

Article 282: Images of Communication –part 2

It is clear that communication, and ohi communication in particular, is complicated by images created from fear, ...images that you can hide behind. If this fear or threat is reduced or alleviated, the communication and understanding increase dramatically and become more precise. Why? Because, as A was not afraid of the flower ...your partner is not afraid of you.

Are you a threat to your partner?

If in your personal-relationship you cannot eliminate the underlying threat and fear of each other directly (I know this sounds absurd, but "threat and fear" are basic components in most relationships ...just as they are active constituents in most lives.) ...how will it be possible for you to communicate openly, honestly, and intimately? ...so that through this communication other barriers can also be eliminated or unified?

If A cannot communicate with B, then, like the flower, let A communicate to, with, and through something else ...something less threatening or fearful, ...let A express by doing, for if A communicates by doing, he is communicating with his expressions ...not directly with B, ...therefore, A does not have to fear or threaten B ...such that *neither party* finds it necessary to create protective images, ...and no protective or defensive images are needed between A and the expressions of doing, for the doing is A's ...and without fear can be an expression of SELF A. No fear or threat to A needs to be involved, but, if existing, then the doing itself will express the misaligned selfimage. And, in this, A has eliminated the need for A_2 and A_B ...such that B can receive this communication without fear of A ...and thus eliminate B_2 and B_A images.

Are you beginning to understand the importance of knowing exactly what you are doing? ...for this alone unveils your trueself.

The communication between A and B must, for a while, follow the route of doing ...which is often expressed as "the direct method of communication" ...but this is in fact indirect and limited. The directness of communicating through "doing" is delusionary because it is considered in relationship to the indirectness and difficulty of communicating through many protective selfimages, ...and compared with that communication, doing is far more direct, but, if SELF A will communicate directly with SELF

B. this will be uninhibited ...and unmistakably clear and precise, ...and far more complete.

Doings pale in comparison to the clarity of languaged-communication.

What additional conclusions and awarenesses can be drawn from these examples? It is obvious that if we are to learn and communicate clearly and directly, especially with intimate partners, then a more-direct means must be established, ...it is not enough to merely develop a precise language~which our dichotomylanguage is not~if we are to disregard the way in which the system is used, the people using the language, and that which is to be communicated~all of which our present language ignores.

Both believing and not believing are hindrances to this new-knowing beyond what you presently know. This example of communication illustrates this, for your beliefs and non-beliefs making up your languaged-image also make up your selfimage, ...and, as we have shown, if you wish to communicate, listen, or learn, you must step away from your selfimage ...or it will limit you, hinder listening, and prevent your knowing beyond the limits set by this image, ...and, in this instance, to *step away from* does not mean to step into another equally limited and limiting selfimage. This is why you must listen in silence (without self-talk either), busy your languaging-mind in reserve, or set your consciousness aside. These acts are the process of *aligning your selfimages* ...or setting them aside to allow communication and understanding to pass from SELF to SELF without distortion and limitations of languaged-images.

And since you established these images from fear, to set them aside, you must set your fears aside as well. To declare that *this cannot be done, that man is inseparable from his selfimage and image-of-images* is to set very strong limits for man, to equate precise expressions to flowers and inanimate objects of reality, and to deny man the ability and benefit of precise communication and understanding within reality, ...which makes man and all he does a complete game of illusion.

Are you and your life merely meaningless illusions?

If this is unacceptable to you, then accept that your languaged-images can be properly aligned or set aside to permit SELF to live and express clearly and directly without hiding, protecting, or limiting yourself,

however, to clearly live and communicate this openly, honestly, and intimately ...you must align all of these images ...or set them aside, and this begins with you, ...is your selfimage as you truly desire? I f not, you will erect a vast array of other images to protect you ...and images of others which will deceive you, and then you will expect to live and communicate openly, honestly, intimately with yourself and others, ...does that make any sense to you?

Religious, philosophical, and [metaphysical] teachings have long-understood the need to eliminate false unaligned images ...but each of these teachings has created confusion by applying this understanding to its own specific system and teaching ...which is assumed to be “right” ...and does not really consider *your desires*. Each of these teachings is attempting to know beyond the image of conscious knowns, yet, all of these teachings and practices apply ITS conscious “knowings” to the process of knowing beyond the known ...and expressing that, ...actually, these systems, and many others, were [and still are] aggressively opposed to one another, ...each espoused its own system and teachings ...and denied the other ...without realizing that each system was attempting to reach the same goal: *to know the unknown ...or that which is beyond present conscious known*. This is the basic truth [and error] of all systems, such as science, philosophy, sociology, mathematics, metaphysics, and so on: each is attempting to know beyond what is known.

The science systems indicate that they “know beyond” by knowing “more”, religions declare to know “God” directly, philosophy and metaphysics indicate that to know you must go “beyond conscious knowing”, sociology seeks “within man’s true nature,” and mathematics creates and follows its own “language” for knowing, ...as a result, sides are chosen up between the individual systems of knowing ...and between groups of systems. Each system of knowing is attempting to know beyond what is known ...so as to expand knowing and express more precisely.

Y et, through all of this, none of these and other systems of knowing seem to realize that...

What is known is limited by the language of knowing
...and you cannot move beyond this known
by using the same language.