

Claus Janew

The Reality of Free Will

(Revision of the second translation from German)

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

Individuality and Reality

Your individuality is much more than a little peculiarity. It is a view that nothing and no one has but you. Otherwise it/he/she would be you. Also, you will have changed your perspective – yourself – in the next moment, and you cannot turn back time.

For convenience, we agree on "common" objects that are supposedly perceived by everyone, although everyone is looking at things from his or her own point of view. If you see me rolling a pen across the table to you, you may think it is the same pen that I see. But I see something *completely* different from what you see. There is not the slightest concord between my perception and yours. Otherwise, I would be sitting in your place, having your thoughts, memories, and feelings, and connecting them to a shape that is rolling toward me.

If you and I can speak of a single pen, it is because we already agreed as children on what we would consider to be *approximately* a common object, or more precisely, a pen. We have done the same for ourselves before, changing our own perspective and noticing the relative permanence of certain shapes. If you now notice that "someone" is rolling such an approximated object across the table, you have again briefly changed your point of view, i.e. you have roughly put yourself into *his* perspective and returned to your own. So you can *conclude* that a common object is rolling, "only" seen from different sides. In reality, however, you have merged *two individual* perceptions into a single unit, which emphasizes a "part" of your own perception (pen) and, in addition, a "part" of the perception of the other, which you have just "spied out" (pen).

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

The widespread assumption that a pen is *independent* of perspectives, on the other hand, leads into the void if one keeps asking "what it is made of": of molecules, these of atoms, these of

elementary particles, these of fields, and these of laws of change. But change *of what*? It is an endless loop.

However, *no* concept has yet been able to explain why a rolling pencil can be quite stable: It does not break or change direction when I just think about it. I have to touch it. And then it changes immediately for both of us (provided we are both looking "there").

In the Perspective Exchange Concept, therefore, we must assume that largely unknown (unconscious) processes stabilize our perception. Their effect must be in accordance with proven physical regularities. Both conclusions are consistent.

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

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

What is Consciousness? (I)

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

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

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

In every circumscription there now arises something that has been enormously underestimated up to now: the center point. A single point that refers directly to the whole. In the case of the water glass, for example, it is the center of gravity and the optical center, or, if the two are different, the center circumscribed by them, and so on. For only the whole as such has a center. Each division creates new centers (those of the splinters), and each change (like a border with a handle) creates another. Even if the change is symmetrical (without a handle):

Since the center, like any other point, is *nothing in itself* and has meaning only in relation to a certain whole, another whole circumscribes another center – even at the same "place" (here the center of a rimmed glass). And already the point next to the center is the center of something else (a unity of glass and spoon, for example).

Thus there is a unique relationship between the infinitely small – infinitesimal – center and the circumscribing whole. To ignore the center is to ignore the whole. In the periphery (edge zone), on the other hand, the outer boundary is definitive of the whole, thereby emphasizing its relationship to the center.

Since this structure also applies to all partial areas of an object, as well as to their relations to the whole, in addition *between* center and periphery, and between *this* center and *its* periphery, and so on, I call this totality the *infinitesimality structure*, or *i-structure*.

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

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

How is Freedom of Choice Possible?

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

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

In the periphery, in turn, our perception of the cinema influences the subsequent perception of the theater, and vice versa – and again, our present, and vice versa. The *indeterminacy* between the *determined* alternatives thus condenses into the *determinacy* of the decision

situation right up to its exact center, which, on the other hand, is completely neutral, i.e. behaves *indeterminately*. But that makes the whole situation indeterminate again, and so on.

We are not finished yet: Cinema and theater inside and outside, as well as the ways to get there with all the details, are also circumscribed by the movement of our attention. Instead of letting our thoughts circle around a cinema, we might as well wander to the subway and the dance club and forget about the whole theater. Instead, we consciously focus on the trade-offs between destinations, seats, access routes. That is, the determinacy/indeterminacy structure applies *to every detail* of the trade-off process. And so small decisions are due everywhere. We cannot escape this decision structure anywhere – it is an i-structure (infinitesimality structure).

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

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

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

What is Awareness? (I)

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

The grasping of this dynamic unity goes beyond mere consciousness, because Consciousness (I) always tends to circumscribing condensation, i.e. to the formation of symbolic, quasi-static objects. In contrast, the change to other points of view – other individual attitudes – is naturally more open. The perception of this alternation is what I call *awareness*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In reality, awareness is *always* an alternation between other awarenesses, between *perspectives* of the whole alternation. Awareness, as I said, changes the rank, the *hierarchy* of potential attitudes. When the "Official" speaks, the inspiration is usually silent, and vice versa. What the official is also aware of, however, is the subordination of his awareness to the awareness of the artist (and so on). It is with the awareness, then, that the whole nesting of descending priorities, points of view, and twists and turns alternates.

So what are we aware of, in short?

- All that is unique is contained in all that is unique.
- The alternation of uniqueness is the most natural thing in the world.

The Reality Funnel – What is Consciousness? (II)

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

Circumscribing movement – consciousness – is of course an alternation of individual points of view. And the perception of an alternation – awareness – also circumscribes a constant center. The difference between *emphasized* circumscription and *emphasized* alternation lies in the density of the circumscribed central area. If the circumscribing alternation (for example, between facades) forms an object (a house), the content-dense center symbolizes its unity

("being inside"). If the alternation is perceived more as such, the object character is thin ("Is it several houses or one?").

The maximum of unity is in the intuitive center point, while the maximum of alternation is in the alternation itself. That is, the alternation is authoritative and the circumscription is derived. (Without facades, there is no interior.)

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

Awareness includes consciousness of this transition ("closer, behind"). But consciousness is in a sense the "upper" part of awareness, while awareness as such also includes the just not conscious "further down" by *alternating* with it. This is more than a point transition or a coagulated potential. From the alternation between conscious and subconscious, awareness "receives," so to speak, impressions and inklings that escape the more static consciousness ("a chamber somewhere").

All in all, consciousness resembles a funnel, the rim of which represents the circumscribing (alternating) movement, which condenses and narrows inward and merges with the funnel stem into the just not conscious. Only the center point of the whole movement remains conscious. Awareness, on the contrary, *follows* the stem to the other side ("to the back, around the corner"), i.e. it changes over there into the consciousness *whose* stem leads back again.

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

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

Some aspects may also become clear from the following figures:




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




Figure 2: This is a summary and further simplification of Figure 1. This time I have emphasized the overall movement of perspective and the resulting spatial object awareness.

All That Is – What is Awareness? (II)

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

This consequence entails others:

1. We must basically be able to put ourselves into the individual awareness of other humans (and even non-humans). Indeed, we empathize with others; otherwise we could not communicate with them. We at least repeatedly *approximate* their points of view and thus converse with persons who are *similar* to them. If we were to put ourselves *completely* in their position, our consciousness would quickly be overwhelmed and would have to repress most of it into the subconscious.

2. Changing a point of view is changing the whole reality (a rearrangement of the Reality Funnel), namely from a foreseen, *probable* reality to an *even more probable* one, the present reality. As one reality takes precedence, the others fall into their subordinate position. They become or remain potential, just as the one that now takes precedence was before. But they do not disappear: They are still aware standpoints.

A standpoint as a place of effect, as a momentary apex of reality and center of structure-forming changes, goes far beyond what we normally understand by "consciousness". Such a point can be *anywhere*, in an ant, in a star, in a vacuum. It would be meaningless if no alternation culminated in it, no circumscription determined it. Ultimately, there is only alternation as such – all-encompassing and therefore indefinitely fast: All That Is.

When alternation forms a circumscription (ant, star, space), it begins to *prefer* this particular movement to others and to filter it out, as it were. Through interwoven repetition, the movement *appears* slower, although the all-encompassing alternation still goes on. Only now it is largely hidden (deep in the stem of the reality funnel).

- Since circumscribing forms create from the beginning what we have recognized as consciousness (Consciousness I), we can also speak of an *all-encompassing consciousness*.
- Since the alternation never stops and only takes place between more or less conscious standpoints (Consciousness II), we recognize an *all-encompassing awareness*.
- Since consciousness also means Freedom of Choice, we are dealing with a *choosing, all-encompassing awareness*.

Some would call it "God" – a God who "lives" in everything and everyone, since everything is a phase of His movement. At the same time, "He" is on such an unimaginable path that His decisions are ultimately "unfathomable". On the other hand, our decisions are a part of His. This means that what we decide is important. It creates a different awareness of All That Is, a unique hierarchy of consciousness, a complete reality.

And only *our* reality follows *our* path. Even in God it is new.

Subconscious – Free or Not?

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

- We are aware of what exists for us in the circumscribing alternation of perspectives as their common approximation.
- When perspectives slip away from the approximation, we can still be aware of them. They exist *as such* in constant alternation.
- Everything that exists dynamically (i.e., alternately) transitions in a funnel-like manner from the most conscious "opening" through a perspectively "narrowing" stem into an awareness that we can call *subconscious*.
- This subconscious ultimately extends to All That Is.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Why is the door frame so solid? It isn't: Take a sledgehammer and smash it! But I think you *want* the frame. You want the earth and the sun. You want conditions. Why *these* conditions – that would be a question to the subconscious where we hope to find more of our essence.

Probability Thinking

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

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

If we decide for job B *through and through*, the others consequently decide for job A or C *in our reality*. More or less consciously. The same is true for the others *in their* realities. There is no contradiction, because in each individual reality, from each perspective, it is a *common* choice. Even if I get job B, I can be aware of my alternative realities in job A or C, so that the individual realities intertwine, interact. Therefore, it may not be easy to come to terms with oneself thoroughly. But once this is achieved, the corresponding reality inevitably follows.

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

Oversimplified because it is more vivid, we can perceive all individuals as "cones" of their probable changes: We are all moving together like spirits (or ghosts) at a certain distance from each other under a single fabric of probabilities that adapts to our shapes and movements. The web shows the "visible" interweaving of our options and choices, and hints at even more potential that lies beneath it. We need to coordinate our choices to move one way or the other, at least roughly, with those of all the other spirits, so that we don't distort the fabric too much or get entangled in it. The priorities and thus the probability shapes adapt to each other until they are predominantly *in harmony*.

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

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




Figure 3: As Berta changes her mind from Job A to Job B, which is a better fit for her, her perceived alternatives are rearranged in the probability hierarchy.




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

Is There a Constant Reality?

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

Of course, by *repeating* the alternation: of thought, of viewpoint, of mutual confirmation, of effect. Exactly, the change can only be repeated for an infinitely short moment; then it must

already go beyond the repetition in order not to cancel itself out. That is to say, it changes *altogether* and thus remains open. For stabilization, however, *approximate* repetition is sufficient. So we believe approximately the same thing for a long time.

Why do we repeat ourselves *at all*? Because otherwise everything would immediately disappear and exist only for an infinitely short moment. But if something has reached a minimum stability and has thus formed a *whole*, this can have a further stabilizing effect, because an alternation *with this whole* now also contains more repetitions: Each alternation *contains* its sides and thus "brings" something from each side into the other. If one of them is relatively constant, the other is "addressed" in a similar way again and again, and thus "seduced" into constancy. Or at some point it loses the connection.

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

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

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

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

It is only about that which we cannot change *in spite of* our deliberate openness that we do not yet know *why* it resists us. On the other hand, it would be strange if we had unlimited potential with limited knowledge of the world – or if we understood our deepest intentions.

Truth, Harmony, and Free Will

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

Such a comparatively harmonious core, such as our inner self, can hold our Awareness (I) together, and from it probably emanate *more comprehensively harmonizing* impulses for thought and action than from the adjusting roles of our little ego. On the other hand, this ego can often handle everyday situations better. Therefore, it is best if each one devotes itself to its *own* subject and *benefits* only from the skills of the other. We can *feel* such a harmony like a beautiful concert. If, on the other hand, the ego is completely in tune with the inner self, we can speak of unity, but hardly of harmony: The connection is too rigid and the duet probably short.

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

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

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

As explained in Freedom of Choice, we make decisions somewhere between the center and the periphery. But the total circumscription now "disappears" into the funnel stem! It is condensed – "perspectively" to a stronger convolution – and finally coincides with the funnel axis. Whether a decision is a free one or whether it is the result of an inner impulse is, in the end, no longer distinguishable! We can only become conscious of impulses further up, where we can then also deviate from them.

Do we have reason to doubt our inspirations? That depends on whether they come from our deepest essence and whether we are in harmony with it. For truth, as I have said, is unity or harmony with the more comprehensive level. However, it is precisely this broader interconnectedness that distinguishes an essence from each of its appearances. Thus, the deeper the origin of an inspiration, the more likely and the stronger the involvement of our most profound being in it, and the more trustable it is. And vice versa, the more authentically we express our deepest inner self, the more trust worthy we are ourselves.

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

<https://free-will.de>



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International [License](#)