

In the Presence of The Elusive Paradigm

Presently we hear the call from many fronts; the synchronous conclusion emanating from all the basic fields of human endeavor seems to proclaim with unanimous Voice: what is needed, what is absolutely *essential*, is that nothing short of a *New Paradigm* be achieved.

In the exigent face of worldwide poverty, exploitation and widespread brutalism, in confrontation with the clutching need to effect a halt and even reversal of the fateful damage done the earth-lungs of the rainforest and the atmospheric epidermis of the ozone layer, what can be so “hold-the-presses” *pressing* about the requirements of an abstract consideration such as that of the *paradigm*?

After all, what *is* a “paradigm”? Isn’t it merely the remote requirement of updated *theory*, sufficiently all-purpose to loan itself to the obscure broodings of a variety of academic disciplines about which the public couldn’t be less concerned, except where it incidentally shows in some consumer good or service?

Indeed when such an “academic” subject does manage to bleed into the peripheries of public perception it tends to be interpreted, by “New Age” popularization, as a kind of Big Theory mystically granting grand overviews and magic-carpet rides to the outskirts of the Possible. At the same time it takes on a *mythic* cast, by virtue of that very flow-line whereby the public acquires the notion obliquely from the academic cloister; “paradigm” is *always* something that seems to be needed, a goal of aspiration like the grael-cup, and is never something which is conveniently present and accounted for (i.e. as “theory” it retains an aura of remote abstraction, eternally over-the-horizon of those shared fields of refractory experience).

Interestingly enough, it would seem that in the Strange Case of the Paradigm the dim and dissolving lines actually obtaining between highbrow, lowbrow and *lumpen* have seen this popularized interpretation (equating “paradigm” with “theory”) *leak right back* into the academic and scientific community thereby appreciably affecting the very grasp of those traditionally expected to be pollinators of the paradigm.

Tap an academic on the shoulder these days, and he’s quite liable to give the New Age “definition” in response to the query “what *is* a paradigm?” “Why it’s the Big Theory, the Grand Viewpoint, the New Worldview—you know, like Darwinism, like relativity, like Freudianism. In the one case the theory’s ‘survival of the fittest’, in the other ‘ $E=MC^2$ ’, and ‘the Oedipal Complex’. It’s a great Idea in which facts that didn’t fit well in the former context are made to feel at home, indeed may be cordially considered essential.” So our academic, our member-in-good-standing of the priesthood of particle physicists or molecular biologists, takes up the torch of Paradigm with noblesse oblige on behalf of the public scarcely noticing the flambeau has been returned to him considerably modified from its short public loan. In falling absent-mindedly into conformance with the aggregate public (i.e. New Age) notion, however, our academic is inadvertently committing a very fateful *petitio principii*. He is *assuming* precisely what has to be proved; he’s putting the proverbial cart before the proverbial horse. How so?

Watch That Middle Step: It’s a Whopper

As with all good professionals in any field, the professionals of the life—and political—and technical sciences (once sensing some rewardable premium has been placed upon the production of a targeted value) erupt in an intramural frenzy of competition sending every self-qualified aspirant to the boards to ink-in that definitive Paradigm. Sliding right along on the lubricating feed-back distortion of the popularizing Psyche, the concept of Paradigm merges seamlessly into the standard notion of Theory, even for those specialists from whose fields the term was first appropriated.

The trouble is, Paradigm is *not* the equivalent of Theory.

To take “theory” for “paradigm” is, as we shall see, the same as deleting the most important step in a linear equation. To derive a *theory* one must first have a pattern or *Model* to which the theory is to apply. The *theory* must solve for the *model*. Yet such a pattern *is* the *Paradigm*. Paradigm indicates the sufficient *Model*; it gives the indispensable *example* in the first place.

Why is this so important? Let’s go back to our competitive academicians, our *professional* theorists. Each wishes to produce that Great Theory, the one-piece key that will command all the tumblers of the Lock at once so that apparently-refractory areas of existence may be related to a common term solving for them all, and indeed which allows their actual *relationships* to catalyze the Resolution. Implicit in this driving desire (whether for “inner” or “outer” reward, we need not say) is the taken-for-granted assumption that the current in-use theories *are* indeed inadequate. Darwinism, relativity, quantum mechanics, the Will-to-power or Oedipal Complex are all in themselves too narrow and

specialized to fit the inflationary picture of proliferating complexities, the stretched canvas of creaking contradictions progressively painting a moribund portraiture from real-life consequences of those separate shortcomings.

On the basis of this taken-for-granted inadequacy of all present theories, however, our Ivy-league rowing teams are preoccupiedly busy hard-stroking toward the golden shore of *new* theories; their whole endeavor is based on the business of drawing alongside and boarding that great replacement-theory, all the while chanting the cadence of “Paradigm”. In so doing, of course, they’re calling upon the very name of that which they’ve unceremoniously thrown overboard, to popular plaudits. The reason for this is that, by failing to honor the “separate reality” of Paradigm as catalyzing Model, they continue to draw up theories against the implicit background of the *old patterns* on which those *confessedly inadequate* theories were originally based. In the field of Superstrings, for example, the ant farm of theoretical physicists continues to interpret its equations against the conventional back-ground of “spacetime”, rather than rechecking the *overall pattern* implicitly rotated a notch by the introduction of “strings” so as to *account for* the emergence of spacetime *by* the theory.

An important factor in the whole *equation* of delivering a full-term *Weltanschauung* to the impatiently-awaiting world is therefore chronically skipped-over, indeed not even noticed due to so convenient yet critical a truncation whereby the “intelligentsia” rushes to register a conclusion before it has satisfactorily considered the *premise*.

For what is essential to a *theory* is that it fit the “present” facts no matter how *refractory*, as well as “facts” which may be generated on the *implications* of the theory. This symmetry between theory and facts is blithely ignored, by improperly compassing the whole process through the unwarranted equivalency between “Theory” and what was *originally* meant by “Paradigm” (indeed what *gave* “paradigm” its distinguishing definition in the first place).

Involved in the question of “theory”, then, are the *facts* to which it must fit; but this necessarily involves a working typology of “reality” in order to determine what *qualifies* for a “fact” in the first place—i.e. what is indeed *real* so that it must be accounted for by the Theory.

All hustling little competitors in the field rush to squeeze “paradigm” into the conceptual Bottle of *theory* where the Genie of refractory reality may be satisfactorily captured. “*Paradigm*” tends therefore to be the *eliminated* (yet no-less-necessary) step in the process, displacing the difficult matter of “reality” onto the outcome of the ultimate “theory” that would *define* it. By calling the *theory* the Paradigm, we seem to evade the requirement sticking out like a sore thumb in the true definition of “paradigm”.

The term, after all, was originated to mean something very specific—it emerged into the vocabulary for a *purpose*. Avoiding *its* specific implications by capitulating to the “popular” (i.e. New Age) lead of marrying it through synonymy to “theory”, accounts in large part for the manifest *inadequacy* of every Grand Theory feverishly brought forward in the closing decades of this century so as to effectively unite the world’s myriad problem-zones to a resolving Common Denominator. **But one can’t “kill two birds with one stone” in this way, when all that’s in one’s slingshot is a clump of loose dirt.**

When we turn to ask *why* all the king’s horses and all the king’s men can only put together (so far) a clump of loose dirt, all we need do is refer back to the missing term, the essential *mediate step* that constitutes *all the creative ground* in the production of any true theory, which has stood and always will stand beneath the pinnacle of any Resolving Worldview as the magnificent Mountain on which the ultimate Perspective of that view was laboriously and creatively raised.

Here is the beginning of our recovery of that all-but-lost *Meaning* of “paradigm”; this proverbial Lost Word is *indeed* first of all a linguistic term.

Conjugating the Lost Word

Resorting to the expedient everyone seems to have forgotten along the way, we may recover its “misty root-origin” by the esoteric means of consulting a dictionary—at which enlightening point we’ll come to find that “paradigm” is actually a term indicating grammatical *inflection*: it refers to the *declension* of nouns, pronouns and adjectives, and to the *conjugation* of verbs. It establishes the grammatical and syntactical relations of case, tense, gender, number and person.

“Paradigm” suggests the *modeling* of a term in all its inflectional forms; it expresses and defines the ways in which we may accept a term as “real”. It *conjugates all the modes of reality of any given term*.

We may immediately see then by contrast that “theory” would be concerned with establishing a consistent set of *rules* whereby the acceptable variations in the reality of the given term might be understood and extrapolated. When we ask how the workaday world approaches the parallel relations between “paradigm” (inflection) and

“theory” (formulaic rules), we begin to get a clearer picture of the way in which the *de facto* approach has effectively sidestepped the issue of inflection altogether (i.e. the determination as to the number of dimensional rotations through which a term may be continued to be regarded as “existing” or *real*), placing the burden of that determination upon the upshot of theory *as if a rule could actually be given* which definitively formulated and resolved the question of what was “real” in the first place.

It is no wonder that, on the basis of this backward approach, such pronouncements of the New Age issue to the effect that “you create your own reality”. Apparently so! if we can give a rule that in itself *determines* the “real” (i.e. the number and quality of dimensions in which a term maybe conjugated) rather than *accounts for* and resolves the variant manifestations in the declension of the real.

Manifestly, however, we *haven't* been able to give such a rule as in the first case; and this is the reason behind the reasons *why* we haven't been able to make that anticipated, collective *move* into a greater Density or internal richness of our own Reality.

The fact of the matter is, the theory can't emerge by natural Birth, until the sufficient Paradigm (the Example or operative Pattern) is given; and the Paradigm can't be given when its popularly-accepted sense has crushed it into a flattened conformance with the profile of Theory.

If the world seems desperately to need a new and resolving Theory to implement a totalizing approach to its problems, it has to have a transformatively critical sense of the *required numbers of dimensions, states and values* into which such an ultimate Theory must go evenly. It has to be furnished an adequate intimation of the actual scope and proportion to which such a resolving “theory” must apply.

What Items Belong in This Picture?

For instance, in formulating our sufficient Worldview, do we or do we not take into consideration—that is, loan any official credence to—the field of alternative and “free” energies? do we or do we *not* make allowances in our pattern for the possible presence of types of consciousness, or kinds of life-form, that must be granted the full dimension of (whether that ultimately means “alien” from the stars, other-dimensional doorways or from the “inner Earth” itself)? Even taking a glance at the Index or Table of Contents of this present work, sliding down such subheadings as those of “Electronic Mind Control Projects”, “Population management through the use of Chemical and Metallic Substances”, “The CIA and Drug Trafficking”, “Covert Research in Biological Weapons for Population Management” etc. it becomes increasingly evident we *must* be willing to ask whether our “sufficient pattern” should be expected to integrate to itself some adequate idea of the *monstrous*—for the conventional psychologies, long-based on old proportions and prior perceptions of the limits of human behavior, are manifestly inadequate to interpreting the typology of that emergent-outline insistently bucking at the grinding plate-seams between Old and New Worlds of manipulative Order. It becomes increasingly apparent that the provision of a proper model is never simply a matter of rotating all the given pins already stuck in the map; it requires a profound rethinking of terms. After all, the *requirement* for a “paradigm” (bringing some such usage back into the vocabulary altogether) doesn't arise until the growing inadequacy of all former models has manifestly left the field in shambles, and the fires of unquenchable crises are roaring up all around.

If therefore the *true* outcome of Theory depends on the preliminary Model (i.e. paradigm) characterizing the terms to be *resolved* and *unified* by the theory, any such theory would be expected to *account for* and *conjugate in* all the actual dimensions through which the factors of the World-problem arise and occur.

But this requires an intelligence able to *identify* those dimensions and those factors.

It's for this reason we can't say the ideal-resolving Theory only need account for those powers and properties that “make physical sense”, as with the field of physics alone; we can't say the satisfactory theory would simply have to achieve an understanding of the perceptual or cognitive means by which meaningful “data” arise to begin with, or solve for the epistemological dilemma solely. We can't assume that such theory would only be ultimately meaningful if its application satisfied the “sociological field equations”, or accounted for human presence in terms of “Topos”.

The conditions of the current “dilemma” cut through *all* the categories in which the terms of existence are conventionally conjugated, and now overlap borders so manifestly co-involved but unconventional that any arbitrary drawing-of-the-line simply to suit the “manageable” becomes a progressively-less tolerable practice in producing the comprehensive Overview, the authentic *Weltanschauung*.

After all, consider: *what is it* that makes a Theory worthwhile in the first place? Isn't it the *applicability* of the theory to *all the relevant factors*, previously identified or not, which rules on its worthiness? What finally justifies the rarefied

abstraction of theory to the concreteness of practice, is certainly the degree to which any such theory furnishes a *workable key* conforming to the contours of all component tumblers of the particular Lock constituting a restrictive shackle upon the world.

Is Fiat in the Imperative Mood, Or Indicative Mood?

Therefore we must ask again: who can truly identify the *terms!* It's only in the proper identification of terms—and a qualified approximation to the allowable elasticity in the “dimensional” conjugations of those terms—that the ultimate Ship of a sufficient Theory may be considered Christened, and launched upon its Way.

We're culturally conditioned to embrace the acceptable Theory, the guideline rule upon which a basic *Worldview* may be stretched (even though the functional significance of that view is far from the place where we routinely perceive). The rule of the Medieval churchmen gave the acceptable *Worldview* of the dark ages, though the operators of that rule resided in the arcanum of illuminated tracts in an era of illiteracy so that the effective distances between culturally conditioned (religious) Theory and feudal *praxis* accounted for the particular “grain” of the general perception upsurging in the Discrepancy. Similarly, we “perceive” reality presently according to the (sociopolitical and cultural) tensions arising in the general relations of indentured “consumerism”, to the technological clergy and empowered priestcraft in possession of that Rulebook we're conditioned to worship as relativistic Gospel in a state of effective quantum illiteracy.

We know of the Gospel of Einstein; we accept the practical validity of His Great Theory. Yet even members-in-good-standing of the relativistic Hierophancy tend to be insufficiently aware of the Process whereby such a Great Theory (or any great theory) originally came about. It's for that reason “we” (and “they”) tend now to worship the Theory, call it by its progenitor-name Paradigm and seek to force it into giving birth again to *Itself*. Thus the continuing state of barrenness under a Thundercloud of Expectation—the ongoing fallowness where we expect the relieving Crop.

It's too-little-noted or understood that before the Einsteinian Theory, there's the Einsteinian *Paradigm*. Before any Great concluding Reason, there's the Great underlying Creative.

Ordinarily when such epoch-making formulae are produced as with the celebrated “Einsteinian field equations”, they're treated as though their titan character is ascribable to the fact that they manage—in whatever manner—to make sense of a group of “established facts” already laying around in a suggestive though apparently unrelated way. It's insufficiently appreciated that we *value* the outcome of the Michelson-Morley experiment, the Machian model of motion, the topologies of Rieinannian space and Maxwell's unification of electricity and magnetism owing to their initial *identification* in the formative phases of Einsteinian theory. There was, in fact, nothing “inevitable” about them until their values were *defined* by the beauty and success of the theory in which they were incorporated.

Thus the generation of the theory depended upon a *foundational work*; and that foundational work involved a faculty of discrimination or power of imaginative perception entering the overall picture as a critical—and indispensable—variable of surpassing Creativity.

The parts ultimately participating in the workable pattern aren't given, *gratis*, they must be *determined*—as an examination of the general state of physics just prior to the Einsteinian epoch will show; they must be *creatively identified* and *integrated* in a frankly-ticklish process that approximates toward Wholeness in delineating dimensions grand-enough to give true measure of the arable ground while sufficiently frugal to act as praetorian valve filtering anything unnecessary to a fit description of that Ground.

This *Pattern*, composed of just such selectively identified and creatively-integrated components, gives us the true sense of *Paradigm* and shows why Theory doesn't *decide* upon the “declensions” in which Reality is to be cast but rather *rises up* out of an initial Vision, sufficiently monumental in scope and secure in its creative courage to declare—in swift bold strokes like an astonishing, deft Picasso—the general outline of the minimum Starmap on which the would-be Magellans of the New Reality must thereafter navigate.

Magi Bearing Gifts of the Paradigm, To the Manger of the Millennial Worldview

The very reason then, that virtually *every* theory generated on the basis of the minimum criteria for “theories” alone (i.e. beauty and fitness of form, applicability to defined sets of circumstances etc.) doesn't break a decisive barrier and bring the general attention to a New World of awaiting productivity, is given in this consideration of the *Epochal Theory*—for only the Epochal Theory has sprung full blown In a state of “critical mass” from the forehead of an adequate *Paradigm*. The *Paradigm* is always the key, that decisive Creative Ground constituting the initiatory Pattern declaring a *revolution* in the inflection of terms, insisting with *persuasive psychic* and *rational Force* upon the inclusion of just so

challenging a dimensional range in the full conjugation of working elements as is *impermissible* in the standard context (yet produced nevertheless at the extremes of that context) without waiting upon due legitimation by the appointed Hierophancy of the present Order.

Only where the ground-breaking creative work of that sufficient Paradigm already exists and has given sign of its activity, may the Epochal Theory be brought forward full term. This fact being critically *under-appreciated* owing to the aforesaid glib equation of *paradigm* with *theory*, we have no reason to wonder any longer why “theory” so often fails to *serve* the field of tangible concerns but instead elicits contemptuous reaction in the frequent functional gap between abstract Pronouncement and refractory, *existential detail*.

Any such Paradigm, any such bold Creative pattern may be identified—in the given case—as having been generated by a source or sources *distinct* from the ultimate theory-bearer, or the *same* as the ultimate theory-bearer. Sometimes there’s a more obvious one-to-one identity between heroic Paradigm-maker and great cultural Formula-bringer as in the case of Einstein himself, or of Darwin who delineated the pattern by an irreducible act of creative selection before distilling from it a single, Survivalist Theory. Sometimes the determinant of Paradigm-relevance will issue as a more collective outline from many, sedulous sources before a single focus crystallizes it to common view—as happened in quantum physics just prior to the posting of Heisenberg’s heterodox billet on the church door of scientific mechanism.

However it occurs it may be uniformly affirmed that, at the juncture of any great Reality-shift it’s always in the creative matrix of an underlying Paradigm that the actual leaps are initially taken, all the deeds of cognitive valor enacted and the taboos tackled as down some dark passage in the Dream-time rite of the Symbolizing Psyche. It’s always in that chthonic stream, that subterranean current crackling with creative fires over the sheet of its surface like a psychic Styx that all the pioneering is actually done, all caves and verboten tunnels (opening tesseract routes under drawn-out trade-lanes above) are explored by persistent assault-waves of solitary spelunking without benefit of miner’s cap or acetylene torch (since No Man has passed this Way before).

Therefore it may be that the white-smocked Theoretician basks in bracing daylight of the general approval, when once he raises high the particular Excalibur of his steely Formula from the Stone-matrix wherein it was complexly embedded; yet all the terse abstraction of his formulaic marks are hewn upon the peak of an incalculable Mountain that few may take the measure of—often including himself. That *mountain* is the Matrix, the Magical Mountain indeed, upthrust in a seeming moment from the flat plain of the demoted worldview where most still lingeringly stand.

The Slithering Serpent of the Slinky-toy Paradigm

Of course we’re used to the term “paradigm” in its relation to the field of physics, since it issues modernly as a scientific pointer—and that’s why we’ve taken such examples here. However, because a true paradigm serves to *determine* the scope of elements ultimately factored into the Resolving Formula, we may say that the greater the emergent Worldview of focused *theory* the greater the underlying *Paradigm*—therefore the less restricted *a priori* to any particular field in the derivation of terms it comes to consider relevant.

Considering how *great* is the requirement for such a Paradigm now, able somehow to resolve the full *panoply* of crises appearing on every single front whether approached categorically in terms of the hard or soft sciences, the “psychic”, “spiritual” or “artistic” sensibility etc., we’re hardly justified in relying on the *scientific hierophancy* itself to save the day (as with the Einsteinian model of our century’s earlier “epoch”) since that field is precisely in question as a total orientation along with all the others.

Indeed we must at this point lift our collective head to review the March of Paradigms (excuse your compulsive punster) over the greater span of history; in so doing we find everything settling into Perspective so that, for example, underlying the emergent Religious Worldview of the Middle Ages we find the paradigmatic substructure of *feudal hierarchy*, beneath the humanistic Worldview we find the foundational paradigm of *fluid capital*, floated toward a *vanishing-point* horizon by the Hanseatic League mediating a mercantile middle-class; and beneath the Scientific Worldview we find an informing paradigm of complex considerations greatly beyond the question of science in itself, rooted in the religious and humanistic crises finding deeply *epistemological* expression in the *cogito* etc.

We may therefore, along with Hegel and his back-masked understudy Mane, look upon that “march of history” itself in terms of the *dialectic* paradigm (since it moves in obvious Sine upon successive arcs of a spiral—or we should say it’s rather more like a Slinky toy undulating along an Escher staircase where, the deeper it descends from the Divine paradigm of theology to the magical paradigm of myth, from myth to religion, from religion to humanism, the higher it simultaneously ascends toward the theological extreme once more only this time in good dialectic fashion having come to the crisis of Divinity again in terms of Consciousness Itself).

From mythic to scientific worldview, then, we trace the saga of consciousness as it seeks to determine the proper field of its study. Therefore just as old Karl came to proclaim that the proper study of Mankind is Man so we are in the advantageous “dialectical” position to proclaim (at this *millennial* juncture of historical crisis) that the proper study of *Consciousness* is the field of *Consciousness* itself!

We find a unique implication in the inexorable character of this conclusion: at this stage, *any resultant theory* able to do justice to the required phase of an epochal Paradigm patterning a *Whole reorientation* with respect to Consciousness itself, must necessarily be a *Living Theory* (in the same way *VGER* of *Star Trek, The Movie* refused the conventional denouement of a merely mathematical bite, insisting on *plugging in* directly the anode and cathode of “conscious” and “autonomic” systems thus generating a Transcendental Fireworks where a dry equation was programmed to take place). Any such Theory must be a Living Theory and thus inseparable from *Practice*. The proper response to any *present* Paradigm of the proper magnitude, then, is necessarily that of *Consciousness in Theory and Practice*.

Buddy, Can You Paradigm?

This brings us to the very *practical* question, then, as to who is in the position to *recognize* the real term of the problem to begin with? who is *factually* capable of understanding that behind each “separate” crisis (in the inequitable distribution of world resources, suppressed and privately arrogated preserves of “alternative energies”, the ubiquitous breakdown of traditional structures, the natural and manmade interplay of ecological catastrophes) there is the critical Common Denominator of *One* unresolved Question: that very question of Consciousness. Who can generate the only *adequate* matrix for a full-term Paradigm commensurate with this moment? Who is capable of *recognizing* the real point, and of *sustaining* that recognition through a thorough and consistent review without succumbing along the way to the universal agitation for provisional (and inadequate) poultices—as if a greater totality could be constructed on the basis of some sham cohomology of myriad, stop-gap patches.

Of course we know so many of instant self-presumption willing to come to the Call; yet one large Type excludes itself on principle, though it would never recognize itself as such, by slamming shut any apparently-material door when the glaring halation of the “psychic” seeps around its opening edges. Another Type excludes itself just as unerringly when in its eclectic eagerness (not to say egregious New Age “openness”) it pitchforks absolutely everything together in one piled recitation without the slightest idea how—or even whether—anything actually fits.

No, in this case of our potential new Paradigm it won’t necessarily be the formal physicist who fashions it, so locked in specialization that his grandest concept of “paradigm” tends to focus down on isolating the proper gauge-group for an unambiguous String Theory... for, even as he mixes and matches the tables of comparative matrices (entranced in his sanctioned redoubt), shadow researchers in electricians’ smock move tables and mattresses of their own into government labs setting up permanent shop in the Alternative Energies wing right across the hall, the door to which is simply marked Maintenance Engineer.

Nor will it be our typical New Ager, sad to say, who for all his openness to alternative theories, his “unhippie-like” willingness—if not compulsion—to embrace technologies of all types no matter how mortally ridiculous, is still by-and-large that prototypical Fool who rushes right in where angels have long since learned to *hover over* the tarp-covered construction pit.

When however the purveyor of any such sufficient Paradigm appears, whether stepping out from the nominal door of any of the conventional categories or emerging from “no expected quarter”— we may recognize him by a manifest transcendence of every categorial limit, by demonstrable surpassing of the professional commitment to one field of expertise or even combinations of fields defined by their specializations.

He’ll appear with wings of intuitive inspiration affixed to the sturdy back of rational inquiry. And we’ll note as well that the sensitivity of the *Artist* isn’t optional in this case, but must show as a visible appointment. Neither shall the will-to-Good be a dispensable feature in identification of the Paradigm-maker; rather shall it be the *sine qua non*.

Nor is it *enough* that he possess *intuition* to spare; the *discriminative faculty* to a superlative degree; the prodigious power of a *subtle rationality* able to hopscotch over tiles inlaid to a Fearful Symmetry, as well as tread the tricky angles of ideal Ratio. He’ll be identifiable owing to the *unerringness* of his intuition even in the face of massed, conventional wisdom or “established fact”; by the paradoxical toughness of his subtle/discriminative faculty; by the unshakable character of his imagination, reason and intuition combined so that, when the inevitable objection issues from Zone of the common Myopia or Vesture of Specialization to the effect that “you can’t say that! you can’t include that! this is unproved! there aren’t instruments to measure it! you’ve gone too far!” he’ll be every-bit able to take the measure of aptness according to a Muse unborn as well as rule upon the ripeness of any term he’d add or subtract so that nothing in Established Heaven or Consensual Earth can dissuade him from an imminent approach to that sufficient grael, the

comprehensive pattern and viable Model without which *no* transformative Theory or Millennial Worldview could ever come about at all.

Time's Up, Folks! The Correct Answer Is...

Given such characterization of the minimally-suitable candidate, the comparative rarity of the required qualities should become evident. Not only are they rare qualities when considering the potential Paradigm-maker; the capacity even to *identify* such qualities in another implies a sufficiency of corresponding substance in the observer. In addition to the question as to *who* might ultimately appear as most-likely candidate to produce the Full-term Model, the sufficient Paradigm, we must also ask the complementary question *who* is going to be up to identifying him should he step forward?

Val Valerian and the *Matrix* material have been around for awhile now, a handful of very high-profile years. A sufficient amount of time has elapsed, a great enough Grace period has been given, as it were, so that if in the interim there were someone qualified to identify What's There he should certainly have done so by now. In all the many words and references read in relation to Valerian, *Matrix* and the periodical *Leading Edge*, whether positive or negative in character, precious few have accorded a recognition really commensurate with the ongoing quality of the Work; and none, absolutely *none* that one has read, have correctly identified that Work for what it is at all.

Thus in illustration of the apparently-indispensable principle "it takes one to know one", the writer of this Introduction himself steps forward at the lapse of the general Timer taking the measure of humanity's furthest capacity for response, so that the presence of a Paradigm-key may be properly announced.

Whether a future Theory-triumphant along with its infeeding paradigm are ever ultimately identified as issuing from one and the same source, or are eventually recognized as belonging to a convergent work on several coordinated Fronts, we may confidently state that the Day of the adequate paradigm in all its imaginative bridges and bold leaps is already upon us. Along with the parallel Initiatory Work of Southern Crown and Its winged messenger-*Thunderbird*, the principal labor of hewing the paradigm-pattern from a large-enough Block of Existence has been accomplished, in the form of the first two *Matrix* volumes (i.e. *Matrix I and II*) and now in this completely new edition comprising a decisive point of departure into the field of Consciousness itself. In the first *Matrix* volumes the verboten *space alien* subject was unprecedentedly aired and fused to themes of alternative technologies, hidden government agendas etc. No self-respecting particle physicist would touch such themes with a ten foot pole—which is exactly why it isn't the self-respecting particle physicist who comes forward now, with a prodigious Proposition basically identifiable in the true measure of its value only *from* the framework of that Whole-being Consciousness toward which it points.

As the *I Ching* says, when in the course of a difficult situation the messenger of importance appears at the Court and there is no one of sufficient station or accomplishment to identify or sponsor him, he may under such extraordinary circumstances introduce himself. In this case there are two such messengers at the Court, so that—at least-one may introduce the other.

Here then is Val Valerian and *Matrix III*. Seekers of the Paradigm may quit seeking. This is what you need to know, and what you need *in order* to know. *If you're for real* in this critical Time and Place and you truly *mean business*, you'll keep this book by your side, you won't put it down; and by your conscientious study you'll demonstrate the degree to which *you* possess progressive power to recognize the Real, as well as to follow out its implication to the End—even to the end of Consciousness Itself.

MT

(Michael Topper)