

Article 200: Is Duality Necessary for Understanding? -part 1

The primary justification for the belief in the separation and dual nature of things is the concept that only through discreetness and duality can things be truly known.

For over twenty-five centuries, many religions, philosophies, and teachers—including many scientists—have taught that you can only know one thing relative to another thing ...such as an opposite, ...in other words, they declared, you can only know, for instance, hot relative to cold, up relative to down, motion relative to rest, right relative to wrong, or love relative to an opposite of fear or hate; ...but is this actually true? ...for if you know cold, down, rest, wrong, or fear/hate, ...do you really know anything about hot, up motion, right, or love? It also seems improbably that you can know anything about hot, up, motion, right, or love by knowing unrelated things such as big, wet, or grief. Also, if you study the basic particles of the universe by smashing them together, do you really know much about those particles? Isn't that like studying automobiles by watching a "demolition derby"? From this, it seems that you cannot know things relative to "opposite" or unrelated things ...nor by observing their interactions in conflict or confrontation, ...but knowing must be possible, ...maybe you can only know one thing relative to a closely related thing.

In this regard, consider that it is also taught that "to know what you are [a spiritual being], you must first know what you are not [a physical being]." This concept, in one form or another, is used to justify a difference between spiritual and physical, wearisome struggles and conflicts, diseases and afflictions, and grief and sorrow ...and the need to learn and endure "life's trials and lessons", ...but is this at all reasonable? ...for it seems that if who you are and who you are not are so intertwined that you cannot know who you are without first knowing who you are not, then you cannot know who you are not without first knowing who you are, ...so this knowing as well seems futile, ...and you cannot know one thing relative to a closely related aspect either, for they will cancel each other and destroy your knowing.

In duality, except in the very simplest form, all systems of knowing, even those using the supposedly pure and "true" language of mathematics, will create a problem or seeming self contradictory box which the system cannot resolve, untangle or escape from. It seems therefore that your knowing can be consistent yet minor and insignificant ...or more complex and confusing ...and lacking in answers.

Maybe there is no knowing in duality ...or maybe all knowing in duality is false-knowing! Could it be that our point of reference or point of relativity is incorrect? Perhaps all knowing is self-knowing ...and, in that, is self-

referential, ...is this possible? Most sentences, beliefs, ideas, and teachings are based on one thing referring to another thing; ...an example of which is: your mind is confused; your emotions are spinning; or your eyes are blue. Self-referential words or concepts refer only to themselves, though this is frequently not clear ...or easy to see or understand. Let's consider this next example ...which is also self-referential.

As a traveler was approaching the gates of Sparta ...in ancient Greece, two men came toward him ...and one said, "Stranger, you have the look of a wise and experienced traveler, and since you are going into Sparta on business, maybe you can resolve my dilemma; ...my friend here is from Sparta ...and he says that all Spartans are liars, ...can you tell me if he is speaking the truth ...or lying?"

Well, you can certainly understand that if the man from Sparta is telling the truth, then he is lying ...because he is a truth-telling Spartan, so all Spartans are not liars, ...and if he is lying, then he is telling the truth. This story is known as "the liar's paradox" ...and is self-referential, and since in duality there are no options other than "telling the truth or lying", the stranger's question cannot be answered. All such self-referential events are "paradoxical" ...and cannot be known or resolved in duality.

In much the same way, since truth must always and in all ways be true, all truths~which must be self-referential~are "paradoxical" and cannot be proved or known ...or even understood; ...and since "a truth" must follow the same pattern, all "truths" are false-truths. It seems, therefore, that unless there is a flaw in these reasonings, there is no knowing in duality through opposition or other comparisons ...and all knowing is paradoxical in self-referential oneness, ...can anything be done about this? ...or must we dismiss all possibility of knowing? Can we add to or change our understandings? Is there a possibility we have failed to consider?

More next week.