Excerpts from the book *The Making of Reality – How Consciousness Creates the World* by Jörg Starkmuth

ISBN 978-3-9813592-0-6
For more information and ordering, please visit www.starkmuth.com.

Furthermore, we cannot perceive space directly, but only via the fact that objects have a certain size and a certain distance from each other. We measure these dimensions by comparing them to the known length of a reference object, such as a ruler. Note that it is again just an assumption that the ruler has a fixed length – nobody can disprove that all things in the universe might be doubling their size every day, because if *all* things (including planets, humans and rulers) were to do so, no one would ever notice! On closer examination, however, this notion makes no sense at all, after all, compared to *what* should all things double their size? *All* sizes are defined as comparisons to sizes that are considered given and constant. Space itself does not have an independent meaning in this system; therefore this term – once again – seems to be more of an auxiliary notion than a classical "thing". But as we already know, this is ultimately true for any term we use to describe the world.

So, in a figurative sense, we can imagine subatomic particles as tiny packets of frozen energy – like ice cubes consisting of frozen water. When the ice cube melts, the water remains, but the cube as such (more precisely: the cubic *shape*) disappears. So matter is in fact more of a *state* than a substance. The mass that gives matter its weight and presence in the world is merely an appearance of energy rather than something existing independently. After all, what remains of an ice cube if you take away the ice? An even clearer analogy is a knot you make in a rope. You cannot really say that the knot "consists of rope" – it is rather one possible form of appearance of the rope. Therefore I like to characterize particles of matter as "knots in the nothing".

So, as a basic principle, we are unable to observe anything on this scale without changing it. The attempt to observe a subatomic particle "in its natural state" is similar to the attempt to "peep" on two lovers in a park at night at close range using floodlights and buzzing video cameras, hoping that the victims of this major voyeuristic offensive will not notice anything and act completely naturally.

I would like to take a closer look at the expression "probability of finding a particle in a certain position" that was used several times above. This might wrongly lead to the notion that the particle (in the sense of the classical "billiard ball" model) actually always exists somewhere within the wave and that we just don't know its current position, so we can only state probabilities for its possible whereabouts. However, as we have seen, uncertainty is an inherent characteristic of matter, which means that the classic particle is in fact *nowhere*, as long as it is not forced to appear in a certain position by means of a suitable measurement setup – which at the same time destroys the original wave function, because once the particle has been registered in a certain place, the probability of finding it there is of course 100 %, thus making it zero at all other locations.

We see that matter is actually more of a musical performance than a "thing"! The phenomenon of vibration seems to be closer to the nature of the world than our conventional notion of solid substance.

This distinction of perception levels is very important, especially in the context of self-awareness. Please try to realize this as clearly as possible: You are *not* your body, you are *not* your brain, and you are *not* your mind. All this belongs to you like your name and your clothing, but *you* – the essence of your being – are something else.

Consciousness as such does not have properties in the usual sense. It *observes* properties. It observes information without interpreting it (which is done only by the mind). At first glance, this seems to be a very passive role. But in the context of quantum mechanics, it becomes clear that observation is a very active process. Because the world we experience as a result of observation is actually *created* by this observation! Without conscious observation, the world as we know it would not exist at all. In other words: *We are the creators of our reality!*

If we now bring in our notion of a possibility space, this means that our consciousness *selects* one specific variant from the multitude of possible realities existing in parallel, thus turning it into our experienced reality. So our perception is basically a *filter*, which filters a certain reality out of a giant spectrum of possibilities.

So the way our consciousness works is characterized by the fact that its perception is limited to a very small section of possibility space, from where it merely perceives three dimensions (our normal space) to a noteworthy degree. At the same time, it is "mobile", which means that is is able to vary the section of the multiverse it perceives – it is sort of "wandering" through possibility space, thus creating the illusion of time and of a changing environment. I like to imagine these instances of consciousness (individuals like you and me) as a multitude of tiny, luminous dots wandering through the multiverse and creating stories of life.

Please imagine that you are the totality of everything that exists or *could* exist (in a way, that's what you actually are, only it's something you've forgotten – more on this shortly). What would you perceive from this perspective? Nothing! You would not even perceive the "white light" or "noise" I occasionally referred to as a simplified description of the superposition of all possible realities. Because perception means *observation*, and in order for an observation to take place, there must be an observer and something that can be observed – two *separate instances*. But if you are *everything* and there is no separation, who could observe something, and what could that something be?

If the idea that we are the creators of reality, as presented in this book, makes sense to you, the following thought may already have crossed your mind: "Oh, great – then I've just got to learn how to deliberately create a certain reality, and then I can solve all my problems that way!" Feel free to try it, but I can tell you directly: With this approach it will most probably not work. It is much more likely that this strategy of "problem solving" will result in the exact opposite: even more problems than before.

One of the most fatal misunderstandings in human thinking is the assumption that happiness largely depends on external circumstances. Extensive social studies prove the contrary: Statistically, millionaires are not happier than homeless people, and even people suffering from chronic pain are, on average, about as happy or unhappy as healthy people. Of course, there are people who are happy a lot more often than others – but the distribution between happier and less happy people does not significantly depend on their external situation.

Any method of problem solving that includes a compulsion – the conviction that we *must* solve the problem – cannot lead to a lasting solution, because a feeling of compulsion indicates that the motivation to solve the problem is based on *fear*, and fear keeps our perception focused on problems.

If there is something like an "evolutionary goal" of humanity on a higher spiritual level, I assume that the next major step on this path, which the first individuals are currently beginning to realize, is to overcome our dependence on the biological programming of our earthly vessels to such a degree that we can create the next level of human society on this planet out of free creativity and without ostensible compulsion.