

# Alignment Beyond Agreement



ADDENDUM

## Kosmic Alignment: Principle of Global Unity

Yasuhiko Genku Kimura

Copyright © 2003

## **Table of Content**

<b>1. Alignment versus Agreement</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Nature of Opinion</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Transcending Opinion</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Creating Alignment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5. From Solution to Resolution</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Addendum: Kosmic Alignment: Principle of Global Unity</b>	<b>13</b>

## 1. ALIGNMENT VERSUS AGREEMENT

Alignment is congruence of intention, whereas agreement is congruence of opinion.

Opinion is a supposition elevated to the status of a conclusion held to be right but not substantiated by positive proof—rational or evidential. Because disagreement means difference of opinion, disagreement often escalates into a dispute as to whose opinion is right. When the dispute is not resolved through the logic of argument, the illogic of *might* tends to enter the realm of *right*, sometimes resulting in violent conflict.

Alignment does not require agreement as a necessary condition. Alignment as congruence of intention is congruence of resolution for the attainment of a particular aim. An aim being in and of the future, unpredicted or unpredictable variables inevitably enter the generative equations for its achievement. Inherent in alignment, therefore, is the spirit of quest.

The spirit of quest generates open and evolving dialogue-in-action. Participants of a quest bring in diverse points of view while remaining united in the same quest. When they jointly choose a course of action, they know that the choice made is a tentative mutual agreement in the manner of a scientific hypothesis, to be modified, altered, or even discarded along the way. The question is not “who is right” but “what is best” for the fulfillment of the intention.

Alignment engenders *synergy*, which R. Buckminster Fuller defines as: *behaviors of whole systems unpredicted by behaviors of their subsystems taken separately and observed apart from the whole.*<sup>(1)</sup> Synergy designates the principle that the behavioral characteristics of the whole system in evolution cannot be predicted from the knowledge of its components observed apart from the whole, whether individually or in partial combinations.

When individuals are aligned in quest, their collective intelligence often produces results that are beyond the intelligence of any single individual. Although the locus of thinking always remains within the individual, the synergetic impact of the thinking of others takes the individual beyond the normal mode and boundary of his or her thinking.

Intelligence follows intention. Aligned intention creates a synergetic field of spiritual coherence that works as a conduit for enhanced intelligence and empowered action beyond the usual limitation of the individual. This explains in part the occurrence of concentrated upsurges of phenomenally creative geniuses in certain epochs in history, such as the ancient Greek civilization, the Renaissance, and the Enlightenment.

In an alignment-based organization or movement, disagreement amongst participants does not diminish but rather enhances the power of the alignment and its synergetic impact. Plurality and diversity of ideas and views, united in a shared intention, mutually enrich one another towards the achievement of an end. In an agreement-based organization or movement, on the other hand, disagreement amongst participants often leads to internal strife, divisive politics, splitting into cliques, or eventual demise.

An agreement-based organization can transform itself to an alignment-based organization by shifting its value focus from agreement to alignment, from opinion to intention. Alignment is not a static state; it is a dynamic process of constant aligning and realigning in the continual movement of time through the timeless commitment to an intention.

People who differ in their opinions can align in their intentions. No more do we need the usual politics of opinion-domination, which is subverting the very integrity of human-unity. What we need instead is a new politics of intention-alignment, which is a cocreative art of peaceful and mutually contributory coexistence of people and nations through alignment beyond agreement.

A host of critical challenges that face humanity today includes the challenge of whether or not we can shift our value focus from opinion to intention, whether or not we can affirm common intentions, whether or not we can transcend differences of opinion and unite in common intentions, whether or not we can forge a planetary alignment for the achievement of our common intentions, and whether or not we can reconcile seemingly conflicting or misaligned intentions.

## 2. NATURE OF OPINION

Opinion is a substitute for authentic knowledge. The epistemic nature of human consciousness is such that we obtain access to reality conceptually through abstract symbolic forms in the symbolic space of images and languages. Real knowledge or truth is traditionally understood to be a contextually unified arrangement of coherent symbolic representations that coincides with (the human experience of) reality. However, except in the discipline of physical science wherein the scientific method and the standard of knowledge have been long established, the distinction between opinion and knowledge in other fields of epistemic pursuit has remained somewhat obscure.

With the establishment of the scientific method in the 17th and 18th centuries by such thinkers as Descartes, Bacon, Galilei, Newton, and Leibniz, the physical science (“natural philosophy”) of external nature in its quantitative and quantifiable aspects (“primary qualities”) has emancipated itself from the realm of mere speculation or opinion. Authentic scientific knowledge is knowledge attained through strict adherence to the scientific method. What makes scientific knowledge objective is the objectivity or the public nature of the scientific method itself.

In science, knowledge claims are legitimized not by their origins, for the origins of knowledge—individual human experiences and observations—are diverse and fallible, but by the objectively established norms and rules of inquiry: the scientific method. Therefore, in science the method is the final arbiter and judge of knowledge claims, which by design always remain to be hypotheses, verifiable or falsifiable, and are in a constant process of modification, improvement, or revision on the way to its ultimate destination—a final and ultimate hypothesis or theory of physical reality.<sup>(2)</sup>

However, no such objective method of inquiry or standard of knowledge exists in any other fields of epistemic pursuit. Science is the systematic pursuit of knowledge of reality *subsumed under the category of quantity*. The domain of proper scientific inquiry is thus outside the qualitative realms of reality and the

value dimensions of life.<sup>(3)</sup> Reality, or experience of reality, however, is not limited to the realm of quantity. In order to live a meaningful life as a functioning human being, we require sound knowledge in the realms of quality, value, and meaning. Yet, when it comes to knowledge in these realms, humanity today remains essentially on the level of opinion.

Whereas quantitative knowledge of physical science pursues *objectivity* and *certainty* through adherence to the scientific method, qualitative knowledge of value and meaning pursues *authenticity* and *clarity* through the attainment of wisdom. Wisdom designates *appreciative discernment* and *critical acumen* in the domains of quality, value, and meaning, which arises in and from a holistic, systemic awareness of reality that is free from ego-logical fragmentation.<sup>(4)</sup>

Without attaining wisdom, qualitative knowledge is doomed to remain at the level of opinion, held to be right but without clarity or authenticity. Wisdom requires a *systemic* intensification of intrinsic cognitive capacity and therefore a *systematic* development of intrinsic cognitive capacity. Unfortunately, relatively few people are given to engaging in such a process of self-development towards genuine wisdom. Hence, our world tends to remain more opinionated than wise.

Wisdom, when it is developed, does not make the individual more knowledgeable but more questioning. With the development of wisdom, the sense of awe and wonder increases, and the individual's ability to question and learn also concomitantly develops. Therefore, the development of wisdom, of appreciative discernment and critical acumen, leads to a heightening of clarity and authenticity. Qualitative knowledge is thus more a matter of awareness than of having knowledge or information.

The knowledge, the awareness, concerning quality, value, and meaning holds a fundamental significance for the human being. Epistemic clarity on the questions of quality, value, and meaning bestows us with *existential certainty* and *psychological security* in facing Reality filled with the unknown and unknowing. "Not knowing is the most intimate," remarked the Zen master Zizang. Authenticity is the existential certainty of the awareness of the unknown and clarity is the psychological security of the awareness of the unknowing. Here the qualitative judgement concerning value and meaning takes on the quality and status of hypothesis.

Traditionally, religions provide answers to the questions of value and meaning. However, religions usually provide answers only in the form of mere beliefs, that is, opinions, and hence it provides only a semblance of clarity, and of certainty and security. Insofar as what religions offer remains mere beliefs or opinions, it can only provide "believers" with a false and deceptive sense of certainty or security. Deep down in their psyche, religious believers remain uncertain and insecure. The doubt is repressed but not resolved. The extremism of absolutistic religious fanaticism, fundamentalism, is a psychologically reactionary, fear-driven expression of this deep-seated doubt, uncertainty, and insecurity.

Similarly, in their search for certainty and security, secular modern and postmodern minds are not free from the absolutist or extremist tendencies characteristic of the mindset of religious true believers. Both the modern and the postmodern minds produced two extremist-absolutist schools of thought, the former being *materialism* and *scientism*, and the latter being *relativism* and *subjectivism*. Certainty is the existential need of the human psyche, which no absolutist-extremist opinion or belief can provide.

What began in the 17th-18th century as the primary focus of scientific investigation—the material realm of reality that yields to quantitative measurement—came to be considered by the 20th century the only reality there is: materialism or *materialistic monism*. The scientific method originally developed in the 17th century for the objective investigation of the quantitative realm of reality came to be considered by the 20th century the only legitimate method of reaching valid knowledge of total reality: scientism.

Yet, ironically, materialism, scientism, and its combination, materialistic scientism, remain to be a species of opinion, along with other kinds of opinion-*qua*-knowledge, because they suffer from the self-deceptive and self-serving irrationalism of excepting themselves from the standard of knowledge they claim to be the only valid standard. That is, materialism in its subject matter belongs to the domain of non-quantitative metaphysics and scientism in its theoretical formulation is not based on the scientific method.

Relativism, which is symptomatic of the pluralistic postmodern mind, is the opinion that absolutely denies every kind of absoluteness. Relativism sets out to reduce every form of absoluteness to a mode of relativity, while making itself the only exception without providing any rationale. Relativism categorically claims that it is *absolutely* true that there is no absolute truth, and that it is *absolutely* true that only relative truths exist. Subjectivism, on the other hand, claims that human knowledge can never escape human subjectivity and therefore no objective knowledge is possible. Subjectivism thus irrationally denies objectivity to all possible knowledge claims except for itself, and thereby self-negates its own verity as well as validity.

Today public discourse is dominated by religious fundamentalism of various denominational persuasions ('absurd absolutism of plural absolutism'), and by secular extremism of various philosophical persuasions ('absolute absurdity of absolute relativism' and 'absolutely objective subjectivism'). The voice of wisdom or reason uttered by the present-day sages and seers tends to become intermixed with the noisy commotion of 'opinionation' and to disappear into a mono-dimensional, flat relativity of multitudinous opinions.

People's opinions tend to differ, sometimes vastly, so vastly that they speak literally different languages even where they share a common linguistic heritage. No universal agreement on any issue is ever likely to be reached. Therefore, if we bet our future on agreement, on congruity of opinions, we will be making a grievous mistake. In fact, what happens is that those who share the same opinion form a group of their own, usually against other groups who hold different opinions. This tendency is most pronounced in the world of politics or wherever politics is involved, because politics as practiced is based on and thrives on the logic of *versus*, of opposition and conflict. What is normally considered a religious or ethnic conflict is often a political conflict for power in the battlefield of opinion-domination.

In the context of alignment, however, disagreement is not only not to be avoided or evaded but also to be welcomed and encouraged. The moral and social philosopher Eric Hoffer states: "The beginning of thought is in disagreement—not only with others but also with ourselves."

Before we can truly agree or disagree with a certain argument, we must first understand it. More often than not, however, people express disagreement without understanding the argument with which they profess to disagree. Such "disagreements" are pseudo-disagreements. Since, as the sociologist and systems scientist

Niklas Luhmann identified, without *understanding* there is no communication, the pseudo-disagreement is a sign of a breakdown or an absence of communication, despite the surface appearance to the contrary.

In the absence of communication, hence of understanding, the person disagreeing is disagreeing really only with an argument of his own making which is not the original argument made. It is a monologue, soliloquy, in which one disagrees with oneself. Such pseudo-disagreements are everywhere. Therefore, by inference, pseudo-agreements must also be everywhere.

What is understanding? Understanding is the successful re-creation of a (complex of) thought. Agreement is the affirmation that the thought re-created and understood is fundamentally identical with that which one holds with respect to the subject upon which the thought is formulated. Disagreement is the recognition that the thought re-created and understood is critically different from that which one holds with respect to the subject upon which the thought is formulated.

In disagreement, understanding requires re-creation in the sense different from 'creating again' but instead in the sense of 'creating a-new'. This intellectual act of 'creating anew' in thought is what constitutes real thinking. Therefore, real disagreement occasions the generation of real thinking. A dialogue-in-action in the context or culture of alignment, which is conducted in the spirit of mutual quest, and where disagreement is welcomed, serves as a fertile ground for the generation of real thinking, as well as real communication and understanding. As the rainforest thrives on rich biodiversity, an alignment-based organization, community, and world will thrive on fecund 'ideodiversity'.

### 3. TRANSCENDING OPINION

Human beings are beings of symbolic consciousness. We obtain access to reality through a symbolic re-creation of reality in the symbolic space of images, languages, and concepts. Thus, in the process of our enworldment, we become existentially embedded in this abstract, symbolic space.

Our opinion is not just a point of view that we happen to hold in order to relate to the world. Our opinion indeed constitutes a significant part of our ego-logical self-identity existing inside symbolic space. That is, we identify our ego-logical self with the opinions we hold and uphold. To a significant degree we *are* our opinions. Therefore, dissemination of our opinion is tantamount to propagation of our ego-logical self. Negation of our opinion is tantamount to denial of our ego-logical self. To the degree to which our opinion is validated or invalidated, our ego-logical existence is validated or invalidated. For this reason, a dispute as to whose opinion is right can escalate into a battle of life or death.

To transcend the stronghold of opinion, we must first transcend the stronghold of our ego-logical self, because the powerful hold that opinion has on our existence stems from the mistaken identification of our opinion with our ego-logical self, which we assume to be our true self.

The self is the locus of integrity that coherently holds the individual's experience together. Integrity is the intentional coherence that maintains the balance and harmony of the whole (system). The ego-logical self has its locus of integrity in the idea of the 'I' inside of the abstract, symbolic space. The idea of the 'I' or the

ego exists in contradistinction to the idea of the 'not-I'. Therefore, the ego, as the locus of integrity that holds experience together, holds experience together in terms of the division between 'mine' and 'not-mine'.

More precisely, the ego-logical self exists as a sentence structure in the symbolic space of language. The ego-logical self is the sentence structure: "I am that I am X" or "I am that it is X," in which the predicate "am that I am X" or "am that it is X" becomes the self-identifier of the 'I', the ego, while "that I am X" or "that it is X" becomes the self/ego-identity of the 'I'. Because the sentence structure of an opinion can be reduced to "(that) it is X," it is easy to recognize how the ego-logical self comes to identify itself with or attach itself to an opinion. (e.g., "I am that Jesus is the savior." "I am that socialism is the answer.")

In the process of our enworldment in term of the ego-logical self, the number of X's in "that I am X" and "that it is X" increases, along with the increase of the number of Y's in "that I am not Y" and "that it is not Y." Thus, the "individuality" that develops with the ego-logical self is based on the *divisibility* or *differentiability* of the world into the 'I' and the 'not-I'. Inside the symbolic space of the human mind, this divisibility or differentiability serves an important purpose and function—that of making conceptual distinctions or differentiations, and thus conceptualization and communication. Yet, the ego-logical self is not the whole self, nor is the "individuality" of the ego-logical self the true individuality.

The totality of our experience includes both the symbolic and non-symbolic experiences, both the internal and external experiences. Our whole self is the locus of integrity that coherently holds and upholds the totality of our experience—the symbolic and non-symbolic, the internal and external. In the presence of our whole self as the locus of integrity, everything that constitutes our total experience integrally coheres into an *indivisible* whole. This indivisible whole is what our true individuality is (from Latin *individuus*: *in-*, not, + *dividuus*, divisible), which is different from the divisible "individuality" of the ego-logical self.

Let us use the term 'Kosmos' to designate the whole world of experience in which the external universe, the *cosmos*, is interpenetratingly conjugate with the internal universe, the *mind*.<sup>(5)</sup> Accordingly, our true, whole self is the *Kosmic Self*, which is the locus of integrity that coherently holds and upholds, in wholeness, the total experience of the external universe (the *cosmos*) interpenetratingly coupled with the total experience of the internal universe (the *mind*). The *Kosmic Self* designates the authentic Self in the presence of which true individuality emerges. When expressed as a sentence, the *Kosmic Self* is "I am that I am" without any particular predicate or identifier 'X'. (I am that I am and therefore I will be who I will be.)

The ego-logical self is a subsystem of the *Kosmic Self*, as the symbolic universe is a subsystem of the whole *Kosmos*. Opinion-making is a sub-process of the whole process of symbolic re-creation of (experience of) reality within the symbolic space of language or the mind. From the *Kosmic* perspective, we *have* our ego-logical self but we *are not* our ego-logical self; and we *have* our opinions but we *are not* our opinions. By thus seeing through and through what the reality of the ego-logical self is and what the phenomenon of opinion really is, we can transcend and free ourselves from the stronghold of the ego and of our opinion with which the ego self-identifies.



#### 4. CREATING ALIGNMENT

Both intention and opinion are functions of symbolic thought. However, whereas intention is creative and future-directed, opinion is re-creative and past-based. Intention uses symbolic thought to create a future as an idea or vision, whereas opinion uses it to symbolically re-create observations of the past. Intention followed by action transforms idea into reality. Etymology indicates that 'to intend' means 'to stretch towards' (from Latin *intendere*: *in* -, towards + *tendere*, to stretch). Through the act of intending, we stretch our thought and imagination towards a future and, through action, bring it forth into reality.

The study by the pioneer consciousness researcher Cleve Backster has shown that sentient organisms from plants and bacteria to human cells respond to human thought and intention.<sup>(6)</sup> Research by the frontier experimental physicist William Tiller has shown that even what is called non-sentient matter responds to human thought and intention.<sup>(7)</sup> Various writings of such visionary thinkers as Emmanuel Swedenborg, Rudolf Steiner, Walter Russell, Sri Aurobindo, Thomas Troward, and Harold Percival expound that the Kosmos/Cosmos itself is a thought-wave-created universe.<sup>(8)</sup> This view, the transdisciplinary researcher and philosopher Keith Chandler calls *mental realism* in contradistinction to *physical realism*.<sup>(9)</sup>

According to the mental realist view, that which is thought or intended invariably happens on corresponding levels of reality, although sometimes unseen or invisible in the physical/material realm. This means that our thoughts and intentions have real consequences in reality and therefore that we are responsible for our originating thoughts and intentions and their consequences. This also means that we hold the power to impact the destiny of the world as well as our own individual destiny.

Thus, the world we observe today can be seen as the manifestation of the collective intentions of the whole of humanity. Accordingly, we are collectively responsible for the state of affairs of the world. Therefore, we can take individual responsibility for the destiny of our world—if not the whole world, then its integral part. To proclaim the power to help mold the destiny of our world may indeed be the most powerful stand that we can take in life.

Looking at the world as a whole, we recognize that the fundamental, underlying problem of the world is the systemic breakdown of integrity, affecting and afflicting the whole meridian of humanity. For example, the astronomical disparity in wealth existing between the rich and the poor of the world is a clear sign of a breakdown of integrity of human-unity. The unending conflicts existing in certain parts of the world is a definite sign of a breakdown of integrity of human-unity. As previously stated, integrity means intentional coherence that maintains the balance and harmony of the whole system. Therefore, a breakdown of integrity indicates a deficiency of intention for coherence as well as of coherence itself.

There exist a multitude of intentions that compose and constitute the world, many of which are misaligned or conflicting. Myopically self-serving ego-logical intentions are often misaligned or in conflict; Kosmically contextualized intentions are fundamentally aligned and in accord. Whereas the basic intent of ego-logical intentions is self-promotion and the promotion of all that as or with which it identifies itself to be, the basic intent of Kosmic intentions is the advancement of the whole, which is the world of experience that coheres into a whole in the presence of the Kosmic Self as the locus of integrity.

Needless to say, ego-logical intentions dominate and have always dominated the state of the affairs of the world. Even the world leaders who profess to champion the causes for the advancement of the whole are often motivated by their ego-logical orientations and self-serving intentions. The ego-logical orientation is fundamentally antithetical and non-conducive to the achievement of successful alignment. Yet, in order to create significant change in the world and in order to generate increasingly greater integrity throughout the whole system of human-unity, it is precisely amongst those who are ego-logically oriented that alignment needs to take place.

The creation of successful alignment requires a cause, a final cause, that transcends but includes individual intentions and concerns of the ego-logical self. Those who are Kosmically oriented are already Kosmically aligned. It is the responsibility of the Kosmically-aligned not only to work with one another to enhance their Kosmic alignment but also to engage with various levels and kinds of people in the creation of an alignment designed to be maximally inclusive and optimally synergetic. Those who are Kosmically-aligned are uniquely qualified for the task of expressly creating a visionary intent that serves as the final cause and the unifying vector which generates an energetic-synergetic field of alignment in the world.

Forging a successful alignment requires tremendous creativity and imagination; it requires a dynamically synergetic art, science, and technology of co-creation. The intentionally co-created alignment with an overall creative design is called the 'creative alliance'. Creative alliance is the *designed order* of energetic-synergetic alignment designed to facilitate the optimal emergence of *spontaneous order* in the fulfillment of a common intention and for the attainment of a shared vision.

## 5. FROM SOLUTION TO RESOLUTION

Einstein's oft-quoted saying, which states in effect that a problem cannot be effectively solved at the same level of thinking at which it was created, does not address the most critical question: how to transcend the level of thinking that created the problem. Einstein himself, however, with his two 1905 papers, not merely solved a set of problems vexing the world of physics at the turn of the 20th century but also, more precisely speaking, *resolved* them by proposing a new vision of the universe wherein the laws of physics were invariant, the speed of light was constant, space-time was relative, and the ether as theretofore supposed was not required.<sup>(10)</sup> Thus, Einstein demonstrated through his work what it meant to transcend the level of thinking that had produced the problem, which was resolved at a higher level of thinking.

There are two distinct approaches to problem solving: the *atomistic approach* and the *systemic approach*. Our normal approach to problem solving is to seek to formulate a solution particular to the problem at issue. This is the atomistic approach in which problems are identified locally in isolation from the whole system and particular solutions are formulated to solve them. A solution thus formulated requires for its existence the very existence of the problem to which it is a solution. For, to have an existence means to have an identity. Therefore, the solution's existence is tantamount to its identity as a solution to a problem. That is, the atomistic existence of the solution depends on the atomistic persistence of the problem. No shift in worldview has taken place; the problem and the solution co-inhabit the same world wherein the problem

has arisen in the first place. Besides, solutions atomistically formulated tend sooner or later to turn into additional problems to be solved.

There is a different approach to problem solving, the systemic approach, which involves a higher level of thinking than the level of thinking at which the problem in question was created. This approach requires (1) that we envision a whole new world or a whole new system wherein the problem at issue does not exist to begin with, and (2) that we take necessary action to systemically and systematically create that new world.

Another of Einstein's insightful statements, that "imagination is more important than knowledge," directly addresses the fundamental difference between those two approaches to problem solving. In the symbolic space of images and concepts, creative imagination *constructs* a future, whereas informational knowledge *reconstructs* the past. When faced with problems, we habitually seek solutions inside that which we already know—the domain of our knowledge. However, the kind of knowledge we have, the kind of being we are, and the kind of thinking we use constitute the kind of world we inhabit, which produces the problems we have and the solutions we formulate.

The systemic breakdown of integrity that underlies the existing problems of the world is symptomatic of the kind of world we inhabit, and is therefore symptomatic of the kind of knowledge we have, the kind of being we are, and the kind of thinking we use. To resolve this systemic breakdown of integrity, we must create a new world where systemic integrity and coherence is present. Viewing a particular breakdown of integrity as a fractal manifestation of a systemic breakdown of the whole, we can systemically approach a particular problem. However, even when we deal with a particular problem, we must first envision a *whole* new world wherein breakdowns of integrity are absent and systemic coherence is present.

In the systemic approach, as Einstein demonstrated in his work, we envision a new world, a new universe, free of the problems at issue. The difference between the worlds of scientific theory and human action (praxiology) is that in the latter the envisioning of a world wherein the problem does not exist is not the end point as in the former but it is the beginning of necessary action for the realization of that world.

The vision of that new world beckons people to come forth in alignment. The intention to create that new world engenders alignment. In envisioning a world wherein the current problems of the world do not exist, we have *resolved* the problems inside of the symbolic space of imagination and ideation. This symbolic resolution of problems through envisioning evolves into an aligned resolution for the creation of that world in reality.

As the new universe envisioned by Einstein required a new set of mathematical equations, the new world envisioned by an alliance integrator requires a new set of praxiological equations proper to that world. That is, the principles of human action and the design of human alignment for the realization of a new world need to be those of that new world, not of the current world, in order for that world to become a reality. We are required to be and to act in accordance with the principles and designs of the envisioned world, not of the current world. Gandhi said this eloquently: "Be the change that you want to make." We must *be* before we can *become*. This also corresponds to the profound but the seemingly paradoxical Buddhist insight that to reach the other shore (*nirvana*) from this shore (*samsara*) one must first come from the other shore.

Opinion by nature is of this shore, and therefore no opinion, no agreement, will ever lead us to the other shore. It is aligned intention alone, empowered and enabled by the vision of the other shore, which can lead us to the other shore. Designed order of creative alliance comes from the other shore. Spontaneous order unfolds in the intentional re-creation of the other shore as this shore. Alignment evolves in the creative dance between the designed and spontaneous orders. Aligned, we remain in but not of this world, because we are of the other world of our envisioning, for the creation of which we are together engaged in transformative action.

## Notes:

1. This definition of the term “synergy” is a combined modification of the original definitions in Fuller, R. Buckminster, *Synergetics* , 1975, and *Synergetics 2* , 1979, Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc.
2. Most penetrating analysis and synthesis of the scientific method can be found in the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce's writings. *The Essential Peirce* Vol. 1 and Vol. 2, (Nathan Houser and Christian Kloesel, Editors), 1998, Indiana University Press.
3. The contemporary scientific work by systems-oriented scientists such as Ervin Laszlo and Wing Pon expands the discipline of science beyond the realm of quantity. (See Yasuhiko G. Kimura's book reviews on their work that will appear in *VIA: The Journal of New Thinking for New Action* throughout 2004.)
4. The terms “appreciative discernment” and “critical acumen” are taken from the Buddhist scholar Herbert Guenther's *The Creative Vision* , Latsawa, 1987, and his other writings, including *Thig-le: Ultimate Simplicity as Dynamic Multiplicity – singulare tantum* , unpublished manuscript, 2002.
5. This definition of the term “Kosmos” is conceptually aligned with Ken Wilber's original distinction in Wilber, Ken, *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality: The Spirit of Evolution* , Shambhala, 1995.
6. Backster, Cleve, *Primary Perception: Biocommunication with Plants, Living Foods, and Human Cells* , White Rose Millennium Press, 2003.
7. Tiller, William A.; Dibble, Walter E.; Kohane, Michael J., *Conscious Acts of Creation: The Emergence of A New Physics* , Pavior Publishing, 2001. Also, Tiller, William, “Toward Quantitative Science and Technology that Includes Human Consciousness,” *VIA, The Journal of New Thinking for New Action* , Vol. 1, No. 4, Vision-In- Action, 2003.
8. Major works of these authors are as follows: Thomas Troward, *The Creative Process in the Individual* (1915); Walter Russell, *The Universal One* (1926); Earnest Holmes, *The Science of Mind* (1938); Harold Percival, *Thinking and Destiny* (1946).
9. Chandler, Keith, *The Mind Paradigm: A Unified Model of Mental and Physical Reality* , Author's Choice Press, 2001.
10. “On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies” and “Does the Inertia of a Body Depend on Its Energy Content?” included in *Einstein's Miraculous Years: Five Papers That Changed the Faces of Physics* (John Stachel, Editor), Princeton University Press, 1998.

Copyright © 2003 by Yasuhiko G. Kimura

## ADDENDUM

# Kosmic Alignment: A Principle of Global Unity

### 1. THE IDEOSPHERE AND ITS TRANSFORMATION

The evolutionary process of the universe is characterized by what is termed *synergy*: the principle that the behavioral characteristics of the whole system in evolution cannot be predicted from the knowledge of its components observed apart from the whole, whether individually or in partial combinations. Many experts agree that the Western world is in a revolutionary “phase-transition,” unprecedented in all of history and only remotely comparable to the Industrial Revolution. They assert that the prime mover of this radical transformation is the powerful confluence of various advanced technologies, and that the speed at which this transformation is unfolding is incomparably greater than that of the Industrial Revolution. Yet, in accordance with the principle of synergy, even with today’s advanced knowledge and predictive ability far greater than any available in the past, not a single expert can predict what the world as a whole will be like in the future. Therefore, people around the world are feeling that the world is becoming increasingly uncertain, fraught with unknown or unknowable perils.

Fortunately, however, we human beings are not only mere observers but are also conscious participants and intentional co-creators of our own world. What we call the world comprises a synergetic network of conversations that is continuously forming, reforming, and transforming. This means that the substance of the world is idea, which forms, reforms, and transforms itself through the conversations of humankind, synergetically organizing itself as an evolutionary, multidimensional network. Thus seen, our most immediate, fundamental, and significant environment is not the biosphere or physiosphere but the ‘ideosphere’—the invisible but intelligible, metaphysical sphere of ideas and ideation that is the material substance of the evolutionary network of conversations that constitutes the world. It is inside this ideosphere that we engage in the creation of our world.

Thus, the prime mover of the world is not technology *per se* but idea. Technology is only an artifact of idea, the prime mover, but not the prime mover itself. Idea, and idea alone, moves the world. This means that we can move the world with our own thinking through the generation and propagation of ideas. The problem, however, is that the majority of humanity remains the consumer of ideas without being the producer. The dominant mode in which people partake in the conversation of humankind is by being consumers of ideas propagated within the network of conversations. Therefore, they often become easy prey to professional promoters and distributors of ideas—such as staid educational institutions or the mass media—whose ideas may be detrimental pollutants to the ideospheric environment, and thus to the individuals mentally breathing in that environment.

Today we bear witness to a proliferation of various ecological movements, yet very few of us are cognizant of the most critical environment of all: the ideosphere. In truth, the ecological movement as such is an ideological movement to be fought within the ideosphere. Therefore, without an ideospheric transformation in

respect to the biospheric environment, there will be no real ecological transformation effected in the biosphere. What we require the most, for the systemic transformation of our world, is an ecological movement of the ideosphere that directly deals with the ecology of ideas and ideation itself. And if this movement is to be successful, it must be conducted primarily within each individual who chooses to participate in it.

For, the locus of thinking is within the individual. It is not the collective but the individual composing the collective that alone can think and generate ideas. The ideospheric transformation of the kind I speak is a synergetic phenomenon that emerges when individuals in sufficient numbers become authentic, independent thinkers, that is, originators of ideas, producers of dialogues, and contributors to the network of conversations that comprises the world.

The configuration of the ideosphere throughout history has remained *concentric* with external authorities at the center surrounded by circles of believers and followers, where an authority did the thinking for its followers. Even today, in the scientifically and technologically advanced Western world, our educational system is, for the most part, designed to produce well-informed, intellectually-adept, and professionally-marketable non-thinking adults. Therefore, the philosopher Martin Heidegger states: "The most thought-provoking thing in this most thought-provoking time is that we are still not thinking." For, authentic thinking requires self-authorship, which in turn requires authentic self-knowledge about which our education is utterly silent.

In following the evolutionary thrust for optimization that is driving our collective transformation toward an unprecedented height of culture and civilization, the ideospheric configuration that we require for the 21st century is *omnicentric*, having independent yet interconnected centers within the intellectually and spiritually sovereign individuals, living and working as self-authorities in the matter of thinking, knowing, and acting. Then, the thinking, knowing, and acting of these authentic individuals will synergetically co-develop throughout the omnicentric configuration of the evolving ideosphere. The Information Revolution that is underway with the omnipresent Internet is simultaneously the manifestation of, and the apparatus for, this new omnicentric configuration of the ideosphere.

The transformation of the ideosphere does not mean the propagation of any particular set of ideas. Rather, it is the transformation of the configuration and organization of the ideosphere itself from concentricity to omnicentricity in which every individual will engage in authentic, independent thinking in synergy with others.

We human beings are at our best not when we are engaged in abstract solitary reflection or on our individual transformation for its own sake but when we are engaged together in the act of transforming the world. The act of idea-generation through authentic thinking and the sustained engagement in the conversation of humankind, if conducted in the context of pursuit of truth, beauty, and goodness, will lead to powerful moral action that will engender a New World. To engage in such moral action and to become a co-creator of a New World is to become a world-weaver in the act of weaving the world and a history-maker in the act of making history.

There is no complete individual transformation apart from real world transformation. For, the individual is the whole world; for, the individual is the whole of humanity. As our thought and ideas are woven into the fabric of the world, so is the world woven into the fabric of our being. To know that we are the world and that we are humanity is to have true compassion. To live from compassion, from this knowledge of the symmetric identity of the individual and the world or of the self and humanity, is to be moral in the deepest sense of the word. The omniscient configuration of the ideosphere allows the individual to experience oneself as the holographic center of the whole world, and requires the individual to be the responsible agent of transformation for the whole of humanity.

## 2. ALIGNMENT BEYOND AGREEMENT

Alignment is congruence of intention; whereas agreement is congruence of belief. Alignment is the new organizational principle of the omniscient configuration of the ideosphere; whereas agreement is the old organizational principle of the concentric configuration. Inside the omniscient configuration, unity is attained as alignment of intention, while diversity of individual views is encouraged. Inside the concentric configuration, unity is attained as agreement in belief, while diversity of individual views is discouraged. Alignment requires allegiance to the self-authority of the individual. Agreement requires allegiance to the authority of beliefs originating from external authority.

Agreement-based groups fall into conflict with other groups that disagree with them. Disagreement often escalates into a dispute as to whose belief is “right,” and the dispute is not usually resolved through the logic of argumentation. Consequently, the illogic of might enters the realm of right, sometimes resulting in violence. Sadly, this is all too common in many parts of the world and in many segments of society.

Alignment is a congruence of resolution for the attainment of a particular aim. An aim being in and of the future, unknown or unpredictable variables inevitably enter the generative equations for its achievement. Inherent in alignment, therefore, is the spirit of quest. The spirit of quest generates open and evolving dialogue. Participants of a quest bring in diverse points of view while united in the same quest. When they jointly choose a course of action, they know that their choice is a tentative agreement, to be modified, altered, or even discarded along the way. The question is not “who is right” but “what is best” for the fulfillment of their shared intention.

Alignment engenders synergy. When individuals are aligned in quest, their collective intelligence often produces results that are beyond the intelligence of any single individual. Although the locus of thinking always remains within the individual, the synergetic impact of the thinking of others takes the individual beyond the normal mode and boundary of his or her thinking. People who differ in their beliefs can align in their intention, turning their diverse points of view into a common asset. No more do we need or can we afford the usual politics of opinion-domination, of agreement versus disagreement, which is subverting the integrity of human unity and endangering the future of the human race. What we need, instead, is a new politics of intention-alignment inside an open, omniscient universe.

When we reflect upon the Kosmos and within ourselves, we realize the existence of a Kosmic Alignment that unites every being in the universe. We also realize that humanity is indeed ‘human-unity’ and that in

our common intention for peace, happiness, and prosperity, we are all already kosmically aligned. If we can awaken to the reality of this Kosmic Alignment, we will then realize that with our current knowledge and collective intelligence, true global peace, happiness, and prosperity are well within our reach.

The power of transformation that we possess is enormous. Instead of fearing uncertainty, we need only to consciously align ourselves with the Kosmic Alignment that eternally exists in the Being of our beings.