

6 – Science and spirituality

Pages 73-79, 89-95 of Crack in the Matrix discuss the topics of science and spirituality. The text is present twice. Once as strikethrough text (pages 73-79) and once with small deviations as text without strikethrough (pages 89-95). The thematic treatment is identical in both texts.

All earthly science, especially western science, is based exclusively on what can be perceived with the physical senses and what is proven by a "scientific material" in which material phenomena are connected with earthly frequencies, whatever that is in biology, chemistry and physics are explainable.

Extraterrestrial or cosmic science has two aspects:

It is a technological and material science consisting of physical apparatuses that can produce phenomena that are denied by terrestrial science because they are not realizable with the terrestrial level of knowledge.

These phenomena, which are common in other worlds, namely the materialization, dematerialization, levitation of objects, transformation and malleability of solid matter, instantaneous teleportation, are characterized by a specific frequency range of Universal Energy.

It is a mental science. Their full knowledge is reserved for the cosmic masters.

*Another name for mental science is **spirituality**.*

According to page 79, spirituality is defined as *knowledge of the mastery of universal energy, in all its manifestations, through its conscious and willed use at all levels of vibration.*

Conclusion:

Ultimately, when we look at the cosmos, we perceive **space** and **energy**. A universal cosmic model must therefore contain the two basic pillars of space and energy. Whereby space and energy can be multi-dimensional.

Then there is the **consciousness**, which perceives and experiences space and forms of energy. Consciousness is therefore the third entity in a universal cosmic model. There are now two ways of looking at this situation:

- 1) If you only look at the space and energy levels, then this corresponds to the conventional **natural sciences**.
- 2) If you look at all levels, then this corresponds to a mental, cosmic science, which can also be called **spirituality**.

So, there are two kinds of science:

1) the material science (natural sciences)

2) the mental, cosmic science (spirituality)

The field of natural sciences is embedded in the mental, cosmic science and the overall view thus represents a holistic concept of the universe.

From an Ummites point of view, however, this could only be described as a way of looking at things that is adapted to people. For the Ummites, both areas have the same basis and for them it is a homogeneous world view in which the distinction between natural science and spirituality actually makes no sense and seems rather artificial. The distinctions can be made, but are not necessary.

6.1 - Gnoseology of the Ummites

The gnoseology (theory of knowledge) of the Ummites is presented as follows:

D80: *We have not developed a theory of cognition that is separate from our own "philosophical theology" (Woala Oleass) and has its own identity.*

Our source of knowledge is empirical. Convinced that "the real being" (Aaiodi) is unknown to us, in the conviction that the universe (Waam) accessible through our intellectual and sensory pathways is an "imagination" created by our "I think" was created, we decide to at least try to penetrate this distorted image of "real being" (Aaiodi) that we have distorted.

Aware that the universe we "consider" that we "think" is not the true universe created by the primal source (Woa), since the function of "thinking" distorts, deforms, its reality man, and consequently every "**thinking being**" (EeseOemii), doomed to erase the true healing inscription that would satisfy his gnoseological longing.

Our ancestors gradually discovered that scientific formulations, elaborated on premises and conclusions based on simplified logic, did not have the apodictic character they first ascribed to them.

There were principles in the dynamics of the universe that could not be accounted for under the qualifications you called "**true**" or "**false**."

Voices have thus emerged calling for a new logic that not only transcends the limits of certain rudimentary forms of informative communication, but also enriches the spectrum of possible "proposals" (Aigaegaa).

How else can we refer to the scientific phenomenology of realities such as "**bad morals**" (Ammioxoo), "**cruelty**" (Iuammio Dii), "**happiness, good morals, inner contentment**" (Yiisa-Oo) and also "**telepathic transmission**" (Oaneeaiyooyo), "**Mind-Body Connection**" (Oenbuuau).

All of these terms cannot be measured analytically and fitted into the framework of objective reality with terms such as the "liquid state of "matter" (Goodaa), "dimensional spheres" (Ibozoo Uu) or "very high frequency radiation" (Ibon-ee).

It was necessary to rid living beings (oemii) devoted to science of their unconscious tendency to imbue their conclusions with emotional hues, thus distorting awareness of objective reality.

Thus, emerged new techniques for accessing what you would call "**spiritual**" (in the sense you give that word, i.e., by verifying the facts and formulating their laws analytically) using a rigorously scientific methodology.

There is only one difference to the scientists of Earth:

You accept a hypothesis by elevating it to the level of rational explanation when its postulates (formulated in Aristotelian terms) do not contradict the mathematically expressed law - mostly statistical in nature - until the discovery of new facts conflicts with the old formulation.

Our "agnosticism" (as you would call it) compels us not only to refrain from defining and exploring something as transcendent as the "primal source" (Woa) or "the real being" (Aaiodi), but when we formulate a theory elaborate and test, we still **do not accept** their authenticity.

This stream of concepts, explanations, hypotheses serves us as mental gymnastics to constantly purify ideas. For example, if a thinker of Ummo formulates a new hypothesis about the influence of the "twin cosmos" (Uwaam), which is confirmed by the facts and by its analytical formulation, **he does not believe it** himself and never accepts it.

The dynamic of the thinking function itself is more important than the "flat" stage of stagnant theory that produces a school like yours. An example, absurd though it is, will illustrate what I am saying. Had Freud had our UmmoEnmii mentality, he would never have dogmatically accepted his own theory of the "Oedipus complex".

This pragmatic behaviour, strange for you, is useful for us because it avoids both the atomization of schools that divide the social web by provoking conflict situations, and the narcissistic and non-objective attitudes of those who take their own spiritual genesis as ultimate truth accepting, forgetting that another, more intelligent and knowledgeable person of the future will perfect the earlier proposals without denying them. For this reason, we do not try in our thinkers to speculate about the nature of the inaccessible (e.g. about Woa and Aaiodi).

6.2 - Ontology of the Ummites

The ontology (doctrine of being, of beings) of the Ummites is presented as follows:

D78: The problem of "**being**" as envisioned by the thinkers of Earth has received a radically different formulation on Ummo. Our ancestors did not for a moment doubt the existence of a reality outside of their own consciousness. The "**things**" existed for them "outside me," but their true essence is masked for us by their encoding of our sense pathways. This principle remained constant until new forms of dialectics expanded our original conceptions.

On this point, Earth thinkers also accept the difficulty of accessing external reality, the mental images of which are integrated through the coding used by our exteroceptor and proprioceptor organs.

A synthesis of our current ontology (Eayodi Goo) could be formulated as follows:

It is not possible to define the concept of "**being**" in a first step. "**For me**", being purely conscious of my **me** (Igioi Ualeexii) and the "things" that "exist dimensionally" (Aiooya) around me, I am immersed in a universe that transcends to me.

The 'things', the objects of my mental process, are certainly not 'as I perceive them', since I process them using a very complex rationalization mechanism. Causal relationships are "in-me" relationships that are processed according to an order worked out by such mechanisms. A plant is captured by an "I" with characteristics that symbolize its "real" qualities. "My" sensory impression, which arrives at the level of consciousness, is undoubtedly an illusion based on external constants. Thus, colour will be the psychological impression of a stimulation of an electromagnetic nature, and the notion of mass printed in my consciousness is very far from being identified with the real physical attribute that produces it.

But even if the "beings/essences" are masked by access to our **selves**, and even we could not know what they really **are**, is their **outside-of-me** essence constant? I may not know how a camphor molecule really "is" that stimulates my olfactory sense organ through conscious perception, but whenever I perceive such an aroma, can I be assured that it is an attribute of camphor alone and not an illusion or hallucination could be?

In other words, even if I didn't know what the "universe really is," the universe is "here," dynamic or static, mutable or fixed, generating ideas that reflect in my consciousness without my "I." can change his essence, his own "being"?

Our answer is **no**.

The living being (oemii) with a defined neurocortical and mental structure (you people of earth, we people of ummo and all the similar beings of the universe) can never access the truth, the essence of the universe - not because such a universe "does not exist" or because there is a barrier that prevents us from doing so, but because when we think of the being/being we change its essence.

(A rough comparison will illustrate our theorem): When a physicist from your planet claims to be observing a micrometallographic sample to check its optical properties, he is creating a change in the process by using light to observe. This is an insurmountable obstacle, since the observation itself changes the true nature of what is observed. Something similar happens with **being**: it **"is there"** **when it is not thought and its idea does not exist in my consciousness.**

As soon as we **think in terms of being**, it is neither **[is]** nor **[is not]** (here your logic does not allow us an informative solution to develop this concept).

We living beings **"create" the universe when we think about it**. The cosmos presents itself to us with a configuration of dimensional spheres (Ibozoo Uu). Undoubtedly, these dimensional spheres exist as a reflection of something-that-didn't-point (Ibozoo)-was before we thought it and (**Thinking is Being**) before we, the living beings, existed.

This is a kind of **"symbiosis"** between **external reality and us**. External reality bends to our mental process, it is altered as soon as we focus our awareness on it.

Therefore, we work out a binary model of the universe composed of the physical factor's dimensional spheres, which is our **"creation"**, and at the same time this reality corresponds to our **self**, creates it, creates it.

At this point you may think that our system is a kind of pantheism that excludes the idea of a **Necessary Being** or Source (Woa) **that transcends the cosmos**. This is not the case, as you will see later.

Let's imagine other "thinking" beings (EeseeOemi) that are different from us. (We are not referring to beings with a different physiological structure, but to "I's" whose mental patterns have a different configuration.) No doubt "they" will try **to think about the cosmos** (of course, the process of **"thinking"** shouldn't be interpreted in an anthropomorphic sense), and "in the process" they will modify his **being**. So, your universe **will not be** our universe (note: **importantly, we're not saying that the universe can't be observed, felt, perceived, or shaped** in various ways - that's obvious. But on the other hand, we're saying that its image of this cosmos must be different, just as an optical image captured by a dipteran insect can be different than that perceived by the human retina).

It is not just the fact that the image of this universe differs from configurations other than ours through the intervention of mental processes. It is that the **essence** itself, the **essence of the universe**, needs to be disturbed. This relativity of **being**, this multiplicity of **"being"** reflected in our logic through what we call the "realm or network of forms of **being**" (Aaiodi Ayu).

Suppose we symbolically arrange all ontological possibilities (let's abstract the Aristotelian principle of the excluded middle) in relation to **"something"** that goes beyond my "I".

(It is a being)**1**, (It is a being)**2**, (It is a being)**3**, (It is a being)**4**, ... (...)... It is a being)**n**

It is a set or series of non-tautological possibilities that we can encode even more synthetically in this way:

S₁; S₂; S₃; S₄; S₅; ... S_n

We come to the meaning of the Aiooya, the transcription of which into the mundane language is impossible. "Being inaccessible" (Aioodi) is "that" which can probably assume infinite possibilities of "existence" ($S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5, \dots S_n$).

For example, a quantum of energy, photon (Aboaya Ou) may (**be**) S_1 or S_2 (**not be**; if turning into mass) - but both possibilities are deformations of an Aiooya caused by my "I" (thinking entity).

We living beings therefore see the universe and its factors in the possibilities $S_1; S_2; \dots S_k$ integrated. You, people of Earth, only accept possibilities S_1 and S_2 at the moment.

But other hypothetical beings will "be inaccessible" (Aioodi) under other possibilities than our recorded $S_{k+1}, S_{k+2}, \dots S_m$.

The drama of the living being or other thinking being is that its search for truth, its search for "that which is inaccessible" (Aioodi), will be fruitless, since it is always found among the characteristics $S_1; S_2$ will present.

My judgements, my actions, ordered according to the ends to be achieved and the means to be employed, also constitute "**in themselves**" just as many $S_1; S_2; \dots S_k$, herself deformed by her own thought process.

6.3 - Earthly Language and Ummian Logic

D77: We are observing striking discrepancies between the logic you are familiar with and our own.

We deny the earthly principle of the excluded middle (Aristotle's "exclusion of the middle"), according to which propositions can only **be true** or **false**.

Such a fixed dialectical line also requires that we deny (which can be translated as psychophysiology) the principle you call **contradiction** (for example in the area we call Bieewiguu theory).

In any case, we respect what you call the principle of identity.

What we have just communicated needs clarification. In our normal "becoming," in our daily life, our dialectic can be confused with yours. If I say, "Yes, I woke up at 26 Uiw", such an assertion is true or I have falsified reality - then in this case another kind of utterance than true or false is not possible (and this here in my three-dimensional frame of my universe).

For normal actions of daily life this artificial bipolar or bivalent (two-valued) principle is valid or useful (nor do you make any relativistic corrections in the market regarding the mass of goods transported from the dealer to the customer).

But if we want to speculate about transcendental values, or if we try to study concepts that you would call gnoseological, ontological, physical, biological, theological... this principle is to be totally rejected.

This is precisely the great obstacle that we point out in the preceding paragraphs. How can we explain our metaphysical foundations to you when our respective "languages" are based on contradictory logical principles? The problem cannot be solved by simply transcribing the meanings of phonemes, as you can imagine.

For this reason (apart from those inherent in the exigencies of censorship) we are obliged to use in our reports terracentric comparisons, garbled and narrowed statements that sap the informative richness of our dialectical expressions.

Just using the verb **to be** limits all of our options. The entire ontology of earthly thinkers is saturated with such expressions as "**be**", "**I am not**", "**I exist**", without the possibility of choosing other forms of different content.

In this sense, the orientation of Earth's neopositivist thinkers like Russell is far-sighted, not through a rejection of all metaphysics, but as a demand for a revision of language. Until your forms of informational communication are clarified, the process of seeking truth will be slow and very tedious.

The Ummo documents can be viewed here: <https://www.cosmic-library.de/ummo/index.html>