroscopic worldfields. Theoretical scientists and experimentalists have encountered instance after instance where classical theorizing does not yield answers as quickly or consistently as those coming from quantum mechanics, for example.

Consequently, it becomes more rewarding to go with the big-river flow, where ideas may or may not seem more intuitive but very frequently prove more practical for obtaining what is needed. This despite quantum rules which in themselves are often elusively vague around the edges; rules giving the impression of not being completely graspable, even though they work.

A few writers and commentators appear to sound disappointed and a little wistful when they become aware of a sort of mental, inter-worlds barrier. Having come to accept as given that quantum laws should be more basic and controlling than those depended upon by classicists such as Newton and Einstein, they bemoan the fact that the full strength and heart of quantum theory remains beyond the most piercing inquiries of scientists.

It is as though mentality is "blind" to laws which have apparently not been intended by either God or Nature for the likes of human beings in the present era.

### **An answer to this enigma could lie in the near future**

I realize the answer I am proposing here is half mere possibility and half a forecast that could become at best a good guess in a couple of years -- or maybe much later. So I don't expect science, faith, or a passing UFO to take such an answer very seriously at this time. But do think about it.

The writers and commentators have good reason to be dissatisfied with what I have called a "mental barrier". But they, along with practicing scientists, will no doubt continue to hope that

the so-called "blinding" factor will somehow be alleviated. As a free-speaker not yet silenced by the mighty, I predict that it will.

But not the way they think it might. It is entirely logical, in my opinion, for science to consider the microcosmic to be closer to whatever began the universe than are stars, planets, animals, people, etc. But if we eventually are forced by proton collisions to lend credence to the idea of a continuum of energies and presently invisible materials, science will surely benefit from a wider outlook.

And my further contention is that such an outlook will, in the long run, adjust to the concept that each level or worldfield of the "earth continuum" *abides mainly by its own laws* -- although there may be various degrees of overlap at the edges.

In claiming illusion as the reason why we are in a sense blind to a better life of quantum-ruled regions, we would be sentencing ourselves to a minor, partly impotent role in the universe. In the larger sense of its progress this is a universe we still know relatively little about. We know our material selves are made of atoms that are obedient to quantum theory. Yet our thought processes seem not to allow us certain privileges enjoyed by mere electrons. Electrons can, for example, by means of "superpositioning", manage to be in two places at once. "Go through two separate doors at the same time" is the way it is usually put.

Somehow this seems a shame to some workers in science. Here we are, skipping and hobbling through lifetimes that are way too short for gaining personal dominance over our own existence. And it would seem that as long as quantum reality represents a more fundamental truth, though it seems fuzzy to us and hard to live by, microscopic presences in formerly "void" regions of space may be just as real as we are. To think otherwise in the face of what science has been discovering lately has to be questionable. Right?



Having perhaps come into existence earlier, to serve as templates for the forms of “hyper-physical worlds”, shouldn’t quantum laws naturally take precedence over those established by Newton, Einstein, etc.? Perhaps so. Or perhaps the idea of precedence in an interdependent continuum is not that important. Right there is where I believe the "unreal illusion" ideas could have begun: “There are not enough known possibilities for science to investigate for the furtherance of knowledge.”

Many things seem potentially rational when you look at them through potential paradigms. As for our brash suggestion to the effect that humanity will eventually evolve into worldfields of a more desirable reality, it is certainly not a prediction but only a hopeful conjecture. And if the Large Hadron Collider should reveal the first indications that a continuum of such realities may exist? (Exist in this solar system? It would have to involve the earth we live on. How not? A continuum always brings into relation its component parts.)

Few sophisticates, even fewer scientists, and almost no religionists are likely to be ready at this time to give consideration to such prospects. That's no wonder. It may be some would jokingly allow it might be enlivening to go through two doors at once. As for myself, there are such things as “optimists, long term”. But surely I'm not alone in suspecting that if we can't pull off such a binary trick yet, that's not such tough luck. Because if we could, we'd probably wind up in twice as much trouble.

I have a feeling that many a thinker would prefer "quantum consciousness" to simply come to us. But right now our problem is simply to survive. If we can do that, why won't we just gradually come to it?

---

**The Great Cycle Worldview follows on next page**