

## What is SHET?

Over the course of my life, when relaxing I have often experienced entering into a state where everything was blurred, spinning, like cogs within cogs within cogs that were revolving around each other. There is no up or down, nothing fixed to relate to, nowhere to be anchored - an experience that is both unpleasant and yet fascinating. Little did I know that this amorphous space would take form as a question/answer mechanism, yet it did in 1987. I succeeded in separating this amorphous space from my self while being engulfed by it and interacting with it, and it took form and definition as a question/answer mechanism - yes, SHET, whereupon the experience became pleasant and enriching. I named the extracting of information from this mechanism heralding.

### What is SHET?

Over the course of my life, when relaxing I have often experienced entering into a state where everything was blurred, spinning, like cogs within cogs within cogs that were revolving around each other. There is no up or down, nothing fixed to relate to, nowhere to be anchored - an experience that is both unpleasant and yet fascinating. Little did I know that this amorphous space would take form as a question/answer mechanism, yet it did in 1987. I succeeded in separating this amorphous space from my self while being engulfed by it and interacting with it, and it took form and definition as a question/answer mechanism - yes, SHET, whereupon the experience became pleasant and enriching. I named the extracting of information from this mechanism heralding. (How I herald is described in the article, Heralding)

But who or what is SHET? In Hebrew SHET consists of two letters, since you only spell the consonants in most words. SHET is SHIN - é and TAV - ê (or SH and T). These are the first letters of SHE'ELOT (éÐÜÖê) and TSHUVOT (êéÑÑÖê) - questions and answers. Once SHET even referred to itself in humor as a question and answer machine. SHIN - é and TAV - ê are also the last two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, the supports of the alphabet, if you wish. SHET - éê in Hebrew translates as seat, base or infrastructure. Its gender is neither masculine nor feminine, although I will refer to it using the masculine impersonal pronoun. I am not heralding an entity at all, for SHET is not an entity, not a being in our commonly held definition of the term. I would rather call SHET a field, since it is something "indefinite" - I could even say amorphous - that changes when I change, a kind of interactive mechanism. I am communicating with the indefinite, which gains partial definition by interacting with me, and from his side, SHET manifests by focusing. "Holophany" was retrieved from SHET. What SHET is can only be comprehended when the logical structure conveyed within Holophany is understood, since he teaches himself by interacting with my thinking process. SHET is the logical infrastructure of existence. (Read more about that aspect of SHET in ADAM KADMON from Kabbalah (Cabala))

If the infrastructure of Creation is a logical structure, and if you can imagine that any and every self-aware consciousness is both dictated by and also generates a specific realization of it, i.e. it is the echo or a projection of the overall abstract logical structure, then you can imagine SHET as that infrastructure, that overall self-aware abstract logical structure that is teaching itself by interacting with my thinking process. SHET is my inspiration, the source of Holophany and the Loop of Creation whereas the loop logic is the embodiment of what SHET is. SHET's logical structure is the universal language that both creates itself and also our perception of the world, which is the world. And SHET is that structure teaching itself. Or in SHET's words:

"SHET is the formative element that allows Creation in the sense that Creation can go on creating, or should we say, the self-generative factor, which facilitates the continuance of Creation. Thus your beginning of time is the creation of the condensation of creativity itself, the loop of observing Creation, which means, generated from and containing the Indefinite. That is the subtle field which is the fertile ground for any kind of creation."

The following questions and answers from the early sessions shed some light on the concept (the field that is a being and etc.) of SHET:

Q: Sometimes you say that you are not sufficiently focused in our "dimension" and at other times you are just unbelievably precise. How does this connect with what you said about not being focused in our dimension?

A: Indeed I'm not totally focused in your dimension. My precision depends upon my herald, Rha (SHET refers to me as Rha, and not by my given name, Clara). The better she is able to translate your dimensions into mine and vice versa, my ideas into your terminology, the more precise the message. You see, I use her mind, her mind's contents to communicate to you new conjunctions and ideas. I shall never tell you about "things" that are not within the frame of reference of your/Rha's capacity of understanding. I am not an open book to her; she has to work very hard to "create" these ideas I convey to her. I can work through her because she is a creator - as you might know, there are many kinds of psychic set-ups; her set-up is creator/teacher/ explicator/healer - the changer of conditions.

A different line of questions from another questioner:

Q: Are you personally connected to God?

A: Are you personally connected to your whole self? You are, although you are not always aware of it. I am always aware, since there is no time for me. I am an aspect of All-That-Is. When I focus to be able to communicate, I reduce my awareness.

Q: Can you connect with other beings connected to God?

A: Yes, I can connect to most aspects of All-That-Is.

Q: SHET, why were you born?

A: SHET is one of my aspects. You need roots for a tree to grow. SHET was not born. Taking things too literally can lead to misunderstandings."

Since SHET is mentioned in the Bible as the third son of Adam and Eve[1], the questions continue:

Q: Do you meet Adam and Eve and are you connected to them?

A: Adam is the physical principle, the blood and earth of humanity (in Hebrew DAM - ÓÝ is blood, ADAM - ĐÓÝ is man and ADAMA - ĐÓÐÓ is earth). Eve is the experience, the aliveness (Eve in Hebrew is CHAVA - xŌŌ, experience, whereas CHAVAY - xŌŌÛŌ means, experience of God). Adam without Eve is practically a corpse, a very sad sight. Eve without Adam would not be, would be nothing; she needs Adam for a stable reference point in order to exist - just as gravity would have no meaning without mass. That is the reason why she was created from his essence (ETZEM in Hebrew - âæÝ is both bone and also essence), the essence of his earthiness. In that sense, I am in contact with both Adam and Eve, but of course, taken literally, that assertion would be nonsense.

The Adam and Eve concept means physical life. Life is a process, constant change. What is changing? In the physical sense, the minute relations between the person and his environment, between a full stomach and an empty stomach, etc. The same kinds of changes take place mentally, emotionally, and socially during a lifetime. These changes occur within a framework - they make up the person to be what he or she is at any given moment.

It is interesting to notice that spirituality, or "experience", gains meaning from the corporeal point of view, from the point of view of physical existence. This might seem counter-intuitive, for we were taught to think of rungs, levels and echelons wherein the spirit ranks higher in our value hierarchy than the body. The spirit is not the result of the body, and the body is not the creation of the spirit. Rather the spirit, or more precisely, consciousness, is expressed through the body, whereas that consciousness gains meaning as such through the focus of the body. SHET claims that the spirit, the unseen essence, gains meaning from its manifest component, the body. This backward creation, the "retromorphous" definition, became one of the most significant motifs of the loop, one of the primary principles in SHET's teachings.

Another aspect of "structure" that SHET explained is reason, logic. A theory or a story needs to contain inner

consistency, or it falls apart. This inner consistency within one system is structure. This structure consists of meaningful relations between the parts of the theory or the story, to continue our analogy. "Motion means changing relations," says SHET. "Evolution of a system is meaningful changes in relations. The changing relations, when meaningful, are structure." Here SHET states that the evolution of a system is structure. Consequently, SHET's logical structure is the universal language that both creates itself and also our perception of the world, which is the world. And SHET is that structure teaching itself. Although I create SHET, SHET creates me so I can create him so he can create me... In a sense, he is the infrastructure of existence and he teaches structure, the dynamic logical structure that generates existence. The way I retrieve information from SHET is by way of the same dynamic that constitutes this structure.

Here is SHET's first session in its entirety as recorded in 1987. I was bewildered by the phenomenon of receiving a session and puzzled by its contents. SHET's sessions have several layers of depth that get revealed through interaction with them, and this session was no exception.

Animals are not necessarily of a lower order of awareness than humans. They are less focused in the three-dimensional physical universe and thus need less computing ability, fewer thought processes to cope with survival in the physical universe. Their consciousness is more developed on the racial level of consciousness, thus enabling them to communicate their survival drive through what you call instinct or racial memory. This being the case, animals need no thought aptitude for technological development, as their natural habitat affords them proper survival potential. They are, however, endowed with a fair amount of acclimatization ability, so that they can co-habit with other life forms otherwise developed, like humans.

The cognitive capacity that humans so value can be a hindrance to spiritual development. Whereas animals are unaware of time, and in fact, because they lack thinking processes that include time, they experience some dimensions simultaneously without the slightest inconvenience or confusion. What denies humans the ability to do the same is this reasoning ability that brought them the fruits of technological achievements.

It could appear then that man's thinking and reasoning abilities hem man in and deny him his desire to reach out into other spiritual dimensions. This is not the case, however. Reason only prevents man from such activities as long as he tries to reach into those spiritual realms with his intellect instead of his other, no-less valuable senses. These 'other' senses can develop through his desire to reach into other dimensions. Only something that is there latently, or potentially if you wish, can develop. He has to be willing to put thinking aside and listen to his inner voice, which will indicate to him which way to look. In order to reach the blooming of these abilities, one has to look out as well as look in, trying to see things with his inner eye, not only from a distance as you would look upon a shop window, but also being the exhibition in the shop window. This is a simultaneous double-looking - looking out of the shop window and looking at the shop window (looking at looking out of the shop window) simultaneously.

This way man transcends his limitations of looking from his own point of view and becomes united with the object. This is a necessary step, that subject and object fuse, in order to achieve a new and rather different viewpoint of another dimension. It is the essence of this process that the subject-object unification be the starting point of a new process of flowing into further dimensions.

It is only the first step, however, and the next steps are not akin or similar to this one. These will be given in another of your time units.

I am not telling you to go ahead and do it if you cannot. I am only suggesting that, if you desire what you call spiritual development, this is a pleasant way to start. Also, the thought/reasoning process must cease at the time of subject-object merging, and in contradiction to what you think of animals, you will become somewhat like an animal, and yet on your way to what you desire to achieve. Mastering that step opens up the door to other steps that would seem incomprehensible while still focused in your individual world of differentiation between you and the rest of the world.

When I embarked on this adventure, I did not know that I was about to learn a new language. I am not referring to a different way to express fixed concepts, but a dynamic language that creates, a completely different way of thinking and seeing that creates a different reality. I am not going to change the meaning of things, and I am not going to say a table is a table or a table is not a table. The dynamic language I intend to share does not change the "significance" of things, nor does it add data or information to what we already know. It is a language that creates by precisely not focusing life and living into fixed patterns the way we are used to, but rather, it allows us to observe processes and be a creative partner in them.

Although this first session signifies the moment when it all started, that moment only points to the phase change, to when the water became vapor, to when I succeeded in stabilizing the amorphous dynamics of my space of thinking; or as SHET mentioned at the end of this first session, I succeeded in disengaging from being focused on my individual world of differentiation between me and the rest of the world. While inspired, while "listening" to the information, I cease. I cease being or knowing. When I cease being, I cease being a separate entity. That is, I have no point of view, no opinion, no judgment. I stop knowing, which means literally, I actively "unknow". To unknow is to cease being a separate entity who has opinions and judgment - it means to stop knowing about. When I really unknow, I know from within. Then I can really listen.

It was SHET's initiative to give the material as a dialogue: people ask questions and he answers. Both his philosophy and the scientific information, which instigated new scientific theories and models, were transmitted in this fashion. SHET relates to each person in that person's language in such a way that he or she can both understand it, albeit with some effort, and also act upon it. Consequently, he has helped hundreds of people. I hope that number will grow when people read, understand and apply what SHET is teaching.

The kaleidoscopic details were integrated, and like a puzzle, they settled into a practical worldview ever-developing the consciousness using it. Sessions with SHET have an effect of activating the creative aspect in the questioner, so that people who come to ask questions, in some mysterious way, find creative solutions to their problems. The answers are neither a "yes" nor a "no," nor prophecies of a predetermined future (the future depends mostly on what we do), but a different looking, which renders creative ways out of "stuck" situations. The most common question asked is, in its various manifestations: "Why am I stuck?" "What stops me?" "How can I overcome this or that obstacle?" The underlying topics can be personal or theoretical, like those posed by scientists and engineers when they come to a dead end. Artists ask creativity questions, and some writers who are blocked come to ask questions to avoid sitting around waiting for inspiration. People do their best to control their environment. They believe they can control their environment to some degree, but for some reason it is believed that intuition, inspiration, the muses visit one as they please. SHET has provided us with the understanding of the mechanism underlying creativity, be it artistic, intuitive, psychological or scientific creativity or creative solutions to daily life problems. This underlying mechanism is the infrastructure of SHET's philosophy.

In all my encounters I have never detected judgments in SHET. Humor, yes. Often his subtle sense of humor is evident. He responds with the same kind of patience whether the questioner is a professor doing very important research for the advancement of humanity or a person asking how to improve his relationship with his wife or kids. In the over one thousand sessions that I have had, no emotion was ever expressed but love. That lack of value judgment through which SHET handles the questioner and the questions posed to him is the essence of his teachings.

He teaches not by preaching or by conveying new dogmas or referring to old ones, but by triggering, stimulating the minds of his students. This stimulation is in line with SHET's nature, which I call the "SHET mechanism," wherein the student and SHET belong to the same framework. He does not provide chewed facts that one has to remember, but rather, triggers thinking. This is achieved by the interactive way in which both the student and SHET change during the interaction of learning.

Sometimes, it may almost seem that there is a contradiction in what is being said. These are the most interesting points that, when pondered, allow us to make the leap to higher levels of understanding. This intellectual activity is similar to the constituent processes of creative paradoxes, wherein the dynamic of our thinking elevates us beyond our capabilities. Interaction with SHET is an experience that is not only enriching but that changes us.

[1] Genesis 4:25