

"You Create Your Own Reality": Tertiary distortion of the Freewill factor in the Law of Confusion (see *Ra* material)—characteristic expression and philosophical promulgation of a certain lifewave type, having no single group composition but a general membership identity across various starfields, galaxies, planes, dimensions, densities and degrees of space and time; does not indicate "positive" or "negative" identity of the communicant giving rise to the expression in any given case.

YCYOR has become the provisional new age shibboleth, owing to the extent to which extradimensional and celestial intelligences committed to its ideals and implications have concentrated a collective focus into this zone of the spacetime continuum during Earth transition to 4th density.

Understanding the reason for such "synchronous" convergence of emissaries with emphasis on this particular type from farflung regions both of space and time, depends on an understanding of the *spiritual time* axis (see essay III of *T-Bird Meets The Phoenix*). Along the spiritual time axis, coordination is evinced not in linear mechanical terms of uniform clock measurement but in *qualitative* congruencies of comparative states. Thus we may envision a multidimensional universe of "wheels within wheels", that is cycles within Cycles, and though a given epicycle may be merely a minute fraction of the parent Cycle in terms of temporal "duration" on the quantitative plane, the only factor of significance on the *qualitative axis* of *spiritual* development is the respective *stage* in the rotating parallelisms of the cycles. Therefore, that which makes two "moments" in space and time compatible in terms of communication and intercourse isn't their "physical propinquity" (a very relative and plastic measure) but *coincidence in cycles*. Regardless, then, whether an extragalactic civilization is aeons in our "past" or light years in our "future" judged by "local" laws of the lightcone, its availability to us (and us to it) depends on the stage or degree of cycle through which each is respectively passing. The transition stage between 4th and 5th densities taking place in an extragalactic civilization comparatively in our "future", is much more "propinquitous" or smoothly adjacent to our present state and condition of being since by synchrony we're passing through a connate *phase* of our own "lesser" cycle, i.e. passing between 3rd and 4th density. It's therefore the synchrony in *cyclic* time which sees these otherwise farflung civilizations and emissaries of "remote" galactic regions right at our doorstep, all—apparently—so "suddenly" interested in us and what "we" as a planetary populace are up to, as if boatloads from virtually every country around the world were suddenly to appear on U.S. shores without prior conference, spontaneously "interested" from each individual angle in what those wild Americans were doing.

Thus the general strength or comparative constitutional "titre" of those beings bearing standards of YCYOR converging upon this Transitional time and place, is attributable to the common circumstance that each is at the "moment" of his own transitional phase and finds *something* of mutual interest (*relative* to his own respective transit) at this 3rd density Earth locus.

(We therefore needn't presume some strange "simultaneity" of behaviors on the part of virtually every being in the spacetime spectrum; as with Einsteinian physics in the "local" case, "simultaneity" is a relative concept depending on the coordinative framework. In this case the coordinate framework doesn't depend on the quantitative propagation of light signals, but rather on the congruency or typical harmony *of phase*. Thus each planetary or star-being whom we may find "presently" converging, by some simultaneity of impulse, upon our planetary doorstep, has in his own framework passed through a measure of "time" perfectly indigenous to native requirements for which any other framework would be comparatively remote and confined to its own concerns; each in his own "temporal" context

eventually arrives at a transition state between the present density-of-being and the next. This transition-state itself is the factor automatically coupling him by resonant synchrony to that *connate* phase in the respective cycles through which all other entities [regardless spacetime location or density-degree] must pass. It's not necessary to contemplate some fantastic "acceleration" or "slowing up" of respective cycles to get them to coincide or "agree" with one particular framework such as "ours"; each coincides perfectly, by virtue of commonality or similitude of phase, regardless how "long" or "short" the respective times each endured toward the transitional moment.)

This explained, we may understand the presence of a peculiar preponderance of professed "reality creators" at our doorstep as function of this *qualitative* congruence. Since the operative factor is *qualitative*, we must ask what *psychic correspondence* exists between our consciousness-type and the type drawn to us, that so many should find their phasic jump to the next-highest density somehow concerned with a factor to be found *here*, at the *lowest* density-transition belonging to self-reflective consciousness altogether, and technically *behind* them—i.e. in their relative "past"—while at the same time "coincidentally" brandishing the same philosophical Flag regardless the "positive" or "negative" background, the spatiotemporal distances separating them, the "current" density level respectively occupied etc.

Indeed, contemplating this single question *gives the game away*. Why all such "civilizations" or social/memory/complexes would beam *au rebours* toward us in concentrated tutelage while ostensibly seeking a *forward* advance upon their *own* next-highest density, is easily understood in noting that any such "higher density" beings must necessarily be—in some sense—our "own" future selves, or probable versions of what "we" are careering toward becoming. They "return" to us in absorptive contemplation at the brink of their own phasic transition, much in the way we study our own psychic background and key episodes in our past (on the "psychiatric couch" or otherwise) when assaying a forward move out of a current psychological impasse. This *infers* that all such beings *are* in some way *at* a psychological (i.e. mind/body) impasse, and are "returning" here to 3rd density and our transition-point as by *compulsion*. Just as those who obsessively brood over their past (in the implicit hopes of "breaking through" the blockage felt to have formed there) tend to bring with them on that psychic forage all the same bag and baggage originally packed "back then" and lugged thereafter, so the "spacebrothers" and entities from farflung "futures" of higher density life return to this their "past" 3rd-density juncture—literally or by satisfactory correspondence—inevitably bearing the load of what burdens their own pending transition; and they bring it with them in much the same way the psychological self-examiner obsessively clings to the *a posteriori* impactions he's determined to undo. Just as the psychiatric patient is grossly *identified* with the very features undergirding his neurosis, so the backtracking spacebeings are grossly identified with the props supporting their own problems of transition. Indeed just as the *subconsciousness* of those continuing knots in the psychiatric case supply the type of difficulty confronted by 3rd-stage psyche in its desire to progress and transcend, so the necessary *consciousness* of the concepts germane to the higher-density states furnishes a resistance-factor enormous in its own way for those seeking synchronous progress on the succeeding turn of the cosmic cycle. The degree of *self-conscious consolidation* as which such entities have introjected—and lived by—the philosophic formulation summed in YCYOR, imparts its own quality of persuasion only secured all-the-more owing to the extent to which it preempts the value of Identity. It has to be understood that, emanating from higher-dimensional consciousness some such statement as YCYOR

isn't just a theory to be tested or applied; it's a proclamation of *Who They Are*. Such proclamation carries psychic weight, owing to the fact that its relative "truth value" is formulated at densities-of-being bearing some necessarily-*direct* relation to essential cosmic principles and values.

This is indeed why we insist, in our various critiques of YCYOR (see *Bashar Book Review* etc.) that the implicit if subliminal "appeal" of such a shibboleth has to do with its emanation from some tangent-to-Being forming more acute angle to the Conscious Axis than that ordinarily styled at the 3rd-stage level. Its original forging in more focused Light of Consciousness gives it a "quasi-validity", apparently accounting for and co-opting the assistance of certain essential principles-of-being—up to a point. It is of course that limiting "point" which has been reached, by the forms of consciousness from which we hear and who strain to link the sum momentum of our motion to their own. As with the tenacity of the ordinary psychic complex, then, the collective "effort" of the spacebeings (regardless individual motives or orientations) is that of bringing to bear all the force of the problematic conclusion itself upon those "past" events having given rise to it in the first place, as if to persuade such events to take their formative point of departure more *seriously at the outset*—indeed to furnish the participants in such events a less ambiguous, more forcefully- formulated and emphatic model to *begin* with so as to "cut to the chase", delete the amount of time "originally" required to consolidate the position and so *streamline* its entry into the 4th-density phase, thus inferentially imparting that much more momentum of initial consolidation to *their own* coupled phase-transition (i.e. to 5th, as in the Sassani case, 5th and 6th in the case of the Pleiadeans etc.).

We may now see why they all apparently come "here" (i.e. why there's such a preponderant proportion in the representation of YCYOR to the face of this plane, a circumstance which is naively taken to bespeak the authenticity of the idea itself—as if mere "consensus" in the higher-density frameworks were any more reason to embrace some notion than it is here). This preponderant proportion of YCYOR proponents is precisely a *mirroring* effect demonstrating the *half* truth or "quasi-validity" of the principle itself. If it's a *mirroring* effect, this obviously means we're having mirrored back to us, in amplified and developed form, some seed-tendency we're "presently" manifesting. These beings and their ideas are *reflections* of what "we" might become, a probable version or versions of some nascent direction we're collectively imparting to our current momentum. By the same token, the fact we may now *clearly identify* the problematic character of the "inspiration" bringing them collectively here from their respective backgrounds, shows us why this *mirroring* effect is only manifestation of a *half* truth, not the exemplification of its ultimate superiority.

While it's true they mirror some present tendency of ours and were attracted here for precisely that reason, it's also evident they manifest such "tendency" to us from an Angle that *suffers some deficiency*. (The Pleiadeans of Marciniak proclaim they're here *precisely* to try to change the "future" from which they come wherein they're *renegades* to a totalitarian empire; the Sassani of "Bashar" overtly try to induce us to endure our spacealien abduction by their grey cousins, and even to *like* it, for the implicit purpose of promoting their own density-maximization as "future" products of the cross-breed.) Therefore it's only-too-apparent they *don't* come from a "reality they've created", to show us how to do likewise. Marciniak's Reality Creating Pleiadeans are manifestly bracketed by a reality that's excruciating to them. Rather, they come from "realities" that are provisional *models* of the presupposition YCYOR, wherein the projected patterns of "their own" desideration are necessarily

reflected, compared, weighed, evaluated, balanced against and ruled upon by the Whole-being Standard of Reality. (For extensive discussion of these ideas see *Bashar* review, *Motto in the Lotto* and *The Big Spin*.)

Why are they attracted *here*, then? Precisely because, as a collective tendency of consciousness we've already got a "start" on the ego-model of "personal reality creation". We're already implicitly-presumed little reality creators in the solipsistic sanctuaries of our brains.

That is nothing more than the overt articulation of the tacit, working "scientific" hypothesis of our day.

Our own unexamined presumptions are just embedded and "writ large" in the presumptions undergirding YCYOR—for the question which such an hypothesis really *asks* of itself (against its Whole-being Ground) as it declares its validity is: "*Who is this 'You'*" and "*Your*"?

The "you" that "creates" by doing, acting, performing etc., is manifestly a *constituted* agent; "you" arises precisely through and in expression of the coordinative qualities triangulating the given, variable-pattern instrument as which *will* is enabled to modulate its focus, and so impart particular *emphasis*.

The question circling around the free-will variable has to do with *emphasis*, not arbitrary latitude.

First of all we must understand the *principle* of this "freedom" within "will", otherwise the most nescient new ager arguing "arbitrary latitude" in flagrant disdain of any personal examination of the themes involved, is vulnerable to the first obvious blow to the conventions of the premise (having never occurred to him, of course, previous to his own ingenuous parroting).

Will isn't free because it "arises in a vacuum without innate values"; even *should* will arise in a vacuum (i.e. the Buddhist *nibbana*, the vaunted state of void-mind etc.) that vacuum isn't without implicit values setting *conditions* to the states in which any "prerogative" may manifest. It is the pre-existence of such values even down to the irreducible vacuum, which *secures* the very quality identifiable as "freedom of will" and at the same time gives us the only set of *operative qualifications* under which "freedom" is at all meaningful.

The easiest way to understand it, is in contemplation of an area of blank page. Label it "vacuum". Make a line (a line is the minimal indication of the principle of Will, since it establishes *emphasis* by both presence and directionality [inclination or axial orientation]). Since this "line" occurs on the background "vacuum" of the page, we have no right to ascribe static values to its angle of orientation. The blankness of the vacuum gives us no external reference, no orienting coordinates of "longitude" and "latitude" etc. We may rotate the page 360°, and our arbitrarily-deposited line will obligingly rotate through every angle to its initial position. It will, in other words, out of its single stroke generate a theoretically inexhaustible set of *radii* inscribing the plane of a complete circle.

Since the lengths of "the line" can be extended infinitely, we may say this is a circle having a circumference which is *nowhere*. The common "point" around which the line was necessarily rotated, has no specific "place" at which it acquires independent reality as a particular "size" or specific location etc. Thus it is "everywhere". (This is why, geometrically, the point is non-dimensional—the *locus* at

which the radii thetically converge form an abstract or "ideal" point which may be regressed to the "infinitely small" without being definitively determined. Point is *irreducible* in the sense of an *ontological presence* without extensionality, not in the sense of having specific dimension, size or position.)

Let's assume the vacuum through which these states inexorably arise, is the equivalent of consciousness (in the fullest spiritual sense of that illimitable Totality which enjoys such perfect consistency and self-continuity with itself in uninterrupted congruence with its own wholeness that it is, ipso facto, *aware of Itself* as such whole-continuity, thus *securing* its unqualified self-congruence by that very coming-to-itself). This "vacuum" or Void which is consciousness-absolute may be considered the total *absence* of all conditions or the total *presence* of all conditions. In either case no *particular* is differentiated, thus conserving its voidness. The *positing* of any particular within its all-permissive potential, generates the complementarity-symmetry of mutual inversions organized around the holohedral features of any such particular; this is what's meant by the "*implicit values* setting conditions to the states in which any 'prerogative' may manifest".

Note that such conditions don't place a qualification upon *consciousness*; their sum is still *zero* (i.e. they share a mutual convergence-locus or common denominator at the—indeterminate—void-point juncture, where every qualification is *cancelled* of its individual emphasis while conserving characteristics of its comparative presence in angular aspect with all else). *Consciousness* is conserved as the all-accommodating *presence* through which such radial distributions of "coordinative trajectories" are enabled, and may be "located" in terms of the superposed circular pattern either at the infinite extreme of expansion or contraction, i.e. as the transcendent factor of infinite radial extension or the zero-sum factor of infinite mutual convergence. Both are implied and required by the Void-totality of consciousness-absolute.

The qualifying radial extensions, theoretically of infinite "density" in the subtle gradation from one to the other, may be considered modulations of the *qualities* (*Gunam*, in Sanskrit terminology). It is through variable coordinative alignments and filtrate organizations in the angular relationships of "diameter" and "radii" with respect to an ideally-delineated "circumference", that the perceptual grid-networks "screening" any given universe of coinvolved/highlight qualities are drawn into *functional relief*. The answer as to how this "miracle of creation" is accomplished in consciousness, when consciousness in itself is definitionally so full and complete as to be unequatable with delimiting instruments, is given in the coincident location suggested above between the convergence locus or common denominator of all radii of the "qualities", and the conserved void-presence indicative of Consciousness. Consciousness, "enabled" to appear across its own potential qualities through the void-point locus connate by "value" with its own nature, takes the form of Will. Will, as the Hadit-point, "fits" consciousness as it were through the void-locus, into *specific* congruence with the lineiform extensions comprising its plenum of manifestable potential.

Slipping consciousness into congruent alignment with its extensible qualities through the common-denominator locus, the Hadit-point may function as central instrument of a variable *modulation emphasis*, since all lines lead mutually to *it*.

Thus consciousness "translates" in terms of the pattern, as Will. It employs the *agency* of those saturate extensions, through coincidence with their common-denominator locus, in stressing selective "keys" simultaneously raising while comparatively lowering overlapping qualities in relative relief and recess thus *modulating* the operative interaction of states to a complex *identity-profile*. Will sets up *waves* in the (equipotential) Symmetry of the potentiating pattern; it plays these variable flux-states like piano keys, generating harmonics of ripple, repercussion and resonance-interference conforming to the "score" written as ideotype for a particular perceptual grid. Will's operation is therefore that of *emphasis*, not arbitrary latitude.

The "qualities" resident in the combinative potential derived from infinite density-gradation between adjacent radii (distributed through the Circle) possess thereby a kind of eternal pre-existence, owing to the All-accommodation of Absolute-being. They're drawn into relief, or comparatively recessed, so as to generate, reinforce or modify the cognitive grid giving form to any world. Even so, one could presume an *arbitrary latitude of emphasis* owing to the thetic infinity of gradation, if the resultant qualities could number "meaning" among their synthetic attributes (i.e. if "sweetness of personality" oozed out of a chocolate candybar along with its characteristic flavor, or "furtive rottenness of soul" came attached like captions in a silent-movie morality play when biting into a wormy apple). Our theoretical "reality creator" could then exercise a truly imperious and absolute power; "meaning", that which ultimately imparts the *significance* for any world, state or form of consciousness thereby giving the Rule both in *principle* and *Person* (i.e. answering *specifically* "Who" and "What" is at the bottom of it all), would be placed *entirely* in the hands of an independent intelligence of purely arbitrary decision and latitude, whether we call it "latitude of choice" — as in "productivity ex nihilo" — or "latitude of emphasis" as in "infinite smorgasbord". Intelligence could — in effect — walk around the circle of infinitely-graded radii and pull out "meaning" from the categorical slot of any potential quality, and *never* have to return to starting point. The circle of radii with their potential combinative qualities would never "circumscribe" such an intelligence, or ever give thought to limit since any given "entry" into the potential of a radius would constitute an inexhaustible tangent for exploitation. Like an eternal infant, the "reality creator" could get lost in the nursery of any given entrance-point to the *elementa* of radii, picking one after another "meaning" along with the quality to which whim might be attracted in order to Authorize another universe.

If "meanings" inhered by one-to-one equivalency *in* the qualities (represented by the graduated radii), "meaning" would be a species in the sets-of-opposites along with color, sound, shape, dimension etc., and the assumption of "reality creators" would be justified: "meanings" could only be charged with equal and opposite values that were equivalently arbitrary, and mutually negating. "You" could then "create" by consciously deciding what meaning you wished to pull out of the plenum of meanings, assigning just that value as interpretive *fiat* of the whole. "You" could decide to live in a world with oranges but not apples. If the elemental ratios constituting "oranges" gave rise in themselves to a property called *happiness*, and the meaning *sorrow* derived from the elemental ratios composing "apples", this kind of garden-weeding version of Reality Creating would be viable; and, as absurd as it sounds stated this way, this is precisely the kind of cognitive error made frequently in any case, as when efforts are made to scourge and "purify" the race through Eugenics, or exterminate a whole people so as to delete "vice" from the world.

Yet we don't *feel* the utter arbitrariness of the meanings which experience seems to engender. We can't pull them out of the manifest qualities like whimsically picking strawberries, and we can't pluck them from our minds like interchangeable counters conjured from mist. Experience *persists* in apparently *recommending* meanings without foisting them as simple ciphers for a given quality, *as if there* was something more substantial to the whole than the idea of "arbitrary impositions" would allow.

Meanings aren't inferences of the polarized "qualities". They are not projections or superpositions from an "independent" consciousness (which would then have no *instrumentality* through which to differentiate and apply "meanings"). Meanings, after all, require a kind of *gestalt* elicitation; they are *expressions* of a compound cognitive grid-network, regardless whether or not that fact *exhausts* their descriptive significance. They express the *relationship* between resultant *ratios of emphasis* constituting the relief field of the "cognized world", and the Whole-being consciousness through which the qualities of that world upsurge. Though the *ratios-of-emphasis* are variable as products of Will (i.e. the determinative impulses issued across trajectories through the indeterminate Void-locus), they uniformly arise within the *framework of a constant* (i.e. the whole-being value of Consciousness). All such ratios, constituting the very (perceptual and cognitive) *essence* of the qualities, are generated in implicit comparative reference *to* that Whole- being standard.

Thus, the "qualities" aren't *fixed* entities or *independent* states of set/static meaning derived from the pre-existent plenum of Absolute, but variable resultants of the interactions driven by "determinative indeterminacy" of the free-will operator functioning through their elemental extensions. They are thus effects of the *relationship between* (whole-being) consciousness and its pre-existent potential; *insofar as they are qualities at all* no matter the range of variability exhibited by their compound character, they potentiate *a halo of meaning* (not reducible to any of their attributes) right along with their experiential values. **Meaning arises in the relation between Whole-being value, and the comparative qualities engendered from the pre-existent plenum of Its background potential.**

We may refer again to the volitional means of raising a given, experiential venue into *being* (as function of a stylized *gestalt* or grid-network patterning elemental ratios of the ideotype). A radius or specialized combination of radii must be drawn into *relief* (emphasized, *stressed by* trajectory-of-attention "pushing off" from enabling triangulation of the coordinative potential belonging to the whole "circle"); this proportionately *recesses* other radii so as to generate the contrastive stress-ratios comprising the *sine qua non* of perception and cognition. Such differential stress, the *simplest component* for producing any given "reality-framework", immediately breaks the *equivalency* resident in the infinite equipotentiality of all radii in themselves. Breaking the (infinite) equivalency by juxtaposed contrast spontaneously *finitizes* the participating terms. It establishes an *angular* relation amongst coordinate radii. This restrictive finitization may be felt to generate a kind of "meaning" already, as it acquires its finite quality in *contrast* to the infinite equipotentiality of the circularly-distributed radii as a whole.

The stress engendering such meaning can't, however, be abolished or "set right" by simple return of the respective radii to their *infinite* equipotential extensiveness, for this would *eliminate* the quality (and thus the Creation) through which it arose in the first place. This would constitute a simple and immediate *lapse*, so that "meaning" and "creation" never got off the ground. Rather, the proportion in the particular ratio *generating* the quality, composed necessarily of unequal "sections", immediately

calls into being its implicit *mirror* of counterbalancing proportions (giving a ratio complementary to the first). Corresponding proportions in the radii "across the way", on the *opposite* side of the circle, are automatically drawn upon. This equilibrates and thus "cancels" the finitude of tilings *abstractly*, on a global scale, without *negating* the respective components of the see-saw equation—while focus may remain preferentially pressed upon a particular *pole* of the global structure.

"Meaning", then, obviously doesn't inhere by one-to-one equivalency *in* the given quality (which arises as an *angle* or combinative ratio of elemental components "finitizing" the theoretically-infinite gradation obtaining between radii). Such a quality *doesn't exhaust* the requirement involved in creative potential, as we've seen; it generates a *stress* with respect to the zero-sum whole. The halo of *meanings* that may arise around any such quality is generated by the *relationship* of the quality with respect to the Whole; it doesn't *inhere* in the quality itself (therefore "meaning", while *participating* in the range of opposites, doesn't collapse into simple *equivalency* with the range of opposites—as if "love" were just *equivalent* in significant charge to "hate" so that they merely *cancel* each other).

We can't understand the Superior Reality informing our processes, ever *exempting us* from the hell of arbitrary "reality creation", unless we understand the perdurable values of Being, the Ontological constants *to which we owe allegiance* and relative to which we *can never stand*, "over against", as their precedent fabricators and imperious "endowers".

As an example of the difference between "meaning" and "quality", and their mutual relationship to the whole: let us consider a particular object of perception; let's contemplate a *lemon*. (Arduous readers will note our persistent use of this *one item* in illustrating a universe of implication, cf. *Bashar* review etc. "Lemon", LMVN, is a *Jupiterian* fruit first of all - number value 126, cf. "Motto in the Lotto"; and its power to get the *imagination* watering in anticipation of the glands makes it a particularly vivid gift for indelibly exemplifying the whole genre.) "Lemon" is a perception elicited through a delimited range of "elemental ratios" (considered as the atomic composition of the fruit, the molecular pattern of your sense-receptors etc.). As such, it establishes *a particular style* of finitizing stress with respect to the whole. It *represents* the whole as "sour". "Sourness" in itself is a *quality*. But what is its *meaning*? Is it strictly *repellent* in terms of *meaning*?

If it had but a single meaning for its given quality, we could say "meaning" and "quality" were equivalent. However, owing to the perception "lemon" being a quality definitionally generated through a specific *range* in elemental alignments, we find the variable play in ratios-of-adjustment between experiencer/experience (*together* composing the total quality) eliciting certain *ambiguity* as far as the reflexive *meaning* of the perception is concerned.

According to the age or growth-conditions of the fruit, the mood or electrolyte balance of the "eater" etc., the quality experienced through-and-as-lemon may be sweetly-sour, tart, gastrically distressing, quenching, exhilarating, attractive or repellent. We don't *arbitrarily* assign these responses to the experience. They're a function of the *whole being*, and the aggregate ratios-of-function obtaining through coordinative constituents of the *whole being*. Therefore "lemon" may *represent* that whole in a *variety* of contingent ways, each conserving the general sense and integrity of "lemon". The quality "lemon" gives rise to variable meanings, but *all* such meanings *reference* the stress-state generated by that quality, *to the whole*. "Sourness" may therefore have *negative* or *positive* meaning for us, under any given set of prevailing conditions or compositional ratios permissive of the experience. The "meaning" doesn't *inhere in* the quality (the fruit, its sourness etc.); it arises in reference *of that* quality

to the whole. Therefore the "positiveness" or "negativeness" of a sour lemon may arise as contingent expression of variable conditions and ratios-of-alignment governing the given experience. But the "positive" and "negative" values *themselves* aren't arbitrary and equivalent meanings! They refer to a real wholeness-of-being. They give us the current index of correspondence between the compositional elements and governing ratios of our being, and the presiding Whole-being value (the Circle) through which they arise. A "negative" response *symbolizes* something immediate, in *terms* of the given quality; it's not that the lemon "is negative"—it gives us an evaluative index of *self-symbolizing* states, portraying— affectively—a certain potential in degree of *congruency* or *inharmonicity* relative to Whole-being value.

The *range* allowed into existence through any given quality may seem to be perfectly self-cancelling (i.e. since "lemon" seems to range in potential value from "positive" to "negative" it may appear to *negate* its own possible uniqueness, relative to all else which equally covers the range and so seems to self-cancel). But the *way* in which it covers and accounts for that range *remains finite*, and therefore remains both comparative and unique. What is "positive", symbolizes our relation to whole-being value in a general way. The "positive" experience of an exhilarating spray of lemon, symbolizes our relation to whole-being value in a *specific* way, as a suggestive or "instructive" mode (purification; conversion of the acidic, by "digestion", to the equilibratively *alkaline* etc.). Note that "positive" and "negative" aren't arbitrarily interchangeable and equivalent. They *give preferential* values with respect to whole-being. This is why "love" isn't just a member of the pairs of opposites, arbitrarily equivalent to "hate". Love *corresponds* to Whole-being positively, "hate" corresponds *negatively* to Whole-being. *No capricious "reality creators" allowed here!*

This *limits* the range of emphasis to a latitude less than arbitrary. **Meanings are made essential to the ratios-of-relationship established against Whole-being Standard** (visualizable as the total Circle with indeterminately extensive radii, indefinitely minute point, and illimitable background Void). In keeping with the spirit of *freedom* ascribed to Void-being, arbitrary meanings can be *assigned* any given value or quality—i.e. you can christen a rock as "God's Bounty" and send it away in a Care Package; but any such meaning is *accountable* to the organic derivation of meanings drawn from the relationship characterized above. **Freedom is thus perfectly conserved through any given context; yet responsibility and consequence aren't thereby negated or overthrown.** *Deficiencies* of operative meaning with respect to the Reality of Whole-being, are a real component of existence. They require compensation, active or passive, as Service to and in implicit homage toward *an eternally greater Being* than can be embossed or embellished by "reality creator", upper-or-lower case. You *can't* create your "own reality", even *given* perfect freedom (or precisely *owing* to perfect freedom)—for **the very nature of that zero-factor freedom involves an invariable supply-side of ontological preconditions in support, maintenance, conservation and honor of the Reality represented in that Freedom.**

Thus the "you" and "your" addressed by the hortatory "reality-creating" expositor from elsewhere (or from "here"), is necessarily the "you" that creates by doing, acting, performing—therefore such a "you" is manifestly a *constituted agent*, arising precisely through and in expression of the coordinative qualities triangulating the given, variable-pattern instrument as which Will is enabled to modulate its focus, and so impart particular *emphasis*.

Such an emphasis may stress the comparative trajectory or axial alignment flowing out along pattern-extensors from the common locus; *or it may settle upon a stabilized attention with respect to that locus itself.*

One road leads along the contingent vector-coordinates of the creation, in irresolvable *displacement* from infinite Self-congruence with its ground; the other abruptly *terminates* as any kind of "road" at all, and leaves nothing left over except the infinite Self-congruence pertinent to the Identity of Its ground.

"But what about God! What about God!" we hear our frustrated "reality creators" calling out in one last monumental challenge, on behalf of the Flounder found flipping its death-gasp on the Greater Beach: "Perhaps limited 3rd density consciousness hasn't the 'right' to proclaim it 'creates its own reality', but what about the higher densities under direct correspondence with or even equivalent *to* God-being. Surely even *MT* would allow God to 'create His Own Reality'."

No. The same applies to Her as to everyone else. It's just that *She* is Aware of the Rule, and so makes most direct and efficient use of It Indeed, She *gives* the Rule, taken straight out of the Opulence of Her own Being, that we may follow it and prosper in Beloved Bliss thereby. AMAEND.