



The Laws of the Inner Universe

By Paul M. Helfrich, Ph.D.

www.paulhelfrich.com
helfrich@newworldview.com

Contents**Acknowledgments****Introduction & Overview****What is the Nature of Universal Truth?****About the Limitations of Language When Talking About Universal Truth****A Transpersonal View on Universal Truth by Ken Wilber****About Seth's Laws of the Inner Universe****About Seth's View of the Psyche and the Use of Inner Senses****Summary: Introduction & Overview****(Note: The main body is not available in this version. The full version is available only through one of my online courses. See www.paulhelfrich.com for more info.)****Endnotes****Acknowledgments**

I would like to dedicate this essay to my friends, Stan Ulkowski and his “partner in time” Lynda Dahl, without whom this probable reality would not exist. I’m indebted to their years of hard work and dedication that led to the re-publication of *Reality Change* magazine, most of the Seth/Jane Roberts’s books, and the creation of Seth Network International, the forum that allowed so many Seth readers to meet and share ideas during the 1990’s.

I would also like thank my life partner, Joanne, whose extraordinary dedication to the pursuit of excellence, creativity, and endless love made this little project possible. I love you my ancient friend!

Kudos, love, and high-fives go out to all of my compatriots and teachers on the Sethnet email list at eGroups.com. Thanks for helping me to experience and ponder the rich subtext within Seth’s ideas and also providing a challenging and creative public forum in which to immerse myself.

Gregory Polsen, from the Land Down Under, has created a wonderful set of indices to Books 1, 2, and 6 of the *Early Sessions* books and made them freely available on the website at the Sethnet email list on the eGroups.com. His spectacular efforts made my research much easier. Many thanks!

I am greatly indebted to author Norman Friedman, who helped open my eyes to the relationship between physics, the Perennial Philosophy, and the Seth Material.

And to Elena de la Peña, thanks for being a friend and an editor extraordinaire.

Finally, to Rob Butts, Jane Roberts, Seth, and the many others involved in making the Seth Material available to a world that can surely benefit from its depth, subtlety, and exquisite richness.

Introduction & Overview ~ What is the Nature of Universal Truth?

Answering the above question, which stands singularly throughout the ages, is the ultimate goal of every science, philosophy, and religion. To date, very few have even dared to pretend that they held the answers to this fundamental question. The scientist, philosopher, and mystic all take different approaches to finding their answers, yet ultimately all approaches lead through the same place; the nature of personal reality. Does our soul really exist? Or are our lives just the results of some cosmic accident? Is the universe really a meaningless, menacing, and chaotic place based upon the survival of the fittest? Do our personalities survive death? Or is that the bleak end to existence as we know it? Is there a Creator “underneath” the divine camouflage that we call physical reality? And if so, is there ultimately a purpose and design to life as we know it? How, then, can we find the answers that will lead us to more deeply understand our own natures in relation to these Universal Truths?

Universal Truth, by definition, is an absolute condition that never changes and is ubiquitous. Yet we find ourselves in a physical reality that seems to do nothing but change, constantly. Can there be Universal Truths or Laws that are indeed absolute and never changing conditions? The Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary (1) defines ‘truth’ as follows:

1 a *archaic* : **FIDELITY, CONSTANCY** **b** : sincerity in action, character, and utterance
2 a (1) : the state of being the case : **FACT** (2) : the body of real things, events, and facts
: ACTUALITY (3) *often capitalized* : a transcendent fundamental or spiritual reality **b** :
a judgment, proposition, or idea that is true or accepted as true <truths of
thermodynamics> **c** : the body of true statements and propositions
3 a : the property (as of a statement) of being in accord with fact or reality **b** *chiefly*
British : **TRUE** **2 c** : fidelity to an original or to a standard
4 *capitalized, Christian Science* : **GOD**
- **in truth** : in accordance with fact : **ACTUALLY**

Already you can see that the above definition covers a lot of ground, some of it seemingly contradictory. Can truth be relative? If so, can it really be considered Universal Truth? Or are we talking about two different things? The purpose of this essay, then, is to provide a thorough introduction to the nature of Universal Truth as expressed by Seth’s laws of the inner universe. First published in *The Early Sessions: Book 2 of the Seth Material* by Jane Roberts and Robert F. Butts, Seth’s laws of the inner universe point the way to some answers regarding the nature of Universal Truth. But before we dig into Seth’s ideas, we’re first going to take a look at the wisdom and insights of other thinkers on the topic of Universal Truth. This will help establish a foundation from which we can more deeply understand Seth’s laws of the inner universe, as they are perhaps the most subtle of all the ideas found in the Seth Material.

As you ponder the following, you can begin to see that the purveyors of Truth are talking about different things most of the time. The word ‘truth’ itself gets tossed about like a ship on a stormy sea, so much so, that the concept of an absolute, Universal Truth reveals itself to be a very slippery topic indeed. So strap yourself in for the ride, we are going to cover a lot of new and challenging ideas. If at any point you get

overloaded, just pick and choose what follows your interests. You can always come back and reread any section of the essay at a later time.

“When we talk about scientific truth—just as when we talk about God—we are in trouble, because truth has different meanings. William James said, and it’s valid, ‘Truth is what works.’

“The idea of Truth with a capital ‘T’—that there is something called Truth that’s beyond the range of the relativity of the human mind trying to think—is what I call ‘the error of the found truth.’ The trouble with all of these damned preachers is the error of the found truth. When they get that tremolo in the voice and tell you what God has said, you know you’ve got a faker. When people think that they, or their guru, have The Truth—‘This is It!’—they are what Nietzsche calls ‘epileptics of the concept’: people who have gotten an idea that’s driven them crazy.

“Thinking you’ve got The Truth is a form of madness, as are pronouncements about absolute beauty, because one can easily see that there is no such thing. Beauty is always relevant to something. That quote from Keats’ Ode on a Grecian Urn—“ ‘Beauty is truth, truth beauty’—that is all ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.”—it is a nice poetic thought, but what does it mean? Speaking of platitudes, I like Robert Bly’s extrapolation of Descartes: ‘I think, therefore I am. The stone doesn’t think, therefore it isn’t.’” – Joseph Campbell (2)

“’Tis strange—but true; for truth is always strange; stranger than fiction.” – Lord Byron (3)

“It is the customary fate of new truths to begin as heresies and to end as superstitions.” – Thomas Henry Huxley (4)

“When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, *however improbable*, must be the truth.” – Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (5)

“There are no whole truths; all truths are half-truths. It is trying to treat them as whole truths that plays the devil.” – Alfred North Whitehead (6)

“Remember one thing, there is no such thing as ‘the truth’ – because, as you each have a separate set of individual finger prints, so have each of you your own ‘truth’.” – Datre, as channeled by Aona (7)

“And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” – The Gospel of St. John 8:32 (8)

“Is it not amazing how liberating truth is? Many religions express giving you truth, that it will be liberating to you, but real truth needs no religious belief system behind it, and can be ultimately liberating in itself.” – Elias; channeled by Mary Ennis (9)

“Truths are constants that may not be eliminated or annihilated. Energy is a truth. Color is a truth. Vibration is a truth. Reality is a truth. You creating your reality is a truth.

Consciousness and its different areas of awareness are truths. You are a truth. Belief systems incorporate a much wider area, for they incorporate much imagination, but even within this you incorporate truth, for all thought becomes imagination and all thought is energy, which is truth, which is also reality. Therefore, all imagination is a reality, which is also a truth!

“Belief systems are those inventions that you create to explain what you do not understand. Truths are unchanging. Reality is a truth, but your viewing of reality is a belief system.” – Elias (10)

“You shall become aware that I speak of truths seldom, for truths are constants and absolutes throughout all of consciousness, which within any particular dimension, they are not recognized. They are distorted and not completely understood, and the importance placed on them is little. You search for truths within your beliefs and you look to philosophical areas or religious areas. Truths, within consciousness, are those elements of consciousness that are within ALL dimensions and that hold an element of significance within ALL areas of consciousness, physical and nonphysical. Their translation may be different, but they are constants. Color is one. Tone is another.” – Elias (11)

“The seeker of truth should thoroughly scrutinize various beliefs; but indiscriminate reading of religious books written by novices or untried enthusiasts yields only an indigestible hash of imagination, emotional outpourings, and diluted realization.” – Paramahansa Yogananda (12)

“... intuition is the power that tests truth. You must feel, you must realize truth before you can know that it is true. What seems true to reason and sense perception is not always true in fact. The only sure way to know truth is to realize it intuitively. To know the atom, you must become one in consciousness with the atom. You must become what you want to know. Can you know the taste of sugar without tasting it? No! So it is with the metaphysician: he experiences everything within himself. The scientist experiments with things outside himself.” – Paramahansa Yogananda (13)

“I do not know what I may appear to the world; but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the seashore, and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me.” – Isaac Newton (14)

“This above all—to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.” – William Shakespeare (15)

“The further one travels, the less one knows.” – Lao Tzu (16)

“Work is for the purification of the mind, not for the perception of Reality. The realization of Truth is brought about by discrimination, and not in the least by millions of acts.” – Shankara (17)

“The truth indeed has never been preached by the Buddha, seeing that one has to realize it with oneself.” – Sutralamkara (18)

“There is nothing true anywhere,
The True is nowhere to be found.
If you say you see the True,
This seeing is not the true one.
When the True is left to itself,
There is nothing false in it, for it is Mind itself.
When Mind in itself is not liberated from the false,
There is nothing true; nowhere is the True to be found.” – Hui Neng (19)

“Now, the last end of each thing is that which is intended by the first author or mover of that thing; and the first author and mover of the universe is an intellect. Consequently, the last end of the universe must be the good of the intellect; and this is truth. Therefore truth must be the last end of the whole universe, and the consideration thereof must be the chief occupation of wisdom. And for this reason divine Wisdom, clothed in flesh declares that He came into the world to make known the truth. ...Moreover Aristotle defines the First Philosophy as being the knowledge of truth, not of any truth, of that, namely, which refers to the first principle of being of all things; wherefore its truth is the principle of all truth, since the disposition of things is the same in truth as in being.” – St. Thomas Aquinas (20)

“There is only one Truth; It can be known only by individual spiritual experience. Such experience will be found to be the same, whether the individual be Hindu, Christian, or a member of any sect or school of thought. But such realization cannot be described in words. It can only be manifested in living the life.” – Paramahansa Yogananda (21)

“If you fix
on yourself and your tradition,
believing you alone have got ‘It,’
you’ve removed yourself
from the rest of the world.” – Joseph Campbell (22)

About the Limitations of Language When Talking About Universal Truth

Are words alone an adequate tool to convey the absolute nature of Universal Truth? Since we are bound by the inherent limitations of our own perception, physical senses, and reasoning abilities, just how close can we get to Universal Truth through the intellectual experience of reading, talking, or thinking about it? What if we were to employ some sort of advanced mathematical language? Could our own intuitions provide us with additional clues to the answers we seek?

Like any body of subtle and complex knowledge, the information that Seth offers has its own learning curve. It is not intended to be embraced by 100% of the population or solve all of the world’s problems. It concentrates on the individual’s right to decide what is fulfilling for him or herself. It does not claim to be Universal Truth, but instead offers a view on understanding Universal “Truths” filtered through our

subjective perception in the context of our cultural belief systems. And for many people, their experience comes in the form of books, audio tapes, or discussion groups; media that employ the use of written and spoken language to convey ideas.

Until organized science and religion expand their present models of the human psyche, which place the channeling phenomenon somewhere between dissociative identity disorder (multiple personalities) and demonic possession, the Seth phenomenon may be best understood in light of what is called the *Perennial Philosophy*, a term popularized by German philosopher and mathematician, Godfrey Leibniz (1646-1716), and made well known by writer Aldous Huxley in his book *The Perennial Philosophy* (1944).

Perennial wisdom is reflected in the established mystical traditions of the East and West in works such as the *Tao Te Ching*, *Bhagavad-Gita*, *The Tibetan Book of the Dead*, the poetry of Rumi, *The Kabbalah*, parts of *The Old and New Testaments*, and the *Gnostic Gospels*. Perennial wisdom is not based upon dogma or orthodoxy, but reflects the common denominator of Universal Truths hinted at by any credible religious dogma and method. This is what is meant, for example, by the Taoist saying that, “the Tao which is written or spoken is not the true Tao.” In other words (pun intended :-), the Tao represents the ineffable Primordial Source of all things: God. And despite our best attempts, our Primordial Source can never be fully expressed or captured by the limiting molds of human belief systems, languages, or dogma. But the Tao, our Primordial Source, can be directly experienced by anyone through their deep intuitions in a type of deep merger or empathic god-communion.

So perhaps the questions that we’re asking here have more to do with the relationships between the roles played by the intellect and reason versus the intuitions and emotions in our perception. Are these aspects of the psyche mutually exclusive when attempting to comprehend Universal Truth through personal experience? Even though every perennial tradition speaks about the importance of direct experience, what is the nature of that direct experience? The direct experience promulgated by Western science excludes the intuitions and emotions, focusing solely upon the intellect and reason. Facts are facts, right? Or are they? How far can we really go in terms of only the intellect and reason in comprehending Universal Truth? Immanuel Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* (1787) builds a strong case regarding the limitations of reason and intellect alone in comprehending Universal Truth. Jane Roberts used the concept of “prejudiced perception” (23) to express something similar, namely that human perception has its own limitations and, by default, is a type of distortion lens through which all experience is filtered. In other words, personal reality is uniquely experienced through the subjective psychological filters of our complex belief systems.

Since our attempts to comprehend Universal Truth are often obscured by semantical definitions and dialectics, we must continue to examine the role of written and spoken languages in the experiential process. It is also just as easy, when studying religious writings, to be led down a similar blind alley through the process of multiple translations in which subtle nuances of meaning, relevant to the original culture, get distorted and calcified over periods of time.

In many translations of the Christian Bible the phrase “the word of God” occurs dozens of times. It is often used to represent the divine authority and dominance of the Christian God over all other gods and peoples. Those who were gifted could hear the “word of God.” They were considered to be prophets, like Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, and so on. In this case, “word of God” is really a metaphor that represents the source energy, vibration, and wisdom of our Primordial Source. To hear these “words” required special

faculties that went beyond the ordinary five senses. In this context the “word of God” is not really a spoken language at all but represents Universal Truths that exist in a realm of consciousness “outside” of the physical realm. Those who are credited with the skill and ability to hear “the word of God” still had to translate their experiences into the spoken and written languages of the times or the process would have no utility for the larger community, benefiting only themselves. So in this case the spoken or written word is a carrier or vessel for the mystical experience of the “hearers,” but should never be confused for the actual “word” itself.

Once again we are returning to the nature of personal reality and trying to further understand our own perception, since it’s the only way we can ever experience and comprehend Universal Truths. As we continue, keep in mind that the words used to describe and convey any valid Universal Truth are themselves representations of something deeper and more ineffable that is beyond complete translation. This is one reason why these translations, in terms of the many extant religious and scientific textbooks, are often so different. They are inevitably tailored to the times and needs of the local cultures. The actual power contained in any book thus has a limited shelf life, since it exists in the physical realm of constant change and evolution. Have you read anything written in the 1750’s or 1850’s lately? The nature of personal reality therefore also exists in a historical continuum of constant change and development. And learning the ability to discern the difference between words and the reality they represent is the key in our search to unlock the mysteries of Universal Truth.

“The subject matter of the Perennial Philosophy is the nature of eternal, spiritual Reality; but the language in which it must be formulated was developed for the purpose of dealing with phenomena in time. That is why, in all these formulations, we find an element of paradox. The nature of Truth-in-Fact cannot be described by means of verbal symbols that do not adequately correspond to it. At best it can be hinted at in terms of non sequiturs and contradictions.” – Aldous Huxley (24)

“That words are at once indispensable and, in many cases, fatal has been recognized by all the exponents of the Perennial Philosophy.” – Aldous Huxley (25)

“In religious literature the word ‘truth’ is used indiscriminately in at least three distinct and very different senses. Thus, it is sometimes treated as a synonym for ‘fact,’ as when it is affirmed that God is Truth—meaning that he is the primordial Reality. But this is clearly not the meaning of the word in such a phrase as ‘worshipping God in spirit and in truth.’ Here, it is obvious, ‘truth’ signifies direct apprehension of spiritual Fact, as opposed to second-hand knowledge about Reality, formulated in sentences and accepted on authority or because an argument from previously granted postulates was logically convincing. And finally there is the more ordinary meaning of the word, as in such a sentence as, ‘This statement is the truth,’ where we mean to assert that the verbal symbols of which the statement is composed correspond to the facts to which it refers.” – Aldous Huxley (26)

“The world as it appears to common sense consists of an indefinite number of successive and presumably causally connected events, involving an indefinite number of separate, individual things, lives and thoughts, the whole constituting a presumably orderly

cosmos. It is in order to describe, discuss and manage this common-sense universe that human languages have been developed.

“Whenever, for any reason, we wish to think of the world, not as it appears to common sense, but as a continuum, we find that our traditional syntax and vocabulary are quite inadequate. Mathematicians have therefore been compelled to invent radically new symbol-systems for this express purpose. But the divine Ground of all existence is not merely a continuum, it is also out of time, and different, not merely in degree, but in kind from the worlds to which traditional language and the languages of mathematics are adequate. Hence, in all expositions of the Perennial Philosophy, the frequency of paradox, of verbal extravagance, sometimes of seeming blasphemy. Nobody has yet invented a Spiritual Calculus, in terms of which we may talk coherently about the divine Ground and of the world conceived as its manifestation. For the present, therefore, we must be patient with the linguistic eccentricities of those who are compelled to describe one order of experience in terms of a symbol-system, whose relevance is to the fact of another and quite different order.

“So far, then, as a fully adequate expression of the Perennial Philosophy is concerned, there exists a problem in semantics that is finally insoluble. The fact is one which must be steadily borne in mind by all who read its formulations. Only in this way shall we be able to understand even remotely what is being talked about.” – Aldous Huxley (27)

“It takes two to speak the truth—one to speak, and another to hear.” – Henry David Thoreau (28)

“The truths contained in religious doctrines are after all so distorted and systematically disguised that the mass of humanity cannot recognize them as truth. The case is similar to what happens when we tell a child that new-born babies are brought by the stork. Here, too, we are telling the truth in symbolic clothing, for we know what the large bird signifies. But the child does not know it. He hears only the distorted part of what we say, and feels that he has been deceived; and we know how often his distrust of the grown-ups and his refractoriness actually take their start from this impression. We have become convinced that it is better to avoid such symbolic disguising of the truth in what we tell children and not to withhold from them a knowledge of the true state of affairs commensurate with their intellectual level.” – Sigmund Freud (29)

“He who knows does not speak;
He who speaks does not know.” – Lao Tzu (30)

“The truth can not be expressed in words, and when words are used, even by a Shankara [Hindu philosopher of the early ninth century AD], acute minds can always find a loophole for attack. The finite, in fact, can not contain the infinite. Truth is not an eternal discussion; it is Truth. It follows that only by actual personal realization, by practice or method ..., can Truth ever be known beyond doubt.” – Douglas Ainslie (31)

“In higher states of consciousness there is an awareness of being one with the universe and all its creatures, of a knowing—a gnosis—related to that of the Creator. Because these kinds of insight are so different from the ordinary experience our language usually expresses, they are not easily conceptualized and verbally communicated. Myth, symbol, paradox, and poetic metaphor become more effective means of communicating these insights and experiences.” – Willis Harman (32)

“Wishing to entice the blind,
The Buddha playfully let words escape from his golden mouth;
Heaven and earth are filled, ever since, with entangling briars.” – Dai-o Kokushi (33)

“What is known as the teaching of the Buddha is not the teaching of the Buddha.” – Diamond Sutra (34) (substitute sage, philosopher, or channeled entity of choice above)

“The history of all religions is similar in one important respect; some of their adherents are enlightened and delivered, because they have chosen to react appropriately to the words which the founders have let fall; others achieve a partial salvation by reacting with partial appropriateness; yet others harm themselves and their fellows by reacting with a total inappropriateness—either ignoring the words altogether or, more often, taking them too seriously and treating them as though they were identical with the Fact to which they refer.” – Aldous Huxley (35)

“The word ‘truth’ has been so misused as to have almost lost its real meaning. Truth is the consciousness that is guided by spiritual wisdom to perform certain actions—not because everybody else says so but because they are right. Truth is eternal, yet ever new. It cannot be monopolized by anyone. It will keep on expressing eternally through the soul of man. Every human being has a right and a duty to express it in his or her own life.” – Paramahansa Yogananda (36)

“By ‘truth’ I mean: i) propositional truth where language is rigorously self-consistent and noncontradictory; and ii) correspondence truth where propositional truth (expressed in ideas/words) is confirmed by empirical evidence. The kind of awareness needed to pursue logical and rational rigor is frequently incompatible with the kind of awareness essential to spiritual wisdom. By ‘wisdom’ I mean an often ineffable knowing born of direct experience, a kind of intuitive pragmatism that works to the extent it takes account of the whole. It is inclusive and integrative, and invariably involves empathy and compassion.” – Christian De Quincey (37)

Hopefully, if you’ve made it this far, you’re beginning to understand that the word “truth” is very subjective, often distorted and inconsistently applied. Defining Universal Truth seems to be quite contextual, seeming to hint at something far beneath the surface of what we’ve been traditionally taught is the absolute truth in terms of scientific and metaphysical laws. Scientific laws are propositional truths, proven through the reason and processes of mutual verification that create a consensus, collective view. These appear to be different on the surface from metaphysical truths, which are more subjective and proven through the direct, intuitive experience of the individual. Yet proponents of both methods claim to be right. Some even believe that they are the “the people chosen as purveyors of The Way.”

Is our intellect really mutually exclusive from our intuition? Are scientists really that different from priests? Or philosophers for that matter? Could we possibly be living during a period of history in which scientific and metaphysical beliefs are merging as we expand our abilities to include objective and subjective experience? Intellectual and intuitive experience – merged? Or will a more collective understanding of Universal Truth forever elude us, since it can never be fully translated or comprehended in terms of our physical experience in the context of our personal realities?

Willis Harman – philosopher, scientist, futurist, and former president of The Institute of Noetic Sciences in Sausalito, CA – offers tremendous insight into the issues affecting the schizophrenic separation of science and religion. He says that, “there appears to be no conflict between a mature science and a mature religion. Indeed, we must seriously question whether we have a mature science as long as such conflict appears to exist.” (38)

The intellect, stripped of its intuition, may never be able to provide a complete picture of the nature of Universal Truth. And intuition, without the intellect, may likewise provide only a dead end if we experience Universal Truth directly but can’t manage to translate it into a useful way that adds value to a larger community. Perhaps we are at a stage in human evolution in which we need to incorporate a wider perspective, one that includes the use of both our intellect and intuition more fully?

As we shall see shortly, in Seth’s laws of the inner universe we will discover a refined approach to and definition of Universal Truth, but it is still constrained by limitations we have been discussing thus far. So we still need to explore some additional ideas before addressing Seth’s.

A Transpersonal View on Universal Truth by Ken Wilber

What we are really pondering at this point is a definition of Universal Truth in the context of the subtle nature of individual and collective subjective experience in relationship to individual and collective objective experience. I’d like to conclude our opening smorgasbord of “wisdom of the ages” with the ideas of Ken Wilber, a preeminent thinker and transpersonal psychologist. His views offer a viable framework within which we can begin to understand the nature of Universal Truth in the context of individual reality in relationship to collective reality, as you can’t really separate one from the other.

The term “transpersonal” refers to the view that the human psyche is very similar to Seth’s view; a multidimensional soul or energy personality gestalt that simultaneously exists in both physical and inner reality that also survives death. The transpersonal view is holistic. It views the physical universe, its galaxies, solar systems, and planets as consisting of interrelated systems that are inseparable; the whole always being greater than the sum of its parts. So it is within this context that we will continue our search for how we can comprehend the nature of Universal Truth.

The following ideas are summarized from Wilber’s book *A Brief History of Everything*.

“Truth, in the broadest sense, means being attuned with the real. To be authentically in touch with the true, and the good and the beautiful.

“And that implies that we can also be out of touch with the real. We can be lost, or obscured, or mistaken, or wrong in our assessments. We can be out of touch with the true, out of touch with the good, out of touch with the beautiful.” (39)

Wilber identifies four main aspects of the transpersonal psyche. Each one has its own, what he terms, validity claim or method of verifying the truth or falseness of any perception. This unique perspective allows him to dig into the more subtle aspects of the psyche, its individual and collective aspects, as well as its objective and subjective aspects. While all divisions are ultimately artificial, we can still get a clear sense of the way the psyche manifests in the world of our collective experience and ultimately how it relates to Seth's inner laws of the universe.

The following is a simplification of Wilber's holistic view of the psyche as related to what I'm calling the four primary aspects of Truth:

1. objective / individual / It
2. subjective / individual / I
3. subjective / collective / We
4. objective / collective / It

The first aspect of Truth deals with the concepts of **objective, individual**, empirical, "out there" reality. Its validity claim is *propositional truth*.

"Most people take truth to mean representational truth. Simple mapping or simple correspondence. I make a statement or a *proposition* that refers to or represents something in the concrete world. For example, I might say, 'It is raining outside.' Now we want to know if that is true or not. We want to know the validity or the 'truth status' of that statement. So basically, we go and look outside. And if it is indeed raining, we say that the statement 'It is raining outside' is a true statement." (40)

The same is true for all scientific facts, the speed of light, atomic structure of hydrogen, and the boiling point of water can all be propositionally verified.

The second of Wilber's four aspects of Truth deals with the concepts of **subjective, individual**, sincere, integral reality. Its validity claim is *truthfulness*.

"The question here is not, Is it raining outside? The question here is, When I tell you it is raining outside, am I telling you the truth or am I lying?"

"And not just about objective truths, but especially about interior truths. I mean you can always check to see if it is raining. You can do that yourself. But the *only* way you can know my interior, my depth, is by asking me, by *talking* to me, as we have seen. And when I report on my inner status, I might be telling you the truth, *but I might be lying*. You have no other way to get at my interior except in talk and dialogue and interpretation, and I might fundamentally distort or conceal, or mislead – in short, I might lie.

"... This is not so much a matter of objective *truth* but of *subjective truthfulness*. Two very different criteria – truth and truthfulness." (41)

The third aspect of Truth deals with the concepts of **subjective, collective**, mass reality, mutual understanding, cultural fit. Its validity claim is *justness*.

“The crucial point is that the *subjective* world is *situated* in an *intersubjective* space, a cultural space, and it is this intersubjective space that *allows* the subjective space to arise in the first place. Without this cultural background, my own individual thoughts would have no meaning at all. I wouldn’t even have the tools to interpret my own thoughts to myself. In fact, I wouldn’t even have developed thoughts, I would be ‘wolf boy.’

“In other words, the *subjective* space is inseparable from the *intersubjective* space, and this is one of the great discoveries of the post-modern or post-Enlightenment movements.

“So here ... the validity claim is not so much *objective* propositional truth, and not so much *subjective* truthfulness, but *intersubjective fit*. This cultural background provides the *common context* against which my own thoughts and interpretation will have some sort of meaning. And so the validity criteria here involves the ‘cultural fit’ [or justness] with this background.

“... The aim here is *mutual understanding*. Not that we necessarily *agree* with each other, but can we at least *understand* each other?

“... You and I can share our depth. When we point to truth, and we are situated in truthfulness, we can reach mutual understanding. This is a miracle. If Spirit exists, you can begin to look for it here.” (42)

The fourth aspect of Truth deals with the concepts of **objective, collective**, mass reality, social systems mesh, systems theory web. Its validity claim is *functional fit*. This is a very broad area.

“... the standard systems scientist, or standard systems theorist, is not primarily interested in any [subjective, cultural background], in any of the interior meaning. Rather, systems theory is interested in the *function* that the Dance [that represents any unique cultural event] performs in the overall *social system*. What the natives *say* this Dance means is not so important. What is really important is that the Dance is part of an objective social system, and this objective system in many ways determines what the individual participants are doing. The real function of the Dance is to provide autopoietic self-maintenance of the system. The Dance is thus part of the social system’s attempt to maintain its social integration, its *functional fit*. It provides a common ritual around which social cohesion is organized. And this can be determined by observing the Dance from an *objective* stance, an ‘empirical’ or positivistic stance – objective and monological. You can even make a monological flow chart of it, which, believe me, is not how the natives experience the Dance at all!” (43)

This fourth aspect – **objective, collective** – focuses solely upon:

“Objective systems within systems within systems – atoms are parts of cells, which are parts of organisms, which are parts of ecosystems, which are parts of the biosphere, and so on. In other words, *functional fit*.” (44)

When comparing the third and fourth **collective** aspects of Truth:

“They are both correct, in my opinion. One approaches the social/cultural holon [a theoretical holistic ‘unit’ of consciousness] from within, the other from without. One is how *subjects* fit together in cultural space—how you and I reach mutual understanding or *intersubjectivity*; the other is how objects fit together in physical space, in the total objective system, in *interobjectivity*. The one uses hermeneutics, or interpretation of inner *depth*; the other uses empirical-analytic observation, or objective analysis of observable behavior. ‘What does it mean?’ versus ‘What does it do?’

“... And ultimately, these four truths are simply the four faces of Spirit as it shines in the manifest world. The validity claims are the ways that we connect to Spirit itself, ways that we attune ourselves to the Kosmos.” (45)

The above is obviously a simplified and condensed presentation of Wilber’s evocative ideas, but the main point here is that the types of Truth we most often talk about are usually relative and not absolute. Wilber’s ideas show just how subtle the shades of gray can be when using intellectual dialectics to describe Universal Truth. Again, our intellects will only take us so far on this journey. At some point we will need to engage our deep intuitions and further understand the nature of personal reality, its physical and inner aspects and the Truths that pertain to each. And so we again return to a favorite topic of Seth, the nature of personal reality – the true context in which we are able to perceive absolute, Universal Truth as it pertains to us individually and collectively. We now have a suitable framework in which we can move on and examine what Seth has to say regarding his inner laws of the universe.

About Seth’s Laws of the Inner Universe

Seth lays a foundation from the very beginning of the sessions in which to better understand the myriad, subtle relationships between physical reality and inner reality. This is no small task, since most of us are well acclimated to our familiar physical reality but unfamiliar with anything “outside” of our five-senses perception. Seth first introduces what he calls the laws of the inner universe in session 44, dated April 15, 1964. He opens this session with a discussion on the nature of dreams, physical reality as mental camouflage constructions, and nonphysical source aspects of the human psyche; light stuff for sure. He says that “the basic inner universe beneath all camouflage does not have an existence in space at all, as you envision it. Space as you envision it, that is as an emptiness to be filled, is a camouflage.” (46) He summarizes that “if the dream world exists, and it does, and if it does not exist in space, then in what, or where, does it have its existence, and what paths if any will lead us to it?” (47)

The notion of an inner source reality is a perennial concept repeatedly described in all of the world’s established metaphysical traditions. It is no accident that there are strong similarities between the mystical aspects of these traditions and many of Seth’s ideas. The main difference is that Seth’s ideas are offered in the contemporary clothing of our own cultural framework. So even though Seth uses different words and analogies, he is attempting to describe the same Universal Truths as these older traditions. And in like manner, Seth provides a set of tools in which anyone, raised in the scientific and religious value systems of the Western world, can explore physical reality and its inner, nonphysical source. But more on those tools in a while.

According to classical Newtonian physics our universe is perceived as a closed, finite, machine that can be broken down into parts like molecules and atoms. Quantum mechanics, a 20th century branch of physics, has essentially thrown out this model upon discovering a “hidden” nonphysical or nonlocal domain that is the source of all physical matter and energy. At the quantum level, physical reality behaves in bizarre and unpredictable ways. Thus our physical universe is no longer understood to be a closed system, but intersecting and exchanging energy with countless probable and alternate dimensions. And even though scientists still rely on physical senses and enhanced measuring devices that greatly extend their physical senses, they still are no closer to discovering the Source of our physical universe.

Though it’s still politically correct to believe that the Big Bang Theory accurately describes the genesis of our universe, postmodern science still refuses to address the Source behind the Big Bang leaving it to the realm of philosophers, theologians, and mystics. Still, where did that Primordial Source come from? And what are the implications if this Primordial Source is conscious and sentient? These are, what author Douglas Adams calls somewhat tongue-in-cheek, the big questions of God, life, the universe, and everything. And we must at least mention them if we are to consider what Seth offers as the laws of the inner universe, for they are likewise dependent upon how we comprehend Universal Truths through personal experience.

The notion of a physical world that’s strongly coupled to a non-material, inner reality is another perennial idea. Seth, years later, went on to introduce the concept of *Frameworks of Consciousness* to expand upon the relationships between physical reality and inner reality. **(48)** In a nutshell, Framework 1 represents the *camouflage constructions* Seth alluded to earlier; the everyday physical reality we take for granted. Framework 2, on the other hand, describes a region of consciousness that provides all of the “source energy” for Framework 1. So Framework 2 is a virtual, psychological medium, consisting of no-space and no-time, that is the nonphysical source of physical reality. Other terms used in session 44 – *inner universe, value climate of psychological reality, fifth dimensional space, and the spacious present* – are also attempts to describe the nonphysical nature of Framework 2 and “inward,” what Seth briefly mentions as Frameworks 3 and 4. **(49)** But for our purposes, we’ll concentrate upon the relationship between Frameworks 1 and 2; physical and inner reality.

It may seem a bit confusing, at first, to attempt to understand inner reality in terms of our physical senses and linear thought processes. What is the best way to best conceptualize nonphysical, nonlinear concepts? Initially, it may seem impossible to reconcile the apparent paradoxes of time and no-time, space and no-space. Yet the great sages, religious geniuses, and mystics have been telling us something similar, over and over, for thousands of years. If we use our deep intuition, or what Seth calls our *inner senses*, along with our intellect these concepts become much clearer. **(50)** This is one reason why Seth introduced the inner senses early on, beginning in session 14, regularly integrating them throughout his early discourses. He encouraged Jane Roberts and husband Rob Butts to regularly experiment with their inner senses, specifically psychological time, as these are the primary psychological tools for directly experiencing inner reality:

“I want to make one note here, that again experience in the use of [the inner sense of] psychological time will bring you close to an understanding of the value climate of psychological reality [Frameworks 1, 2, 3, 4 ...], for obvious reasons. Psychological time

indeed is a part of this climate as it appears in fairly uncamouflaged form in your own universe. You can get the feel of it.” [session 44] (51)

And later...

“You will see also how the inner senses are equipped to perceive basic inner realities of the inner universe, in much the same manner that your outer senses are equipped to manipulate within your camouflage universe.

“This material is actually not nearly as difficult to understand as it may seem. Intuitively you should pick up much of it. The intuitions are not bound by the so-called laws of logic, and cause and effect. They do not take time as you know it into consideration, therefore they are not bound by continuity or limited to communication of words or even thoughts, strung out one after another.

“The intuitions are able to accept conceptual reality so some degree. They can feel the content and validity of a concept, where the brain itself may fall short.” [session 44] (52)

So we need to make an important distinction here, namely that when Seth talks about the inner senses he is talking about a type of subjective, psychic perception that is part of our genetic and spiritual heritage and has been experienced in every culture since the beginnings of the species.

I like to use the word *hyperception* to describe this type of inner perception. It’s derived from the word “hyperspace,” a word used in early science fiction to describe a fictional space containing more than three dimensions that allowed for extraordinary events, such as faster than light travel. More recently hyperspace has been used by quantum physicists to describe theoretical multidimensional space-time frameworks. Most of us are familiar, for example, with television’s Starship Enterprise engaging its fictional warp engines, entering hyperspace, and exiting in another quadrant of the galaxy many millions of light years from the entrance point. Hyperception is the logical extension of this same concept to the type of perception that results when consciously engaging the fuller use of our inner senses.

Perhaps the notion of a type of waking dream state is the closest analogy to describe hyperception. Just as we click on hyperlinks to jump at the speed of thought to any page on the World Wide Web, so too can we use hyperception to instantly travel anywhere within our own psyches. When using our inner senses we are not, however, talking about abandoning our intellect, skepticism, or losing our sense of identity. Far from it. Seth strongly encourages maintaining an equilibrium between our intuitions and intellect when learning to consciously engage our inner senses. In fact he strongly suggests that the human race is in the midst of a profound shift in consciousness in which we are just beginning to collectively learn the proper use of our inner senses in the waking state. In other words, our species is rapidly evolving toward what has previously been the purview of only adepts, sages, and mystics.

Returning to our laws of the inner universe, Seth says that:

“... the so-called laws of your camouflage universe do not apply to the inner universe [Frameworks 2, 3, 4 ...]. They do not even apply to other camouflage planes [other Framework 1’s]. However, the laws of the inner universe apply to all camouflage universes, and all consciousnesses on any plane must follow the basic laws of the inner

universe. Some of these basic laws have counterparts known and accepted on various camouflage planes. There are various manifestations of these laws and various names given to them.” [session 44] **(53)**

So it’s important to realize that when trying to understand Seth’s laws, they are the foundational, underlying principles that are in essence Universal Truths that apply to inner and outer reality. So perhaps what we’ve been taught by our mainstream scientific and religious belief systems as Universal Truths or Laws are too narrow and really incomplete definitions. Again, the words that are used to describe Seth’s laws of the inner universe can never fully express these Truths. They are not offered in a philosophical dialectic or mathematical language. In other words, every time you begin to get lost in the inherently paradoxical nature of Seth’s semantical descriptions of these inner laws, that’s a sure sign that you’re rationalizing too much and not sensing and feeling the deeper meanings that lie underneath the words used to describe them.

To get a clearer sense of the subtle nature of these laws of the inner universe, let’s briefly explore two of Seth’s foundational concepts:

1. *All-That-Is* **(54)**
2. *consciousness units* (CUs) **(55)**

In a nutshell, Seth uses the term All-That-Is to represent our Primordial Source, or what we conventionally term God. Seth defines All-That-Is as an eternal action or process in which every aspect has some form of conscious awareness. In other words, God is not “out there” somewhere but literally “inside” and intimately woven into the fabric of all Its creations. On the other hand, CUs are the most basic, essential, nonphysical “unit” of the divine totality of All-That-Is. CUs are “awareized” conscious energy imbued with an innate intent to group together and form the various building blocks for matter, from sub-atomic particles all the way up to galaxies. By awareized, Seth doesn’t mean aware in human or anthropomorphic terms, he means aware in terms of the innate consciousness of All-That-Is. In this sense formations like atoms, oceans, or supernovas are acknowledged to be conscious and also imbued with an innate propensity for continued development.

Ultimately then, All-That-Is and CUs together form two primary qualities of an infinite spectrum of conscious awareness to which any definition of Universal Truths or Laws must apply. This spectrum can be understood as infinite *Frameworks of Consciousness* that begin with our familiar Framework 1 reality and enfold “inward” toward the divine totality of All-That-Is. So Framework 2 is really only the first nonphysical framework that directly affects, supports, and nurtures Framework 1. Again, Seth briefly hints at the existence of Frameworks 3 and 4, but leaves them be as, once again, we very quickly get into unfamiliar territory where most of our cultural definitions of Truth no longer directly apply to this Sethian context.

Our conventional definitions of Universal Truth are based solely upon the objectification of an absolute, externalized, cause and effect reality that is believed to be the same for each of us. In other words, it is believed that this absolute, consensus reality actually creates us. In this belief system it is not even possible that we could create our own realities! The most often used method for validating the factual evidence of propositional truths in Western belief systems is one of scientific verification using

corroborative measurements on predictive models of physical behavior. For example, we believe that water boils at the temperature of one hundred degrees Celsius. This is accepted as a fact because we can measure and verify that condition at various atmospheric pressures in various locations around the planet. We are mistakenly taught to believe these qualities of our physical world are thus absolutes; Universal Laws. Gravity, the speed of light, and the electromagnetic spectrum are also considered fundamental Laws of our Universe that are verifiable through measurement. However, in Seth's view, these appear to be absolutes only in terms of Framework 1 camouflage formations of matter and energy.

Once you expand your perception to include other *Frameworks of Consciousness*, the boiling point of water in Framework 1 is no longer "Universal." There is no-water in no-space/no-time! What indeed appears as a Law in Framework 1 applies only to Framework 1. In other words, our conventional concepts of Universal Truths and Laws are only belief systems that suit us well here in Framework 1 terms but lose their absoluteness when perceived from a wider, multidimensional view.

Seth uses the concept of *root assumptions* (56) to describe what we conventionally consider to be Universal Laws like gravity, death, and taxes (that last one's a joke :-). This to say that *root assumptions* are only relative to the *Framework of Consciousness* that they exist in, they are not absolutes. This is not to say that they aren't important, for they provide the primary guidelines for all potential experiences within any *Framework of Consciousness*.

So the laws that Seth presents – laws of the inner universe – must apply to the innate qualities of All-That-Is as well as CUs. They must apply to the "largest" and the "smallest" aspects of our infinite spectrum of conscious awareness. If your brain is starting to hurt at this point, try to resist the natural inclination to say that this is all too technical and you'll never understand it! Give it time, take little bites, slowly reread the information, and meditate on conceptualizing these ideas. Dream on these concepts. Be persistent! Since we each create our own realities, so too do we create our own understanding of Universal Truths, they do not exist "outside" of us, but are an intimate aspect of our personal realities. Given enough time and willful intent, the synergy of your intellect and intuitions will together reveal the deeper meanings of these laws to you.

About Seth's View of the Psyche and the Use of Inner Senses

Since our inner senses are the primary tools that help us to bridge our perception between physical and inner reality, a brief look at Seth's "model" of the human psyche will help to outline the psychological mindscape in which the inner senses work. In a nutshell, Seth's view of the psyche is multidimensional, saying that the psyche resides to some degree within each *Framework of Consciousness*. And again, only Framework 1 has physical attributes. Seth describes three primary qualities in which the psyche works together seamlessly in this multidimensional context:

- outer ego (waking self, outer senses)
- subconscious (dream self, outer/inner senses)
- inner ego (inner self, inner senses)

According to Seth, all three qualities are conscious aspects or "layers" of the psyche but each functions in a very different way. Obviously, the outer ego relies primarily upon the five senses and neurological

processing within the brain and central nervous system. The subconscious is aware of a much greater array of body data, feelings, emotions, and peripheral physical and inner information, but these remain in the outer ego's background, usually at weaker intensities from which the outer ego picks and chooses according to circumstances and intent. The subconscious actually extends much deeper than Western scientists presently believe, containing personal, racial, and collective regions. The subconscious is also involved in all of our so-called *unconscious* states such as sleep, dreams, and various altered or non-ordinary states. It thus serves as a gateway between the outer and inner egos.

The inner ego exists in what the Science of Psychology still considers to be the unconscious. And this is a very broad mindscape that, according to psychologist Carl Jung, is merged with the deep, collective unconscious of the entire species. Seth, however, consistently refutes that any part of the psyche is *unconscious*. He says repeatedly that All-That-Is consists of infinite spectrums of awareness and orders of intensity that, relative to themselves, are all quite conscious. So if a tree falls in the woods, does it really make a sound? Well, according to Seth's definition of the psyche it does. Even though your outer ego isn't present to make an observation or take a measurement, your inner ego is literally omnipresent and holds the ability to access every aspect of All-That-Is including the tree falling and the sounds it makes. And to be clear, omnipresence does not mean omniscience, these are two different qualities of consciousness. The former means holding the ability to access and be anywhere within All-That-Is. The latter means to fully understand and know the reasons why for everything.

Perhaps another way to conceptualize the omnipresence of the inner ego is to imagine it residing in Frameworks 2, 3, 4, and so on, in the same nonlocal state described by the quantum physicists. So it is literally no-when and no-where in those terms, and thus has instant access to any-when and any-where in multiple, simultaneous Framework 1's. Apparently, this type of perception is only as difficult as we truly believe it to be, since it's part of our genetic heritage and available to one and all. But that is a loaded statement, as hang-gliding, playing professional sports and violin concertos are also available choices of experience.

Hopefully you're beginning to get the idea that you're a part of something that's much bigger than you previously believed. And once we make the conceptual leap that the so-called *unconscious* or inner ego is really a fully conscious entity, then all divisions of the psyche into ego, subconscious, and *unconscious* ultimately blur. The point is that these qualities of the psyche are not discrete parts of some machine, but more like holistically integrated aspects of a comprehensive source self that simultaneously exists inside and "outside" of space and time.

This is a big concept to understand if you're used to thinking of yourself as a single separated ego-self, isolated from everyone and everything else. So one way to make this simpler is to use the analogy of the transpersonal psyche as an iceberg. The tip of this iceberg represents you, the outer ego-self. The air around you represents the time framework that you live in. This tip lives in a realm where time seems to flow from past to future in fairly predictable fashion. Stability, predictability; these are good things!

The water line in our analogy acts as a subconscious boundary between the tip and submerged aspect of our iceberg; the realm of the inner ego. The subconscious is like the two-way traffic cop that mediates the feedback loop between the outer and inner egos, using the inner senses to translate between Framework 1 and Framework 2 orders of perception. But the subconscious is also fluent in the use of the physical

senses, aware of a much greater array of sensory information than the outer ego that relates directly to the complex biology of our body consciousness in any given moment point.

As we turn our attention to the size and nature of the submerged portion – the inner ego – we begin to sense its true multidimensional nature; the inner ego is so vast that it literally fuels entire galaxies and solar systems, revealing the infinite nature of our own source energy! And we can't consciously perceive the submerged source in its entirety because full cognition of the inner ego would overwhelm our brains and nervous systems. However, we can perceive the invisible affects of our inner ego through the affects of dreams, inspiration, intuition, and other meditative states engaging our inner senses.

Seth also uses what he terms “entity names” to describe our inner ego. As you read the Seth books you'll notice that he refers to Jane as “Ruburt” and Rob as “Joseph.” This practice often strikes a new reader as unusual and it is always footnoted and explained at the beginning of every book. Seth's intent in using entity names is to get us to recognize how conscious and aware our inner egos really are, even though they seem mysterious and, for the most part, silent to us. According to Sue Watkins, the former ESP class member, family friend, and author of *Conversations with Seth*, entity names:

“... are supposed to express a person's whole self, or ‘the image of the sum of your various personalities in the past and future,’ as Seth explains in *The Seth Material*. ‘The names are a sound that you make – that your mind makes, when it meets with the universe, as the leaves each have a sound that they make as they move against the sky,’ Seth added in an informal class gathering in 1979. ‘So, your mind sounds. And that sound has a certain identification. It is the sound of the movement of the leaves of your mind.’ ”

(57)

So the key points to keep in mind as we forge ahead are that we're dealing with an open model of the human psyche that is multidimensional and not limited to a single lifetime – a psychological source self, conventionally known as the soul, that exists in more dimensions than those perceived by the five physical senses and also survives physical death. Since no discussion of Seth's view of the psyche would be complete without mentioning the perennial concept of reincarnation, we'll briefly mention that, according to Seth, all lives occur simultaneously in multiple Framework 1's supported by the merged inner Frameworks 2, 3, 4. However, there is nothing like the religious belief system of karma, the so-called law of moral cause and effect, at work here. (58) For now, we can leave reincarnation be as we're concentrating on our individual selves and our ability to comprehend Universal Truth and Seth's laws of the inner universe.

Back to our inner egos. According to Seth the inner ego is the primary psychological aspect that directly manipulates nonphysical “source energy” through the relatively unrestricted use of the inner senses, constantly creating anything and everything in physical reality. The inner ego, being safely ensconced in inner reality, is fully conscious and aware but in a nonphysical manner that initially appears quite alien in terms of our physical senses and outer ego. From the outer ego's perspective the inner ego at first seems quite mysterious, literally the stuff of dreams:

“Now: the inner ego is the organizer of experience that Jung would call unconscious. The inner ego is another term for what we call the inner self. As the outer ego manipulates within the physical

environment, so the inner ego or self organizes and manipulates with an inner reality. The inner ego creates that physical reality with which the outer ego then deals.

“All the richly creative original work that is done by this inner self is not unconscious. It is purposeful, highly discriminating, performed by the inner conscious ego of which the exterior ego is but a shadow – and not, you see, the other way around. Jung’s dark side of the self is the ego, not the unconscious. It is the product of an inner consciousness with far more sense of identity and purpose than the daily ego. It is the daily ego’s ignorance and limited focus that makes it view so-called unconscious activity as chaotic.

“The conscious ego rises, indeed, out of the ‘unconscious,’ but the unconscious, being the creator of the ego, is necessarily far more conscious than its offspring. The ego is simply not conscious enough to be able to contain the vast knowledge that belongs to the inner conscious self from which it springs.

“It is this inner self, out of massive knowledge and unlimited scope of its consciousness, that forms the physical world and provides stimuli to keep the outer ego constantly at the job of awareness.” [session 509] **(59)**

So one of the main processes of personal growth, at this present state of human development in purely physical terms, is learning to unblock the outer ego’s limited “five senses only” perception by creating a bridge between the inner and outer egos with our inner senses. And learning to use your inner senses to conceptualize Seth’s laws of the inner universe will provide the foundation from which to know your inner ego better, since these are the laws that govern the *Frameworks of Consciousness* in which your inner ego constantly operates.

“The basic rules of the universe as I have said appear differently on different planes [Frameworks]. The camouflage [of Framework 1] is necessary at this stage of development, intricate, complicated, various and beyond understanding of the outer senses which are the perceivers of camouflage itself, peculiarly adapted to see under particular circumstances. You cannot use camouflage to see through camouflage. There are basic rules in the universe. The inner senses use the rules consistently and well.

“It is only the inner senses which will give you any evidence at all of the basic nature of life itself. Since very often the vitality or stuff of the universe [consciousness units] seems as innocuous as air might seem to you, then look for what you do not see. Explore places that appear empty, for they are full. Look between events. What you see clearly with your outer senses is camouflage. I am not suggesting that you take everything on faith, nothing of the sort. I am saying that what seems vacant lacks camouflage, and therefore if this is explored it will yield evidence. I hope that I have not carried you too far too fast.

“Effects would seem to be evidence, and therefore when you probe into seemingly empty spaces you will receive effects which will be evidence. In concrete terms, if a tree branch blows you can take it for granted that something moves the branch. You know wind by its effects. No one has seen wind but since at times its effects are so observable it would

be idiocy to say that wind did not exist. Therefore you will come up against the basic stuff of the universe and feel its effects, though your outer senses will not necessarily perceive it.

“Granted, your camouflage is in itself an effect. If you look at the observable physical world in this life, you can, it is true, learn something about the basic rules of the universe, if you take into consideration camouflage distortion. There is so much to be said here, and you have so much to learn that sometimes I have to admit that I’m appalled.”
[session 19] (60)

As stated earlier, the laws of the inner universe can never be fully expressed in philosophical dialectics or mathematical equations, but they can be hinted at and, of course, be directly experienced through deep intuition. There are many perennial teaching traditions, some thousands of years old, that have faced this same challenge, that of introducing the concept of Universal Truth in terms of spoken and written words to novices. The solution is to intuitionally experience the difference between theory and practice. The following advice from a highly accomplished Tibetan teacher of Dzogchen Buddhism, Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche, directly applies here:

“By ‘applying in practice,’ we mean turning what has been conceptually understood – what has been received, pondered, and made meaningful – into direct experience. This process is analogous to tasting salt. Salt can be talked about, its chemical nature understood, and so on, but the direct experience is had when it is tasted. That experience cannot be grasped intellectually and cannot be conveyed in words. If we try to explain it to someone who has never tasted salt, they will not be able to understand what it is that we have experienced. But when we talk of it to someone who has already had the experience, then we both know what is being referred to. It is the same with the teachings. This is how to study them: hear or read them, think about them, conclude the meaning, and find the meaning in direct experience.” (61)

The direct experience that Tenzin Wangyal refers to comes through a variety of meditative and psychic practices perfected over thousands of years that also include dream and sleep yoga. I mention this to say, again, that most of what we experience with our five senses is a limited, not absolute, method of perception that has been deeply entrenched into our consensus, mass reality by the vast majority of people over many, many millennia. There are other modes of perception waiting to be experienced that are neurologically available, including Seth’s psychological time, that open the gateway to the inner ego and inner reality. So to answer some of our earlier questions concerning the nature of personal reality and how we can ever really know Universal Truth: in the context of Ken Wilber’s individual and collective, subjective and objective aspects of Truth and Seth’s multidimensional psyche, perhaps the simplest conclusion to make is that only when we, an outer ego, become consciously aware of our inner ego through the conscious use of inner senses, will we unequivocally comprehend Universal Truth. And that is another loaded statement!

When Seth says to always trust the evidence of your senses, he means physical and inner senses. In other words, trust the evidence of your own experience. And this doesn’t mean to forsake a healthy skepticism and embrace superstitious nonsense. The point is to use your common sense, be consistent and persistent in your personal search for meaning and Universal Truths. And just as learning to walk, swim, or play a

Beethoven piano concerto takes time, so does learning to consciously use your inner senses. Just as you are a different person now than when you were nine years old, so too will you be different in the future. Why not dedicate some time, now, to learn more about yourself and your psychic abilities?

Perhaps, at this point, it's best left to Seth to introduce and explain the laws of the inner universe in his own words, leaving the rest up to you to digest at your own pace. But first, some preparatory thoughts from this self-described teacher:

“You are in physical existence to learn and understand that your energy, translated into feelings, thoughts and emotions, causes all experience. There are no exceptions.

“Once you understand this you have only to learn to examine the nature of your beliefs, for these will automatically cause you to feel and think in certain fashions. Your emotions follow your beliefs. It is not the other way around.

“I would like you to recognize your own beliefs in several areas. You must realize that any idea you accept as truth is a belief that you hold. You must, then, take the next step and say, ‘It is not necessarily true, even though I believe it.’ You will, I hope, learn to disregard all beliefs that imply basic limitations.” (62)

“As mentioned, the first important step is to realize that your beliefs about reality are just that—beliefs about reality. You must make a clear distinction between you and your beliefs. You must then realize that your beliefs are physically materialized. What you believe to be true in your experience is true.” (63)

“There is a great fallacy operating. People believe that there is one great truth, that it will appear and they will know it. Now a flower is a truth. So is a lamp bulb. So is an idiot and a genius, a glass and an ant. There is little exterior similarity, however.

“Truth is all of these seemingly distinct, separate, different realities. So [Jane] is a part of the truth [s]he perceives, and each of you are a part of the truths that you perceive.

“‘Truth,’ reflected through [Jane] becomes in a way new truth, for it its perceived uniquely, (as it would be for each individual who perceived it). It is not less truth or more truth in those terms. It becomes new truth.

“Such ‘new truths’ can still be very ancient indeed, but truth is not a thing that must always have the same appearance, shape, form or dimension. Those who persist, therefore, in shielding their truths from questions threaten to destroy the validity of their knowledge.

“Again, those who are so certain of their answers will lack that need to know that can lead them into still greater dimensions of understanding. Any valid expansion of consciousness is itself, of course, a part of the message. The personality finds itself encountering living truth, and knows that truth only exists in those terms.

“I have used the term ‘expansion of consciousness’ here rather than the more frequently used ‘cosmic consciousness’ because the latter implies an experience of proportions not

available to [hu]mankind at this time. Intense expansions of consciousness by contrast to your normal state may appear to be cosmic in nature, but they barely hint at those possibilities of consciousness that are available to you now, much less begin to approach a true cosmic awareness.”

Later...

“The integrity of any intuitive information depends upon the inner integrity of the person who receives it. Expansion of consciousness, therefore, requires honest self appraisal, an awareness of one’s own belief and prejudices. It brings a gift and a responsibility. All who wish to look within themselves, to find their own answers, to encounter their own ‘appointment with the universe,’ should therefore become well acquainted with the intimate working of their own personality.” (64)

“Beneath [the subconscious], pure and simple, undistorted, there for the searching, absolutely free for the asking, is the knowledge inherent in the inner self pertaining to the inner universe as a whole, its laws and principles, its composition. Here you will find, undistorted, uncamouflaged, the innate knowledge of the creation of the camouflage universe, the mechanics involved, much of the material that I have given you, the method and ways by which the inner self as a basic inhabitant of the inner universe, existing in the climate of psychological reality [Frameworks 1, 2, 3, 4, ...], helps create the various planes of existence, constructs outer senses to project and perceive the various apparent realities or camouflages, how the inner self reincarnates on the various planes. Here you will find your answers as to how the inner self transforms energy for [its] own purposes, changes [its] form, adopts other apparent realities, and all this free for the investigation.” [session 45] (65)

Summary: Introduction & Overview

- *Framework 1* represents our everyday physical reality. *Framework 2* represents the nonphysical inner reality that is the source of *Framework 1*.
- The *laws of the inner universe*, by definition, must apply to every aspect of *All-That-Is*; within the smallest “unit” within every *Framework of Consciousness*.
- Our conventional definitions of Universal Truth are incomplete and inadequate in the context of the previous definition.
- The three primary aspects of the human psyche – *the outer ego*, *subconscious*, and *inner ego* – work in concert, using a spectrum of outer and *inner senses* to create our own versions of Frameworks 1, 2, 3, 4, ...
- Learning to consciously use *the inner senses* is the only way in which to fully conceptualize and comprehend the *laws of the inner universe*.

And now onward and “inward” to Seth’s laws of the inner universe ...

(Note: The main body is not available in this version. The full version is available only through one of my online courses. See www.paulhelfrich.com for more info.)

Endnotes:

- (1) Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/dictionary>, September 22, 2000.
- (2) Joseph Campbell, edited by Diane Osbon, *Reflections on the Art of Living: A Joseph Campbell Companion*, HarperCollins Publishers, New York, New York, 1991, p. 134.
- (3) John Bartlett, Lord Byron, *Bartlett's Familiar Quotations*, Sixteenth Edition, Little Brown and Company, Canada, 1992, p. 403.
- (4) Bartlett, Thomas Huxley, p. 505.
- (5) Bartlett, Arthur Doyle, p. 577.
- (6) Bartlett, Alfred Whitehead, p. 584.
- (7) Aona, *DATRE Session #156 (May 2000)*, <http://www.mindspring.com/~datrenet/datre151-200/Datre156.html>, September 22, 2000.
- (8) *1769 Authorized Version, The Word from Online Bible*, version 1.00, Timnathserah Inc., Winterborne, Ontario, Canada, 1997-2000.
- (9) Mary Ennis, Vicki Pendley, *The Elias Transcripts*, session 17, June 25, 1995.
- (10) Mary Ennis, Vicki Pendley, *The Elias Transcripts*, session 45, October 15, 1995.
- (11) Mary Ennis, Vicki Pendley, *The Elias Transcripts*, session 275, April 23, 1998.
- (12) Paramahansa Yogananda, *Self Realization Fellowship Lessons*, S-5, P-105, Los Angeles, California, p. 3.
- (13) Yogananda, p. 4.
- (14) Brewster, *Memoirs of Newton*, II.27.
- (15) William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act I, scene iii.
- (16) Aldous Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, Harper & Row, New York, New York, 1945, Lao Tzu, p. 127.
- (17) Huxley, Shankara, p. 294-295.
- (18) Huxley, Sutramkara, p. 127.
- (19) Huxley, Hui Neng, p. 126-127.
- (20) Huxley, St. Thomas Aquinas, p. 295.
- (21) Yogananda, S-4, P-104/1, p. 6.
- (22) Campbell, p. 147.
- (23) Jane Roberts, *Adventures in Consciousness: An Introduction to Aspect Psychology*, Sethnet Publishing, Eugene, Oregon, 1998.

Jane uses the term *prejudiced perception* in this, her first of three Aspect Psychology books to show that our five physical senses, while incredibly rich and varied, can never provide us with a complete picture of Universal Truth. For example, our hearing range covers a spectrum of only 20-20,000 vibrations per seconds. Our visual field can perceive only the thinnest band of the electromagnetic spectrum as we can't see infra-red light or x-rays. So we now know that we are surrounded by physical energy spectra that we can't directly perceive with our physical senses, though we can measure their effects with sensitive instrumentation.

All of the data that we do perceive and process in our brains gets filtered through our conscious minds and our belief systems. If we hold erroneous views about physical or inner reality, these beliefs will continue to translate erroneous perceptions about the nature of Universal Truth. For example, what is now called the Copernican Revolution witnessed the Roman Catholic dominated view of the Earth as the center of the universe toppled by the observations and views of Polish astronomer Nicolas Copernicus. A paradigm shift resulted that literally changed the face of the Western world during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

(24) Huxley, p. 128.

(25) Huxley, p. 129.

(26) Huxley, p. 125.

(27) Huxley, p. 34-35.

(28) Bartlett, Henry Thoreau, p. 477.

(29) Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, (translated by James Strachey et al.), Standard Edition, XXI, Hogarth Press, London, 1961, p. 44-45.

(30) Huxley, Lao Tzu, p. 216.

(31) Paramahansa Yogananda, Forward by Douglas Ainslie, *The Science of Religion*, The Self-Realization Fellowship, Los Angeles, California, 1994, p. x.

(32) Willis Harmon, *Global Mind Change: The Promise of the 21st Century*, Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco, California, 1998, p. 79.

(33) Huxley, p. 126.

(34) Huxley, p. 127.

(35) Huxley, p. 129.

(36) Yogananda, S-4, P-80, p. 5.

(37) Christian De Quincey, *Consciousness, Truth or Wisdom?*, Institute of Noetic Sciences Review, Sausalito, California, March-June, 2000, p. 10.

(38) Harmon, p. 117.

(39) Ken Wilber, *A Brief History of Everything*, Shambhala Publications, Boston, Massachusetts, 1996, p. 105.

(40) Wilber, p. 106.

(41) Wilber, p. 108.

(42) Wilber, p. 112-114.

(43) Wilber, p. 117-118.

(44) Wilber, p. 116-117.

(45) Wilber, p. 118-119.

(46) Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions: Book 2 of the Seth Material*, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, New York, 1997, session 44, p. 12.

(47) Roberts, session 44, p. 11.

(48) Seth formally introduced the concept of Frameworks 1 and 2 in one of his dictated books in *The Individual and the Nature of Mass Events*, (1981), session 815, December 17, 1977, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, California, 1995. The concept had originally been introduced during a private session on September 17, 1977, according to Rob Butts' note on p. 63.

The concept of *Frameworks of Consciousness* describes closely related regions of consciousness that work together to make the physical universe, as we know it, possible. They are not stepping stones or layers of so-called higher consciousness either, but are interpenetrated within each other. Obviously, Frameworks 2, 3, 4 and beyond exist “underneath” the range of our physical senses.

Other thinkers have used different methods to describe the same thing as Seth. Physicist David Bohm uses the terms Explicate Order and Implicate Order; the Explicate Order describes physical reality and the Implicate Order describes nonphysical reality as a region that contains the “source energy” all of the potential states and probabilities possible in physical reality. Bohm even postulates Super Explicate and Super Implicate Orders that are analogous to Seth's Frameworks 3 and 4.

This concept of source and manifest realities is not new either. There are accounts that date back to Plato that describe the same phenomena. Plato's famous *cave allegory* compares physical reality to two people chained to an inside wall beyond the sight lines of the cave's entrance. Thus all they ever see are the shadows projected through the mouth of the cave from a fire burning “outside.” Their chains (i.e. physical senses) limit their perceptions to the shadows on the cave's wall, so they are unable to see the fire (i.e. source reality) “outside” of the cave.

(49) Here's more material on *Frameworks 3 and 4* from *The Individual and the Nature of Mass Events*:

“There is, incidentally, a Framework 3 and a Framework 4, in the terms of our discussion – but all such labels are, again, only for the sake of explanation. The realities are merged.” [p. 71]

Later on, Seth describes the relationship between Jane Roberts and himself when he ‘comes through’ during a session:

“While our meetings take place in your time, and in the physical space of your house, say, the primary encounter must be a subjective inner one, an intersection of consciousnesses that is then physically experienced.

“The encounters themselves occur in a Framework 3 environment. That framework of course, again in terms of an analogy, exists another step away from your own Framework 2. I do not want to get into a higher-or-lower hierarchy here, but the frameworks represent spheres of action. Our encounters initially take place, then, beyond the sphere that deals exclusively with either your physical world or the inner mental and psychic realm from which our present experience springs.” [pg 88]

“These frameworks, while I speak of them separately, exist one within the other, and each one impinges upon the other. To some extent you are immersed in all realities.” [p. 89]

Finally, from *The God of Jane: A Psychic Manifesto*, Chapter 13, Seth on the Big Flats Affair, Moment Point Press, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, 2000:

“I told you that there was a Framework 3 and mentioned a Framework 4 some time ago. You must understand that I am making distinctions for your benefit.

“Framework 2 is connected with the creativity and vitality of your world. In your terms, the dead waken in Framework 2 and move through it to Framework 3, where they can be aware of their reincarnational identities and connection with time, while being apart from a concentration upon earth realities. In those

terms, the so-called dead dip in and out of earth probabilities by traveling through Framework 2, and into those probabilities connected with earth realities.

“Some others may wind up in Framework 4, which is somewhat like Framework 2, except that it is a creative source for other kinds of realities not physically oriented at all and outside of, say, time concepts as you are used to thinking of them. In a way impossible to describe verbally, some portion of each identity also resides in Framework 4, and in all other Frameworks.” [p. 129.]

(50) The concept of inner senses was introduced by Jane Roberts in *The Seth Material*, (1970), Chapter 19, The Inner Senses – “What They Are and How to Use Them,” Buccaneer Books, Cutchogue, New York, 1970.

According to Seth, “If you would momentarily put aside the selves you take for granted, you could experience your own multidimensional reality. ... I have told you that there are Inner Senses as well as physical ones. ... You must, first of all, cease identifying yourself completely with your ego, and realize that you can perceive more than your ego perceives. You must demand more of yourself than you ever have before. ...”

Jane explains that, “The Inner Senses are not important because they release clairvoyant or telepathic abilities, but because they reveal to us our own independence from physical matter, and let us recognize our unique, individual multidimensional identity. Properly utilized, they also show us the miracle of physical existence and our place in it. We can live a wiser, more productive, happier physical life because we begin to understand why we are here, individually and as a people.” [p. 275-277].

Seth offered the following inner senses:

1. Inner Vibrational Touch
2. Psychological Time
3. Perception of Past, Present, and Future
4. Conceptual Sense
5. Cognition of Knowledgeable Essence
6. Innate Working Knowledge of the Basic Vitality of the Universe
7. Expansion or Contraction of the Tissue Capsule
8. Disentanglement from Camouflage
9. Diffusion by the Energy Personality [Essence]

(51) Roberts, *The Early Sessions: Book 2 of the Seth Material*, session 44, p. 15.

(52) Roberts, session 44, p. 16.

(53) Roberts, session 44, p. 14.

(54) The concept of All-That-Is was first introduced by Jane Roberts in *The Seth Material*, Chapter 18, “The God Concept – The Creation – The Three Christs,” (1970), sessions 426-428, (no date given.) According to Seth, God is an action or process that is never completed, inside of all Its creations, and incomprehensibly vast.

(55) The concept of consciousness units (CUs) was introduced by Jane Roberts in *The “Unknown” Reality*, (1977), Vol. 1, session 682, February 13, 1974. According to Seth, the essential inner vitality of all consciousness – All-That-Is – is formed from these inner “units.” They form the foundation for all physical and non-physical domains.

(56) Seth discusses *root assumptions* in *Seth Speaks: The Eternal Validity of the Soul*, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, California, 1994.

“Root assumptions are those built-in ideas of reality of which I spoke – those agreements upon which you base your ideas of existence. Space and time, for example, are root assumptions. Each system of reality has its own set of such agreements. When I communicate within your system, I must use and understand the root assumptions upon which it is based.” [p. 37]

“Root assumptions are those upon which you agree in any system of reality. You agree, for example, upon what objects are physical – it makes little difference whether they are or not, as long as you agree upon this. Your consciousness belongs in a body. You would not be caught DEAD with your consciousness outside of your body. It is taboo! Now the fact is that your consciousness is not imprisoned within our body; but as long as you believe that it is, again, you will not be caught dead outside of it. And when you are caught dead outside of it, there will be some amazement, indeed.

“There are other root assumptions that you take as a basis of reality. And in other levels of reality, there are other root assumptions. These are the seeming laws by which you govern your experiences.” [p. 403]

(57) Susan M. Watkins, *Conversations with Seth: The Story of Jane Roberts's ESP Class*, Chapter 7, “The Sumari (And Others) Come Home,” Moment Point Press, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, 1999, p. 141.

(58) Rob Butts offers his view of Seth's ideas on reincarnation and karma:

“In Hinduism and Buddhism, karma is thought of as the total moral sum of an individual's acts in any one life – thus determining the person's fate or destiny in the next. Seth sees reincarnational lives as all existing at once, so there is a constant give-and-take among them. A ‘future’ life, then, can affect a ‘past’ one, so karma as it is usually considered does not apply.” – Jane Roberts, *The Nature of Personal Reality*, session 614, Amber-Allen Publishing, San Rafael, California, 1994, p. 23.

Jane Roberts offers some further comments about Seth's ideas on reincarnation:

“Why would anyone choose a life of illness or poverty? And what about children who die young, or servicemen killed in war? All of these questions came into our minds when Seth began speaking about reincarnation. As I mentioned earlier, when the sessions started [in late 1963] I didn't believe that we survived death once, much less many times. If we lived before, I thought, and if we can't remember, then what good does it do? ‘Besides,’ I said to Rob, ‘Seth says that we live in the ‘Spacious Present’ [Frameworks 2, 3, 4 ...], and that there really isn't any past, present, or future. So how can we live one life ‘before’ another?’” – Jane Roberts, *The Seth Material*, Chapter 12 – “More on Reincarnation – After Death and Between Lives,” (no session number given), Buccaneer Books, Cutchogue, New York, 1970, p. 172.

(59) Jane Roberts, *The Seth Material*, Appendix, session 509, Buccaneer Books, Cutchogue, New York, 1970, p. 328-329.

(60) Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions: Book 1 of the Seth Material*, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, New York, 1997, session 19, p. 134-135.

(61) Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche, *The Tibetan Yogas of Dream and Sleep*, Snow Lion Publications, Ithica, New York, p. 18.

(62) Roberts, *The Nature of Personal Reality*, p. 22.

(63) Roberts, *The Nature of Personal Reality*, p. 72.

(64) Roberts, *Seth Speaks*, p. 398-400.

(65) Roberts, *The Early Sessions: Book 2 of the Seth Material*, session 45, p. 21.