



Who is the “You” in You Create Your Own Reality?
By Paul M. Helfrich

www.paulhelfrich.com
helfrich@newworldview.com

This eBook may only be used for private study, scholarship, or research.

PART 1

(Originally published in The Seth Journal, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2004)

Who are you?

Who? Who?

Who? Who? ~ The Who, 1978.

Overview

This series of articles uses an *integral conscious creation* approach to explore the “levels of selfhood” in the work of Seth/Jane Roberts. Why are “levels of selfhood” important? If we explore the basic structures nested within the psyche and All-That-Is, then we can more accurately define the “You” in You Create Your Own Reality.

Conscious creation is the belief system that consciousness is primary and causal, not the other way around. Put simply, consciousness creates All; the body and brain are secondary, though they play very important roles. This isn’t a new idea, however; it’s present in all the perennial wisdom traditions (e.g. Buddhist, Hindu, Taoist, Sufi, Kabbalah, Christian mystics, etc.).

Integral conscious creation is a multidisciplinary method that integrates scientific, artistic, and moral perspectives within body, mind, and spiritual domains. “Integral” is a way to more holistically explore any body of work, including the Seth Material. The dictionary defines integral as “comprehensive, balanced, inclusive, and essential for completeness.” [1]

Though that covers a lot of ground, the intent is to look at the Seth Material from a wider lens – one that includes any relevant perennial wisdom source, channeled source, science, psychology, art, etc. All add their unique perspectives to further identify the “you” in you create your own reality.

Thus, the integral approach forces us to break out of “Seth says” or “Einstein says” as final truth by authority, and cross reference with other disciplines to see what they add to the mix. An integrally informed interpretation aims to mine new gems, while building bridges between science, art, and morals, within body, mind, and spirit. [2]

What’s the Best Way Approach the “You” in You Create Your Own Reality?

Originally, I began to explore the mechanics or “how” of conscious creation, but soon moved into the area of exploring the nature of personal reality in relation to the psyche and All-That-Is. *Ontology* is a fancy word used by philosophers, psychologists, and biologists to explore “the nature and relations of being.” So, ontology is just another way to say “levels of selfhood,” and puts the focus on the “who” of conscious creation.

In addition to basic “levels of selfhood” (ontology), however, there’s a counterpart we need to

factor in – “levels of reality” (cosmology). This adds the “when,” “where,” and “what” of conscious creation to the mix. In terms of the Seth material, then, we need to consider Frameworks 1, 2, 3, 4, and All-That-Is. [3]

This is important because all the perennial wisdom traditions contain basic maps of “levels of selfhood” and “levels of reality.” Scholars like Huston Smith, Rene Guenon, Ananda Coomaraswamy, Fritjof Schuon, and Ken Wilber have compared these “maps.” They point out a general spectrum of consciousness from body, to mind, to soul, and spirit (selfhood) in relation to manifest, transcendent, and omniscient domains (reality). [4] Thus, humans have mapped the psyche and All-That-Is for thousands of years, and there are significant similarities found across cultures and milieus that we can compare to the Seth material.

Idea Constructions

Jane Roberts wrote *The Physical Universe As Idea Construction* in September 1963 during a powerful three-hour altered state that set the stage for Seth to “come through” on the Ouija board later that December. Parts of *Idea Construction* outlined multidimensional selfhood (ontology). I’ve added Seth’s terms in brackets.

“Energy [consciousness] is the basis of the universe.

“Ideas are mental transformations of energy by an entity [inner ego] into physical reality [outer ego].

“Idea constructions are transformations of ideas into physical reality.

“Space is where our own idea constructions do not exist in the physical universe.”

“... The subconscious is the threshold [or mediating “layer”] of an idea’s emergence into the individual conscious mind. It connects the entity [inner ego] and the individual [outer ego]. [5]

Jane’s *Idea Construction* laid a theoretical foundation for what would be fleshed out over the next twenty-one years in collaboration with Seth and Rob Butts. It hinted at the basic “levels of selfhood” that Seth would flesh out during the first year of sessions. It also hinted at the basic “levels of reality” (four Frameworks of consciousness) that Seth would later introduce. Here’s more from *Idea Construction*.

“Each evolutionary change is preceded and caused by a new idea. As the idea is in the process of being constructed onto the physical plane, it prepares the material world for its own actuality and creates the prerequisite conditions.

“Evolution is energy’s movement toward conscious expression in the physical universe, but it is basically nonphysical. A species at any given time is the materialization of the inner images or ideas of its individual members, each of

whom forms their own idea constructions.

“... After death, the entity [inner ego] will have its ghost images (memories) at its command, though their apparent sequence will no longer apply. Memories are properties of the subconscious energy entity and, as such, are indestructible (though they may be unavailable to the individual under various circumstances).

“The next plane of existence [i.e. Framework of consciousness] will involve further training in energy use and manipulation, since the energy of which the entity [inner ego] is composed is self-generating and always seeking more complicated form and awareness.

“Each material particle is an idea construction formed by the individualized bits of energy [6] that compose it. [7]

Jane’s “idea constructions” weren’t a new concept, but rather a contemporary translation of a perennial truth. For example, the Idealist philosophers in the West from Plato to Plotinus, Shelling, Fichte, and Hegel all saw the physical world as a construction by a hidden source domain. Plato’s cave is a famous metaphor that compares human perception to viewing shadows on a wall, while the source “light” lies “outside” the cave. Still, in this early context *constructions* are the basic metaphor used to introduce the action of conscious creation.

The Outer Ego, Subconscious, and Inner Ego

The nine volumes of *The Early Sessions* (1997-2002) contain many new ideas that weren’t published during Jane’s lifetime (1929-1984). They provide even greater detail of the psyche than such early books as *How to Develop Your ESP Power* (1966) and *The Seth Material* (1970). For example, the following is from *Book 1*, session 35. It outlines a basic three-part structure or “levels” of the psyche: outer ego, subconscious, and inner ego. Notice how Seth integrated the concept of *inner senses* in this explanation. [8] Also, I added my own clarifications in brackets.

“You may have experiences through all [nine] of the inner senses but not at once. This is a great simplification. What I should perhaps add for the sake of clearness is that you will not as a rule be aware of data that comes to you through more than one sense, inner sense, at a time.

“The fact is that the whole self is constantly experiencing data from all of the inner senses. The inner ego is of course aware of this. The subconscious is sometimes aware of this, and the outer ego is aware of very little. I have explained the reasons for this in past sessions. The outer ego must concentrate much of its energy toward survival in and manipulation of the outer camouflage world [Framework 1]. This world has already been created by the inner self, and its continuing existence is determined by the constant vigilance of the inner self [i.e. the inner self is primarily causal, not the body or brain].

“Only when a certain level of confidence is reached can the outer ego afford to become familiar with these inner workings, at least on your plane [Framework 1]. Otherwise you would falter. As a rule, even though the whole self is capable of organizing the data from all of the inner senses, the subconscious can rarely receive such communications full blast; and the outer ego, concerned as it is with camouflage pattern, and really born [co-created] to deal with camouflage patterns, simply could not stand the shock of realization that a complete set of inner senses would bring.

“This sort of experience will always be shielded from the outer ego of necessity. Even a watered-down version of a direct inner experience is a shock to the outer ego on your plane, since the [outer] ego imagines itself and its own perceptions to be supreme [Primarily Causal]. You have no idea, even with what training you have, of how shattering such a complete experience would be to the outer ego... [This shattering is also called satori, moksha, remembrance of essence, etc. in various perennial traditions].” [9]

In summary, the basic “levels of selfhood” first introduced by Seth consisted of three general structures: [10]

- Inner ego (= entity = source self = energy personality essence [11])
- Subconscious (mediating “layer”)
- Outer ego

Jane also referred to the same three-part structure in her three Aspect Psychology books: [12]

- Source self (= inner ego = entity = energy personality essence)
- Nuclear self (= subconscious)
- Focus personality (= outer ego, probable selves)

These maps seem consistent, but so what? As I hope will become clear, it’s inaccurate to say that thought, emotion, and expectation alone create all reality. Also, if we ignore the basic deep structures outlined above, we marginalize the impact that our objective physical reality – brains, neurochemistry, and other bodily functions – plays in our perception and cognition.

Again, our integral approach includes objective and subjective perspectives. Seth and Jane focused on the subjective nature of consciousness as a reaction to the hegemony of materialist sciences that reduce all subjective experience into objective its, things, and processes. In other words, their work sought to rehabilitate the subjective dimensions of experience. However, we commit the same error when we marginalize objective, physical reality and collapse everything into subjective, inner experience, belief systems, feelings, intention, etc. The result is just another equally incomplete worldview that leads to all kinds of problems, as we’ll see later in Part 3.

Pyramid Energy Gestalts

Seth went on to introduce a “God concept” that was initially termed a “primary pyramid gestalt” and later All-That-Is. These concepts round out Seth’s version of the perennial spectrum of consciousness. They extend our “levels of selfhood” from body, to mind, to soul, and now to spirit. The following are from sessions 95 and 96.

“There is a constant, ever-enfolding [‘involution’] and ever-expanding [‘evolution’] reality. The pyramids of psychic gestalts of which I have spoken represent in your terms all beginnings and all endings, which again expand into new beginnings and new forms.” [13]

“There is no one reality. There are many, in fact infinite, realities. There is no beginning and end. When beginnings and endings are spoken of, the implication is always there, that there must be but one reality, and that it must have a beginning in time and an ending in time.

“... Realities merge, one into the other. Personalities, or any type of individualized energy, may pass through various realities. The appearance of energy in one form could be said to end in that form were it not for the existence of the spacious present, in which all realities are simultaneous.

“... It is true that the pyramid gestalts of which I have spoken can be said to merge into what you may refer to as a unitary and even sublime being, but this is grossly simplified.

“... you will see that while these pyramid energy gestalts do, on the one hand, achieve a unitary character and sublime intelligence, on the other hand they form only an approximation of humanity’s concept of a God. This unitary gestalt which we may call, and I prefer it to the word God, the primary energy gestalt [All-That-Is].

“This primary energy gestalt may be thought of as straddling all realities, or existing in the infinite realities of which we have spoken. Yet in this prime gestalt that is unitary, there is again an infinite diversity and literally numberless personalities. Nor are these personalities that compose the prime psychic gestalt dependent or submissive to any one dominating personality within the gestalt.” [14]

Seth would later make another distinction to show that the inner ego was, in turn, co-created by an individualized energy gestalt that was, in turn, co-created by All-That-Is. So he added another “level” that served as a mediating layer between All-That-Is and the inner ego. The following is from session 305.

“... Entities [inner egos] are obviously subdivisions of the whole, or All That Is. You retain your individuality as part of an entity, and the entity retains its individuality as a part of an energy

gestalt.

“An energy gestalt maintains its individuality as a portion of All That Is. These are not impersonal energy forms. They are very highly individualized psychological entities. Their psychological development is far different than any that you know.

“There are simply psychological realities of which you are completely ignorant, and these are interwoven into energy frameworks containing dimensions you cannot understand.” [15]

In summary, the basic “levels of selfhood” presented in *The Early Sessions* consist of five general structures:

- All-That-Is (nondual)
- Energy gestalt (individuality = duality)
- Inner ego (= entity = source self = energy personality essence)
- Subconscious (meditating “layer”)
- Outer ego

These five structures provide a simple map to show nested creation and co-creation in the context of basic ontology. Some perennial traditions use 3, 4, 7, or even more “levels of selfhood,” but don’t be fooled by these surface differences. They are all attempts to map The Infinite and are useful only insofar as they help us to directly experience the territory. For example, the Hindu tradition outlines:

- Atman/Brahman
- Causal body
- Subtle body
- Gross body

The Buddhist tradition outlines:

- Buddha Nature
- Alayavijnana
- Manovijnana
- Five sense vijnanas

The distinctions Seth made were only for purposes of illustration and are ultimately invisible. Just as we can discern distinct colors in a rainbow from a distance, as we peer closer we can see no clear divisions between main color groups. Thus, all five structures are nested and present at all times. As we’ll see, they work in concert to form the “you” who creates its own reality. So “you” are much more than your body and outer ego!

The Four Glasses Analogy: Perspectives and Space Continuums

We've outlined Seth's basic "levels of selfhood" only to ballpark our discussion. Let's return now to the more familiar body and outer ego structures to see what Seth had to say about their role in conscious creation.

The four glasses analogy was originally published in abridged form in *The Seth Material* (1970), but was fleshed out in much greater detail in *The Early Sessions, Book 2* (1997). Seth used it to introduce the idea of individual perspectives and space continuums. The following is from session 68.

"... No material object of any kind is formed without the cooperation [a law of the inner universe [16] and without the inner consent of the atoms and molecules that compose it. Form is not thrust upon matter.

"The atoms and molecules themselves, through their own capsule comprehension [an inner sense], form into particular objects under the direction, but not the coercion, of the individual who is in charge of any given particular physical construction.

"Without such cooperation no physical construction would be possible. I will, if I may, use our glass again to make another point clear.

"(Jane had prepared a glass of iced coffee before the session began. Now she lifted it to show Bill and me. At the same time, her voice began to grow somewhat deeper and stronger.)

"I have said that if five people seemed to view this glass, then what you would have in actuality would be five individual physical glasses. As you and Ruburt [Jane] and Mark [Bill] view this glass, each of you see a different glass.

"... Neither of you can see the glass that the others see. We spoke of this briefly. I would like to go into more detail. The three of you each create your own glass. You each create your own glass in your own personal perspective. Therefore, here you have three different glasses, but each one exists in a different perspective, in an entirely different space continuum.

"... Now Mark [Bill], you cannot see Joseph's [Rob's] glass, nor can he see your glass. This can be proven mathematically, and scientists are already working with the problem, though they do not understand the principles behind it.

"However there is a point, an infinitesimal point, where Mark's [Bill's] perspective, and yours, and Ruburt's [Jane's], overlap. Again, theoretically, if you could perceive that point, you could actually each see the other two physical glasses.

“Physical objects simply cannot exist unless they exist in a definite perspective and space continuum. But each individual creates his own space continuum.” [17]

Thus, there is a type of causality within each perspective and space continuum. Another interesting feature of the above excerpt is the use of so-called *entity names* [birth name in brackets] to represent Rob, Jane, friend’s, and student’s inner egos. In hindsight, it’s clear that this was another strategy designed to shift attention away from the primacy of bodies and outer egos.

A Universe or a Multiverse?

The four glasses analogy and earlier material on pyramid energy gestalts imply that there isn’t any single pregiven physical reality “out there” somewhere. In session 68 Seth said that,

“... it is completely erroneous to think in terms of one physical universe. You now exist in four different universes at this moment. That is, in the apparent space of one room, you will understand that there are four rooms.” [18]

From this perspective we can more accurately conceptualize Framework 1 as a *multiverse*. This means that there is no singular or absolute flow of linear time in relation to space. For example, Einstein’s relativity theory formalized this in terms of quantum science. Also, postmodern philosophers refer to the “myth of the given” – the error made when assuming that we’re studying a modern Newtonian machine clock universe “out there” in which space-time is absolute, linear, singular, and primary.

What does postmodern mean? Ideas, concepts, and theories that critique modernity as defined by the Western enlightenment, materialist science, idea of progress, etc. While these critiques are aimed modern religion and science, two favorite targets of Seth and Jane, they also attempt to provide new solutions and theories. In this sense, then, Seth and Jane’s work is postmodern.

Recent quantum string theorists (e.g. Brian Greene and peers) realize that space-time is not the primary building block of reality but the result of other still unknown processes at infinitesimal scales. But they are still locked in a modern reductionist and materialist paradigm, trying to find the basic “unit” of physicality without accounting for the consciousness of the researchers. For example, according to physicist Brian Greene,

“... quantum fluctuations so mangle space and time that the conventional ideas of left/right, backward/forward, up/down, and before/after become meaningless.

“Scientists are still struggling to understand these implications, but many agree that just as the percentages in political polls are average, approximate measures that become meaningful only when a large respondent pool is canvassed, so conventional notions of time and space are also average, approximate concepts that become meaningful only when considered over sufficiently large scales. Whereas relativity established the subjectivity of time’s passage, quantum

mechanics challenges the conceptual primacy of time itself.

“Today’s scientists seeking to combine quantum mechanics with Einstein’s theory of gravity (the general theory of relativity) are convinced that we are on the verge of another major upheaval, one that will pinpoint the more elemental concepts from which time and space emerge. Many believe this will involve a radically new formulation of natural law in which scientists will be compelled to trade the space-time matrix within which they have worked for centuries for a more basic ‘realm’ that is itself devoid of time and space.” [19]

Yet, the quantum materialists will remain on the hamster wheel of “reductio ad absurdum” until they incorporate a viable postmodern theory of consciousness. This results in what American philosopher Ken Wilber calls “flatland,” when all subjective perspectives are reduced to its, things, or objects verified by only the five senses. In other words, materialism, reductionism, and scientism result when we claim that the five physical senses provide an absolute view of truth and reality.

Many now agree that modern materialist Newtonian worldviews are woefully incomplete. Yet, modern worldviews tenaciously hold that matter, and thus the body, is primarily causal in terms of body/mind consciousness. But according to the premodern perennial traditions, consciousness is primarily causal. Seth and Jane agree with the premodern traditions, and sharply disagree with the modern scientific traditions in this area.

This concept alone – consciousness is causal – would transform modern sciences (e.g. quantum, biological, chemical, neurological, psychological, etc.) into postmodern sciences. There has been a lot of excellent work in the twenty years since Jane’s passing toward the creation of a viable theory of consciousness. Physicists like Amit Goswami, Fred Wolf, and Peter Russell, and Philosophers like David Ray Griffin, Christian de Quincy, and Ken Wilber have made tremendous strides. This is something to keep in mind when reading Seth’s critique of modern sciences. That is, Seth’s critiques are no longer applicable to certain breakthroughs in post-1984 science because they existed only as latent probabilities relative to that past-present. However, they still apply to modern materialist science because they remain mired within the same narrow paradigm.

Now, if we take the four glasses analogy even further, we can speculate that each outer ego co-creates relative to its own perspective, space-time continuum, subconscious, and inner ego. Thus, each outer ego creates a unique version of objects and space-time, and a unique version of the multiverse. In this context, our body/minds are a kind of space-time “machine.” That is, our bodies, outer egos, subconscious, and inner egos simultaneously co-create space-time in nested fashion.

This notion of unique perspectives and continuums is also being explored in Ken Wilber’s latest theory (Wilber-5). He begins with the basic perspectives already contained within most languages: I, We, It, Its. These are the four basic perspectives the outer ego uses depending on various contexts. For example, when referring to self, “I” language is present. When referring to

a group, institution, society, or entire species, “We” language is present. When referring to objects, processes, things, or anything not-self, “it” (singular) and “its” (plural) language dominates. According to Wilber, “Moving from perceptions to perspectives is the first radical step in the move from metaphysics to post-metaphysics.” [20]

Let’s not sweat the subtle details of integral post-metaphysics for now, but simply note that the early Seth sessions foreshadow leading-edge work being done some thirty-five years later that may lead to the emergence of authentic dream-art sciences introduced in *The “Unknown” Reality*, Vol. 1 (1997). [21] All of which will include a viable postmodern theory of consciousness and increased use of inner and outer senses.

Finally, let’s consider the distinction between so-called inert and active matter made in session 68. It hints at additional perspectives and space continuums within “inert” constructions.

“... There is one point from our previous discussion that should be added to. It is in terms of a clearer definition. You call matter living or dead according to quite arbitrary designations. We have a step further here to take. In our last session, I mentioned that you considered live matter [biological] to be action in motion.

“Actually, you consider action which seems to be at least partially self-directive as living matter. Action that seems to be of a static nature, you refer to as inert matter. It should go without saying that all action is indeed self-directed action to some degree, and therefore should be termed as living matter.” [22]

Therefore, we could also factor in the perspectives and space continuums of the table, glasses, magazines, paintings, carpet, air molecules, and on and on. Even though they don’t have an outer ego, subconscious, or inner ego like humans, they are formed by a type or species of consciousness that is distinct from humans and energy personality essences. The permutations are mind boggling, but the point is simple: the modern notion of a singular universe “out there” somewhere is being replaced by the postmodern notion of a multiverse and nested perspectives, including the perspectives of “inert” matter.

Primary and Secondary Constructions

So how does consciousness, which is not a thing, really No-thing, manage to create Some-thing? In other words, how does The One (All-That-Is) create the many?

We just saw that, according to Seth, our outer egos perceive through a unique perspective and space continuum. But as we’ll see in session 71, there’s much more going on than meets the eye of flesh. And, even though this session focuses on primary and secondary constructions, Seth hints at additional subdivisions and types of constructions involved in conscious creation. Thus, the idea of primary and secondary are only meant to ballpark us, and are in no way final.

“... I would like to continue our discussion on matter. If you recall, we were entering into primary and secondary constructions.

“There are of course many subdivisions here, and also other types of constructions. We will begin however with primary and secondary ones.

“A primary construction is a psychic gestalt, formed into matter by a consciousness [inner ego] of itself. Such a primary construction is an attempt to create, in the world of matter, a replica of the inner psychic construction of the whole self [inner ego].

“Such a primary construction allows consciousness to operate, manipulate and be perceived in the world of matter. The physical construction of consciousness never is complete as far as fulfilling the inner purpose is involved; that is, consciousness can never fully construct itself in matter, and to do so would indeed imprison such a consciousness so that it could not escape the transient nature of matter itself.

“Even a primary construction, therefore, is but a partial appearance of inner nature into matter. The term consciousness, as I am here using it, may need some explanation, although you should by now understand my meaning.

“... What you consider your consciousness, or your self, or your thinking [outer] ego, represents of course only one portion of your entire consciousness, that part which you are using at this time. It is as if, for example, consciousness of any whole self [inner ego] were compared to a huge, and indeed almost infinite light, with the ability inherent in the light to focus in many directions; to be diffused, as if the light had many switches that would turn it to greater or lesser intensities and directions.

“Some conditions, some roads and countries, would require different beams to meet different circumstances, as even in automobiles you use high beams or low beams according to necessity or utility; and in some cases the high beams would not only be ineffective but dangerous, and so low beams are used.

“So the whole self turns various portions of its whole consciousness on or off, according to the field [Framework of consciousness] in which the whole self is endeavoring to make contact, manipulations, and according to the field in which he is endeavoring to project himself.

“To use full consciousness would be most distracting in many instances. When I speak, therefore, of primary constructions in the physical field [Framework 1], other fields [e.g. probable Framework 1s or nested Frameworks 2, 3, 4] of course have their own primary constructions also, though they would not be composed of matter in your terms [relative to our native Framework 1].

“Secondary physical constructions are those created by a consciousness of its

conception of other consciousnesses, from data received through telepathy and other means [e.g. five physical senses].

“... Consciousness [inner ego] therefore forms the primary construction about itself, not to protect itself from matter but in order to become allied with matter, the consciousness [inner ego] obviously being diffused through the whole physical construction.

“... Secondary constructions, being composed of atoms and molecules [body/mind], contain generalized consciousness and innate capsule comprehension [i.e. some type of physical and psychological boundary]. They do not contain the unifying, integrating, organizing, personal direction of a whole self [inner ego].” [23]

In other words, the inner ego can never fully manifest within the constraints of a primary much less a secondary construction. However, the inner ego is by definition *Some-thing*. So it, in turn, is co-created by an energy gestalt, which by definition is *Some-Thing* that in turn is co-created by *All-That-Is*, which is *No-Thing*. Consciousness is not a thing or process, but an “always already” perspective. What we’re really dealing with is a series of nested “levels,” each of which is causal in a relative way. Therefore, each “level” has a relative species of free will, choice, and causality that is very easy to confuse.

For example, how many outer egos willfully participate in their birth or death? When does the outer ego actually form and dissipate in relation to birth and death? Doesn’t the outer ego develop through various stages that coincide with body stages of perinatal, infant, child, adolescent, adult, senior, and corpse? Therefore, how primary and causal is the outer ego?

When Seth talks about causal consciousness, that doesn’t mean the outer ego is causal in that sense! This is an important distinction to keep in mind. The outer ego does not create the primary construction. It is the primary construction. In other words, the outer ego emerges as a surface structure when the inner ego projects itself into space-time constructions.

Thus, the *outer ego* is always co-created and supported by the *inner ego*, which in turn is co-created and supported by an *energy gestalt*, which in turn is co-created and supported by *All-That-Is*.

In this context, then, conscious creation is much more than the thought process, emotions, and expectations of the outer ego alone. There are other supporting, nested psychological structures or aspects that simultaneously co-create within nested Frameworks of consciousness. For example, a four-celled fetus has no capacity for thought, emotions, expectations, etc. in the sense the infant, child, adolescent, or adult do. Therefore, something must be consciously creating at this stage. That something is really *Some-thing*, our inner ego.

Sorry dear outer ego, dear mortal self in time, you are a construction, part of the divine camouflage, maya, or samsara. Our inner ego creates primary constructions, and is purposefully

designed to be mostly invisible to the outer ego's thoughts, emotions, or expectations. The inner ego, in turn, is co-created by an energy gestalt, which in turn is co-created by All-That-Is: Eternal Consciousness, Always Already, No-Thing.

Now, don't worry outer ego, there is a very important role for you! Conscious creation at the outer ego layer consists of secondary constructions – perceptions influenced by our neurochemistry, body/mind, thoughts, belief systems, five physical and nine inner senses, etc. This is where all the fleshy action and secondary constructions are experienced in the world of Framework 1.

Even though conscious creation is a nested array of primary and secondary constructions, the outer ego does create. Again, all forms of consciousness create, but in a relative, nested manner that factors in “levels of selfhood” and “levels of reality.”

In Part 2, we'll further explore primary and secondary constructions, primary and secondary *experience*, and a map called **I-I-I**.

PART 2

(Originally published in *The Seth Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 2004)

In Part 1, we explored the basic “levels of selfhood” presented by Seth in *The Early Sessions* (outer ego, subconscious, inner ego, energy gestalts, and All-That-Is). The intent was to further explore the nature of the multidimensional Self that creates all of its reality. I also proposed the radical idea that most current definitions of conscious creation are ontologically inverted. That is, they promote the outer ego to a primacy that simply doesn’t exist within the wider ontology of All-That-Is, as defined by Seth and the perennial traditions (e.g. Buddhist, Hindu, Taoist, Sufi, Kabbalah, Christian mystics, etc.).

In Seth’s terms, the *outer ego* is itself a primary construction and thus nested within deeper mental structures and Frameworks of consciousness that all simultaneously create and co-create in nested fashion. Thus, the outer ego does create, but it creates secondary constructions within its own perspective and space-time continuum. Put another way, the inner ego creates multiple simultaneous outer egos as primary constructions, and they in turn, create secondary constructions through their perception, which includes physical and inner senses. The inner ego is causal in that it creates primary constructions, which in turn, exert a type of nested causality that results in secondary constructions.

When we confuse secondary constructions for primary constructions, we commit what philosophers call a category error. It’s like saying that a gourmet chef and the delicious meal she cooks are somehow the same thing. However, one is primary and the other a secondary construction. So there’s an important ontological relationship between them that is easy to confuse.

So what are the criteria by which we can discern the primacy or “secondcy” of any idea construction? Put in terms of All-That-Is, where do we each begin and end? Where does the world “outside” begin and end? Or is there only the clever, seamless illusion that inside and outside exist at all? Are there any boundaries besides those we strongly believe in?

Though Seth provided only a rough outline – a “roadmap of the psyche” tailored for grass roots consumption in the 1970s, we can still make some interesting speculations based upon the exercises he offered over the years to test it out. For example, by using the seventeen Practice Elements in *The “Unknown” Reality* (1996) it is possible to discern different kinds of boundaries. And within those boundaries, we can we observe relative kinds of free will, choice, and value fulfillment.

However, we also need to factor in the simultaneous physical, mental, and spiritual aspects of anything we define as a “self.” For example, don’t atoms and molecules have distinct boundaries? And don’t our cells have distinct physical boundaries? If we can transplant a heart, liver, or lungs, then wouldn’t they have discernable boundaries too? The idea that an atom, water molecule, liver cell, or heart has a discernable physical boundary is well within our modern scientific worldviews. But what about the mental aspects of atoms, water molecules, liver cells,

and hearts? Couldn't they also have a relative species of free will based upon some kind of mental awareness? And of course, this begs the most important question: if consciousness is causal, then doesn't it follow that atoms, liver cells, and the like have conscious or spiritual aspects as well? In other words, we need to consider the nested relationships of cause and effect, free will and choice within body, mind, and spirit as a basic requirement for any viable theory of consciousness.

To return to Seth's "levels of selfhood," even though he didn't say this overtly, isn't it possible that the *inner ego* or inner self is likewise a primary construction relative to yet another native focus of attention in another Framework of consciousness, an energy personality gestalt that has its own relative species of free will, choice, and value fulfillment?

Seth stated in Part 1 that,

"... At your level [Framework 1] the sieve of the subconscious is a necessity and that is one of the main reasons why Ruburt [Jane] dissociates during our sessions, even though his experience of inner reality is received secondhanded, so to speak, through me.

"It is thinned out further by my own subconscious, because my inner and outer egos are not yet a complete unity, although I am, or my outer ego is, in direct contact with my inner ego on some occasions. Nevertheless my subconscious is not yet dispensed with but is still retained somewhat in the order of your archaic appendix." [24]

Seth hints that he, in turn, has a relative kind of outer ego, subconscious (translating), and inner ego structure, but on a different order or species than ours. Which begs the question of how deep do these nested structures exist before they break down into the nondual, infinite, formless be-ing of All-That-Is? The answer is we still don't really know in any collective sense. Furthermore, toward what larger purpose did Seth present his "roadmap of the psyche" that outlined basic "levels of selfhood" and "levels of reality"? Don't we find some variation of these maps in all cultures and epochs? We'll return to this shortly.

However, most people would agree that we – *outer egos* – have free will and make choices. But again, these affect and color our perception of secondary constructions and individual space continuums. This is another way to suggest that conscious creation as it has been defined in the past is really inverted. The outer ego's perception is really the domain of secondary constructions, itself being a primary construction of the inner ego.

To repeat: the outer ego's perception and cognition result in secondary constructions. Therefore, the ontologically inverted definition of conscious creation *confuses* secondary constructions as being primary, when they are not.

Again, who actually creates the primary construction?

The inner ego.

Who actually creates the inner ego?

An energy gestalt.

Who creates the energy gestalt?

All-That-Is.

But Who creates All-That-Is?

No-Thing.

The reason I harp on this and stretch the rational mind toward the transrational is to suggest that we've become comfortably numb with an inaccurate and ontologically inverted definition of conscious creation. Our outer ego is a primary construction of the inner ego, which in turn is a primary construction of an energy gestalt (Seth 2 for example), which in turn is a primary construction of All-That-Is, which in turn... you get the idea.

The point is that we need to reorient ourselves and awaken to the direct experience of this authentic ontology of be-ing because that is "who" creates at all "levels" of All-That-Is. Conscious creation is a nested affair of primary/secondary constructions within primary/secondary constructions. For all we know in these nests may go on ad infinitum....

Now, let's explore some other ways that Seth used idea constructions to explain paranormal and transpersonal phenomena. As mentioned in Part 1, the concept of primary in relation to secondary is only meant to ballpark us. There is really a spectrum of constructions depending on one's innate perspective. For example, Seth casts the action of sexual reproduction in terms of a subdivision of primary constructions. Recall that in session 71 Seth said,

"The cooperative aspects of consciousness construction form the whole fabric of your material universe. A subdivision of primary construction can be called the *distortive mirror construction*, which would include of course the physical construction of another physical being in birth." [25]

What other kinds of relationships between constructions are there? In session 253, Seth talks about apparitions, projection forms, and mass dreams in the context of primary and secondary constructions. For example,

"So-called apparitions, again, are not unusual. They are more or less constant. Many of these apparitions exist in their own system whether or not you perceive them. Some apparitions are constructed [secondarily] by the perceiver and are basically caused by a telepathic communication [i.e. inner senses]. But all apparitions are not of this nature. All apparitions, however, to appear as or within

the physical system, must be constructed [secondarily] by the perceiver [a primary construction] in the same manner that all physical objects are constructed [as secondary constructions].

“This does not mean that apparitions are only the result of such construction on the part of the perceiver. The perceiver constructs the pseudo-material apparition as he constructs the physical image of his contemporaries, but in, or rather and in line with telepathic data that is received by or from the consciousness [relative primary construction] whose material image is being constructed.

“You recall we spoke of primary and secondary physical constructions. These classifications apply regardless of the basic nature of the consciousness that is to be materially formed. An apparition constructed as a result of telepathic data, picked up by the perceiver in message form, will be constructed by him in precisely the same manner that an apparition will be constructed that is a reflection of a survival personality [another species of primary construction, or outer ego nested within the afterdeath Framework of consciousness [26].” [27]

If we add Seth’s Frameworks of consciousness (“levels of reality”), we begin to sense how primary and secondary relationships may extend from Framework 1 perception into Frameworks 2, 3, 4. This covers a vast spectrum of psychological ground!

Holons, CUs, and EEs

There has been a lot of excellent theoretical work done since Jane’s passing in 1984 in the field of consciousness studies that sheds new light on Seth’s concepts. Let’s consider a theoretical concept intended to bridge micro and macro, outer and inner, and science and spirit. It’s called a *holon*. It’s a theoretical unit coined by social philosopher Arthur Koestler in 1967, several years before Seth introduced the concepts of EEs and CUs. [28]

A holon is simply a whole made of parts that allows us to look at “vertical” and “horizontal” dimensions of being. Holons are very similar to the way Seth uses the word “gestalt.” They show the nested relationships between everyone and every *thing*, from body, mind, and spirit (vertical) to science, art, and morals (horizontal). An example of vertical holonic relationships would extend from m-strings, to atoms, to molecules, to galaxies, to solar systems, to planets, to biospheres, to people, etc. We can easily discern physical boundaries that make each of them a whole, and yet discern their parts. Each holonic whole transcends and includes its predecessor in linear and physical terms (Framework 1). That is, the building blocks come first, then atoms, molecules, galaxies, etc. in terms of Framework 1’s unfolding as we know it.

Ken Wilber further developed Koestler’s metaphor and formulated the basic characteristics of holons, called the twenty tenets, in *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality: the Spirit of Evolution* (1995). [29] He showed that there were various hierarchical relationships (vertical) that simultaneously occur within heterarchical relationships (horizontal). For example, holons of less to greater complexity occur in developmental stages in human development (vertical) in relation to holons of similar types that occur as people, water molecules, atoms, etc. (horizontal). So this is another way to

distinguish between various primary constructions in addition to human beings. Systemically, these relationships are more aptly described as a *holarchy* – a multidimensional nest of relationships.

According to developmental psychologist Mark Edwards,

“As with Koestler, Wilber uses the holon theory to, ‘undercut the traditional argument between atomism ... and wholism.’ For Wilber to incorporate holonic theory into [his] theoretical structure ... was easy at one level because both theories were founded on the idea of hierarchical inclusion. The difference between them was that Wilber’s ... framework was a way of seeing the whole developmental and evolutionary nature of all relative knowledge, experience and activity. Wilber took Koestler’s holon to its logical end and, ... saw the holon as a way of analysing all aspects and domains of reality. The subtitle of *SES* is ‘The Spirit of Evolution’ and to my mind the book is an attempt to bring evolutionary theory out of its traditional biological home and to apply to all levels of existence – *from matter to spirit* [my italics]. Wilber does this through the identification of the holon as his core explanatory device. This is the absolutely crucial part that holons play in his model.” [30]

Seen in this context, Seth’s consciousness units (CUs), electromagnetic energy units (EEs), and primary/secondary constructions are holonic in nature. [31] I don’t believe that CUs were an attempt at reductionism, because within holonic theory, there is no stated irreducible unit or part that makes all wholes – energy-matter constructions – possible. They consist of holonic aspects that simply nest “all the way up and all the way down.” It is reductionist to the core to interpret Seth’s CUs as only a theoretical smallest unit. However, Seth uses this metaphor to integrate Framework 1 and 2 constructions all the way into the nondual domain of All-That-Is, which is consonant with “all the way up, and all the way down.”

“We must unfortunately often deal with analogies, because they can form bridge works between concepts. There are units of consciousness, then, as there are units of matter. I do not want you to think of these units as particles. There is a basic unit of consciousness that, expressed, will not be broken down, as once it was thought that an atom was the smallest unit and could not be broken down. The basic unit of consciousness obviously is not physical. It contains within itself innately infinite properties of expansion, development, and organization; yet within itself always maintains the kernel of its own individuality. Despite whatever organizations it becomes part of, or how it mixes with other such basic units, its own identity is not annihilated.

“It is aware energy, identified within itself as itself, not ‘personified’ but awareized. It is therefore the source of all other kinds of consciousness, and the varieties of its activity are infinite. It combines with others of its kind, forming then units of consciousness – as, mentioned often, atoms and molecules combine.

“This basic unit is endowed with unpredictability. That very unpredictability allows for infinite patterns and fulfillments. The word ‘soul’ unfortunately has been so used in regard to your species that it becomes highly difficult to unravel the conceptual difficulties. Using usual definitions, you would call a soul the result of a certain organization of such units, which you would then recognize as a ‘soul.’

“... These units can indeed appear in several places at once, and without going through space, in your terms. Literally now, these basic units of consciousness can be in all places at once. They are in all places at once. They will not be recognized because they will always appear as something else.

“Of course they move faster than light. There are millions of them in one atom – many millions. Each of these units is aware of the reality of all others, and influences all others. In your terms these units can move forward or backward in time, but they can also move into thresholds of time with which you are not familiar.” [32]

“We will call the basic units of consciousness ‘CU’ – the letter ‘C,’ the letter ‘U’ –consciousness units. From them EE units are formed, and the first roots sent out into the world of physical matter.” [33]

Our Integral Conscious Creation model is thus holonic, derived from Koestler, Wilber, Seth, Elias, Kris, and many others. It’s basic intent is to explain how conscious creation is the action of consciousness, in which No-Thing, creates some-thing. It outlines how the One (All-That-Is) becomes the many (energy gestalts, energy personality essence, and focus personalities, and all matter); how the many are all nested primary/secondary constructions, ad infinitum...

In this context, then, what Seth calls energy personality essence (inner ego/source self/entity/soul), in turn, is also created, but on a completely different level of reality, so much so that it can be considered another species of consciousness in relation to the outer ego. For example, Elias states that his native focus is Framework 4 [34] (he uses the term “Regional Area 4.” Seth never stated, in the extant published material, where his native focus was manifest.)

In any case, this suggests that “we” are simultaneously nested within all Frameworks of consciousness in order to manifest within any Framework 1. Put another way, the “you” in “you create your own reality” exists within Frameworks 1, 2, 3, and 4 to some extent at all times and no-times. Why is this important? Because it helps explain causality in holonic terms, which is to say once again that conscious creation is a nested, multidimensional affair. It is also a way to understand the authentic implications and power of the statement that “we create our own realities.”

“We” are the primary constructions (outer egos) who create our own secondary constructions of other primary constructions of similar primacy, while simultaneously nested within a different order or species of primary constructions (inner egos), who in turn create our own secondary

constructions of other primary constructions of similar primacy. In other words, any holon in Framework 1 terms will have nested primary and secondary aspects. However, these primary/secondary distinctions are aspects of some species of duality. And, the metaphor ultimately breaks down within the nondual Ground of All-That-Is.

Still we ask, “who” creates each nested level of primary constructions?

Who is really the “you” in “Which you? Which world?”

Apparitions, Thought-forms, Pseudo-forms, and Projections

Seth gives additional examples in which he fleshes out additional ways that primary and secondary constructions exist within a holonic spectrum that nests beyond Framework 1. From *Seth Speaks*, session 540,

“Such other existences and realities as just described [i.e. dream and afterdeath environments] coexist with your own, and in the waking state you are not aware of them. Now, often in your dreams you are able to perceive such other situations, but you often wind them into dream paraphernalia of your own, in which case upon awakening you have little clear memory.

“In the same way in the midst of life, you dwell with so-called ghosts and apparitions [perceived as secondary constructions], and for that matter you yourselves appear as apparitions [secondary constructions] to others, particularly when you send strong thought-forms of yourself from the sleep state, or even when unconsciously you travel out of your physical body.

“There are obviously as many kinds of ghosts and apparitions as there are people [i.e. a spectrum that goes much further than just primary and secondary]. They are as alert or as unalert to their situation as you are to your own. They are not fully focused in physical reality, however, either in personality or in form, and this is their main distinction. Some apparitions are thought-forms sent by survival personalities out of lingering deep anxiety. They portray the same compulsive-type behavior that can be seen in many instances in your ordinary experience.

“... Now I am speaking generally. Again, there are exceptions where memory is retained, but as a rule ghosts and apparitions are not any more aware of their effect upon others than you are when you appear quite unconsciously as ghosts in worlds that would be quite strange to you.

“(The combination of) thought, emotion, and desire creates form, possesses energy, (and) is made of energy. It will show itself in as many ways as possible. You only recognize the physical materializations, but as mentioned earlier in this book, you send pseudoforms of yourself out from yourself of which you are not aware; and this is completely aside from the existence of astral travel or

projection, which is a much more complicated affair.” [35]

Remember, consciousness creates within some type of nested primaryness or secondaryness. So we – an outer ego, primary construction, and body-mind – in turn create pseudo-forms. These pseudo-forms have a holonic (whole-part) integrity that makes them a nested primary construction, but on a different order, so this is a grey area. They are not body-minds, but a nonphysical construction that can be perceived as a relative kind of secondary construction by other body-minds/outer egos/primary constructions, or a nonphysical primary construction in relation to our Framework 1.

And, astral projection forms are a somewhat more complicated affair! Again, Seth hints at a relativistic, holonic spectrum of nested primary and secondary constructions. Here’s more.

“You appear in astral form in realities that are comparatively more advanced than your own. You are usually recognized because of your disorientation. You do not know how to manipulate. (Humorously). You do not know the customs. But whether you have a physical form or not, if you have emotions or feelings, these will take form. They have a reality. If you think strongly of an object, somewhere it will appear.

“If you think strongly of being in another location, a pseudoimage of yourself will be projected out from you to that place, whether or not it is perceived and whether or not you yourself are conscious of it, or conscious in it. This applies (both) to those who have left your physical system and to those who are in it.” [36]

This further hints at the mechanics of so-called bi-location where we create a projection form complete with a temporary *outer ego* to explore aspects of Framework 1, as in certain types of remote viewing, or other probable Framework 1s, and even Frameworks 2, 3, or 4.

“All of these forms are called secondary constructions, for as a rule full consciousness of the personality is not in them. They are automatic projections. “Now, in primary constructions, a consciousness, usually fully aware and alert, adopts a form – not his ‘native’ one – and consciously projects it, often into another level of reality. Even this is a rather complicated endeavor, and one seldom used for purposes of communication.

“There are other much easier methods. I have explained to some degree the way images are constructed out of an available field of energy [Frameworks of consciousness]. You perceive only your own [species of] constructions. If a ‘ghost’ [or ‘alien’ for that matter] wants to contact you therefore, he can do so through telepathy, and you can yourself construct the corresponding image [a secondary construction] if you desire. Or the individual might send you a thought-form [a secondary construction] at the same time that he telepathically communicates with you. Your rooms are full now of thought-forms that you do not perceive; and again, you are as much a ghostly phenomenon now as you will

be after death. You are simply not aware of the fact.” [37]

We, as primary constructions are still constrained by how many types of primary or secondary constructions we can actually perceive due to the development of our physical and inner senses. However, this is more a function of our current stage of development and our ability to use our inner senses. [38]

“You ignore certain temperature variations and stirring of air as imagination, that are instead indicative of such thought-forms. You thrust into the background telepathic communications that often accompany such forms, and you turn aside from all clues that other realities exist quite validly with your own, and that in the midst of one existence you are surrounded by intangible but valid evidence. The very words ‘life’ and ‘death’ serve to limit your understanding, to set up barriers [boundaries] where none intrinsically exist.” [39]

Well, we could say the same thing about primary and secondary constructions in general. But still, Seth’s point is to show that death is not the end or ultimate completion of existence. Again, these nested constructions can appear like an infinite onionskin, particularly within our present physical constructions where our sense of separation and boundaries appear quite extreme and solid!

“... Some dead friends and relatives do visit you, projecting from their own level of reality into yours, but you cannot as a rule perceive their forms. They are not more ghostly, or ‘dead,’ however, than you are when you project into their reality – as you do, from the sleep state.

“As a rule, however, they can perceive you [i.e. create secondary constructions] on those occasions. What you often forget is that such individuals are in various stages of development [Seth uses hierarchical “stages of development” in his model]. Some have stronger connections to the physical system than others. The length of time an individual has been dead in your terms has little to do with whether or not you will be so visited, but rather the intensity of the relationship.

“As mentioned earlier, however, in the sleep state you may help recently dead persons, complete strangers, to acclimate to after-death conditions, even though this knowledge is not available to you in the morning. So others, strangers, may communicate with you when you are sleeping, and even guide you through various periods of your life.

“It is not a simple matter to explain life conditions as you know them, so it is extremely difficult to discuss the complexities of which you are not aware.

“The main point I want to make in this chapter is that you are already familiar with all conditions you will meet after death, and you can become consciously aware of these to some extent.” [40]

Thus, Seth's primary and secondary constructions are not intended as dry academic maps, but a clever way to explain basic metaphysical "levels of selfhood and reality" that include transpersonal thought forms, apparitions, projection forms, and the continuation of personality after death.

Seen in this light, space-time and energy-matter are not the Primary Causal aspects of consciousness. Everything is conscious, but it's a question of intensity and degree at various nested "levels." For instance, m-strings, quarks, atoms, molecules, cells, organs, bodies, ecosystems, planets, solar systems, galaxies within Framework 1s, 2s, 3s, 4s, to Primary Unity of All-That-Is.

All-That-Is is an infinite pyramid gestalt of nested relationships as The One creates the many, who in turn are imbued with the ability to create nested, primary and secondary constructions. And yet, at some point in our development, the boundaries blur, the sense of separation diminishes, and some kind of realization, remembrance, enlightenment, or awakening occurs. Interestingly, Seth mentioned that,

"All portions of All That Is do not recognize themselves consciously as All That Is. But know themselves mainly as individuals, not as the prime gestalt individual. When realization is reached at the highest level, then All That Is instantly creates new realities, and to some extent, you see, loses the conscious knowledge of its own identity.

"The loss is always temporary and self-generated." [41]

The last line is really important. Our forgetting is "always temporary and self-generated." Holy Shit, can't you see the headlines? God has Alzheimer's! So these primary and secondary constructions are intentionally Self-Generated all the way "up" and "down" our levels of selfhood and reality.

And so we ask, yet again, since the outer ego is the "you" who co-creates its own space continuum and creates secondary constructions, who is the "you" who creates the primary constructions?

Who is the "you" in you create your own reality?

Which "you"? Which world?

Primary and Secondary Experience

Individual space continuums, primary and secondary constructions, etc., show how human perception works in Framework 1 terms. We can also extend these metaphors into the "unknown" reality of Frameworks 2, 3, 4, and All-That-Is.

We've covered a lot of ground, and our poor outer ego has taken a beating, realizing that we are only a primary construction! And our free will, choice, and perception create secondary constructions. No wonder just thinking about a million dollars doesn't magically deposit that in my bank account, create parking spaces, kill my enemies, solve world hunger, impose civil rights, women's rights, gay and lesbian rights, or ban weapons of mass destruction! My outer ego and secondary constructions don't always match other outer ego's secondary constructions. In fact, oftentimes they are in conflict with one another. Remember the aphorism about five blind men who attempt to describe an elephant through only their sense of touch?

Even though we are a primary construction, we are empowered to co-create a world of our choosing within the limits of our primacy. Thus, the outer ego has the power to create within the Self-imposed constraints of body/mind, brain chemistry, belief systems, expectations, emotions, physical, inner senses, and so on. And these limits can always be expanded. This is why personal development is so strongly stressed by Seth.

“We have never told anybody to do anything, except to face up to the abilities of consciousness.” [42]

“If you would momentarily put aside the selves you take for granted, you could experience your own multidimensional [holonic] reality. These are not just fine words that mean nothing. I do not harp to you about theory simply because I want to spout theory, but because I want you to put these ideas into practice.

“... I have told you that there are Inner Senses as well as physical ones. These will enable you to perceive reality as it exists independently of the physical world. You must learn to recognize, develop, and use these Inner Senses. The methods are given in the material. But you cannot utilize the material until you understand it.

“... You must, first of all, cease identifying yourself completely with your [outer] ego, and realize that you can perceive more than your [outer] ego perceives. You must demand more of yourself than you ever have before. The material is not for those who would deceive themselves with pretty, packaged, ribboned truths that are parceled out and cut apart so that you can digest them. That sort of material serves a need, but our material demands that you intellectually and intuitively expand.” [43]

Now, let's move on to an excerpt by Seth on primary and secondary experience. Seth discusses the subjects of fear and anxiety – all secondary constructions – co-created within mass events and collective co-creation. To be clear, primary and secondary experiences are not the same as primary and secondary constructions. Seth uses the terms “primary experience” and “secondary experience” to help us discern the difference between immediate, immanent threats and secondary, more distant threats that often lead to confusion, conflict, and unnecessary fear in modern and postmodern life. However, both result in secondary constructions. So we're just

going to explore some different kinds of secondary constructions.

The following excerpts further explore the importance of the collective dimension of co-creation in light of primary and secondary *experience*. Keep in mind that it refers to the world of 1977, but is still applicable today.

“Now: Physically your body has a stance in space and time. I will speak of primary and secondary experience. Let us call primary experience that which exists immediately in sense terms in your moment of time – the contact of body with environment. I am creating certain divisions here to make our discussion – or (with a smile) monologue – easier. Therefore, I will call secondary experience that information that comes to you through, say, reading, television, discussion with others, letters, and so forth.

“The secondary kind of experience is largely symbolic. This should be clear. Reading about a war in the middle of a quiet sunny afternoon is not the same thing as being in the war, however vivid the description. Reading about the energy shortage is not the same as sitting in a cold house. Reading about the possible annihilation of mankind through nuclear destruction or other stupidities, while you are sitting calmly enough in your living room, is obviously far divorced from the actuality described in an article.

“At the levels with which we are concerned, the body must primarily react to present, immediate, primary existence in space and time. At other levels it is equipped to handle many kinds of data, in that I have mentioned before the precognition of cells. But the body depends on the conscious mind to give it a clear assessment of precise conditions of the space and time it occupies. It depends upon that knowledge.

“... If you are safely ensconced in a comfortable room, in no present danger, your senses should accurately convey that information. Your conscious mind should assimilate it. It should be an easy enough accomplishment to look around you and see that you are in no danger.

“Your conscious mind is meant to give your body an assessment of what I will call cultural conditions, for there are sophistications and specifications that in your terms consciousness alone can assess. If, under conditions naturally safe in the terms of primary experience, you become overwhelmed by unsafe signals from secondary experience – that is, from your reading or whatever – you show a lack of discrimination. You are not able to differentiate between the physically safe present situation, and the imagined, which is perhaps unsafe, calling forth the alarms of danger.

“The body mechanisms become highly disoriented. The signals to the body are very contradictory, so that after a while, if such conditions continue, you can no

longer tell whether you are in actual danger or imagined danger. Your mind then forces your body to be in a state of constant alert – but more unfortunately, you train yourself to ignore your direct, sensual feedback in the present moment.

“Your body then might say you are safe, and your senses show you that no danger is present – yet you have begun to rely so upon secondary experience that you do not trust your creature reactions.

“Because of man’s great gift of imagination, however, the alarm signals not only invade a safe present moment, but go jangling into the next one and the one following, and are endlessly projected into the future. To whatever extent, and in whatever fashion, each individual is therefore robbed of his or her belief in the personal ability to act meaningfully or with purpose in the present.

“The body cannot act tomorrow, today. Its sense data must be clear. This resulting feeling of powerlessness to act leads to a state of hopelessness of varying degrees – and that mood does not tie itself to specific details, but pervades emotional life if it is allowed to. To whatever degree, the condemning, critical material too often becomes self-prophesying – for those who put merit on it allow it to cloud their reactions.

“... Whatever your scientists think, your body and your consciousness and your universe spring constantly into actualization. Therefore, through cultivating the dear experience of your own consciousness and being with time and with the moment as you feel it, you can draw upon the greater vitality and power that is available.

“To do this, rely upon your immediate sense data, not secondary experience as described. That primary sense data, while pinpointed in the present, providing you with the necessary stance in time, still can open up to you the timelessness from which all time emerges, can bring you intuitive intimations, hinting at the true nature of the ever-present coming-to-be of the universe.

“That kind of experience will let you glimpse the larger patterns of man’s creativity, and your part in it. You have been taught to concentrate upon criticisms and faults in your society; and in your times it seems that everything will work out wrong – that left alone the world will run down, the universe will die, man will destroy himself; and these beliefs so infiltrate your behavior that they organize much of your experience and rob you of the benefits nature itself everywhere provides in direct primary experience.

“Often then you ignore your senses’ reality in the world – the luxurious vitality and comfort of the daily moment – by exaggerating the importance of secondary experience as defined for this discussion.” [44]

This is a key idea, namely, the exaggerated importance of a distant (secondary) vs. immanent

(primary) threat. The political implications are significant, too. For example, politicians use distant threat overseas to justify activism, idealism, and even war, while others simply focus upon the immanent environment in their native country. Obviously, there's a wide spectrum in-between. Neither is better or worse intrinsically. However, problems arise when folks impose their sense of distant threat on others, and confuse it, masquerade it as an immanent threat for political, economic, and social gain and hegemony.

Again, these are all valid secondary constructions, but we attach different values of better/worse based upon our ethical and moral belief systems. So the effect of our belief systems on our perception (i.e., secondary constructions) has a huge impact on the collective psychic politics in any moment point.

“You must trust your sense data in that regard. Otherwise you confuse your psychological and corporal stance, for the body cannot be in a situation of safety and danger at the same time. It wastes its resources fighting imaginary battles.

“To some people wars, poverty, murder, treachery, corruption, are primary experience, and must be dealt with – as requiring immediate action. The body must react. Such persons are beaten up, or robbed. Those are immediate sense data, and in one way or another they do react. However feebly, their point of power corresponds immediately with the point of danger.

“You cannot react physically in the same way to projected or imagined dangers [i.e. secondary constructions of distant threats as opposed to immanent threats]. There seems to be no possible reaction. You are frustrated. You are meant to deal with your immediate, primary experience, and in so doing you take care of your responsibility. You are able to take action in your own experience, and therefore affect others. You do not have to be ignorant of wars in other corners of the world, or close your eyes. But if you allow those experiences to overcloud your present, valid intersection with reality, then you speak and act from a position not your own, and deny the world whatever benefits your own present version of reality might allow you to give.” [45]

When we begin to obsess on secondary experience (distant threats) at the expense of primary experience (immanent conditions) it is possible to end up completely dissociating from primary experience. This dissociation serves to perpetuate ‘negative’ secondary experiences. Seth never says to close our eyes or ignore distant threats, but to keep it in a balanced perspective, integrated into, not dissociated from primary experience.

“The natural creature-validity of your senses must remain dear, and only then can you take full advantage of those intuitions and visions [secondary constructions] that must come through your own private intersection [primary construction] with space and time [Framework 1].

“In those terms, the ever-actual integrity of nature everywhere surrounds you. It

represents your direct experience. It offers comfort, creativity, and inspiration that you only impede if you allow secondary experience to supersede your daily moment-to-moment encounter with the physical earth.” [46]

Even though the “point of power” is in the Now, it is possible to use that power to dissociate from primary experience and create unnecessary problems!

This concept is even more relevant to our present 24-hour, 7-days-a-week media access via the Internet, email, cell-phones, cable channels, in addition to conventional newspapers, books, and magazines. We now get news from Mars rovers – hundreds of millions of miles away – within twelve minutes, and it goes right onto a web page of newspapers, NASA, and other science sites! Our perception (secondary constructions) of global events continues to shrink as we blur the lines between what was secondary experience twenty-seven years ago into our primary experience today.

Seth repeatedly mentioned that the individual was his main focus, as seen in his best-selling self-help book, *The Nature of Personal Reality* (1994). However, he also delivered an entire book whose focus was collective co-creation, *The Individual and the Nature of Mass Events* (1995). This was to show how individuals form complex social systems and relationships, how collective secondary constructions co-create at the cultural level. *Mass Events* was intended as a sequel to *The Nature of Personal Reality* as an effort to connect individual and collective co-creation.

Individual reality creation seems complex enough, particularly in light of the spectrum of consciousness that spans outer ego, subconscious, inner ego, energy gestalts, and All-That-Is. Yet, emerging sciences like systems theory, chaos theory, autopoiesis, spiral dynamics, integral psychology, etc. have begun to explore how billions of people co-create economics, politics, art, science, and morals – the accoutrements of culture. This leads us to the conclusion, again, that there is no conscious creation without conscious co-creation. [47] Conscious creation is holonic because we are holonic beings.

Philosopher Ken Wilber calls this “agency in communion.” Each primary construction has its own boundaries, agency, and autonomy, but exists in communion with a vast array of simultaneous primary constructions. This is another way to see how conscious creation involves endless relationships between primary and secondary constructions in Framework 1, 2, 3, 4 terms.

Again, since the outer ego is the “you” who co-creates its own space continuum and secondary constructions, Who is the “you” who creates the primary constructions?

Who is the “you” in Which you? Which world?

I-I-I

Seth’s said that he spoke for all of our inner selves. Thus, he simultaneously spoke for both the outer and inner ego in all his books. His magnum opus, appropriately called *The “Unknown”*

Reality (1996), further explores the unknown processes involved in nested reality creation. For example, Seth referred to himself as a *bridge personality* – a temporary outer ego or primary construction, when he came through Jane. Thus the Seth we know is really a temporary outer ego that we can relate to, but it is a unique translation of the nonphysical inner self into the guise of the physical self we are accustomed to.

I would like to propose a simple way to summarize these basic “levels of selfhood” presented in the Seth material: **I-I-I**.

Each “I” represents an ontological level of selfhood that can be conceptualized as the irreducible minimum necessary construct for reality creation. Interestingly, this occurs not only in the Seth material, but within all the nondual traditions. Each “I” has its own type of nested free will, choice, and value fulfillment that work in concert. Together, these foundational aspects point out the overall “you” in “you create your own reality”:

- **I** = All-That-Is (nondual singularity)
- **I** = inner ego (e.g. God of Jane/Seth)
- **I** = outer ego (e.g. Jane)

We can split this into as many subdivisions as necessary, so it’s not a rigid threesome, but this trinity elegantly expresses the basic minimum. Also, note that “in between” each “I” is some kind of mediating structure or translation processes, as we have seen, so it’s also a five-part structure.

- **I** = All-That-Is (nondual singularity)
- SUBconscious (mediating processes, energy gestalts, Seth’s “inner ego” relative to below)
- **I** = inner ego (e.g. God of Jane/Seth’s “outer ego” in relation to above)
- subconscious (mediating processes)
- **I** = outer ego (e.g. Jane)

I-I-I create my own reality. That sentence more accurately expresses the nested nature of multidimensional, holonic personality. Yet, for all practical purposes, the outer ego remains a focus of exploration and creativity. Let’s remain grounded in that. However, the idea behind this series is to help push into the “unknown” reality of the inner “I”, because as every perennial wisdom tradition already knows, it is a stepping-stone that leads to the eventual realization of the nondual “I”.

This gets lost sometimes in many interpretations of the Seth material, but awaits those with the intestinal fortitude to seek it. In other words, when this material was originally given, it was primarily a way to open people to the inner self. So it’s no accident that Seth included 17 Practice Elements, as mentioned earlier to awaken aspects of the inner “I”. This is the closest thing to a system of yoga in the Seth material. Most of the other exercises were tailored for Jane, Rob, and students during in the 1960s and 1970s. However, they are still viable, and can be

incorporated within postmodern integral practices.

In this sense, the Seth material has not been used as a nondual dharma teaching in any collective sense. Most students used it for personal development during the heyday of the human potential movement that explored dozens of systems. However, it's important to point out that the nondual is included in Seth's maps, and only lying latent for those who seek it.

So I propose to use **I-I-I create my own reality** as a reminder about the nested nature of reality creation, and its nondual source (All-That-Is) in the context of multidimensional, holonic personality.

The following, then, is a very general summary of **I-I-I**.

I =	All-That-Is (nondual)	Gnosis	Spirit	Holy Spirit	No-thing	Omniscient	All-That-Is	Causal Domain
I =	inner ego (God of Jane, Seth)	inner senses	soul	Parent	Some-thing	transcendent	Frameworks 2, 3, 4	Subtle Domain
I =	outer ego (Jane)	outer senses	body/mind	child	some-thing	immanent	Framework 1	Physical Domain

As mentioned earlier, there is no conscious creation without conscious co-creation, no agency without communion. This applies “vertically” to **I-I-I** as well as “horizontally” within each Framework of consciousness. We’ve explored the “vertical” or ontological relationships throughout this series. Earlier, we explored the “horizontal” relationships as six billion focuses of energy personality essence co-create secondary constructions through primary and secondary *experience* in their own space-time continuums. (Say that ten times fast J.)

Put another way, creation and co-creation occur in multiple, simultaneous nested contexts. All of which contribute to our everyday perception. The basic idea of our **I-I-I** map, then, is to serve as an authentic reminder of the nature of selfhood and reality. Therefore, the goal is simply to “face up to the abilities of consciousness,” to literally be all we can be within the constraints and boundaries of our primary selves.

A Middle Way

While, the Seth material is a transcendental body of work, its purpose is not to deny the flesh in terms of the “ascending” perennial traditions that end up devaluing the “descended” material world. Nor is it intended to perpetuate the idea of “the sinful self” that says we are all flawed creatures from birth or trapped in an endless cycle of reincarnations and suffering. Nor is it a purely “descended” tradition that glorifies only the five senses at the expense of the inner senses. It is a middle way, opening to door toward the remembrance of Self, developing psychic abilities, balancing intellect and intuition, physical and inner senses, while nurturing healthy

body/minds and pursuing maximum value fulfillment on individual and collective levels.

“Though I may emphasize the importance of inner reality in this book, therefore, I am in no way denying the great validity and purpose of earthly experience.

“Any exercises in this book should help you enrich that experience, and understand its framework and nature. None of the exercises should be used to try to ‘escape’ the connotations of your own earthly reality.

“... You are presently little aware of the dimensions of consciousness – your own or those seemingly ‘beneath’ your own **[I-I-I]**.” [48]

Who-Who-Who is the “You-You-You” in You Create Your Own Reality?

I-I-I!

In Part 3, we’ll explore some notable critiques of YCYOR and channeling as new paradigm, as well as offer some ways to put theory into practice and explore the “unknown reality” of **I-I-I** directly.

PART 3

(Originally published in *The Seth Journal*, Vol.2, No.1, 2005)

In Parts 1 and 2, we covered a lot of ground based mostly on new material from the early Seth sessions. I outlined the basic “levels of selfhood” (ontology) as well as the mechanics of space continuums, primary and secondary constructions, primary and secondary experience (which result in individual and collective secondary constructions). I proposed a simple map called **I-I-I** in which to better understand the basic levels of selfhood that consciously co-create all reality.

I also proposed the radical idea that many in the New Age community have become comfortably numb with an inaccurate and ontologically inverted definition of conscious creation; that the outer ego (**I**) is a primary construction of the inner ego (**I**), which in turn is a primary construction of an energy gestalt, which in turn is a primary construction of All-That-Is (**I**), which in turn....

Again, we need to reorient ourselves and awaken to the direct experience of this authentic ontology of be-ing, because that is what literally creates and co-creates within all “levels” of Self. Conscious creation is a nested affair of primary/secondary constructions within primary/secondary constructions. For all we know in these nests may go on ad infinitum....

- **I** = All-That-Is = Primary Source
- **I** = Energy Personality Essence (Primary Construction whose Source is All-That-Is), Free Will/Primarily Causal
- **I** = outer ego (primary construction whose Source is energy personality essence), free will/primarily causal

The outer ego uses physical senses, perception, cognition, emotions, etc. to create secondary constructions within its own space continuum. It has free will based upon its ontological boundaries, as does energy personality essence (inner ego).

Next, we’re going to explore a notable critic of “new paradigms” whose critiques take on conscious creation and channeling, and address his concerns in light of what has preceded. Ken Wilber wrote a stinging social critique of the baby boomer generation that focused upon the humanities in academia, but extended its reach to New Age movements. *Boomeritis* (2002) is a parody of everything it criticizes. I highly recommend it. (Wilber’s model of the psyche is beyond the scope of this series. However, there is a 77-page outline available for those interested on the NewWorldView website: *Ken Wilber’s Model of Human Development: An Overview*. [49])

What is Boomeritis?

“Boomeritis is simply pluralism [i.e. the ability to hold multiple perspectives] infected with narcissism [outer egocentric].

“... Boomeritis is that strange mixture of very high cognitive capacity (... and

noble pluralism) infected with rather low emotional narcissism ... exactly the mixture that has been noted by so many social critics. A typical result is that the sensitive self, honestly trying to help, excitedly exaggerates its own significance. It will possess the new paradigm [e.g. the Seth, Elias, Kris material], which heralds the greatest transformation in the history of the world; it will completely revolutionize society as we know it; it will save the planet and save Gaia and save the Goddess; it will personally be the vanguard of the great coming social transformation that will totally revolutionize history; it will

“Well, off we go with some of the bulging grandiosity of Boomerville.

“... Once again, that is not the whole story of the Boomers, but it appears to be an unmistakable flavor. In particular, boomeritis has significantly tilted and prejudiced academic studies; it is behind much of the culture wars; it haunts almost every corner of the New Age; it drives many of the games of deconstruction and identity politics; it authors new paradigms daily. Virtually no topic, no matter how innocent, has escaped a reworking at its hands....

“Put simply: boomeritis is high pluralism mixed with low narcissism. And that is the strange, strange brew that has accompanied the Me generation at virtually every twist and turn of its otherwise idealistic saga. And with this understanding, my dear friends, we have arrived at the very heart of this generation.” [50]

I must admit that this book really blew me away and yet seriously challenged me. With further study of Ken’s work, I have come to understand and finally agree with most of its criticisms, because they help point out how we boomers have become comfortably numb in so many ways. But you’ll have to read the book to explore the fine points (tip: start on p. 324-326 where the inside joke is revealed).

We’re going to explore Wilber’s critique of YCYOR and channeling as boomer new paradigms taken to extremes. Keep in mind that he’s not trying to negate their gems at all, but put them in a wider perspective that more fully aligns, or so I maintain, with our **I-I-I** context. Again, *Boomeritis* bothered me the first time I read it because it didn’t take long to realize that I was “infected” to some degree! Yet, Wilber consistently admits to his own boomeritis, so he’s not putting himself above it all, just issuing a none too subtle wake up call.

Hopefully it will bother and challenge you, too. You’ll notice that he doesn’t reference a single word or book by Seth/Jane Roberts. So what follows are a critique of flawed, extreme, and overly dogmatic interpretations that continue to be foisted by us boomers, and now our Gen X and Y progeny. Therefore, what follows are critiques of the *outer ego* (I), who pays lip service to *inner self* (I) and *All-That-Is* (I), but has put itself on top of the food chain creating a false sense of primacy where none really exists! That is, the “you” in YCYOR becomes mostly all about the grandiose and self-important outer ego.

“The core of New Age spirituality ... is the belief ‘you create your own reality.’

Actually, psychotics create their own reality.... [Ironically they do, but within the context of **I-I-I.**]

“To its credit, the New Age movement is attempting to get in touch with an all-pervading spiritual and creative source, but the idea often gets filtered through boomeritis and comes out slightly loopy. ... The point is that the final New Age product is part mixture of good cognitive psychology, part emotional narcissism and prerational magic [i.e. 2-7 year old belief systems], and part what seems to be a rather complete misunderstanding of the mystical traditions [i.e. Eastern and Western nondual schools].

“... The cognitive psychology component is fairly straightforward and seems accurate enough: people’s belief systems [i.e. worldviews or memes] help to determine their experiences. To change your beliefs is to help change your response to life. This is certainly true. Although I cannot choose my sensations, I can choose how to think about them, and by consistently altering my beliefs and reframing my experience – perhaps from cynical to caring, or from pessimistic to optimistic, or from self-belittling to self-accepting – I can change the very nature of my outlook on life.

“There are, of course, limits to what my beliefs can accomplish. Except if I have boomeritis, in which case the grandiosity involved recognizes no such limitations at all. ‘Thoughts influence reality’ becomes ‘Thoughts create reality.’ In order to bolster the notion that my [outer] egoic thoughts govern all of reality, it would help if I could claim the authority of the world’s great spiritual traditions, if I could claim, that is, the voice of God himself. And looking over the world’s mystical traditions, that is exactly what I find. Don’t the world’s greatest saints and sages all announce that one’s deepest Self is one with the Divine? That one’s innermost awareness is Spirit itself? And doesn’t that Spirit – my very own Self – create the entire world? You create your own reality, you see?

“Step by step, that is a narcissistic perversion of the mystical view. ... It is indeed true that the world’s great ... spiritual traditions maintain that the deepest part of your awareness is one with Spirit, and that this divine oneness can be realized with enlightenment – satori, moksha, cosmic consciousness, unio mystica, call it what you will. I believe that this is the essential truth that many New-Agers are attempting to embrace, and we can all honor that truth, I hope. But the Self that is one with Spirit has little to do with you; it is, in fact, the transcendence of your [outer] ego that allows the [nondual] Spirit to shine forth. That self is the absolute opposite of boomeritis!

“The typical New Age notion is that you want good things to happen to you, so think good thoughts; and because you create your own reality, those thoughts will come true. Conversely, if you are sick, it’s because you have been bad. The mystical notion, on the other hand, is that your deepest Self transcends both good

and bad, so by accepting absolutely everything that happens to you – by equally embracing both good and bad with equanimity – you can transcend the [outer] ego altogether. The idea is not to have one thing that is good smash into another thing called my [outer] ego, but to gently rise above both.

“... Of course, we all want to be healthy and not sick, financially secure and not destitute, loving and not hateful – and it is completely acceptable to work hard for all of those. But I need to be very careful when I start claiming that ‘I create my own reality,’ because which ‘I’ am I actually listening to: my [outer] ego or my Self [All-That-Is]? The [outer] ego in me or the Spirit [All-That-Is] in me? For the Spirit that is in me is not concerned with just me. The Spirit that is in me is likewise in all beings great and small, and that Spirit does indeed create the entire universe: it creates its own reality, which includes the sun and moon and stars, the wide oceans and pouring rains, the nations of this earth and all its blessed inhabitants, the light and the dark alike. But when I start claiming to create my own reality and that reality is about nothing but getting a new car, a new job, more money, fame, health instead of disease, happiness instead of sadness, joy instead of pain, light instead of dark, then perhaps I might start to question just which ‘I’ is getting a hearing, because I am no longer being one with everything, am I? I am only being one with a small slice of the universe governed by my small [outer egoic] desires and wants. And friends, that is not Spirit [All-That-Is], that is the [outer] ego, plain and simple.

“... ‘You create your own reality’ – *your own omnipotent [outer] ego creates reality – is the absolute essence of boomeritis* [my italics]. It lies behind the social construction of reality; it lurks in the notion that the critic, not the artist, creates the artwork; it subsists in the heart of deconstruction; it is the major motor of new-age spirituality. It even lurks in the very depths of modern physics....” [51]

As mentioned earlier, when I first read this I was challenged to further understand the context in which Ken’s comments were framed. Initially it seemed like a brutal polemic, but it didn’t completely resonate with my own understanding. That cognitive dissonance motivated me to ponder them and further study his work. I discovered two things:

1. As a transcendentalist, he is an authentic postmodern dream-art scientist in my view. Ken quite properly hammers away at the definition that the “you” in YCYOR is only the thoughts, emotions, expectation, etc. of the outer ego. Put in Sethian terms, *all secondary constructions get confused as primary constructions*. Again, though it’s beyond the scope of this article, his “spectrum of consciousness,” first published in 1977 and developed continuously thereafter, is ontologically consonant with Seth/Jane’s “levels of selfhood,” and actually, much more refined because it includes five decades of developmental scientific research.

2. As such, his definition of the term “narcissist” is broader than the American Psychiatric Association’s DSM IV definition of Narcissistic Personality Disorder:

“Narcissistic personality is characterized by behavior or a fantasy of grandiosity, a lack of empathy and a need to be admired by others. Narcissistic personality has a pathological unrealistic or inflated sense of self-importance, has an inability to see the viewpoints of others, and is hypersensitive to the opinions of others.” [52]

We must also factor in Wilber’s decades long study and personal practice of various nondual teachings that makes it easier to spot when we confuse our outer ego with All-That-Is, outer ego = God, rather than a nested aspect, co-created within a spiraling **I-I-I**. Again, no one is trying to undermine the importance of the outer ego and its role in physical reality, just pointing out relentlessly confused interpretations of Seth/Jane’s and other’s roadmaps of the psyche that elevate outer ego (I) to energy personality essence (I) or God (I). Thus, Wilber’s broad use of “narcissism” in boomeritis is a polemic designed to shock, a wake-up call to the comfortably numb, still sleepwalking, all the while flying the banner of outer egoic awareness as the same as All-That-Is.

Again, notice that there isn’t a single reference to the book that started this – *The Nature of Personal Reality* (1974/1994) – nor any of his usual carefully researched and cross-referenced comments that show any familiarity with the larger body of Jane’s work. Therefore, his critique is quite appropriate methinks, when correctly applied to the inverted ontology and flawed interpretations of the Seth/Jane material in the New Age community at large.

So it’s not the body of work, or Jane and Rob personally, but the interpretations. And he’s right on target. So, what happens when we apply these kinds of flawed interpretations of YCYOR to dis-ease? According to Wilber,

“... illness demonstrates that your are not a good, loving person. The worse the illness, the more unspeakably horrible you have been. Because the [outer] ego creates all reality, then a bad ego – an unloving, unkind [outer] ego – creates all illness.

“... Nobody is denying that thoughts and psychological attitudes have a substantial, sometimes decisive, effect on physical illness, as psychoneuroimmunology has demonstrated. ... Evidence suggests that, depending on the disease, the psychological component might constitute between 2% and 20% of the cause of the illness [i.e. thoughts, emotions, expectations are not primarily causal, but secondarily causal]. But most of the diseases once thought to be largely psychogenic [mental] – such as tuberculosis and ulcers and colitis – are now known to be caused largely by physical factors, such as bacteria and diet. But once the physical causes are addressed, the psychological component of cure can become rather significant, accounting for perhaps 10% to 30% of the healing process.

“But boomeritis, anxious that illness brought on by causes outside of its control might weaken its omnipotence, must make the psychological component of the illness the sole component of illness. Thus, you are sick because you are

unloving; the [outer] ego creates all reality, the [outer] ego can cure all reality: narcissism reigns [i.e. outer ego (I) dissociated from inner ego (I) and All-That-Is (I)].

“... This painfully guilt-inducing claim – you [outer ego alone] have created your illness – actually benefits only one group: those selling the books making the claims, who happen – for the moment – to be healthy people who generate a great deal of money and power by telling sick people how to think. As for those who are actually sick, this notion simply acts to instill in them an enormous amount of ‘New Age guilt,’ which, if anything, will further depress their immune systems and help to make them even sicker.

“... Of course, done appropriately, an engagement of the psychological and spiritual aspects of illness and healing can be a very powerful and wonderful tool. I believe these types of psychosomatic techniques – including psychotherapy, group therapy, visualization, affirmation, mediation, and prayer – should be an indispensable part of every integral medical treatment. But they can only be effective to the extent they are approached realistically [i.e. oriented to accurate “levels of selfhood”], which means, taken out of the hands of boomeritis, which, as always, takes an important topic and blows it up to extremes via an unquenchable narcissism, with the resultant harm outweighing the undeniable good.” [53]

Wilber speaks from first-hand experience. His second wife Treya passed away from cancer in 1989. Both Ken and Treya dealt with “New Age” friends and healers, some of whom laid a comfortably numb interpretation of conscious creation on both of them. See *Grace and Grit* (1991) for the moving details.

In my view, Wilber captures one of the cruelest interpretations of YCYOR, when healthy people use it to dissociate from compassion and grace towards those with serious dis-ease or pathology. As though the outer ego intentionally thinks tumors, sore joints, strokes, heart attacks, psychotic breaks, car accidents, and wars into existence all by itself. And that just by thinking about healing, they should be able to cure themselves. This interpretation ends up “shoulding” all over people!

There are others who say something very similar, that outer egoic thoughts are not primarily causal in the context of **I-I-I**. The following is from Elias, channeled by Mary Ennis of Brattleboro, Vermont.

“This is another association which is being misinterpreted, misunderstood. I am not expressing to any of you that you do not think. ... For this is a function of your objective physical manifestation [i.e. body/outer ego]. It is no less of a function of your physical consciousness... than your heartbeat or than your breathing. It is quite valuable, and it is being generated continuously. It does not stop any more than your heartbeat stops or your breathing stops. What occurs is that you move

your attention. At times you are paying attention intensely to your thoughts, and at times you are not.

“... What I am expressing to you is not a devaluation of the mechanism of thought, but to recognize what it is, to understand that it is not a communication [from inner ego], that it does not precede your creation of reality.

“You [outer ego] may think and think and think and think, and it shall not create your reality. You may wish all that you may, and you may think of what you are wishing and not create it, and the reason that you may not create it is that thought does not generate reality. It does not create reality; it interprets. It translates communications [from inner ego], and you offer yourselves many avenues of communication. It is the function of thought to translate.

“But if you are not offering this mechanism of thought adequate information in association with your communications, it is not translating accurately. It translates generally, and this is the significance of paying attention to what influences your choices and paying attention to your choices.

“What you choose may be associated with your direction. Your choices are what you do, not necessarily what you think. You may think to yourself in one moment, ‘I am going to move across this room and consume appetizers.’ And what you may actually do is turn your attention to the individual that is sitting beside you and engage in conversation. You are not DOING what you thought, but [you] are doing what you desire, in association with your direction.

“This is the significance in paying attention to what you are doing and what influences what you do. For your doing is your choosing, and what influences your choosing is quite significant, for your beliefs influence your choosing continuously.” [54]

The following is from Kris, channeled by Serge Grandbois of Toronto, Ontario.

“For the last few years, this concept [YCYOR] has been bounced around like a proverbial Super Ball. It has been touted as the latest cure-all, the best fix-it-all, the magic cure. Yet, very few people actually understand the entire scope of the process.

“Due to your Western society’s fixation with consumerism and over-the-counter quick-fixes, the concept of ‘You Create Your Own Reality’ has often been watered down to barely recognizable fibers of the original cloth it was ripped from.

“In some people’s eyes, the concept, like many things, has to be watered down to the point it is barely a shadow of its true intent, depth and scope. Unlike over-the-

counter quick fixes, this is one area that cannot be watered down just so it doesn't really challenge preconceived notions of reality. It is 'meant' to challenge. It is meant to provoke and accelerate that grey matter in your brain. It is meant to shake and jiggle the Jell-O between the ears!

"Never should it be considered that such a concept be no more difficult than three clicks of your heels and you are 'there'. The Princess of Oz only has one cherry from the pie, not the whole thing. This statement doesn't negate the spontaneous miracle of 'thought into matter', the transformation of energy from one state to another. There is more to this than meets the eye [I-I-I, pun intended J].

"The concept of the individual creating his or her personal reality, and the masses creating their joint or collective reality is not new. It has been around as long as humans have been on your world, and that is far longer than your sciences dare to imagine. In our view, the process is also not something you suddenly 'do' solely from the [outer] ego's focus, as much as it is a spontaneous 'act' of the human personality. In fact it is a definite aspect/characteristic of the human personality... a creator essence, belonging to a matrix of living dynamic essences of personality! [I-I-I]" [55]

So, both Elias and Kris offer information that is consonant with Wilber's critiques, namely, that conscious creation is much more than the thoughts of the outer ego. But does this contradict what Seth had to say about our thoughts? Compare the following excerpt from *Seth Speaks* (1994).

"... Now it is nearly impossible to separate a discussion of the nature of the soul from a discussion of the nature of perception [by the combined inner ego, subconscious, and outer ego]. Very briefly let us review a few points: You form physical matter and the physical world that you know [this definition of 'you' includes inner ego, subconscious, and outer egos]. The physical senses actually can be said to create the physical world, in that they force you to perceive an available field of energy in physical terms, and impose a highly specialized pattern upon this field of reality. Using the physical senses, you can perceive reality in no other way.

"This physical perception in no way alters the native, basic, unfettered perception that is characteristic of the inner self [inner ego], the inner self being the portion of the soul that is within you. The inner self knows its relationship with the soul. It is a portion of the self that acts, you might say, as a messenger between the soul and the present personality. You must also realize that while I use terms like 'soul' or 'entity,' 'inner self,' ['inner ego'] and 'present personality,' I do so only for the sake of convenience, for one is a part of the other; there is no point where one begins and another ends [In other words, the map Seth presents is not the territory, and is useful only insofar as it allows us to directly explore the territory].

"You can see this easily for yourself if you consider the way in which

psychologists use the terms ‘ego,’ ‘subconscious,’ and even ‘unconscious.’ What seems subconscious in one instant may be conscious the next. An unconscious motive may also be conscious at one point. Even in these terms your experience should tell you that the words themselves make divisions that do not exist in your own experience.

“You seem to perceive exclusively through your physical senses, and yet you have only to extend your [outer] egotistical idea of reality, and you will find even your egotistical [waking or dreaming] self accepting quite readily the existence of nonphysical information.

“As it does, so its own ideas of its own nature will automatically change and expand, for you will have removed limitations to its growth. Now, any act of perception changes the perceiver, and so the soul, considered as a perceiver, must also change. There are no real divisions between the perceiver [primary construction] and the thing seemingly perceived [secondary construction]. In many ways the thing perceived is an extension of the perceiver. This may seem strange, but all acts are mental, or if you prefer, psychic acts. This is an extremely simple explanation; but the thought creates the reality [well, he said it was an extremely simple explanation]. Then the creator of the thought perceives the object, and he does not understand the connection between him and this seemingly separate thing.

“This characteristic of materializing thoughts and emotions into physical realities is an attribute of the soul [inner ego is causal, not matter alone]. Now in your reality, these thoughts are made physical. In other realities, they may be ‘constructed’ in an entirely different fashion. So your soul, that which you are, constructs your physical daily reality for you from the nature of your thoughts and expectations [i.e., inner ego creates an outer ego as a primary construction, which in turn, creates physical perception as secondary constructions].

“You can readily see, therefore, how important your subjective feelings really are. This knowledge – that your [physical] universe is idea construction – can immediately give you clues that enable you to change your environment and circumstances beneficially. When you do not understand the nature of the soul, and do not realize that your thoughts and feelings form physical reality, then you feel powerless to change it.” [56]

Don’t Seth’s definitions contradict Elias’ and Kris’? After all, Seth said, “your thoughts and feelings form physical reality...” Well, Seth also said that this was an extremely simple explanation. As such, it served, some thirty years ago, as a useful orienting generalization to point to the importance of mental attitudes and belief systems in relation to how we create and co-create. However, as we dig deeper, cross reference, and further explore the basic ontology of our multidimensional selves, we see that all three sources point out that thought alone is not primarily causal, and thought alone does not create all our reality (perception or secondary

constructions). The main point is that while our thought processes do play an important part, there has been way too much emphasis put upon thoughts alone and thus the outer ego alone as being primarily causal. While we can further debate semantics, it's clear enough that none of these sources are really making that claim, yet it is still found throughout various New Age communities.

Now, let's move on and explore a final excerpt from *Boomeritis* that critiques the channeling phenomenon.

“Common forms of new Boomer religion include, of course, New Age religion, ... and the closely related phenomenon of channeling, where a higher intelligence, usually from another planet, speaks through a specially chosen person – the channel – often bringing information about what the Human race must do in order to avoid extinction and usher in an extraordinary world transformation. To be chosen as the special channel for the highest intelligence in the universe would certainly look good on most resumes.” [57]

Wilber doesn't really go into any level of details that shows familiarity with the channeling phenomenon as, say, the work of parapsychologists Arthur Hastings or Jon Klimo does. Though he does reference *A Course in Miracles* in his writing, he never explores the channeling of Helen Shucman, the psychology dynamics that resulted in its creation. Still, to be constructive, let's see how Wilber's comments apply to what we know about Jane Roberts point by point.

1. A higher intelligence (yes)
2. Usually from another planet (no)
3. Specially chosen person (yes, in the sense that Seth states that he wouldn't come through another)
4. Bringing information (yes)
5. To avoid extinction (secondarily, but not the main emphasis)
6. Usher in an extraordinary world transformation (no, not directly, but yes, in terms of the 2075 material in *Seth Speaks*)

So we hit on roughly three of six. And even though most of us reject the notion of the Seth material being a religion, I think that one can easily find cases where this is so. Particularly in the case where “Seth said” equals proof of truth alone, or is used as an excuse to marginalize all other sources of knowledge. In this context – overly dogmatic interpretations by outer egos – *Sethism has become a boomer New Age religion*. For evidence, check out the archives of the Sethnet email list which has been around since October 1998. [58]

Now, to frame his criticism in a wider context, further exploration of Wilber's developmental

model shows almost no information on the channeling phenomenon per se. So his comments above are very, very broad and apply even more polemically to other bodies of channeled information in the New Age landscape, though again, Wilber didn't offer any specifics. However, many channeled sources are detailed in Jon Klimo's *Channeling: Investigations into Receiving Information from Paranormal Sources* (1998). Points five and six are also heavily featured in the alien encounter/abduction/UFO phenomenon detailed in John Mack's *Passport to the Cosmos* (1999) and many other sources. Still, these books show that scientific evidence is slowly mounting for these kinds of paranormal phenomenon.

On the other hand, there has been little groundbreaking research done in the past forty years on the channeling phenomenon. Research in the area of mediumship and spiritualism harkens back to the era of William James and Frederick Meyers. So there is still no clear academic consensus on what is going on, yet. But again, Wilber's integral approach provides a more inclusive method to conduct rigorous research on channeling than any preceding methodology. For example, a hypothesis I believe could be tested is:

Channeling is a spectrum of dissociative states that develop over time in discrete stages, similar to any multiple intelligence. In its mild form, the dissociative state is more like an enhanced creativity which can be applied to any field (e.g. writing, music, art, engineering, etc.). In its more extreme form, the dissociative state includes fully formed secondary personalities (bridge personalities, personagrams) that offer knowledge well beyond the current capacity of the proximate self (outer ego). Accessing this state at will is characteristic of a later, mature stage.

In other words, based upon the groundbreaking research of Howard Gardner in *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (1993), and others, I believe that channeling is simply another intelligence or ability. Gardner's research supports the notion that we all have multiple intelligences, for example, emotional, linguistic, mathematical, musical, interpersonal, etc. But like most authentic science, this research takes years to compile and interpret by competent researchers.

However, it is a logical next step to postulate that channeling, though relatively rare, is still an innate potential or intelligence within every human being. Again, Wilber's model is beyond the scope of this compilation, but provides a viable theory of consciousness that includes multiple intelligences (also called streams, lines, or modules) to test this out. [59] (Interestingly, the idea of multiple intelligences is also consonant with Elias' theories of *alternate selves* and *aspects of essence*. [60])

Therefore, Wilber's critique of boomer religion is just that, an appropriate critique of the channeling phenomenon as *sole proof of truth by authority*. I believe Wilber's critiques, in general, to be an important wake up call. He doesn't have it all figured out, and readily admits it. Hell, the guy wants "He was true, but partial..." inscribed on his tombstone. [61] So take him with a grain of salt, but realize that he has authored close to twenty books that have been translated into over twenty languages. At last count Jane's work included over forty books

translated into seventeen languages. This is a sure sign that each author has something very important to say that resonates with large audiences.

Many critics often take short excerpts out of context, and often are not familiar with the over all body of work. This applies equally to the work of Jane Roberts and Ken Wilber. Both have similar views on who the “you” in you create your own reality is, namely, a nested, simultaneously co-creating set of structures that span matter to body to mind to soul to All-That-Is. Again, we can simply refer to this spectrum of consciousness as **I-I-I**.

Conscious Creation includes Nested Conscious Co-Creation

This series has explored many new ideas in the growing body of the Seth material that included idea constructions, space continuums, primary and secondary constructions, primary and secondary experience (as secondary constructions), **I-I-I**, critiques of YCYOR and channeling, and more. We have outlined Seth/Jane’s “roadmap of the soul” to present a postmodern view that shows we’re created co-creators who create/co-create.

That’s all well and good, but so what? What good do these maps serve? How can we use them in practical everyday terms? Seth cautioned that,

“This material is not for those who would deceive themselves with pretty, packaged, ribboned, truths – truths that are parceled out and cut apart so that you can digest them. That sort of material does serve a need, and there are many who give it and it is helpful for those who need it. This material demands more. It demands that you intellectually and intuitively expand it demands that you use your abilities.

“There are other ways far more difficult and you are not ready for those, but you are ready for the methods that I have given if you are willing to work. And yet by work, I mean a joyful endeavor, a spontaneous endeavor. You have simply to allow yourselves to be yourselves.” [62]

Thus, like all authentic perennial traditions, Seth, Elias, Kris, and others provide various exercises to test out their maps, and we’ll explore these at the end. In the mean time, it is clear that humanity is dynamic and ever changing-in-time toward new horizons. We can now begin to explore evolutionary unfolding using physical and inner senses, whose combination Seth refers to as “high intellect.” [63] And, if we substitute the words “creation” or “construction” for evolution, that’s all the better. Thus, conscious creation, conscious construction, and conscious evolution are really three ways to say the same thing: *reality creation is a nested affair of conscious creation and conscious co-creation.*

I-I-I Consciously Creates and Consciously Co-creates “Horizontally” and “Vertically”

The following map is a highly condensed, general summary of what we’ve explored so far in Parts 1-3 in terms of *who* creates in relation to *our selves*, *our world*, and *how we can all get*

along.

- Vertical = **I**/All-That-Is
- Vertical = **I**/inner Ego (Frameworks 2, 3, 4)
- Vertical = **I**/outer ego (Framework 1)
- Horizontal = Our Selves (**I**), Our World (**It, Its**), How We Can All Get Along (**We**) perspectives (Framework 1)

The vertical “dimensions of being” deal with the *who* – “levels of selfhood” and “levels of reality.” **I-I-I** summarizes the basic map of All-That-Is outlined in the Seth material. It’s consonant with the perennial wisdom traditions and other channeled sources like Elias and Kris. Again, we can expand it to include more “levels” or domains, but this trinity is the basic irreducible minimum for the physical creation of energy-matter and space-time.

The horizontal “dimensions of being” deal with first person “I,” second person “We,” and third person “It/Its” in linguistic terms. That is, we can find these perspectives occurring naturally in most of the world’s languages. Thus, we use these horizontal perspectives to generally describe *our selves* (individual interiors/I) in relation to *our world* (individual exteriors/It, collective exteriors/Its) in relation to *how we can all get along* (collective interiors and morals/We).

Together, these vertical and horizontal “dimensions of being” outline **I-I-I** as a vast, infinite *Holarchy* of nested hierarchies (vertical) and heterarchies (horizontal). **I-I-I** has nested aspects that complement each other and cooperate to make each other possible. Thus, no aspect is ultimately more important or better than any other, but interdependent and cooperative aspects of creation and co-creation. Again, this means *there is no conscious creation without simultaneous conscious co-creation*, horizontally and vertically. Seth repeatedly used the words “multidimensional” and “multipersonhood” to hint at something similar.

Seth also pointed out that,

“Your eyes and your eyelashes, being individual, express the individuality of All-That-Is [**I-I-I**]. No snowflake is alike. No person is alike. Through the manifestation of individuality does All-That-Is express its being. To be yourself, you are, in your terms, what God is. And in your way, you become a conscious creator. You are co-creators whether you know it or not. You are creators whether you know it or not. You are created and you create whether you know it or not. You can learn to be conscious co-creators. You form your reality. You can do this consciously – even when you choose to think in terms of a nebulous, beneficial, divine Oneness in which you hope to hide your being and lose it.” [64]

“You have chosen a different kind of consciousness [than animals]. That kind of consciousness necessitated a different kind of challenge, so that with your new kind of mind, you would come to different crossroads; you would forget what the animals knew. But with a different kind of consciousness, you would triumphantly then become aware, but in a different way, of the animal’s blessed

knowledge, and use it again in new terms as conscious co-creators. You have not as yet reached that level, but you are working toward it. That is in partial answer to your question. There is a great conscious revelation that in all probability can come to each of you, and to those of your species, in which you understand the nature of your own grace, and your relationship with All-That-Is within the reality that you know. And then you will realize many things.

“When you do not define your existence as physical, only, then you will not feel that you must breed indiscriminately, because you have been told that you should breed, or because you fear that your immortality is dependent upon the seed that falls from you into the earth. You will recognize your own immortality and therefore be free and joyous with your mortality, and you will gracefully take your part as co-creators on a conscious level, with all the conscious and unconscious beings that dwell within your physical reality.” [65]

“Even when you lost sight – as you knew you would – of those deep connections [between man and animals], they would continue to operate until, in its own way, man’s consciousness could rediscover the knowledge and put it to use – deliberately and willfully, thereby bringing that consciousness to flower. In your terms this would represent a great leap, for the [outer] egotistically aware individual would fully comprehend unconscious knowledge and act on his own, out of choice. He would become a conscious co-creator. Obviously, this has not as yet occurred.” [66]

And obviously this has yet to occur in any collective sense some thirty years later, though it’s clearer that conscious creation could more aptly be called *conscious co-creation* or *conscious co-construction* when we take Seth’s words and factor in an integral matrix of vertical “dimensions of being” (**I-I-I**) in relation to horizontal “dimensions of being” (*our selves, our world, and how we can all get along*).

Putting Theory into Practice

“What a looooooong, strange trip it’s been.” ~ The Grateful Dead (1970)

In Parts 1-3, I challenged some of the conventional assumptions – invisible beliefs – underlying many New Age interpretations of the Seth Material. I used a multidisciplinary approach to show how the ontology of **I-I-I** is, at the very least, more complex and subtle than many realize.

I also hope to have motivated you to further develop your “high intellect” and explore this “unknown” reality of **I-I-I** further. But again, this will remain only a map – so much theory and intellectual prattle – without your own direct experience to inform it. That is, the maps presented by Seth and others are only meant to take us so far.

With this in mind, I’d like to close this series with a listing of exercises available in the Seth/Jane books, the Elias forum website, and other perennial sources all freely available on the Internet.

Also, Roger Walsh's *Essential Spirituality: The 7 Central Practices to Awaken Heart and Mind* (John Wiley & Sons, 1999), and Michael Murphy and George Leonard's *The Life We Are Given: A Long-Term Program for Realizing the Potential of Body, Mind, Heart, and Soul* (G.P. Putnam, 1995) provide systemic methods in which we can plug in various Seth, Elias, Kris, and other exercises.

Together, these resources provide a comprehensive array of introductory practices to further explore **I-I-I** within the context of *our selves, our world, and how we can all get along*.

Seth said, "All roads lead to the inner self." [67] Yet, I hope to have shown that they lead even further within **I-I-I**, to that very heart of hearts, source of sources, our own Original Face, as Zen calls it, to All-That-Is. Put another way, there are personal transformations – astral and nondual realizations – that can result with persistent practice of these exercises. Peak experiences are temporary altered states. They are the beginning of personal transformation, but serve only as "peek" experiences to quote Roger Walsh, or "divine invitations" to quote Father Thomas Keating for further growth. In other words, much more lies ahead as temporary states transform into permanent realizations.

The initial strategies introduced by Seth focused generally on developing the inner senses. According to Jane,

"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." [68]

Seth goes on to outline three basic forms of the dream/astral/subtle body that, when developed sufficiently, lead toward causal/nondual experience. Also, notice in the following excerpt that Seth repeatedly points out Rob and Jane's levels of development and how experience will deepen as they further develop their abilities.

"Now. You recall certainly the material dealing with the inner senses. Experiments and experiences using psychological time, and all projection events, deal rather directly with the use of these inner senses.

"Such experiences as projection will therefore involve you in extremely vivid movement and sensation. You may to some extent, and you should, use your critical faculties when you are projecting. However you cannot emphasize these too strongly or you will terminate the experience.

"Training will allow you to maintain the proper balance. Usually you do not use all of the inner senses in any given projection experience. Now, for this reason you see certain projections will seem entirely different than others.

“You remember that I listed briefly the three forms that you use during your projections. Now I will also say that in the first form you usually use certain inner senses; in the second form you use more of these, you see, and in the third form you make an attempt to use all of them, though very rarely is this successful.

“You should find it interesting, when you note waking or dream projections, to notice the overall form of perception that you seem to be using. You will automatically shield yourself in a large measure from stimuli that is too strong for your own rate of development. This balancing attempt may lead to an unevenness of experience during any given projection.

“As you know however, it is almost impossible for you to be aware of the full perceptions possible, for the ego would never stand for it. Oftentimes, even in simple dreams, you feel concepts, you understand a particular piece of information, without a word having been spoken.

“... You see, some experiences will be simple attempts to use the inner senses more fully. You are at a point where you can utilize these to a much larger extent. Some such experiences will appear to be projections, and as we go along I will tell you how to distinguish between them.

“You will be able to look back and see your physical body upon the bed on some occasions, and in other cases you will not be able to do this. The form that you see will allow you to have some idea of your abilities in any given projection. You may begin a projection in one form, and then project from it to another form.

“... In the first form, you can look back, and see your body. If you project from this form into another in order to intensify your experience, then from this second form you will not see your body upon the bed.

“You will be aware however of your body, and you will experience some duality. In the third form you will no longer be aware that your body is on the bed, and you will not see it.

“In the third form your experiences will be more vivid. They will involve you perhaps in other systems beside your own, and you will have little contact with your physical form. For this reason projection in the third form is the most difficult to maintain. The possibilities are truly fascinating, but there are dangers that do not exist when the other two forms are used.

“Your consciousness is far divorced from the physical organism, and it would be dangerous to stay away for any extended period of physical time. It would for example be quite possible to return to the physical body from this form, and not recognize it as your own. We would not want you to have such an experience.

There is confusion and disorientation that can occur, using this third form. You need have no worries however, since as a rule your excursions will be along the lines of your own development.

“Using this third form, there would be a tendency for you not to recognize your own physical situation. It would be difficult to carry the memories of the present [outer] ego personality with you. This third form is the vehicle of the inner self. The disorientation that it feels is the disorientation, you see, that it will feel when the physical body is deserted, or at the point of death.

“The disorientation is only temporary, and when the form is severed from the physical body, then all the memories and identity within the electromagnetic system become part of the inner self [ego], of course.

“But this is not an instantaneous process, and in any projection attempt there is no need whatsoever for this to be carried any further. This form is used however for purposes of instruction. It is used now and then to acquaint the whole personality with those circumstances that shall at one time affect it.

“There are occasions, though they are rare, when the disorientation period is completely passed, and connection with the body is therefore nearly broken. We shall not however deal with this situation. Most of your projections will be in the first and second forms.

“Usually you will project from the physical body into the first form, and then perhaps into the second form. Occasionally this will happen and you will not know it, despite all your attempts to ascertain your circumstances. There are indeed however ways and signs that tell you when you switch from one form to the other, and we shall indeed see that you know these. You should both – this is [Rob] and [Jane] now – you should both have several examples of projections within the first and second forms in the following months, if your development continues at its present rate.” [69]

Finally, there is no best way to integrate these exercises into your daily practice, but to ignore them is to remain standing in the doorway to the “unknown” reality without ever venturing within. If you’re new to this kind of thing, you could begin with *The Early Sessions*, and slowly work your way to *Seth Speaks*, then *The Nature of Personal Reality*, and finally *The “Unknown” Reality*. Yes, I know, that’s thirteen books! But, the kind of transformation we’re talking about takes years to realize, for most of us anyway, so it’s more important to be regular and persistent rather than occasional and half-hearted, after all, we get what we concentrate upon.

The books contain the sequence of concepts and exercises given to Jane, Rob, and their students. And, based upon twenty-eight years of experience, I can attest that they promote a deeper realization of **I-I-I** and what is meant when we say, “**I-I-I** create my own reality.” But don’t take

it on my say-so, dive in and find out for yourself!

Which you? Which world?

As always, your choice!

Appendix 1 – Index of Material on Constructions in The Early Sessions, Books 1-9
(With special thanks to Gregory Polson, Bob Proctor, and Susan Williams)

Construction

ES2: session 57 p. 120
ES2: session 64 p. 176
ES2: session 68 p. 215
ES2: session 72 p. 251
ES2: session 73 p. 261
ES4: session 160 p. 70
ES6: session 253 p. 115
ES6: session 266 p. 219
ES9: session 485 p. 313

Constructions

ES2: session 64 p. 173-174
ES2: session 66 p. 189, 192-193
ES2: session 67 p. 195-200
ES2: session 68 p. 210-212
ES2: session 69 p. 224-227
ES2: session 72 p. 252
ES2: session 73 p. 256-257, 260
ES2: session 84 p. 330
ES3: session 139 p. 292
ES6: session 240 p. 2
ES6: session 262 p. 191
ES6: session 265 p. 208-209

Construction of energy-idea into material object

ES2: session 63 p. 163

Construction of energy into matter

ES3: session 87 p. 87

Construction of form

ES9: session 433 p. 54

Construction of matter

ES3: session 139 p. 294

Construction of others

ES9: session 472 p. 279

Construction of physical matter

ES5: session 236 p. 317

ES6: session 266 p. 218

Construction of physical universe

ES4: session 159 p. 69

Distortive mirror constructions

ES2: session 71 p. 241

Dream constructions

ES3: session 115 p. 190

ES4: session 173 p. 165

ES6: session 259 p. 166

Dual hybrid constructions

ES3: session 92 p. 143

Idea constructions

ES1: session 5 p. 27

ES2: session 51 p. 77

ES4: session 157 p. 44

chemical propellants in,

ES7: session 302 p. 170–71

defective, cause of,

ES2: session 69, 75 p. 227, 271

by different species,

ES2: session 64, 66 p. 172–3, 191

emotion's role in,

ES8: session 334 p. 1–2

examples,

ES2: session 81 p. 304–7

ES4: session 162 p. 85–87

ES5: session 201, 222 p. 19, 199–203

ES7: session 281 p. 2

ES8: session 338 p. 17–18

expectation's effect on,

ES2: session 76, 79 p. 275–82, 294

ES6: session 253, 274 p. 114–15, 281

ES7: session 292 p. 99

ES8: session 336 p. 8–9

growth in physical reality,

ES2: session 54, 71 p. 94, 242–44

immaterial constructions,

ES2: session 67 p. 196

ES6: session 240 p. 2–6

nonphysical intervals,

ES6: session 275 p. 286–87

original intensity and age,

ES9: session 481 p. 287

in physical reality,

ES2: session 44, 49 p. 15–16, 61–62

ES2: session 51, 57 p. 73–78, 119–20

ES2: session 64, 66 p. 174–77, 189–93

ES2: session 68 p. 209–12

ES9: session 472, 509 p. 279–82, 437–39

psychological structures in,

ES2: session 75, 79 p. 268–73, 293–94

replacing “bad” constructions,

ES9: session 481 p. 287–89

requirements for,

ES2: session 81, 82 p. 305, 314–17

Physical constructions

ES2: session 66 p. 191

ES2: session 76 p. 275

ES3: session 86 p. 2

ES3: session 87 p. 9

ES3: session 88 p. 17

ES3: session 98 p. 79–80

ES3: session 115 p. 190

ES4: session 160 p. 72–79

Primary and secondary constructions

ES2: session 69 p. 228

ES2: session 71 p. 239–241

ES6: session 253 p. 113–114

ES7: session 282 p. 12
ES8: session 413 p. 298

Psychological constructions

ES2: session 75 p. 270

Unsupervised constructions

ES2: session 76 p. 277

Whole-self constructions

ES3: session 107 p. 143

Endnotes

[1] Ken Wilber, “An Integral Spirituality,” www.beliefnet.com/story/141/story_14148.html, March 08, 2004.

[2] For more information on Integral Conscious Creation, see “Integral Conscious Creation: Rocket Science for the Soul,” *The Seth Journal*, Vol. 1, 2003. See also [Integral Conscious Creation: Rocket Science for the Soul](#).

[3] Seth introduced Frameworks 1 and 2 in *The Individual and the Nature of Mass Events* (1995). Though he provided a rich outline of Framework 2, very little material was given on Frameworks 3 and 4.

“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.” (Jane Roberts, *The God of Jane*, Chapter 13, Seth on the Big Flats Affair, p. 129.)

For more on “levels of reality” (cosmology), Seth’s four frameworks of consciousness, and [Elias’ four Regional Areas](#):

[4] For more information on how Seth and Elias compare to these perennial maps, see [Elias session 1357, endnote 15](#):

See also, [What is Integral Conscious Creation?](#)

[5] Though Jane referred to this manuscript in various early books, an abridged version was published posthumously in *Seth, Dreams, and Projections of Consciousness*, Stillpoint, Walpole, NH (1986), p. 44.

[6] This reference to “individualized bits of energy” foreshadows Seth’s concepts of electromagnetic energy units (EEs) and consciousness units (CUs). They are basic nonphysical causal “units” for all energy-matter and space-time. EEs were first introduced in 1969.

“Now: the EE (electromagnetic energy) units are the forms that basic experience takes when directed by this inner self. These, then, form physical objects, physical matter. Matter, in other words, is the shape that basic experience takes when it intrudes into three dimensional systems. Matter is the shape of your dreams. Your dreams, thoughts, and emotions are literally transformed into physical matter purposefully by this inner self.

“The individual inner self, then, through constant massive effort of great creative intensity, cooperates with all other inner selves to form and maintain the physical reality that you know, so that physical reality is an offshoot or by-product of the highly conscious inner self.

“... The powers of consciousness are clearly not understood, then. Each individual has his part to play in projecting these EE units into physical actuality. Therefore, physical matter can be legitimately described as an extension of the self, as much as the physical body is a projection of the inner self.” – *The Seth Material* (1970), p.318-332

CUs were later introduced in 1974.

“We must unfortunately often deal with analogies, because they can form bridge works between concepts. There are units of consciousness, then, as there are units of matter. I do not want you to think of these units as

particles. There is a basic unit of consciousness that, expressed, will not be broken down, as once it was thought that an atom was the smallest unit and could not be broken down. The basic unit of consciousness obviously is not physical. It contains within itself innately infinite properties of expansion, development, and organization; yet within itself always maintains the kernel of its own individuality. Despite whatever organizations it becomes part of, or how it mixes with other such basic units, its own identity is not annihilated.

“It is aware energy, identified within itself as itself, not ‘personified’ but awareized. It is therefore the source of all other kinds of consciousness, and the varieties of its activity are infinite. It combines with others of its kind, forming then units of consciousness – as, mentioned often, atoms and molecules combine.

“...Their nature is the vitalizing force behind everything in your physical universe, and others as well. These units can indeed appear in several places at once, and without going through space, in your terms. Literally now, these basic units of consciousness can be in all places at once. They are in all places at once. They will not be recognized because they will always appear as something else.

“Of course they move faster than light. There are millions of them in one atom – many millions. Each of these units is aware of the reality of all others, and influences all others. In your terms these units can move forward or backward in time, but they can also move into thresholds of time with which you are not familiar.” – *The “Unknown” Reality*, Vol. 1, (1977), p. 39-45, 53-54.

[7] *Seth, Dreams, and Projections of Consciousness*, p. 46-47.

[8] The inner senses are deep intuitions or what’s commonly called the sixth sense as a complement to the five physical senses. I sometimes use the term *hyperception* to describe the same set of characteristics. Used primarily by the inner ego, the outer ego can learn to manipulate these through a spectrum of altered neurological focus that results from practicing any authentic mind/body/spirit “yoga.” Seth discussed nine in *The Seth Material* (1970) and *The Early Sessions, Books 1-2* (1997).

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]

[9] Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions, Book 1*, Session 35, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, NY, 1997, p. 278.

[10] For a further introduction see *The Early Sessions, Book 1* (1997): Session 35, 36, and 37. Also, *The Early Sessions, Book 2* (1997): Session 45, 49, 50, 54, 55, and 66.

[11] Note that the *inner ego* is roughly ontologically equivalent with the following terms: entity, source self, inner self, energy personality essence, soul, psyche.

The last two, in particular, are used in a wide variety of contexts that don’t always mean *inner ego*. For example, the psyche can

mean the sum or gestalt of outer ego, subconscious, and inner ego structures.

[12] *Adventures in Consciousness: An Introduction to Aspect Psychology* (1997), *Psychic Politics: An Aspect Psychology Book* (2000), *The God of Jane: A Psychic Manifesto* (2000). All are published by Moment Point Press, Portsmouth, NH.

[13] Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions, Book 3*, session 95, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, NY, 1998, p. 60.

[14] *Ibid*, session 96, p. 65.

[15] Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions, Book 7*, session 305, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, NY, 1999, p. 201.

[16] These are Absolute Universal Truths that impact all aspects of All-That-Is. Seth also calls them “natural laws.” These are not to be confused with root assumptions, which are local to Framework 1 constructions. The laws of the inner universe were introduced in *The Early Sessions: Book 2* (1997).

1. Value fulfillment
2. Energy transformation
3. Spontaneity
4. Durability
5. Creation
6. Consciousness
7. Capacity for infinite mobility
8. Changeability and transmutation
9. Cooperation
10. Quality depth

[17] Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions, Book 2*, session 68, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, NY, 1997, p. 208-219.

[18] *Ibid*, p. 218.

[19] *NY Times*, January 1, 2004, <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50F1FF9355A0C728CDDA80894DC404482>

[20] *Excerpt D: The Look of a Feeling: The Importance of Post/Structuralism*, 2003.
<http://wilber.shambhala.com/html/books/kosmos/excerptD/part1.cfm/>

[21] Here’s more from Seth.

“The true art of dreaming is a science long forgotten by your world. Such an art, pursued, trains the mind in a new kind of consciousness – one that is equally at home in either existence, well-grounded and secure in each. Almost anyone can become a satisfied and productive amateur in this art-science but its true fulfillment takes years of training, a strong sense of purpose, and a dedication – as does any true vocation.

“To some extent, a natural talent is a prerequisite for such a true dream-art scientist. A sense of daring, exploration, independence, and spontaneity is required. Such a work is a joy. There are some such people

who are quite unrecognized by your societies, because the particular gifts involved are given zero priority. But the talent still exists.

“... A practitioner of this ancient art learns first of all how to become conscious in normal [outer ego] terms, while in the sleep state. Then he becomes sensitive to the different subjective alterations that occur when dreams begin, happen, and end. He familiarizes himself with the symbolism of his own dreams, and sees how these do or do not correlate with the exterior symbols that appear in the waking life that he shares with others.” – *The “Unknown” Reality*, Vol. 1, p. 182.

For more on Seth’s dream-art science, see *The Dream-Art Science Sessions (700-704), Abridged*.

[22] *The Early Sessions, Book 2*, p. 208.

[23] *Ibid*, p. 239-240.

[24] Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions, Book 1*, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, N.Y., 1997, session 35, p. 281.

[25] Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions, Book 2*, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, N.Y., 1997. session 71, p. 241.

[26] Though Seth never assigned a particular Framework of consciousness to the afterdeath environment, Elias has. He uses the same basic four-part structure but calls them Regional Areas of consciousness. As such, Elias claims that Regional Area 3 is where the action of transition from physical to nonphysical focus occurs. For more information, see [Regional Area 3](#).

[27] Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions, Book 6* New Awareness Network, Manhasset, N.Y., 1999, session 253, p. 113.

[28] EEs or *electromagnetic energy units* were introduced in 1969, and CUs or *consciousness units* were introduced in 1974. For more information, see Part 1, endnote 6. Coincidentally, Elias calls CUs [links of consciousness \(LCs\)](#).

[29] For an introduction to Wilber’s twenty tenets of holons, see:

<http://www.esalenctr.org/display/confpage.cfm?confid=10&pageid=113&pgtype=1>

[30] Mark Edwards, *A Brief History of Holons*, The World of Ken Wilber website, <http://www.integralworld.net/edwards13.html>, March 02, 2004.

For those interested, here are some further implications of using holons in an integral theory of consciousness:

“...The holons construct is so critically important to the utility of the Integral model because it enables the [integral] framework to be focused on any point in the holarchy or, to put it another way, it enables any developmental event to be analysed in terms of an Integral methodology. As such, the concept of the ‘holon’ does away with the endless quest of trying to find the fundamental parts or wholes that constitute reality and it releases us from the basis mythologies inherent in materialistic, mentalistic, animistic, relativistic, or idealistic conceptions of reality. Quantum physics, that most advanced of all natural sciences, now overtly recognises the completely mythological nature of ‘matter’ (Davies & Gribble, 1992), and of ideas that regard reality as simply permutations of solid substance, empty space, and linear time. The [integral] model, when it is used as an interpretive schema, extends this demythologising awareness across all explanatory systems (including itself) and brings to the fore the holarchic and developmental nature of reality. With the idea of a nested holarchy of holons, Wilber has opened a vision of reality that does not fall into the errors associated with various forms of reductionism, elevationism or relativism. In bringing Koesler’s holon concept into his model, Wilber has not only opened up the possibility of a truly open-ended Theory of Everything but also a systematic theoretical approach towards any thing/process/event.

“...It is my opinion that Ken Wilber’s Integral theory is the only philosophical/epistemological/ theoretical framework that attempts to present a comprehensive understanding of the complex and multi-layered reality that we see about us. One of the most attractive central features of Integral theory is that it does not rely on

ontological reductionism to simplify that complexity, as do many other branches of science. The neurologist and the medical specialist reduce the human to the biochemical with their unit of study being the chemical compound. The behaviourist reduces the human to physical action with their unit of study being the behavioural stimulus-response cycle. The cognitivist reduces the human to the world of behaviour and thought with their basic unit of explanation being the pattern of thought, belief or feeling. The evolutionist reduces it to reproductive advantage with the locus of explanation being the adaptive interaction between environment and phenotype. The sociologist reduces the human to the world of interpersonal relations and group dynamics with their focus of explanation being the social event. The humanist reduces the human to the world of being and identity with authenticity in word and deed being their centre of interest. The transpersonalist reduces, or more correctly elevates, the human to the world of spirit and finds explanation in the analysis of the mystical event.”

[31] For more on holons in relation to conscious creation, see *The Dream-Art Science Sessions (700-704), Abridged*:

[32] Jane Roberts, *The “Unknown” Reality*, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, CA, 1996, Session 701, p. 39-40.

[33] *Ibid*, p. 54.

[34] Elias uses the same four basic divisions of consciousness as Seth. Seth calls them Frameworks of consciousness. Elias uses the term Regional Areas. He claims that his native focus occurs within RA4.

“I am Elias. I am an energy personality essence. I occupy an area of consciousness which shall be known to you henceforth as Regional Area 4. In this realm, I occupy a position of teaching. I am in conjunction with many other essences which are also in the capacity of teaching. I speak to you in response to you all in your questioning of this shift in consciousness, which is occurring upon your planet within this time framework in this present now, in which you are all involved.” [session 270, March 19, 1998]

[35] Jane Roberts, *Seth Speaks*, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, CA, 1994, session 540, p. 144-145. This material is from Chapter 10, “Death” Conditions in Life.

[36] *Ibid*, p. 145.

[37] *Ibid*, p. 145-146.

[38] Seth provides an exercise to develop our inner senses. See *Seth Speaks*, Learning to Use the Inner Senses, session 522, p.56-7.

[39] *Ibid*, p. 146.

[40] *Ibid*, p. 146-147.

[41] Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions, Book 7*, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, N.Y., 1999, p. 240-241.

[42] Jane Roberts, *The Individual and the Nature of Mass Events*, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, CA, 1995, p. viii.

[43] Jane Roberts, *The Seth Material*, Buccaneer Books, Cutchogue, NY, p. 275-276.

[44] Jane Roberts, *The Nature of the Psyche: Its Human Expression*, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, CA, 1995, session 799, p. 212-215.

[45] *Ibid*, p. 216-217.

[46] *Ibid*, p. 217.

[47] This is a variation of a phrase coined by Tom Bauer on the Sethnet email list in April, 2003, “there is no create without co-create.” However, the concept of co-creation in relation to conscious creation or “you create your own reality” had been introduced by Seth in ESP class as far back as 1968, and was first published in *The “Unknown” Reality*, Vol. 1 & 2 (1977/1979).

“You are co-creators. What you call God is the sum of all consciousness and yet the whole is more than the sum of its parts. God is more than the sum of all personalities, and yet all personalities is what He is. There is constant creation, but peace is to be found in creation. There is a force within you that allows you to breathe. There is a force within you that knew how to grow you from a fetus to a grown adult. This force is part of the innate knowledge within all consciousness and it is a part of the God within you.” – *ESP Class*, March 12, 1968.

“You will learn that you are a part of the web-work of consciousness. You will learn to be conscious co-creators. You will learn, or you will destroy the planet which you now inhabit! And if you do, your consciousness will begin in another reality. You will learn to recognize within yourselves the joy and the true reality of being. You will learn to distinguish between the reality of joy and pseudo-realities that you have created, or you will begin again. But you will learn. You are indeed as blessed as any god and as gifted. When you learn to honor yourselves, you will be free. And you will create with joy and spontaneity when you recognize that within the leaf of a flower the consciousness that is within it, and relate it to yourself, and honor it and treat it as a little brother, you will be free.” – *ESP Class*, March 17, 1970.

“Creativity is always discontent – and always about new surprises. Therefore, the entity itself is never completed. You are learning to be conscious co-creators. But you do not always know what the creation, in your terms, will be.” – *ESP Class*, March 17, 1970.

“I have said to you before, using, if you will forgive me, your terms, that you are the black sheep of the universe, because you will no longer blame gods or devils nor circumstances for those effects in your life that you do not like, nor bow down to gods, devils or circumstances in praise for those good conditions that you have yourselves created. That therefore you will become conscious co-creators with an All-That-Is that has little to do with the puny concepts in which God has been entrapped for centuries, as far as your religions and myths are concerned. For those myths have also trapped you who believe in them.” – *ESP Class*, March 26, 1974.

“You have chosen a different kind of consciousness. That kind of consciousness necessitated different kinds of challenges, so that with your new kind of mind, you would come to different crossroads. You would forget what the animals knew, but with a different kind of consciousness, you would triumphantly then become aware, but in a different way, of the animals’ blessed knowledge and use it again in new terms as conscious co-creators. You have not as yet reached that level but you are working. That is in partial answer to your question.

“There is a great conscious revelation that in all probability can come to each of you and to those of your species in which you understand the nature of your own race and your relationship with All-That-Is within the reality that you know. And then you will realize many things, when you do not define your existence as physical only. Then you will not feel that you should agree, or because you feel that your immortality is dependent upon the seed that falls from you into the earth. You will recognize your own immortality and therefore be free and joyous in your mortality. And you will gracefully take your part as co-creators at a conscious level with all the conscious and unconscious beings that dwell within your physical reality.” – *ESP Class*, June 11, 1974.

“You are all multi-dimensional realities. You are learning to use your consciousness to become conscious co-creators of your own reality. Some of you this evening, after class, will be involved in some adventures that I hope you will remember.” – *ESP Class*, August 31, 1971.

“Your eyes and your eyelashes, being individual, express the individuality of All-That-Is. No snowflakes are alike. No person is alike. Through the manifestation of individuality does All-That-Is express its being. To be yourself you are, in your terms, what God is. And in your way, you become a conscious creator. You are co-creators whether you know it or not. You are creators whether you know it or not. You are created and you create whether you know it or not. You can learn to be conscious co-creators. You form your reality. You can do this consciously. Even when you choose to think in terms of a nebulous, beneficial, divine oneness in which you hope to hide your being, and lose it.” – *ESP Class*, January 22, 1974.

“Even when you lost sight – as you knew you would – of those deep [inner] connections, they would continue to operate until, in its own way, man’s consciousness could rediscover the knowledge and put it to use – deliberately and willfully, thereby bringing that consciousness to flower. In your terms this would represent a great leap, for the egotistically aware individual would fully comprehend unconscious knowledge and act on his own, out of choice. He would become a conscious co-creator. Obviously, this has not as yet occurred.” – *The “Unknown” Reality*, Vol. 1, session 688.

“Cherish the gifts of the gods. Don’t be so anxious to throw your individuality back into their faces, saying, ‘I’m sick to death of myself and of my individuality; it burdens me.’ Even one squirrel’s consciousness, suddenly thrown into the body of another of its kind, would feel a sense of loss, encounter a strangeness, and know in the sacredness of its being that something was wrong. Wear your individuality proudly. It is the badge of your godhood. You are a god living a life – being, desiring, creating. Through honoring yourself, you honor whatever it is God is, and become a conscious co-creator.” – *The “Unknown” Reality*, Vol. 2, Ap. 15.

Furthermore, the concept of co-creation had been discussed earlier on the list dating back to at least June 2002. Even earlier, Elias had begun discussing the nature of co-creation in relation to individual conscious creation in [session 713, October 22, 2000](#).

Finally, my larger discussion of this concept, in the context of the ontology of the “you” who creates 100% of your reality, incorporates Ken Wilber’s holonic theory (there are no parts without wholes, there is no agency without communion, no competition without cooperation, etc.) which was first published in *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality* (1995), The concept of holons (whole/parts) were introduced by Arthur Koestler in *The Ghost in the Machine* (1967).

[48] *The “Unknown” Reality*, Session 701, p. 187-188.

[49] Paul M. Helfrich, *Ken Wilber’s Model of Human Development: An Overview*, version 3.0, January 27, 2004.

[50] Ken Wilber, *Boomeritis*, Shambhala, Boston, MA, 2002, p. 36-37.

[51] *Boomeritis*, p. 334-338.

[52] *Psyweb.com*, February 23, 2004, <http://www.psyweb.com/Mdisord/napd.html>

[53] *Boomeritis*, p.328-330.

[54] Elias forum website, [session 1252, January 18, 2003](#).

[55] From the *Kris Chronicles* website by Serge Grandbois and Mark Bukator:

[56] Jane Roberts, *Seth Speaks*, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, CA, 1994, p. 77-79.

It’s also interesting to note that Seth stopped using the term “inner ego” in *Seth Speaks* and thereafter. It was relegated to the early sessions (1-510), and Seth used the terms “entity,” “soul,” “inner self”, and “energy personality essence” to refer to essentially the same over all structure. Jane would later use the term “source self” to refer to the same structure in her three Aspects Psychology books (see Part 1, endnote 12).

[57] *Boomeritis*, p. 184.

[58] I’ve been the List Administrator for the Sethnet email list since October 1998. There are plenty of examples in the archives where people invoke “Seth said” as an Absolute Universal Truth, in spite of the fact he stated early on that he was not to be considered an infallible source like the Pope in the Vatican (see session 47, *The Early Sessions*, Vol. 2). I have done this in the past, too, so I know the symptoms well and it’s much easier to spot when you’ve been there yourself. While the particulars of Sethism are beyond the scope of this article, I will be addressing it in the future.

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/sethnet/>

[59] For more info on Wilber's model in relation to channeling and the Seth material, see *The Dream-Art Science Sessions (700-704), Abridged*.

[60] For more information on these two Eliasian concepts, see the Elias forum website: [alternate selves](#) | [aspects of essence](#).

[61] Ken Wilber, *Introduction to Volume Eight of The Collected Works*, Shambhala website, http://wilber.shambhala.com/html/books/cowokev8_intro.cfm/, February 12, 2004.

“And on my own tombstone, I dearly hope that someday they will write: He was true but partial....”

[62] Jane Roberts, *ESP Class*, October 21, 1969.

[63] Jane Roberts, *The “Unknown” Reality*, Vol. 2, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, CA, 1996, session 688, p. 408.

“Actually, the intellect and intuitions go hand in hand. In Ruburt's [Jane's] experience, the two finally began to work together as they should. What I call the high intellect then took over, a superb blend of intuitional and intellectual abilities working together so that they almost seem to form a new faculty (intently).

“The development freed Ruburt from many old limitations, and allowed him to at last have practical experience with the unknown reality in intimate terms.”

[64] Jane Roberts, *ESP Class*, January 22, 1974.

[65] Jane Roberts, *ESP Class*, June 11, 1974.

[66] Jane Roberts, *The “Unknown” Reality*, Vol. 1, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, CA, 1996, session 688, p. 100.

[67] Seth Network International, *1996 Membership Gift*, ESP class session July 30, 1974, p.1.

[68] Jane Roberts, *The Seth Material*, Engle-wood Cliffs, NJ, 1970, p. 276.

[69] Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions*, Book 6, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, NY, p. 238-241.