

Realization

Stories

Steven E. Kaufman*

ABSTRACT

Religion tells a story about What Is Actually There. Science tells a different story about What Is Actually There. Lao Tzu also told a story about What Is Actually There. Lao Tzu knew that he was only telling a story about What Is Actually There. Religion and science, on the other hand, each believe they have captured, in their stories, What Is Actually There.

Key Words: Formless, experience, story, science religion, Tao, Lao Tzu.

All experience is a story,
something said about
What Is Actually There
as viewed from
a particular perspective.

But the story is never
and can never be
What Is Actually There.

And so all stories,
no matter how accurate,
are a sort of fiction
because no story
can truly capture
What Is Actually There.

The moment one speaks about
What Is Actually There
one has told a story
that must deviate in some respect
from What Is Actually There.

For What Is Actually There
is not a story,
for What Is Actually There
is not an experience,
is not a form.

*Correspondence: Steven E. Kaufman, Independent Researcher. <http://www.unifiedreality.com>
E-mail: skaufman@unifiedreality.com

What Is Actually There
is formless.

This too is a story
that is accurate
and yet is a fiction
because it still is not
What Is Actually There.

Religion tells a story
about What Is Actually There.
Science tells a different story
about What Is Actually There.
Lao Tzu also told a story
about What Is Actually There.

Lao Tzu knew
that he was only telling a story
about What Is Actually There.

Religion and science,
on the other hand,
each believe they have captured,
in their stories,
What Is Actually There.

Because Lao Tzu knew
that he was only telling a story
What Is Actually There
was not obscured
and so he was able to describe it,
to tell a story about it,
with great and timeless accuracy.

On the other hand,
because religion and science
each believe they have captured
What Is Actually There
in their stories about
What Is Actually There,
What Is Actually There
is hidden from them,
and so their stories about
What Is Actually There
become increasingly inaccurate
with the passage of time.

How can one tell a story
with any accuracy
regarding That which one cannot see,
and which one only obscures further
when speaking about it
while not recognizing
the difference between the story
and That which the story is about?

The more the descriptions,
the more the stories
are mistaken for What Is Actually There,
the more What Is Actually There
becomes obscured.

And the more obscured
What Is Actually There becomes,
the more the stories deviate
from the truth
of What Is Actually There.

And so religion now tells the story
of a vengeful and jealous god,
of an egoic god,
that is completely separate from its creation,
completely separate from the universe
and the beings that dwell within.

While science now tells the story
of a godless and lifeless universe
composed of energy and matter
that gives rise by pure chance
to the phenomena
of life and consciousness.

Increasing belief
in the story told by science
has lessened the belief
in the story told by religion.

The ironic thing is,
with respect to What Is Actually There,
the story told by religion,
as inaccurate as it is,
is somewhat more accurate
than the story told by science.

The story told by religion
about What Is Actually There
at least contains a character
that represents an intelligence
underlying the universe,
and so contains a character,
however distorted,
that has as its basis
What Is Actually There.

The story told by science
about What Is Actually There
eliminates that character
from its story altogether,
and in so doing
removes from its story
any mention
of What Is Actually There.

Science is very accurate
in its story
about what lies at the surface
of What Is Actually There.

In mistaking what lies at the surface
of What Is Actually There
for What Is Actually There,
science has mistaken
what is only a reflection
for What Is Actually There,
and in so doing
has completely obscured
what it thinks,
what it believes,
it is describing.

Science believes its story,
which is called materialism,
accurately describes
What Is Actually There.

But what science is actually doing
with its materialistic story
about the nature of reality
only obscures more effectively,
more completely,

more thoroughly,
What Is Actually There
underlying the surface reflection,
underlying the story,
that is experiential reality.

And so in telling its current story
about What Is Actually There,
science is not revealing to humanity
What Is Actually There,
but is actually hiding from humanity
What Is Actually There,
and so is hiding from humanity
both the true nature of humanity
and the true nature of the universe.

For What Is Actually There
underlying the surface reflections,
underlying the shadows,
underlying the stories,
that we call experience,
that we call reality,
is what we truly Are
and what the universe truly Is,
which is not a story
but is the formless Consciousness,
the infinite Intelligence,
by which all stories are told
and by which all stories are known.

And What Is Actually There
can Itself be Known,
but it cannot be Known
as a story,
as a form,
as an experience.

What Is Actually There
can only be Known
as it Is,
once it is no longer obscuring Itself,
once it is no longer hiding Itself,
behind some form,
behind some story,
behind some experience,
that it once mistook for Itself,

that it once mistook for
What Is Actually There.

And once you Know
What Is Actually There,
once you Know
That by which all the stories are told,
and That by which all the stories are known,
then you Know
what you actually Are
and what the universe actually Is.

And once you Know That,
then the fairy tales one has been told
by both religion and science,
the mutually exclusive horror stories
of a lunatic god
and a meaningless universe,
become transformed into and retold as
a story more wondrous and wonderful
than any Storyteller,
while their true Self remains hidden,
could ever imagine.