INBETWEENNESS: THE INDIVISIBLE WHOLE

Sunnie D. Kidd

If we consider consciousness as undivided the distinction between the knower and the known disappears. Experience is complete in itself and is self-assuring. Experience is not the content of a reflective act of consciousness, for then it would be something of which we are conscious; rather it is the act itself. It is something we live in and through, it is the very attitude we take toward life and in which we live.

Experience can become an object of reflection but then it is no longer immediate experience but the object of another act of encounter. Experience exists before the subject-object separation. Separation is itself a model used by reflection. Experience then is not distinguished from perceiving or apprehending itself. Experience represents that direct contact with life, which we may call immediate lived experience. Experience is a realm before subject-object, a realm in which the world and our experience of it are given together.

Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan[1] tells us there is no pure experience independent of interpretation. Mystics of each religion identify religious experience with the ideas and figures of their respective cultures. They also offer different interpretations of their experience to a reality beyond experience. This points to a distinction between the religious experience itself and the interpretation of that experience. Following out this thought one could ask whether religious experiences are necessarily experiences of God. In Buddhism and in Taoism there is no idea of a personal God who creates the universe and who one can pray to. In Hinduism there are interpretations of Brahman which, identify it with a personal God and those who do not.

Interpretation is the most basic act of human thinking; existing itself is its primordial ground. One always stands within a circle of contextual meaning which means that any interpretation is not presuppositionless. This ground upon which we stand in understanding is that which every act of interpretation stands, within its horizon.

We can now ask whether it is ever possible to distinguish experience from the interpretation of it. If not, it is unclear how any experience can be said to be self-assuring. The idea that the religious experience is independent of any interpretation of it can lead to the claim that there is an underlying unity of all religions, that different religions are simply different forms of truth. If religious experience is itself universal and independent of any particular religion's interpretation of it, then not all religions are derived from the same experience but point to a dimension of existence which is

beyond religion itself. This is the spiritual realm of *Inbetweenness*. The spiritual is the fundamental ground of religion and each religion is a different form of it.

Everyone who is in search of the great experience, whatever you want to call it, there will always be someone who can sell you on a way to find it. If you think there is something more that you ought to be than you are, you have divided yourself from reality, from the universe. As Samkara says, that which knows, which is in all beings the knower, is never an object of its own knowledge. This assumes a different reality, one composed of gradients rather than boundaries. *Inbetweenness* is the absolute wholeness that is the fundamental ground giving rise to the relatedness of the universe. It is not an object presented to knowledge but is the condition of knowledge. Relative knowledge requires a subject and an object; awareness of the Self is absolute and requires no object.

Entities exist but not discretely, waves have individual existence but are continuous with each other and with the ocean that gives rise to them and in which they emerge. Every wave simultaneously is every other wave, inseparable in time and space. This is *Inbetweenness*, an indivisible wholeness of movement and vibration. *Inbetweenness* is what it is, a universe in which intuition is possible.

The discoveries of modern physics have come to find that the mystics claim that, the world being composed of objects is an illusion, because we tend to divide the world of experience into fixed entities, which we order into fixed categories of time and space. The world is really a flowing activity in which forms appear and disappear, transient patterns in a dynamic living flux, a formlessness mystics call a void or the absolute. Denying all attributes and relations does not mean absolute vacuity. Radhakrishnan put this to clarity: when we call it nothing we mean that it is nothing which created beings can conceive or name and not that it is absolutely nothing.

Mystics claim that the world of isolated objects perceived by our senses is not composed of a linear sequence of events but rather an interrelated organic pattern and simultaneous relationships of which linear relationships form a minor part. For human beings, *Inbetweenness* is a spiritual dimension. Between is physical.[2] *Inbetweenness* is the spiritual dimension in which we reside. Upon this fundamental ground is the possibility that we can resonate with one another.[3]

The fundamental characteristic of *Inbetweenness* is movement and vibration. The idea is that all developments in nature, the physical world and human situations show cyclic patterns of coming and going, of expansion and contraction.

Cyclic patterns in movement and vibration are generated by the dynamic interplay of *Inbetweenness*. Matter is highly condensed energy, each is a participator within the field of *Inbetweenness*. Moving beyond the observer and the observed to a participator presents a view of reality of innerconnectedness. Mind and matter are different vibrations or ripples in the same pond, a continuum, a spectrum of fields within a field of *Inbetweenness*. Each contributes in the cyclic patterns of movement and vibration.

Elsewhere, beyond time, space and causation, beyond future and past is the absolute field of *Inbetweenness*. This is a plane of being not a place.

Notes

1) Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, "Personal Experience of God," *An Idealist View of Life* (London: Unwin, 1988), pp. 70-81.

2) Between is a word-object. With *Inbetweenness* there is no physical substance to matter. Matter is vibrations. *Inbetweenness* is beyond objects as we view them.

3) Without theory we would not have vision to bring about that which is possible.