

The unlived variants

Traduzione del brano "Le varianti non vissute" del libro *LA FONTE PREZIOSA*,¹ pp. 299-308

Tradotto da Francesco Innocenti

Kempis: "You have certainly noticed that our enunciation of Truths that escape man's verification starts, as far as possible, from the certainties that man has, or relies on logic and, in any case, refrains from asking him for acts of faith. On the other hand, when certainties should derive from scientific statements that are not certain, we feel compelled to criticize them, such as the one that the beginning of life depicts in favor of materialism because it is a phenomenon that can be traced back to biochemistry: A simple encounter of suitable substances and materials, and the beginning of an evolutionary process.

Of course, such a discovery destroys something, but it only destroys an erroneous conception of God, that is, of a God who would have created life waving a magic wand, that is, with a direct intervention out of the ordinary. Instead, if we think that the divine intervention makes use of laws and establishes an order according to which life manifests itself, even the discovery of the biological laws pertaining to the phenomenon called "life" does not add a point to the materialistic conception of reality.

Saying that everything was born from an explosion of cosmic matter is not enough to explain the origin of the principles on which life is born and life itself then evolves. Now, if materialism helps us to destroy the mistakes of spiritualism, materialism is welcome, but let us be aware that it only gives us a partial view of reality.

I was saying that we are trying to substantiate our statements, which are uncontrollable to you, starting with the things you can touch with your own hands, even though we are currently at such a point in the development of our teaching that it is difficult to find points of similarity in the worlds of perception. One of the most appropriate similitudes - also because it is an application of the same principle - was the two-dimensional vision of the two eyes which, perceived simultaneously by the mind, originates in it a three-dimensional vision, that is, a vision that is greater than the sum of the two. We have used this similitude to illustrate the principle of transcendence, in which, due to fusion and simultaneity, a leap in quality is made, a state of knowledge and consciousness is reached that is greater than the sum of what was possessed.

The principle of transcendence has been recalled by us to explain how God - even though He is the Whole and therefore has an immanent nature - is very different from the sum of all His parts and therefore is transcendent, besides being immanent. The *absolute consciousness* (coscienza assoluta), though virtually made up of all possible *relative feelings* (*sentire relativi*), transcends them, and is something quite different from their sum. The leap in quality is enormous from relative to absolute.

¹ *LA FONTE PREZIOSA: rivelazioni sull'Assoluto*. Cerchio Firenze 77, (a cura di Luciana Campani Setti). Roma: Edizioni Mediterranee, 1987.

However, the principle of transcendence is found in every manifold consciousness and every consciousness - except the atom of *feeling* (*sentire*)- is manifold in its structure, always remaining unified in its expression, in its *feeling*. So that the consciousness which is manifested by the communion of many *feelings* is far greater than the sum of these *feelings* and, by the principle of unity, is a single being. A proof that such consciousness is a being that transcends the *feelings* making it up is that, in order to feel in an enlarged way, it does not need the historical memory of the experience that amplified the *feeling* and, by its nature, feels in a way not conditioned to that memory. It then follows that, in the phase of new incarnation, man's *awareness* (*consapevolezza*) is reduced compared to the possessed *consciousness* (*coscienza*) because, as we know, *awareness* implies the mind which, being new in each incarnation, does not possess the memory of the experiences it has had. However, I repeat, the essence of all experiences is saved in the new being's *consciousness* and reappears by guiding his/her behavior consistently when the being is stimulated by circumstances.

Man's *awareness* is made up of sensory impressions, emotions, thoughts, memories, feelings that condition him; but only a part of it comes from his *consciousness*, that is, from the true and indelible part of his being; the rest is the result of his education, character and so on. But this rest is a superstructure that he needs to experience and gain the necessary understanding to broaden his *consciousness*, his ability to feel. In his choices, man is influenced not only by his true, indelible being, but also by the artificial part that comes from his human position.

This fact would be unacceptable, if it were believed that man is responsible for his choices for an eternal reward or punishment, because it would prevent him from choosing freely. On the other hand, one cannot certainly use the claim that man is free in his choices as a proof of man's eternal reward or punishment, because the opposite is so evident that no one can reasonably support the concept of free will. Man's freedom consists of escaping certain influences, of choosing between one deterministic chain and another. However, the fact of choosing under certain influences does not affect the consequences of the choice, because the purpose of life is not to reward or to punish, but to give what is missing. For instance, if there is no altruistic consciousness, the choice will be selfish, but the consequence of this choice can only lead to a more altruistic consciousness.

Living means expressing one's degree of *consciousness*, and unconsciously working to integrate it. This basic concept entirely characterizes our teaching and makes it an evolutionary doctrine. However, evolution here only means that the *feeling* (*il sentire*) manifests itself in a succession of enlargement - as seen from the perspective of *becoming* - or that the *feeling* is logically ordered from less to most, and therefore the more contains the less - as seen from the perspective of *being*.

Now, from the principle of transcendence it follows that the most transcends the least, not only in terms of quantity but also in terms of quality, since quantity and quality identify themselves when one deals with the *feeling*. Furthermore, saying that the *feeling* manifests itself in a succession of enlargements and is logically ordered from least to most, means to say that there are no wrong choices in absolute sense, or at least that they do not affect or concern the manifestation or concatenation of the *feeling of consciousness* (*sentire di coscienza*) - which, whatever the choice of man is, can only have a broader successor.

We have always affirmed that choices or *variants* (*varianti*) concern the *feeling in a broad sense* (*il sentire in senso lato*), the *awareness* of man, and not the concatenation of the *feeling of consciousness* (*il sentire di coscienza*). For the sake of understanding, one can say that choosing one way or the other might lead to a more or less painful path, but in any case, the resulting *feeling* is always the logically succeeding *feeling*. Of course, it is not the same, from a contingent point of view, to reach the logically succeeding *feeling* from one path or the other.

Now, if one admits that reality is "being" - an indispensable admission to make the concept of God-Absolute true - one must conclude that in the Eternal Present, in which everything exists, a real possibility of choice must correspond to several versions of individual history of equal reality, so equally real that, for an external observer, no one could know which version the individual lives. In other words: Among the many versions, only one is lived by man's *awareness*, and only he who lives it knows in which one he is living. However, in the reality of things that are realizable and therefore realized in the Eternal Present, they must all be realized. Otherwise, it would not be a real possibility of choice and the individual would only have a supposed, nominal freedom, reducing reality to a rigid determinism.

The Eternal Present is a state, not a place. But let us suppose we can visualize it, or better, to visualize the real possibility of choice of a man, as he appears in the state of Eternal Present. One would then see the *frames* (*i fotogrammi*), that is, the cosmic situations, of all the possible choices concerning the physical world, the astral world, the mental world, all of which are related to his *feeling of consciousness*.

In other words, all versions of his history in the worlds of perception are linked to the *feeling of consciousness*, representing the choices that can be made. However, man's *awareness* makes only one version be *felt in a broad sense* (*sentire in senso lato*): the version that has been chosen. This does not mean that the other versions are not complete with physical, astral, mental *frames* (i.e. actions, sensations, thoughts); because if, in *becoming*, they were chosen, they should give the corresponding *feeling in a broad sense*, more or less fatiguing, more or less painful or welcome, capable of broadening the *feeling of consciousness*.

In other words, when man has freedom of choice, to a single *feeling of consciousness* corresponds a pluralisation of *feelings in a broad sense*, inherent to a pluralisation of *frames* of which, however, only one series is perceived.

The visualization I have done is very crude and contains conceptual inaccuracies, but it is quite suitable to effectively explain such an unusual Reality. The most relevant mistake that one can make when misinterpreting this exemplification, is to understand that the *frames* are objectively existing beyond the *creation-perception* (*creazione-percezione*) of the individual. Instead, they are all existing in the state of Eternal Present, because precisely in that state every succession is canceled, and therefore they are all *created-perceived* simultaneously, so that it disappears the sense of passing that instead springs from the *creation-perception* in illusory succession. Not for anything else.

Going back to the example of the film flowing in front of the lens and projecting the *frames*, we could say that in the Eternal Present there are as many lenses as there are frames, and therefore all are projected simultaneously. The individual perceives in succession what exists in the Eternal

Present simultaneously, but it exists in the Eternal Present because he perceives it, and he perceives it because the *feeling* creates it.

A question then arises, which I mentioned last time: if the *variants* exist equally realized in the Eternal Present, who does realize them since the individual perceives only one? Not only that, but how can it be that the individual perceives only one *variant*, since they are all structurally identical?

Many times, speaking of *feeling*, we have used the similitude of the mirror, that is, we have mentioned the double action of *feeling*: one of self-manifestation, and the other of disclosure that leads to the manifestation of a broader *feeling*. Lately, we have used the verb *create-perceive* (*creare-percepire*) as a single verb precisely to bring together in one word the double activity of *feeling* which, in fact, is always unitary. And this applies as much to the *feeling in a broad sense* as it does to the *feeling of consciousness*. However, it should be pointed out that perception is a process that is related to the worlds of appearance and therefore to the *feeling in a broad sense*; so that when the being has left the wheel of birth and death, it no longer has any perception; but that does not mean that the being does not feel anymore. On the contrary, its self-awareness covers the full breadth of its *feeling of consciousness*, which is not the case when *awareness* is linked to perception, to the *feeling in a broad sense*.

Dwell on this statement: It means that, in man, *awareness* is linked to perception in a very large part, and that only a small part is aware of the *feeling of consciousness*. This does not prevent the *feeling of consciousness* from manifesting itself if stimulated, that is, on the appropriate occasion, because it is not lost, it is only excluded from the *awareness*, the process of which, by habit, reveals almost exclusively what man perceives. This is because, in man, *awareness* is by habit an almost exclusively mental fact; while in beings free from the wheel of birth and death, *awareness* is a matter of *consciousness*.

But back to us. I was talking about the dual activity of *feeling*: one of creation or externalization, the other of perception or *awareness*. Now, the question about *variants* makes us think that the process of creation or externalization or manifestation is not necessarily related to perception, that is, that the *feeling* may create and creation may not be perceived. On the other hand, since the *feeling* is unitary, it cannot be that one of its twofold activities is absolutely missing; at least one creation, when there are many creations, must be perceived. Not so necessarily the others. But when does the *feeling* have multiple creations? Every time a logical fact dictates it. And why is only one creation perceived? Because the logical fact rules it out. That is, the creations are not complementary, but they are alternatives. In the logical succession, or in the deterministic chain, man can do something in a way or in another way, the equation can be solved in a way or in another way, by choice.

Again, in the creation phase, the creations of the *feeling* are manifold whenever the logical succession imposes it. Instead, in the process of perception, the creations are alternatives, so only one is perceived, because each one excludes the others.

Now, we must dwell on the creation of the *feeling* to ask ourselves: which is the *relative feeling* (*sentire relativo*) that creates cosmic situations and, in particular, the *unlived, unperceived variants*? The current *feeling*? If this were the case, the result would be a dismembered All, or at

least unified only in a vertical sense, because it is an individual *feeling* that does not have the ability to escape from its own limitation, individualization, to make various stories common to others. If it were that *feeling*, it would be a reality in existence but made up of many dreamlike worlds. So, it must be a non-individualized *feeling*.

Do you remember when we said that the whole reality of a situation common to many *feelings* is known only by the *feeling* that, because of its breadth, contains all the *feelings* related to that situation? Well, the answer is in this statement. Thus, bearing in mind that the discourse applies to all the *feelings* of the whole *cosmos*, what is the *feeling* which by amplitude can contain all the *feelings* of all cosmic situations, all cosmic reality, if not the *cosmic consciousness* (*coscienza cosmica*)? And what is that *feeling* which within its environment includes all *feelings* and therefore is not individualized, if not the *cosmic consciousness*? Thus, the entire *cosmic consciousness* feels the entire cosmic reality, not only what is perceived by the *relative feelings* which constitute it, but also, by the principle of transcendence, that part which is not perceived but which must exist for the completeness of the development of the logical construct.

The *cosmic consciousness* which, as we have said, is always in a state of eternal present, constitutes a part of the *virtual splitting* (*virtuale frazionamento*) of the *absolute feeling* (*sentire assoluto*). Its delimitation derives from the fact that it represents the logical development of a certain *virtual limitation* of the *absolute feeling*, the so-called "*fundamental module of the cosmos*" (*modulo fondamentale del cosmo*). Each cosmos has its own module because it represents, with its *cosmic consciousness*, the logical development of a different virtual limitation of the *absolute feeling*: developments that are all carried out in an independent chain, one for each cosmos. The *consciousness* of every cosmos is independent of that of any other cosmos, as is the unfolding of one equation from that of another. Instead, the *feelings* that constitute the *cosmic consciousness*, of which it represents the logical point of departure or arrival, are not independent of each other, but due to their dual activity of creation, perception, awareness, they are horizontally linked in groups, and vertically in a logical and consequent order. However, in the *cosmic consciousness* is found the synthesis and the final or primitive mutual dependence of each *feeling* of the cosmos: *cosmic consciousness* which, by the principle of transcendence, is able to complete, unifying it, the individual logical discourse where, because of its alternativeness, it cannot be created-perceived by the individual.

To recapitulate, the *variants* concern the *feeling in a broad sense*, because they are only on the way to the fall of a limitation of the *feeling of consciousness*, and are alternative facts, that is, facts that go beyond the information that the *feeling* has from perception. Thus, their creation within the *indivisible divine substance* (*divina sostanza indiversificata*) cannot take place by the *feeling* that does not receive that information, but only by a *feeling* that in creating goes beyond *perception-awareness* and goes there not in the individual sense, like that of two or more unified *feelings*, but goes there in the total sense, like that of the *cosmic consciousness*.

Thus, the *cosmic consciousness*, by the principle of transcendence, logically completes the creation-perception of individual *relative feelings*, not through perception but through the conditioning of the *divine substance* of which it is constituted, and therefore of which the entire cosmos is constituted. This conditioning is essentially the basic limitation of the *cosmic*

consciousness, that is, the *fundamental module of the cosmos*; which in itself already enucleates from the *indivisible divine substance* an environment: the *cosmic environment*.

This environment - compared to the *absolute consciousness* in which everything is present, but nothing is highlighted, and this explains God's transcendence - already represents a particularisation, which can only take place through the *limited-relative feeling*. In fact, it is because of the limitation that the *relative feeling* draws out, creates, perceives, feels only something from the All. And the more limited the *feeling*, the more elementary the particular created-perceived is. Therefore, the limitation of the *feeling*, a consequence of the *virtual splitting* of the *absolute feeling*, pluralizes. And this pluralisation, consequence of the *virtual splitting*, makes the *absolute consciousness* not a feeling, but the absolute feeling, which, to be such, must contain the maximum possible pluralisation, that is, all possible *feelings*.

If you analyze the logical phases from *Absolute* to relative, you have:

- *absolute consciousness*;
- its *virtual splitting* resulting in the virtual decomposition-composition of the *cosmic consciousnesses*;
- in turn composed-decomposed into individual *relative feelings*;
- creation, by enucleation from the *indivisible divine substance*, of the *cosmic environment*, including the worlds of perception, by the *cosmic consciousness* and the individual *related feelings*.

The enucleation, direct consequence of the degree of limitation of the *relative feelings*, has as a consequence - as I said - the creation of the *cosmic environment*: which, however, does not exist objectively but only as a fact connected with the limitations of the *feeling*, and is therefore dependent, in the end, on the type of limitation of the *cosmic consciousness* relative to the *Absolute*, that is, on the *fundamental module of the cosmos*.

This phase of unfolding, of development, of limitations, can be defined as *pluralisation*, and therefore of creation or manifestation of the *feeling*. However, pluralisation, being contained in a logical development, is not infinite; being subject to a law that orders it, it is finite. That is why the cosmos is limited. Therefore, in this sense, already in the creation of the *feeling*, in pluralisation, there is inherent unification. In other words, in the non-temporal but structural moment in which the *absolute feeling* is relativized, there is a pluralisation, which includes all possible *feelings* according to a logical development; development that marks the limits of every cosmos, in which every *feeling* - among the many other logically consequent limitations - has one in common: the basic one. Due to this basic limitation, the cosmic environment created by the *relative feelings* is common to each one.

The *feeling* that has only the basic limitation is the *cosmic consciousness*. And, it is the *cosmic consciousness* that, due to this basic limitation and the principle of transcendence, brings about the horizontal unification of all *feelings* which proceed from it.

You do understand what the horizontal unification is: It is the unification that occurs to all equivalent *feelings* as a consequence of the fall of a limitation. The synthesis of these *feelings* is made by the cosmic consciousness; otherwise, each *feeling* would only remain vertically bound.

Each *feeling* is linked vertically when in logical succession it proceeds from the other, i.e. it is included by the other. And this is the vertical unification, which makes of the many interested *relative feelings*, in themselves completed, a being that feels rather than many separate *feelings*.

Perception-awareness is the result of this unification, and it is the second phase of the *feeling*, a phase that concerns unification rather than pluralisation, even though it is the cause of the illusion of *becoming* in which separation seems objective.

The astonishing warp and fabric that is the Existing, so barbarically illustrated by this narrator, who asks for forgiveness for this and much more, is not a mechanism, but a wonderful organism in which every part, even the most insignificant fragment, is irreplaceable and therefore of paramount importance, and therefore immortal.

If one comes so far to believe the truth of all this, one understands the meaning of the highest morality, and suddenly the meaning of life, of existence, of the right relationship with the others, becomes clear.

But who are the others? The more dismissive, hated, evil, the more confused and far from the truth, and therefore more in need of understanding and love? But what would be the point of knowing all of this, if one lived as one who ignores it?

Such is indeed the question I leave to your meditations.”