

Excerpts from *The Nature Of Reality* – Coburn - #64277

Here are five excerpts illustrating differing approaches and tones. First, using logical progression to make a point:

Nature of the Universe

If we were to examine the nature of the universe—from the precise balance within the numerous vast galaxies to the makeup of a simple atom, we would discover that *everything* appears to be an integrated portion of a larger whole. Therefore, to suggest that we are separate beings without direction or inner dependence would appear to go against the pattern of everything that occurs in nature. In light of just this single observation, to conclude that we are nothing more than the net result of a random, purposeless existence that just somehow happened to come about out of the void of nothingness might seem to defy simple logic. We might then conclude that if this were true, “something” probably had to design and create the complexities of what we know as consciousness and physical existence.

Next, simplifying a complicated concept into easily understood terms:

Does the future already exist?

When asked to address this question, Albert Einstein speculated that we would have to first look at the nature of time itself. He postulated that if the future can be observed, then it has to have already existed, suggesting that there is no such thing as *absolute* time. Instead, he proved in his *Theory of Relativity* that time differs based on the observation and motion of the observer. This can be illustrated by the now accepted scientific premise that an astronaut in a spaceship approaching the speed of light would age more slowly than one who has never left the planet.

Time is relative to the observer

Let’s look at an example. Assume you are in the back of a space ship moving very close to the speed of light. If you were to toss a ball 20 foot in the air and it were to take two seconds before it returned to your hand, the guy standing next to you could safely argue that he could easily follow the flight of the ball as it traveled 40 feet—20 feet up and 20 feet down—in 2 seconds.

However, if we somehow possessed x-ray vision, a third observer on earth could accurately contend that because the ball left your hand when the craft was over, say, the Empire State Building in New York City but landed as it was passing by the Statue of Liberty, it traveled a few *miles* in those same two seconds.

Einstein went on to surmise that because time is relative to the observer, there is no reason why the past, present *and* future could not be perceived in varying order. Would this suggest it *is* possible, in theory at least, to allow one to perceive the future *before* it occurs? Perhaps we could conclude that what we label as the future is just *one* of *many* possible outcomes.

However, there are some lighter moments salted with some humor:

The gospel according to the National Enquirer

On a lighter note, some of new millennium predictions headlined in such periodicals as the *National Enquirer* have been somewhat more off the wall or just down right wacky. Included in the pages of these gossip periodicals have been such earth-shattering revelations as Madonna giving birth to quintuplets, Roseanne shedding her clothes and conducting a TV talk show from a nudist colony and the discovery of an abandoned alien space station complete with the bodies of dead extraterrestrials.

It was left for us to speculate if some members of the alien crew are still alive with plush governmental jobs in Washington DC.

Here is an example of some instructional material:

Getting answers

Once you have made the initial connection with your higher self or guides, you can begin to do it instantaneously, much as you might turn to a co-worker for the answer to a problem. Begin by asking a question of them before you fall asleep and see how you feel about the issue in the morning. Then begin to dialogue with them in your meditation, whether by way of a formal ceremony in a sacred space or in a less formal setting, such as watching a tropical sunset or a walk along a quiet beach. Lie on your back and observe the patterns in the clouds drift by in the afternoon sky. Perhaps you will hear the answer in a casual discussion with a friend or you will “by chance” overhear a conversation that provides the resolution to your problem.

Synchronicity is still alive and well this side of Oz.

. . . *And finally, some historical information and questions for the reader to ponder:*

Ancient manuscripts

It is well known that for the first three centuries following the death of Jesus of Nazareth, the political rulers of Rome persecuted the early Christians. Then, following Emperor Constantine's sudden conversion, Christianity became the prevailing religion of the powerful Roman Empire. When their interpretation of the canon conflicted with that of Alexandria and Constantinople, Rome's domination of the ecumenical council assembled in AD 367 led to the creation of what we know as the New Testament.

Not only did the editors apparently intentionally exclude those stories and concepts that did not support their view, but many would suggest that they might well have modified them to suit the political needs of the church authorities of that day. Add to that the failing eyesight of the scribes, inaccurate translation or simply embellishments and changes made to support the doctrinal or theological beliefs of those in charge, and you have a document with a built-in bias toward the Roman point of view.

Recently discovered manuscripts, such as the Codex, Sinaiticus, written around 340 AD and discovered in the Greek Orthodox monastery of St Catherine of Alexandria by German scholar Constantin Tischendorf in 1859, bears this out. ¹² In addition, the existence of a large body of Gnostic writings such as the *Gnostic Gospel of Thomas*, found in a cave in Nag Hammadi, Egypt in 1945 supports this theory as well. These, as well as other excluded texts, suggest that the New Testament might well have been edited and embellished for political and doctrinal reasons.

Clement of Alexandria, an early Church father, wrote that Jesus had secret teachings not recorded in the Gospels and that they were intended only for those who were initiated into the great mysteries. Were these early teachings banned or destroyed by the Orthodox Church because it disagreed with them? Could it be possible that the early church leaders, not unlike some of the present day governments, did not tell us the entire story?