



**DAVID  
YOUNG**

**THE  
DIVINE PATTERN**

**The First Book in the Consequences Trilogy**

THE DIVINE PATTERN

**DAVID YOUNG**

**THE  
DIVINE  
PATTERN**

THE FIRST BOOK IN THE CONSEQUENCES TRILOGY

© David Young. 1993

This work is copyright. Apart from fair dealing for the purpose of criticism or review as permitted by the Copyright Act 1968, it is against the law to reproduce any part of it by any means whatsoever without the written permission of the author.

First published 1993                      Jarrahdale Press  
Second edition 1995                      Sphinx Print  
Third edition 2004 Young Claire Pty.Ltd  
Fourth edition 2008 Almyne Pty. Ltd.

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in-Publication entry: Young,  
(David John). 1943- .  
The Divine Pattern.  
Bibliography  
ISBN 1 87551105 9

Spirituality. 2. Spiritual life. 3. Philosophy and religion. 1. Title.

Published on line by Almyne Pty

Email [daviy@westnet.com.au](mailto:daviy@westnet.com.au)

Original cover artwork by Chris Nicholas

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>PARADOX</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>THINKING</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>LOGIC</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<b>CREATIVITY</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<b>TIME</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<b>POWER</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 8</b>	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<b>SCIENCE</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 9</b>	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<b>ECONOMICS</b>	

**CHAPTER 10** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**RELIGION**

**CHAPTER 11** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**LAW**

**CHAPTER 12** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**BUREAUCRACY**

**CHAPTER 13** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**LOVE**

**CHAPTER 14** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**REALITY, ILLUSION AND CONSCIOUSNESS**

**CHAPTER 15** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**FINDING INNER KNOWING**

**CHAPTER 16** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**THE DIVINE PATTERN**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

# INTRODUCTION

My qualifications for writing this book are experiential.

I have experienced in one form or another, everything I have written about.

I spent my childhood in immediate post-war East London. It was not a particularly deprived childhood except that all children from that area and time experienced deprivation from the aftermath of the World War without knowing it. My parents' expectations were that I would learn enough at school to get a proper job. I gathered that meant working on a production line for fifty years and then getting a gold watch and pension. In this respect I have failed miserably.

My first marriage took place when I was twenty, immediately prior to migrating to Australia. Three years later I was divorced. For the next few years I wandered around Australia, working mostly as a draftsman, while I learnt how to fly.

I then worked as a commercial pilot and flying instructor until my second marriage. During the sixteen years of that marriage I learnt how to be a good co-dependant. During that time, as well as fathering three children, I also worked my way through university to become an architect.

By 1987 I had become involved in a rather shady business, buying and renovating pubs. Shady because it was some time before I realised that the managing director had sold shares in the company many times over, and that I owned 22.5 percent of nothing. Another director and I sought justice through the legal system until at last we had the 'managing director' cornered. We knew he would find some way to get out of it. He did. He died.

At the time I had completed six units towards a Master of Business Administration degree. This was put on hold while I got divorced again.

Early in 1988 I found my way to Holyoake (The Australian Institute for Alcohol and Addictions), and completed the co-dependants program there. This was my introduction to self-help and personal growth work. Later I completed the group facilitator training program at Holyoake. For a while I worked with co-dependants, and later transferred to the ACA (Adult Children of Alcoholics) program.

In 1990 I returned to university with the intention of completing my MBA. The first unit was statistics. This I find to be a simplistic subject, but for some reason I struggled. When I went into the final exam I was faced with a paper that even though I knew all the material, for some reason I couldn't start. I tried a short meditation and asked the question 'Why can't I do this paper?' The answer came straight back that I didn't need to be there and I didn't want to be there. I quit my MBA studies there and then.

Instead of completing my MBA I wrote "The Consequences Trilogy". It seemed a much more useful thing to do.

\* \* \*

Throughout my life I have seen the people I care about destroy themselves with drugs, alcohol and greed. It has taken me a long time to realise that it was not they who were sick. Rather they have been the victims of a sick society - society built on addictions and greed.

I am not, of course, the first to discover this. It has been known since at least 1925 when Rudolf Dreikurs wrote the following:

The consequences of a mental illness depend on the social milieu of the patient. One of the essential characteristics of psychopathy is the diminished ability to adapt to given conditions and the low resistance to unfavourable influences. In this way, concern with extra-mural care led to Social Psychiatry. Its task was not only to determine the influence of social conditions upon the development of a mental disease and the course it took, but also to examine the social significance the disease posed. This was particularly true for psychopathic disturbances which constituted primary social malfunctioning.

(Turner & Pew, 1978)

What an indictment of modern society to say that people become mentally ill when they can no longer resist its bad influence. A major part of *The Divine Pattern* is looking at the sickness of a society that views everything back to front. The sickness is to see everything as being external when true knowing comes from within. Once the world is seen from the viewpoint of inner knowing, rather than as a reaction to outside physical factors, the whole world changes.

I know from experience, mine and that of people I have worked with, that the mainstay of recovery from all types of addictions is the belief in the concept of a higher power, that somehow there is a higher power that gives meaning to the seemingly meaningless experience of modern living. Whatever the concept of this higher power, call it spiritual, religious, or plain intuition, it comes from within.

This book is a result of that search for meaning. My experience has been that the major problem for many people is the separation of the physical and the spiritual aspects of their lives. People either totally deny the existence of a spiritual life or separate the spiritual out to mean church on

Sunday mornings. Whatever the source of our inner knowing, if we separate it from our physical lives we have problems.

The two extremes are the total megalomania of physical force and the 'mystic' sitting on top of a mountain for sixty years believing that they have found peace. It is more likely that what the mystic finds is total apathy. Our inner knowing is not separate from our physical being; it is an essential part of it if we are to live fulfilling lives.

*The Divine Pattern* centres on what happens when the physical and spiritual worlds are seen as separate, and the pain and suffering caused by that separation.

\* \* \*

What I have been searching for is a spiritual base that is entirely integrated with the physical world. A spiritual base that is a practical way of living. No separation between the spiritual and the physical.

The failure of Christianity and other religions for me has been that God has been placed 'out there' and we are down here. Totally separate. The corner stone of Christianity has been the separation of the human race and God. We are but poor sinners here on earth and God is up there counting our sins so that we can be punished later. I don't like that idea very much.

*The Divine Pattern* is an integrated spiritual philosophy. A corner stone of this philosophy is that there is no right or wrong, only consequences. Why that has to be the case comes later, but for now it means that the true test of *The Divine Pattern* is whether or not it works. For me it works. That is essential. The only test of a spiritual concept is whether it works in the physical world.

\* \* \*

The easiest way of explaining *The Divine Pattern* is to relate how it was formulated.

During a particularly peaceful meditation, I became aware of a pattern of enormous beauty. The pattern was whole, complete and in perfect balance at any instant, each part being in a particular place simply because that was where it needed to be.

I could see only part of the pattern, but I was aware that it had to extend forever in all directions and in all dimensions. The pattern was perfectly still and at complete peace with itself. However, new elements were constantly being added to the pattern and, as each new element joined, the pattern instantly changed to maintain perfect balance.

Changes occurred without resistance of any sort. Each part just knew where

its new position was and instantly went there. The feeling of the pattern was one of complete harmony, with an underlying sense of intelligence beyond comprehension.

That meditation resulted in major changes in my life, but still something about the pattern eluded me. I had missed something of great importance.

The part of the pattern that had eluded me fell into place when I read Wayne Dyer's book *You'll See it When You Believe it*. I had been reading about synchronicity. I knew that synchronicity worked - my life was full of synchronicity - and yet there was something about it that was not quite in place. Then came the connection between synchronicity and the pattern in my meditation. Of course synchronicity had to exist. Every time a new element is added to the pattern all the other parts of the pattern had to move in a synchronised way to maintain balance.

Dyer talks of synchronicity in these terms:

The term synchronicity was first used by Carl Jung. He spent his life attempting to unravel the mysterious threads that seem to wind together in a pattern that is impossible for us, in form, to decipher. He described synchronicity as 'the simultaneous occurrence of two meaningful but not causally connected events'. He hypothesised that a collaboration exists between people and events that seem somehow to involve fate, and that is always operating in the universe.

(Dyer, 1989)

Since Newton formulated the uniform laws of motion man has attempted, without success, to find a mathematical model for perfect balance within the Universe. Suppose that this balance exists, not as a mathematical balance, but as a spiritual balance? That is the Divine Pattern, a spiritual balance between all things that cannot be separated from the physical world because the spiritual balance exists in the physical world.

The problems that we, the human race, experience in the world stem from trying to go against the natural balance of the Universe. We try to separate ourselves from God and then act as if we are god. Throughout this book I will use a lower case g for god where it denotes the individual trying to be god.

*The Divine Pattern* looks at the various ways that we foul up in the physical world when we try to separate ourselves from the Universe.

The second book in the Consequences Trilogy, *Genesis and Janus*, looks at the separation within our own brains that causes us to see the spiritual and physical as separate, and how to heal the separation.

The third book in the Consequences Trilogy, *God Wants to be Human*, looks at the separation of the human race from the Universe, and how to heal that separation. I prefer to use the term Universe rather than 'God' because it is all encompassing, whilst 'God', the word, has become severely limited by religious dogma.

For now the subject is how we foul up in the physical world by ignoring our inner knowing.

# CHAPTER 1

## PARADOX

The way to personal power is to accept powerlessness. The way to abundance is to detach from the material. If someone special is to remain in our life they need to be free to leave.

Paradox after paradox emerges from personal growth and metaphysical inquiry. At least that is the way it seems to be. The greatest paradox of all is that there is no paradox. All paradox comes from the belief that there is separation between the physical self and the spiritual self.

When we believe ourselves to be physical, and only physical, then all information is processed as a reaction to outside influences. Information that comes in about outside events is processed from a defensive stance of fear, shame and aloneness. Our reaction is to throw our response defiantly back at the world. Separation of the physical and the spiritual being that each of us is, results in feelings of fear and shame. Bradshaw (1988) offers the best illustration of this with the story of Adam and Eve. The forbidden fruit that Adam and Eve ate, was the belief in separation; after they ate it they saw themselves as naked and were ashamed. To believe in separation is to live a life of nakedness and shame that needs defending. We can only see ourselves as naked if we see ourselves as separate from our common spirituality.

Where there is no separation of self, information from outside is carried through our physical being to The Garden of Eden within. Then answers based on inner knowing come back to the physical being and we act on these answers in the outside world.

In the first case, answers are a reaction to a seemingly hostile environment, whilst in the second they come from within, as guidance rather than reaction. Is it any wonder then that, with 'answers' coming from opposite directions, there is an appearance of paradox?

The basic problem is that we, the human race, work back to front. Something happens outside, we make a judgement in the cognitive brain that the event is good or bad, and then apply a standard answer to the event. No free will. We just react to everything that happens with a standard right-or-wrong decision, and the consequences that follow are beyond our control.

War is an automatic consequence of judging right and wrong. So are greed, poverty and prejudice. We have no free will to change the consequence until we forget right and wrong.

If the event is seen without judgement we can then decide what consequences we want, and our inner knowing will guide us to those consequences.

The judgement of right and wrong is a barrier between the physical world and ourselves. We are not our brains, we are not our belief system, we are who we are: the ghost in the machine. When our brains make judgements about right and wrong we cannot be heard. The brain simply does not allow our will to be heard in the physical world.

Paradox. We do what we 'think' is right and the results are not what we want. Everybody is right; nobody gets what they want. This is the result of back-to-front thinking. We never get what we want; we can never be happy.

Working the other way around that changes. The first thing that changes is that the person is free to decide what they really want rather than what the outside world tells them they should want. That is a major step forward. The ghost in the machine now controls the machine; no longer is it the machine trying to control the outside world without reference to the self (another name for the ghost in the machine).

Having found that what we really want is often quite different from what we are told we want, we can decide how to bring about the consequences we do want. Often what we need to do is opposite to what we think we should do. Follow your intuition.

Paradox. Intuition is seen as a funny sort of feeling from within that attempts to guide us. It is seen somehow as a mysterious thing. Sort of psychic. The reality is that intuition is not at all mysterious; it is the self trying to get past all the mind chatter of right and wrong. We do not have intuition, we are our intuition, and once the self has been set free we become our intuition, guided at all times.

## THE DIVINE PATTERN

When I write about 'inner knowing' I am writing about the true self trying to get past the right and wrong of the brain.

## CHAPTER 2

### THINKING

God does not think. When Edward De Bono made that statement to a group of school teachers in Ireland (De Bono, 1987), he was greeted with derision. The logic behind the idea that God does not think is impeccable. Since the purpose of thinking is to move from one place to another, God does not have to think since God is already there. Infinite intelligence just does not have to think, since that intelligence already knows everything.

Because we think in a particular way, there is the belief that we always thought this way and that we always will. We did not always use the thought processes we employ now. It seems likely that at one stage we did not 'think' as we know it. We just 'knew'.

What the world was like is illustrated by the following story from Chaung tzu *When life was full and there was no history*.

In an age when life was full, no one paid any special attention to worthy men, nor did they single out the man of ability. Rulers were simply the highest branches on the tree, and the people were like deer in the woods. They were honest and righteous without realising that they were 'doing their duty'. They loved each other and did not know that this was 'love of neighbour'. They deceived no one, yet they did not know that they were 'men to be trusted'. They were reliable and did not know that this was 'good faith'. They lived freely together giving and taking, and did not know that they were generous. For this reason their deeds have not been narrated. They made no history.

(cited Wicks, 1988)

We have no history of this age simply because history is a chronicle of conflict. No conflict existed. We can, however, piece together evidence that such an age did exist.

The term 'bicameral mind' is used in this book because I quote from *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*, by Julian Jaynes, and the term is used in that book. In the context of this book it is used to represent the age when we did not 'think', we just 'knew'. It represents the age when the true self was in control and the cognitive brain worked under the direction of the self. This was the age before the brain invented right and wrong and usurped the power of self. This was the age before we became prisoners of our own brains.

In one part of his book Jaynes gives a picture of the 'bicameral' world similar to Chaung Tzu's story (cited Wicks). Unfortunately Jaynes contradicts this in other parts of his book when he relates consciousness to the post-bicameral mind, and the bicameral mind to hallucinations and schizophrenia. This is shown in the following:

He would have to wait for his bicameral voice which with the stored-up admonitory wisdom of his life would tell him non consciously what to do.

And:

But what were such auditory hallucinations like? Some people find it difficult to even imagine that there can be mental voices that are heard with the same experiential quality as externally produced voices.

(Jaynes, 1982)

One of the ideas I want to use is Jaynes's concept that the bicameral mind saw itself as having a personal god that guided it, and that the personal god carried messages back and forth to the God of everything. All was one. How about the idea that the 'personal god' was the self?

Why is it difficult to imagine mental voices? We all have self-talk. We think in language, or at least the cognitive brain does, so why are internal voices so hard to imagine? Jaynes can only be talking about a voice seen as separate from the brain. It could well be that the voice would have been the self telling the brain what the self wanted the brain to do. That sounds like a perfectly satisfactory arrangement to me; the self deciding what it wanted and telling the brain what to do.

The breakdown came when each saw themselves as separate from the self. A contradiction in terms but accurate. The idea of right and wrong somehow got into the cognitive brain and the brain started making decisions for itself without waiting for the directions of the self (the invention of the I concept). To make up for the loss of their personal god (the self) each became their own god. Jaynes appears to see this as the beginnings of consciousness. I see it as a change in the state of consciousness from an 'inner knowing' consciousness to an externally based consciousness.

Because the self is connected to the Universe, as soon as the cognitive brain starts making decisions based on right and wrong the connection to the Universe via the self is lost. As soon as the connection with the Universe was lost we started acting independently for our own self interest rather than collectively for the best interests of everybody.

The brain now makes its own decisions. To account for the fact that it is now acting independently of the self it has to invent a reason to account for its apparent independence from the self, and call itself 'I'; and to account for its apparent separation from the Universe came to believe that it was god in its own right. Thus the 'I-god' comes into being.

The 'I-god' is known by many names - ego, command self and others. In *Genesis and Janus* it is called the false self.

\* \* \*

The same event is chronicled in the story of Adam and Eve. I am using the *Bible* here as an historical reference, not to 'push' any particular religious conviction.

NOW the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which

the Lord God had made. And he said to the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

2 And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden:

3 But of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it lest ye die:

4 And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die:

5 For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.

6 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.

7 And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.

(Genesis 3, KJV)

When your eyes are open you will become as gods. When the concept of 'I' was invented we each became our own god. The 'original sin' of Adam and Eve could be seen as inventing the concept of 'I'.

The original Jewish *Book of J.* version of Adam and Eve translates slightly differently than the *Bible* version. One of the changes is that 'Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it lest ye die:' has been substituted for 'You can't eat from it, you can't touch - without death touching you' (*Book of J.* translated Rosenberg). Death indeed did touch the self: it became a prisoner of the brain.

Also 'And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat' is, in the *Book of J.* 'Now the woman sees how good the tree looks to eat from, how lovely to the eyes, lively to the mind'. The self becomes a prisoner when the mind becomes lively. Inventing right and wrong is the original sin, or error, because it makes the brain lively and the self a prisoner.

This is the problem. The brain is not supposed to be lively; it is supposed to be passive. The Brain is supposed to follow the directions of the self. As soon as the brain becomes lively it thinks it is the self, and the true self is ignored.

\* \* \*

According to the story of Adam and Eve, it was the female of our species who first invented the concept of 'I'. Robert A. Johnson's books *He* and *She* look at the psyches of the male and the female of our species. Of the two, it seems that the male is considerably more 'innocent' than the female psyche. An interesting speculation is that the difference between the male and female psyches could be related to the difference in time between the invention of the 'I' by the male and the female.

The three stages of the development of the male psyche, as given by Johnson, could be seen as a map for the development of consciousness in the human species. In the young male there is unconscious innocence. Then there occurs an event that causes a loss of innocence (the 'Fisher King wound'). After the Fisher King wound, the male lives a life of conscious duality trying to find a way back to innocence. Finally, with luck and the right circumstances, the male becomes consciously innocent. If not, the male becomes a crusty old man.

Is this the direction that the human race is taking? First the unconscious innocence of the bicameral mind, then the conscious duality of the 'modern' mind. The future for the human race is either to find conscious innocence or to destroy itself.

\* \* \*

Returning to the loss of innocence of the human race: what was the 'changeover' period from the bicameral mind to the modern mind like? Jaynes uses the Iliad extensively to illustrate his concepts:

The characters of the Iliad do not sit down and think out what they must do. They have no conscious minds such as we say we have, and certainly no introspections. It is impossible for us with our

subjectivity to appreciate what it was like. When Agamemnon, king of men, robs Achilles of his mistress, it is a god that grasps Achilles by his yellow hair and warns him not to strike Agamemnon (1:197ff). It is a god who then rises out of the grey sea and consoles him in his tears of wrath on the beach by his black ships, a god who whispers low to Helen to sweep her heart with homesick longing, a god who hides Paris in a mist in front of the attacking Menelaus, a god who tells Glaucus to take bronze for gold (6:234ff), a god who leads the armies into battle, who speaks to each soldier at the turning points, who debates and teaches Hector what he must do, who urges the soldiers on or defeats them by casting them in spells or drawing mists over their visual fields. It is the gods who start quarrels among men (4:43ff.) that really cause the war (3:164ff.), and then plan its strategy (2:56ff.). It is the one god who makes Achilles promise not to go into battle, another who urges him to go, and another who then clothes him in golden fire reaching across the bloodied trenches to the Trojans, rousing in them an ungovernable panic. In fact, the gods take the place of consciousness.

(Jaynes, 1982)

In contradiction to other parts of his book, where the bicameral world is said have been extremely peaceful, Jaynes uses this passage to illustrate an entirely different place. Does this passage really illustrate the workings of the bicameral mind?

I don't think so. Rather it illustrates what was happening when the brain had become lively and had invented the concept of 'I' but the self was still conscious: doing battle with the 'I'. We were stuck in the middle, not knowing which self was the true self.

The result is the conscious and the unconscious mind. We try to probe the secrets of the unconscious mind and cannot. Or that is the way it seems. The opposite is true. The unconscious is the self, a prisoner of the 'I'-god. The unconscious is only unconscious because if it became conscious. The 'I'-god would have to admit that it is only a figment of its own imagination, and that the 'I' was not god. The paradox is that the unconscious is very conscious, but the 'I'-god ignores it.

You know about denial? Pretending that something that we don't want to know about doesn't exist? Addicts who can deny they are addicts even though all the physical evidence proves that they are? The unconscious mind is the ultimate in denial. Anything that we don't want to know about becomes unconscious. We do not want to know that there is a power greater than ourselves so we deny it and make it unconscious. Unconscious to the

'I'-god only. The unconscious is very conscious and is aware of everything that is happening with us and with the Universe. But in our efforts to be god we deny its existence. The only thing the 'I'-god is fooling is the 'I'-god - the puny little 'I'-god whose only defence against anything greater than itself is to pretend that it doesn't exist.

This is what the spiritual journey is about - learning to let go of the denial that stops the unconscious (to the 'I'-god) becoming conscious. In that unconscious lies the self, and the connection to the Universe. Within each of us lies the answer to all things and the connection with all that is. To have access to those answers, and to have the connection, we need to stop denying that we already have them.

The paradox of the spiritual journey is that it is a search for what we already have.

\* \* \*

That there was a change in the way we think is beyond doubt. It is documented by several cultures, Western and Eastern. As a final illustration of the change in the thinking of humanity, the following comes from *Ten Religions of the East* :

According to the Taoists, the first to tamper with men's hearts and minds was the Yellow Ancestor when he taught goodness and duty, which were the virtues preached centuries later by Confucius and his followers. In obedience to these teachings the Sage Kings Yao and Shun slaved for their people until there was no hair on their shanks and no fuzz on their thighs, and they wore out their guts in endless acts of goodness and duty and depleted their energies in establishing laws and regulations for the populace. But none of these made the people good; tyrants, robbers, thieves and brigands abounded, charlatans and honest men fought with each other, and in short, bad went to worse.

The philosophers confused themselves about joy and anger, deceived themselves about stupidity and wisdom, criticised themselves about good and evil, and maligned themselves about falsehood and truth, the world began to decline. Excellence in all its grandeur lost its equality, and life itself slipped away. The world grew fond of know-how, and the people sought to exhaust it. Axes and saws served as laws, plumb lines determined death, awl and chisels formed

judgements. The world went straight to pieces,  
the Chuang tzu says.

(Rice, 1978)

The same thing in different words from a different culture. We formed judgements and the world went straight to pieces.

\* \* \*

The 'I' tries to take on a job for which it is not equipped. Even if its intentions are good it still fouls up. It fouls up initially by trying to define good and bad, and then by trying to impose these definitions on the world in a god-like manner.

The destructive nature of the 'I'-god is apparent in today's world. Since 'I' is a god, it needs to god over something or someone. And so it attempts to dominate. Unfortunately, since all 'I's are gods there is no one to dominate except other 'I's, and so we end up in a world full of gods running around doing atrocious things to each other, all in the name of right and wrong.

If an 'I'-god cannot dominate it will become very passive, looking for a strong 'I'-god to look after it and provide all the answers. Some 'I'-gods turn to addictions to give them a sense of dominating. Alcohol, drugs and sex are the most obvious, but there are many more: power, work, relationships, religion, sport, knowledge, money to name a few.

Some 'I'-gods use a parody of thinking to show their dominance. These are called 'describers' by De Bono (1987). Some years ago I read an account of the work of some researchers in New York. It seems that they spent many months and many thousands of dollars studying the attitudes and performance of a group of office workers. After much correlating, analysing and writing, the researchers came to the conclusion that workers who enjoyed their work performed better than those who did not enjoy their work. Thus describers assert their dominance in the strange world of academia. The 'I'-god expects that by studying each item in isolation it will somehow come to understand the whole.

\* \* \*

In contrast, aboriginal people (used in the sense of original inhabitants of land) throughout the world seem to have a common propensity to view all things as related. There are things that are known, things that are unknown, but all is related.

Knudtson and Suzuki in their book *Wisdom of the Elders* contrast the difference between the scientific view and the aboriginal view with particular reference to the ecology. Throughout there is a common theme in the aboriginal view that all things are related, that the human race is part of the earth and related to all animal and plant life on this planet. There is a spiritual connection between all things, known and unknown. It is easy for 'civilised' races to dismiss aboriginal myths: we know that if something is unknown then it does not exist. That is part of our mythology. There is an obvious difference in the way the two groups think.

Bone dry river beds and grassy plains fan out from the northern flanks of the MacDonnell Ranges of Central Australia. Here the red kangaroo, *Macropus rufus*, is no ordinary marsupial to members of the venerable Krantji Kangaroo clan, who trace their spiritual lineage to this totemic figure.

After detailing the myths surrounding the red kangaroo held by the Krantji clan, Knudtson and Suzuki examined the possibility that these myths may have an underlying ecological rationale. They conclude:

Traditional Aranda beliefs about the sacred site called Krantji appear to represent a remarkable fusion of ecological and spiritual knowledge. They encode genuine ecological truths about the population dynamics and dietary preferences of local red kangaroos. At the same time, unlike sterile scientific findings, they contain a moral code mandating irrevocable human responsibility to honour and nurture those precious, life-sustaining animal populations in perpetuity.

and

Over millennia, by seamlessly combining ancient spiritual insights into the human psyche with painstakingly accumulated knowledge of the concrete structures and processes of nature, Aranda thought and memory seem to have given birth to a 'land ethic' in the truest, most holistic, sense of the term. For the traditions surrounding the Red Kangaroo Dreaming at Krantji, to the extent that we understand them, equip human beings with a profound emotional and ecological connection with the rest of creation and, as a result, with in Aldo Leopold's apt phrase, an 'ecological conscience' - a responsibility to conserve forever the capacity of the land for self-renewal.

(Knudtson & Suzuki, 1992)

The holistic thinking of aboriginal peoples may be, or maybe close to, the thinking of Jaynes's bicameral mind. Things can be known simply because that is the way that it is. With everything seen as a related whole, there is a responsibility to nurture and conserve.

With the introduction of the 'I' concept the responsibility to the whole is lost. The invention of 'I' was indeed the end of living and the beginning of survival. The invention of modern thinking was a step backward, not progress, as so many believe. This could be the event referred to in Isaiah:

4 Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward.

5 Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint.

(Isaiah 1: KJV)

The above quote from Isaiah is typical of passages depicting the sort of anger that the *Bible* says God displays towards man.

It is interesting to note that displays of anger towards the human race in general do not seem to appear in aboriginal mythology. As far as I am

aware, there does not seem to be any equivalent to the story of the fall of man in the mythology or religions of any aboriginal peoples.

It would be interesting from a scientific point of view to test the hypothesis that there is a higher intelligence that gets most upset with peoples that damage or destroy the balance of the ecology while it remains friendly to those people that display responsibility towards the ecology. This hypothesis could be tested against the null hypothesis that there is no higher intelligence and that religious mythological concepts occur randomly. Intuitively I believe that statistical testing would indicate a high degree of probability that such a higher intelligence exists.

Assuming that there was a basic change in the thinking of the human race (or a large portion of the human race), there would have to have been a regulatory system introduced to stop the human race destroying itself. Before, the human race would have been self-regulating, acting only in a way that was in accordance with the good of the whole planet; after, it was everyone for themselves. We needed laws.

We have the beginnings of law with Moses. At the time that Moses received the ten commandments, by whatever means, the 'I' was still very new. It probably had not developed reasoning powers to any great extent. It was probably extremely hedonistic and very dangerous. Reading the *Old Testament* seems to support this view.

To bring any sort of order to the world it was necessary to introduce rigid rules. Rigid rules obeyed out of fear were probably the only thing that the 'I' understood. Understandable because the 'I' only exists in the form of right and wrong. And so we get 'thou shalt not' as the dominant form of law. Some things haven't changed much.

3 And approached *to* him Pharisees tempting him and saying: If it is lawful to dismiss the wife of him for every cause? 4 And he answering said: not did you read the [one] creating from [the] beginning male and female made them? 5 And he said: For the sake of this shall leave a man the [his] father and the [his] mother and shall cleave to the wife of him, and shall be the two in flesh one. 6 so as no longer are they two but flesh one. What therefore God yoked together, a man let not separate. 7 They say to him: Why then Moses did enjoin to give a document of divorce and to dismiss? 8 He says to them: Moses in view of the obduracy of you allowed you to

dismiss the wives of you; but from [the] beginning not it has been so.

(Matthew 19, translated Marshall)

Obduracy,.... impenitence; obstinacy. (Concise English Dictionary). In the beginning the human race had obeyed the laws of God without question, but by the time of Moses had become obstinate, and needed rigid rules to keep it in some sort of order.

\* \* \*

The next stage in the development of human thinking can be seen as beginning between 1400 BC and 37 AD. During those years men began to appear who achieved what I hope will be achieved by humanity in general. They achieved a conscious innocence that integrated the 'I' with inner knowing to the extent that they became one with the Universe.

To show what can be achieved I want to look at the lives of two men: Jesus and Akhnaton, Pharaoh of Egypt.

When Jesus gave his commandment 'You shall love one another as I have loved you', he marked the end of the period when humanity needed to be blindly obedient to rigid laws. The 'I' had grown sufficiently in reason to now begin to accept the concept that we are one with each other and that what each of us does directly affects all of humanity.

Loving one another supersedes the ten commandments because loving acts carried out consciously from a position of inner knowing will automatically be for the good of all. I am not saying that the ten commandments are not good; I am saying that if a person lives a life based on love of one another then there is no need for rigid rules. Also when the 'I' invented itself the connection with the Universe was lost. Loving one another is the best substitute we can get for acting for the good of all that existed before we became separated from the Universe.

One of the parables from the Gnostic gospel of Thomas, (deleted from mainstream Christianity in about 400 AD) is that when Jesus came across a man working on the Sabbath. Jesus said "Friend, if you know what you are doing, you are blessed, if you do not, then you are an accursed breaker of the law" (Sandford 1987). If we can elevate our thinking to the level where we can consciously make choices from a position of loving one another then we are blessed. If not, stick to the law: it is safer.

\* \* \*

The circumstances of the birth of Jesus need looking at to further understand modern thinking. We are told that he was born to the 'virgin' Mary. Suppose that there is an interpretation of 'innocent' here as being sexually innocent, when the innocence could have been innocence of mind. To produce a man such as Jesus in physical form it would have been necessary to provide the correct environment in childhood. A mother with a 'bicameral' mind may well have been a requirement for creating that environment.

Also, Jewish law at the time of Jesus was extremely puritanical. Sex was considered obscene to the extent that a legal definition of virginity applied to women during a 'betroval' period of one year before the legal 'taking to'. The distinction between betroval and marriage was a fine one. It seems that during the betroval period the woman was still legally a virgin even though the difference between betroval and marriage was only that the woman had not been taken to live in the husband's family home. Mary may well have been a legal virgin according to Jewish law, and this definition carried over to the Bible without the understanding of its source.

The exact legal difference between betroval and marriage in Palastine at the time of Jesus is not know exactly, and even appears to have varied from district to district. It is know though that the difference between betroval and marriage was very small.

The 'I'-god needs to create miracles to account for things outside its understanding. Without the concept of miracles, the 'I' cannot reconcile the fact that it is god with there being things outside its control. It doesn't matter one little bit if Mary was a virgin or not; it is the teachings of the man that matter. However, for the 'I'-god it is of extreme importance. How could the 'I'-god account for the existence of a clearly superior being, when it itself is god, without the concept of the miracle?

The concept of the miracle is totally limiting. The 'I', needing to reinforce its need to be god, assigns the word 'miracle' to anything outside its understanding or control. It's the old bureaucratic solution of solving problem A by calling it problem B; problem A then no longer exists. The miracle exists to account for things that are clearly superior (in the worldly sense) to the 'I' without taking away the 'I's concept of itself as god. Why this is so limiting is that having defined something as a miracle the 'I' has put it out of reach. The teachings of Jesus are a way of life. By assigning the birth of Jesus to the status of a miracle it has effectively put a Christian

way of life out of reach of Christians. And so we have the paradox that before Christian churches can teach Christianity they have to discard the concept of the miracle, which is a cornerstone in the teaching of Christianity.

Paradoxically, once the concept of the miracle is forgotten there is no problem with the virgin birth of Jesus. All things operate in perfect accord with spiritual law. Just because we do not know the spiritual law, it does not mean that it does not exist. If there were spiritual reasons why it was necessary for Jesus to be born by a virgin, then that is just the way it needed to be.

The concept of the genius is very similar to that of the miracle. It accounts for people existing who are superior to the 'I' in intelligence. Geniuses are seen as freaks of nature. Thus the 'I'-god has assigned unnatural causes (beyond the control of the gods, or an act of god) to someone who could deflate the 'I'-god's concept of itself. Thus the 'I'-god remains safe. The difference between a miracle and a genius is the difference of degree. There is no suggestion that Einstein's birth was anything but natural, so he is assigned the lower status of genius. Again, by assigning the word 'genius' to an individual the 'I'-god ensures that it will never be compared unfavourably with a 'superior' being. It also ensures that it can never rise to the level of the genius. The need to be god totally limits the development of the 'I'.

The point of the teachings of Jesus is that, whatever the source of his being, everything that he did, he did in human form using only the human faculties that we all have. Humanity can develop to the level of consciousness that Jesus achieved. That is the promise of Christianity, but it cannot be achieved by the blind observance of dogma.

Savitri Devi illustrated the same point when writing about Akhnaton.

If anything can arouse in a man that yearning to live in harmony with eternal values that dominate him, it is surely not the tedious observance of duties imposed on him, once and for all, by law or custom. But it may be the glowing example of a superior individual. All the great teachers of the world, the founders of all lasting religions, seem to have been far greater by the personal example they

have set than by the precepts they have left, however sublime these be.

(Savitri Devi, 1981)

The elevation of the human race's thinking requires that the concepts of the 'miracle' and 'genius' be deleted from our vocabulary. We need to accept that what can be achieved by one can be achieved by all.

Akhnaton did not perform 'miracles' in the form of healing or in any other form. His life was different from the life of Jesus in every way. He spent it surrounded by wealth, but still managed to live by the same basic principle as Jesus: Love one another as I have loved you.

Akhnaton seems to have arrived at the same place from a totally different direction.

Starting from the worship of the sun, the state religion of Egypt at the time, Akhnaton intuitively found his way to 'knowing' that there was only one substance in the Universe - energy - and that all is one. His intuitive power was so great that his teachings embodied the very concepts that modern scientists working in the area of quantum physics are only now discovering. And the result of this inner knowing was to teach universal love and truth.

If we regard that One object of worship, that essence of the sun, which is the essence of the solar system as the same mysterious entity that modern science calls Energy and places at the root of all existence, material and immaterial, then what we have said of the meaning of creation becomes clear. That idea of the infinity of beings as transient products of one fundamental agent, power and substance, Essence of life as well as the so-called inanimate existence; that the concept of a world in which, strictly speaking, there is no place for pure passivity, but where the inanimate is just life, so as to say, at a lower stage, is indeed the one suggested by the boldest generalisations of our times. We may call it metaphysical, in a way it is. But this is no airy metaphysics; no outcome of pure fancy; no dialectic invention. It fits in with the accumulated experience of men who have learnt to measure the infinitely small and the infinitely great, and to see the universe at different scales of vision. It should perhaps as yet be called an hypothesis rather than a

fact. But it is the hypothesis that explains the facts which we know: it is the philosophical projection of the science of our times. And one can only wonder at the intuition of the adolescent king who grasped it thirty three hundred years ago.

(Savitri Devi, 1981)

Akhnaton possibly shows us the way out of the mess that humanity seems to have got itself into. Once thought, a thought cannot be un-thought (De Bono, 1987). And no matter how much many people of our time wish to return to The Garden of Eden by simply forgetting that we have left, we cannot do it that way. We cannot return to the bicameral mind. We cannot force 'I' to forget that it has been thought. The course has to be to develop our thinking to such an extent that the 'I' sees for itself that the only rational way is to become reconciled with inner knowing in the state that Johnson (1989) calls conscious innocence.

What would conscious innocence be like?

Conscious innocence is conscientiously deleting right and wrong from our thinking and allowing the self to resume control of the brain. Instead of making judgement we just 'know'. We know what we want, and we know how to bring about the consequences we want. We know ourselves to be one with everything. We become ourselves.

## CHAPTER 3

### LOGIC

Reasoning and logic are to each other as health is to medicine, - or better - as conduct to morality. Reasoning refers to a gamut of natural thought processes in the everyday world. Logic is how we ought to think if objective truth is our goal - and the everyday world is very little concerned with objective truth. Logic is the science of the justification of conclusions we have reached by natural reasoning.

(Jaynes, 1976)

If our natural reasoning comes from a position of inner knowing then logic need not exist, inner knowing needs no justification. If our logic is not based on inner knowing, then it is being used to reinforce a pre-determined prejudice: the concept that the 'I' is god.

Used to excuse hatred, to be called upon as a higher authority to cover up prejudice, and to separate humanity from the very source of humanity, logic is used to 'prove' the unprovable, to discount anything not 'scientific', and to control and manipulate without mercy. All to reinforce the concept that 'I' is god.

The human race are spiritual beings. Spirituality is a statement of the way we function. We function from inside to outside; we all have an inner source of knowing. Remove the connection with our inner knowing and all we have left is logic. Remove the source of our humanity, and we become humanoid rather than human, only able to function by reacting to external forces with so-called logic, all the time thinking that 'I' is god.

The pursuit of logic seeks to make reasonable the unreasonable. Ultimately nothing is reasonable; it is only the way it is.

Spirituality is itself a paradox. We are only 'spiritual' because we have created the unconscious by ignoring it, and it is the unconscious, the self, that is the source of our 'spiritual' inner knowing. If we become ourselves we are no longer 'spiritual', we simply are. The unconscious becomes conscious, but we do not realise that because, as the unconscious becomes conscious, we are not aware that it used to be unconscious.

\* \* \*

Logic is a secondary thinking process. It begins with a subjective premise, and the quality of the outcome depends on the quality of the premise. The premise is always justified. Begin with garbage and the outcome will be garbage. The result may be logically elegant garbage, but it will still be garbage.

The 'I'-god needs reasons to justify its existence. It needs to find reasons for external conditions beyond its control that threaten its status as god. Invariably those reasons will be fear-based because it is alone, cut off from the very source of its humanity. Fear-based reasons are inhuman simply because they do not come from the source of our humanity: inner knowing. They do not come from the self.

Let us look at some fear-based reasons that have led to logical, but completely inhuman, results. All have been used in this century to justify war and genocide.

'We have nothing because the Jews have it all.'

'Might is right.'

'My god is the only god.'

'Everyone should be the same.'

'Blacks were made to be the white man's slave.'

Throughout history there has been suffering, butchery, pillage and genocide resulting from perfect logic based on 'garbage' premises. In our daily lives we are bombarded with the logical - always logical. But how many of us bother to ensure that the premises are valid?

Premises spring into being seemingly instantly from others, from beliefs put into our belief system by parents and peers, from edited news items, cultural prejudices, traditions, sexual bias and an infinite number of other external sources. Logic is applied to these premises and we wonder why the result is not the one we wanted. 'But it seemed so logical.' Of course it was logical, but what about the validity of the premise?

Logic is used to prove or disprove anything and everything. If I don't like your ideas then 'It's just not logical'. Or 'I'm right because it's the only logical answer'. No answer is logical. Nothing is the way it is simply because it is logical. It is the way it is simply because that is the way it is.

\* \* \*

Engineers use logic in a valid way when they start with pre-determined prejudices such as 'Buildings should stand', 'Airplanes should fly' and 'Electric lights should work'. As a result, buildings usually stand up, aircraft fly and lights work when the switch is turned on. Logic is applied to predict the behaviour of the materials knowing how those materials usually behave. But the logic does not answer the question 'Why do those materials behave in that way'. Go deep enough into any subject and the final answer on a material level can only be 'That is just the way it is'.

\* \* \*

Logic does not fit into the Divine Pattern.

Paradox. How can anything not fit into the Divine Pattern when everything is balanced within the Divine Pattern. Logic is justification for what is; it is not what is itself. The justification for what is doesn't change a thing. That is still just the way it is. And so logic is of no importance to the Divine Pattern. It doesn't change anything.

History can be justified from many different angles, but no justification can change the event: that happened the way it happened. All the different justifications do, however, reinforce the idea of separation.

And so logic is no more than the justification of a predetermined position. Logic is an excuse to do whatever the 'I'-god wanted to do anyway.

Why do things need to be justified? Why not just accept them the way they are? Without separation the 'I'-god cannot exist. Logic is needed to justify separation so that the 'I'-god has an excuse for being.

Logic was used by St Thomas Aquinas to 'prove' the existence of God. The basic form of the argument was that anything that I can conceive must exist. I can conceive God, therefore God exists. This basic argument was expanded to form the basic teachings of the religious theological establishments that grew into the universities of today.

The basic argument of logic has become 'Since I can conceive myself as separate I am separate and therefore I am god'.

The basic problem for modern man is not to find God, as so many would claim. The basic problem for modern man is to try and forget that God exists, so that he can become god.

The 'I'-god still carries that memory of the infinite power of the Universe, and no matter how hard the 'I'-god tries it cannot totally erase that memory. So we end up with logic being the tool used to justify the existence of the 'I'-god. Used to excuse hatred, to be called upon as a higher authority to cover up prejudice, and to separate humanity from the very source of humanity. Logic is used to prove the unprovable, to discount anything not scientific, and to control and manipulate without mercy. All this to prove that the 'I' is god and to hide in fear from that infinite power that the 'I'-god tries to deny exists.

The logical argument of this chapter has ended right back where it started from. Logic always ends up being circular. Logic always ends up proving whatever prejudiced position it started from. Engineers usually start from the prejudiced position that they like the buildings they design to stand up. The use of logic to justify the engineers' prejudiced position in this case is useful: buildings usually stand up. What if the engineer took the position that because he designs buildings that usually stand up, this sets him apart from others, and therefore he is god? Would this be useful? This form of logic is the form logic takes in the modern world. I want to be god therefore I will prove that I am separate and thus prove logically that I am god.

This might work except that even the most powerful 'I'-god that could exist cannot forget the memory of the power of the Universe. And so fear pushes us to be ever more logical; but no matter how logical we become the memory still remains.

How do we escape from the logic trap? How do we escape from a life that

just goes round and round in circles? If we continue to use logic as the basis of our lives the only place we can end up is where we started from.

De Bono (1987) wrote that once a thought is thought, it cannot be unthought. I would like to add that once something is seen as logical we cannot un-logic it. Maybe we can become so logical that we see that using logic to prove that we are god is not logical. We will always end up where we started from. We didn't start as god and no amount of logic will make us god. But maybe we can become so logical that it is logical not to keep ignoring the self and allow the unconscious to be conscious. It seems perfectly logical to me to want to be who I am rather than who I think I am.

This chapter ends the same way as it started. Logic is the justification of a pre-determined prejudice. By being logical I am just going around in circles. That is the way it is.

Logic is the art of starting where you want to finish and then going round a great circle until you end up at the beginning. Thus the illusion is created that you have been somewhere. It may mean something to the 'I'-god, but it doesn't mean a thing to the Divine Pattern.

## CHAPTER 4

# QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

We seem to live in a world where everyone is looking for answers, always looking for the answer to this and that. And yet answers seem hard to come by. Humanity looks for the meaning that will make life worthwhile, or that is the way it seems.

Working from a position of belief in separation, answers are not sought at all. Questions are only asked to support a position that has been decided in advance.

The system works this way: decide the answer in advance, work backwards logically to find the question that can only lead to that answer, and then ask the question. This method works well if the only reason to ask a question is to support a pre-judged position.

Try watching television interviews to see this system in action. How often does the interviewer ask questions that prevent the interviewee from expressing any view contrary to the interviewer's. Try listening to any discussion on politics, religion, economics or any other subject, and most of the time the so-called answers will be no more than a statement of a particular set of prejudices.

To work from a position of separation is to work from a position of fear and shame that needs defending. The 'answers' will be defensive, fear- and shame-based, and contradictory.

And so each hides away behind row after row of defences, each knowing the answer to everything for themselves and everyone else. Unfortunately everyone has a different set of answers.

Questions asked from a position of separation have much in common with the use of logic, except that the process works in reverse. Instead of starting with a 'garbage' premise, logic is used to work backwards to create the 'garbage' question, and then the logic is worked forward to the desired

answer. Is it any wonder then that valid answers are extremely rare in our physical world?

With a belief in separation, learning is impossible. Every answer has been decided beforehand to reinforce existing prejudices and beliefs. So the same mistakes are made over and over again.

Working from a position of inner knowing, we are open to answers, and valid answers are always there for us when we ask valid questions.

Valid questions are those asked from a position of openness, with a desire to learn. Not only are valid questions asked from a position of openness but the answers are accepted with openness whatever that answer may be.

Within the Divine Pattern, questions are asked with a genuine desire to learn, and that produces the synchronicity that facilitates answers. Answers received from the Universe in this manner are free of prejudice. They lead to expansion of knowing, and understanding of humanity by humanity. Promotion of peace and understanding amongst humanity requires us to learn how to ask valid questions from the source of all knowing, and to act on those answers without fear.