How to Read My Books

Understanding My Theology, Pedagogy, and the Art of Spiritual Realization

Stephen T. McClard

Introduction: Why My Books May Challenge Your Beliefs

My books may cause considerable anxiety if your understanding of religion rests upon the unquestioned fundamentals of orthodoxy. This is not accidental, nor is it my intention to attack the sincere faith of those who have found meaning within their inherited traditions. The discomfort arises because my method of teaching deliberately challenges the assumptions through which religious beliefs have become familiar and secure. I approach scripture, philosophy, and the world's spiritual traditions as instruments of discovery rather than closed systems of unquestionable conclusions. When I present a contradiction, challenge an accepted doctrine, or compare teachings that appear irreconcilable, I am not necessarily declaring that one tradition must be defeated by another. I am inviting the reader into an investigation of the concealed truth that may become visible through the opposition. Unless my pedagogy is understood from the beginning, this method can easily be mistaken for inconsistency, irreverence, or an effort to undermine religious faith. In reality, my objective is precisely the opposite. I want the reader to discover a faith that has passed through examination and emerged with understanding rather than remaining dependent upon inherited certainty.

The distinction between belief and realization is central to everything I write. Belief may be received from parents, teachers, institutions, sacred texts, and the surrounding culture without the individual ever examining the foundations upon which that belief rests. Realization requires something more. It demands that the meaning of a teaching become intelligible within consciousness through sincere investigation, experience, and recognition. A person may spend a lifetime repeating that God is Love without examining the consequences of that statement for doctrines of judgment, exclusion, punishment, salvation, and the destiny of humanity. Another may proclaim divine unity while imagining creation divided into permanently irreconcilable portions. I introduce these contradictions because they reveal the difference between knowing the language of a tradition and understanding the mystery to which its language points. My purpose is not to supply the reader with another theology to memorize, but to encourage the development of discernment through which Truth, Love, Unity, and Wisdom may be recognized independently of the authority claiming to possess them.

Blind Faith Under Fog

Blind belief is the necessary condition of a consciousness learning beneath the fog of forgetfulness, where the nature of good and evil must be discovered through experience rather than simply accepted through inherited instruction. Romans 11:32 reveals the mystery of this condition: “For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.” If all have been bound under disobedience, then the blindness cannot be understood merely as an individual failure deserving

permanent condemnation, but as a universal condition permitted within the education of the Whole. We enter incarnation without full knowledge of our identity, surrounded by competing doctrines, contradictory appearances, and the consequences of our own divided understanding.

Under this veil, faith begins as belief in what we cannot yet see, while the experience of good and evil gradually reveals the difference between selfishness and Love, deception and Truth, separation and Unity. Our true day of decision is therefore not merely the moment we profess allegiance to a religious authority or accept a particular theology. It is the day we recognize Love and Truth as worthy of our acceptance on their own merits, without the coercion of fear, the promise of reward, or the authority of an external image. That same day is also the unveiling, when the fog intentionally permitted for our education is finally lifted and we recognize why the blindness was necessary.

The decision and the revelation become one event, for only when we see clearly can we freely affirm what we have learned. The judgment is not the selection of a favored few from a condemned multitude, but the disclosure of the nature of Good to all who were subjected to ignorance so that mercy might finally embrace the Whole. The fog was never the destination, and blind belief was never the completion of faith. The purpose of the veil was to make possible the discovery of what remains when the veil is removed: Love accepted because it is Good, Truth embraced because it is True, and Unity realized because no being was ever outside the inheritance of First Cause.

Scripture as a Paradoxical Koan

I approach scripture as a vast collection of paradoxical koans, through which the apparent contradictions of existence become instruments of spiritual understanding. In Zen teaching, a koan frequently presents a question or situation that resists the ordinary habits of conceptual reasoning. The student discovers that the assumptions used to approach the problem are themselves part of what must be investigated. I recognize a similar method operating throughout the symbolic language of scripture. Life is discovered through death, greatness through humility, freedom through surrender, wisdom through foolishness, and self-realization through the apparent loss of self. These inversions are not merely literary ornaments. They invite consciousness to recognize that the relative distinctions through which the mind ordinarily interprets existence may conceal a more comprehensive unity.

Knocking Out False or Clouded Footholds

For this reason, I frequently place biblical passages into conversation with teachings that appear to contradict them. I may challenge the character of the Lord as portrayed in one passage by comparing it with the nature of the Father revealed in another. I may investigate the distinction between First Cause and secondary cause, or question whether a doctrine traditionally regarded as an expression of divine justice can actually be reconciled with unconditional Love. These investigations are examples of what scripture calls testing the spirits. The purpose of the test is not to condemn every teaching that initially appears problematic, but to determine whether its deeper implications agree with the nature of Truth. When Paul instructs Timothy to rightly divide the word of truth, I recognize a principle of discernment that must be applied even to interpretations claiming biblical authority. We must distinguish the

outward narrative from its inward significance, the temporary condition from the enduring principle, and the limitations of relative understanding from the nature of First Cause.

Great Doubt and Great Faith

The apparent contradiction becomes especially valuable when it awakens the doubt necessary for genuine investigation. Without great doubt, there can be no great faith, because a conviction that has never encountered examination remains dependent upon the absence of challenging questions. This does not mean that uncertainty is superior to understanding or that contradiction should be preserved indefinitely as an intellectual achievement. Doubt is the movement through which an unquestioned assumption becomes available for examination. Once the assumption is recognized, the student can investigate whether the opposition is genuine, whether the terms belong to different levels of interpretation, or whether the contradiction reveals a deeper principle concealed beneath both perspectives. The resulting faith is not simply a stronger attachment to a familiar conclusion. It is an understanding that no longer requires ignorance for its protection.

When you encounter a statement in my books that appears irreconcilable with another statement, therefore, consider whether the opposition is intentional before concluding that it represents a failure of reasoning. The question is not merely which statement should be accepted and which should be rejected, but what assumptions have created the appearance of irreconcilable difference. Sometimes a contradiction must be acknowledged as a genuine disagreement between traditions or authors. At other times, it may reveal the distinction between a literal narrative and its symbolic meaning, or between an immature understanding and the wisdom acquired through experience. My method does not require every contradiction to disappear. It requires every contradiction to become an opportunity for examination, through which the reader learns to distinguish what is concealed from what is merely assumed.

The Rainbow of Wisdom Among the Nations

My second governing principle is that God has left the strands of the rainbow's light throughout the traditions of all nations. I do not regard divine illumination as the exclusive possession of a single religious institution, civilization, or theological vocabulary. Humanity has investigated the mysteries of consciousness, suffering, justice, love, death, creation, and transcendence through many different cultural languages. Hebrew scripture, Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, Sufism, Greek philosophy, and other traditions contain symbolic structures through which these questions have been considered. Their differences are real, and their teachings cannot always be reconciled at the level of doctrine. Nevertheless, I trust that the same greater mystery has been approached through these differing expressions, and that each tradition may preserve something valuable for the reader willing to examine it without premature condemnation.

The rainbow provides a particularly meaningful symbol for this understanding. White light contains the colors that become visible through its differentiation, yet no individual color constitutes the entirety of the light. The colors are not enemies because they differ in appearance, and the recognition of their unity does not require pretending that their distinctions do not exist. In Genesis 9, the rainbow becomes

the sign of a covenant extending across the living world, a promise that precedes humanity's later divisions into competing theological systems. I interpret this covenant as an especially important image of freely given goodness, because its scope is not restricted to those who have successfully discovered a particular doctrine. The gift is established before the recipients can claim that their understanding has earned it. In this sense, the rainbow represents both the universal reach of divine generosity and the distribution of wisdom through the varied expressions of creation.

I also contemplate Joseph's multicolored garment through this symbolism. Within my interpretive framework, the garment represents the gathering of different strands of knowledge into a more comprehensive recognition of the Whole. Joseph's journey into Egypt then becomes more than an ancient narrative about one family and its conflicts. It becomes a symbolic account of wisdom entering the world of divided nations, where understanding must eventually become fruitful beyond the boundaries of its original household. This is my allegorical reading rather than a claim that the historical text explicitly defines every color as a particular religious tradition. The value of the image lies in its capacity to reveal a principle consistent with the larger investigation: no individual strand is the entire garment, and the fullness of the light cannot be recognized by condemning every color except one's own.

This is why I refuse to dismiss an entire tradition merely because its outward language differs from the theology in which another person was raised. If I judge a tradition before investigating the wisdom it contains, I may lose the very insight that would have clarified something concealed within my own understanding. Yet respect for all traditions does not require uncritical acceptance of every doctrine they preserve. Some teachings genuinely contradict others, and certain interpretations may produce consequences inconsistent with the nature of Love. The appropriate response is neither indiscriminate agreement nor wholesale rejection, but careful discernment. I seek to recognize the light wherever it appears while remaining willing to investigate the distortions introduced by limited understanding. To honor the rainbow is not to declare every color identical. It is to recognize their participation in a greater unity without denying the distinctions through which that unity becomes visible.

The Inner Truth as the Measure of Theology

My third principle is that I refuse to accept another person's theology when it fails the test of the hidden inner truth. This does not mean that personal intuition automatically possesses greater authority than scholarship, scripture, or tradition. The inward life is capable of error, and the mind can mistake preference, fear, pride, and imagination for revelation. An inward conviction must therefore be tested with the same seriousness applied to every outward doctrine. What I refuse is the assumption that inherited religious authority can settle a question merely by forbidding further investigation. A claim does not become true because it is ancient, because a respected teacher repeats it, or because an institution has declared it essential to orthodoxy. Its meaning must remain open to examination through the nature it describes and the consequences it produces.

The hidden inner truth concerns the relationship between consciousness and the greater Being from which it proceeds. The outward narrative may describe God, the Lord, the Son, humanity, judgment, sacrifice, death, and resurrection as though each were principally an event or identity located

somewhere beyond the reader. My investigation asks what these symbols reveal concerning the present condition of the consciousness encountering them. If scripture declares that humanity is the temple of God, that the kingdom is within, and that the Father dwells within the Son, then the question of divine identity cannot remain exclusively external. The reader must investigate how the symbols illuminate the nature of awareness, the limitations of the embodied condition, and the relationship between First Cause and the relative expressions of Being.

The distinction between the Father and the Lord becomes especially important within this investigation. I understand the Father as First Cause, the original Source whose nature is Truth, Love, Unity, and Wisdom. The Lord, by contrast, may be contemplated as the governing identity expressed through the conditions of secondary cause, where knowledge develops through experience and the consequences of relative action. When scripture describes the Son learning obedience through suffering, I recognize a process of becoming rather than an immutable Source acquiring a perfection previously absent. The Lord's education reveals the consequences of divided understanding, while the Father's nature provides the enduring principle through which those consequences may be evaluated. This interpretation is intended to open a paradox for investigation, not to conceal the fact that other theological traditions interpret these relationships differently.

The inward test must therefore examine whether a doctrine reflects the nature of the Source or merely preserves the authority of a particular image. If God is Love, then a theology that treats permanent hatred as the culmination of divine purpose demands examination. If God is One, then a doctrine that places portions of Being beyond all possibility of restoration presents another question. If mercy is freely given, then we must investigate the assumption that its highest expression depends upon an endlessly maintained division between the deserving and undeserving. These are not questions I raise merely to provoke religious discomfort. They arise from taking the claims of scripture seriously enough to investigate their implications. The inner truth is not a private permission to believe whatever feels agreeable. It is the demand that our understanding become consistent with the very nature of Truth we claim to honor.

PaRDeS and the Four Levels of Interpretation

The Jewish interpretive framework known as PaRDeS provides a valuable means of organizing the different dimensions of scriptural understanding. Its four traditional categories are Peshat, Remez, Derash, and Sod, commonly associated with the plain meaning, the hinted meaning, interpretive inquiry, and the secret or mystical meaning. I employ this framework as a model for my own pedagogy because it illustrates how a single passage can be investigated through different forms of attention without requiring every level to perform the same function. The literal account supplies the narrative and historical context, the symbolic level reveals patterns and correspondences, interpretive inquiry develops relationships through comparison and questioning, and the mystical level directs consciousness toward the inward mystery disclosed through the text.

Peshat begins with the words themselves. We examine what the passage says, how its language operates, and what its historical and literary circumstances permit us to understand. This foundation matters because an interpretation becomes unreliable when it erases the material it claims to explain. A

reader who immediately replaces every narrative detail with private symbolism may discover an imaginative system, but that system cannot automatically be attributed to the original text. I therefore regard the plain meaning as a necessary starting point, even when my eventual interpretation moves far beyond it. The outward account provides the vessel through which the deeper investigation begins.

Remez concerns the hints and symbolic correspondences that emerge from the narrative. Water may suggest birth, purification, or the conditions of incarnation, while fire may signify judgment, refinement, illumination, or transformation. The wilderness may become an image of confusion and preparation, while the promised land may represent a condition of understanding or fulfillment. These associations must be considered in their contexts rather than applied mechanically, but they allow the reader to recognize relationships extending beyond a single passage. The symbolic language of one tradition may illuminate another, revealing patterns that become increasingly meaningful as they are considered together. This is where the rainbow of traditions becomes particularly valuable, because a symbol that appears obscure within one culture may receive additional illumination through a related expression preserved elsewhere.

Derash develops understanding through interpretation, examination, and the investigation of relationships within the sacred material. In my pedagogy, this is the level at which paradox becomes especially productive. The reader places one statement beside another, compares their implications, and asks whether the resulting disagreement arises from the text, the interpreter, or the limitations of the conceptual framework being employed. Socratic questioning becomes a natural companion to this activity because it refuses to allow an unsupported assumption to remain invisible. The purpose is not to manufacture agreement where genuine disagreement exists, but to expose the reasoning through which meaning is constructed. A contradiction may reveal a mistaken premise, an overlooked distinction, or an incomplete understanding that requires refinement.

Sod concerns the inward and mystical significance of the investigation. Here, the reader begins recognizing that the narrative is not merely describing events external to consciousness, but may also disclose the spiritual conditions through which consciousness itself develops. Adam, Egypt, Israel, Babylon, the wilderness, the temple, the cross, and resurrection can become symbolic mirrors through which the reader investigates identity, limitation, ignorance, awakening, and restoration. The hidden meaning does not require the destruction of the outward narrative. Rather, the narrative becomes an instrument through which the inward condition is made recognizable. My use of Sod emphasizes realization because understanding reaches a different quality when the symbols are no longer merely objects of discussion but become intelligible through the reader's own experience.

These four dimensions should not be understood as a rigid ladder in which one level must be abandoned because another has been reached. The plain meaning can correct an extravagant symbolic interpretation, while the mystical significance can reveal dimensions of the narrative that a purely historical reading leaves unexplored. Each contributes a different form of understanding, and the movement among them requires discernment. My particular use of PaRDeS is a pedagogical adaptation informed by comparative religion and inward investigation. It is not a claim that the traditional Jewish framework originally contained every theological conclusion I develop from it. I employ its structure because it allows the reader to recognize how outward language and inward realization can remain related without being confused with one another.

Maieutics and the Birth of Understanding

The method through which I guide the reader across these levels is closely related to Socratic maieutics, the art of intellectual midwifery. Socrates compared his questioning to the work of a midwife because he sought to assist the emergence of understanding rather than simply place conclusions into the student's possession. A teacher may provide information, demonstrate reasoning, and challenge assumptions, but genuine realization cannot be transferred as though it were an object passing from one hand to another. The student must participate in the discovery. Understanding becomes personally meaningful when the mind recognizes why a conclusion follows, what assumptions support it, and how its consequences agree with the greater truth being investigated.

This is the purpose of the unsettling questions found throughout my books. I may present a familiar theological statement and ask the reader to follow its implications until an apparent contradiction becomes unavoidable. I may then introduce a perspective from another tradition or a neglected passage of scripture that reveals the assumptions underlying the original interpretation. The resulting anxiety is not necessarily a sign that something has gone wrong. It may mark the moment when an inherited belief becomes available for conscious examination. The reader must decide whether to defend the assumption merely because it is familiar or investigate the possibility that a greater understanding lies beyond it. My role is to hold up the mirror, not to force the reader to accept my reflection as the final answer.

Within this method, PaRDeS supplies the dimensions of interpretation while maieutics supplies the process of discovery. The plain text provides the initial material, symbolic investigation reveals possible relationships, questioning exposes contradictions and hidden assumptions, and inward recognition allows the mystery to become meaningful within consciousness. The movement is not guaranteed to occur in a predictable sequence, nor does every question produce immediate realization. Sometimes an uncertainty must remain unresolved while further experience supplies what abstract reasoning cannot. The important achievement is the development of a mind willing to investigate without surrendering either intellectual honesty or the possibility of faith.

This approach also explains why I do not regard my own interpretations as doctrines that must be accepted without examination. If I demanded that the reader adopt my conclusions simply because I presented them with confidence, I would contradict the method I claim to practice. The objective is not to replace one orthodoxy with another bearing my name. The objective is to awaken the capacity through which the student can investigate, discern, and recognize Truth independently. A person who finishes my books merely repeating my vocabulary has not necessarily accomplished what I intended. A person who emerges more capable of questioning inherited assumptions, recognizing wisdom across traditions, and expressing Love with greater consistency has approached the purpose of the work.

The Sandbox of Incarnation

My understanding of spiritual education can also be contemplated through the image of a sandbox prepared for the learning of children. Within its boundaries, a child encounters materials, limitations, opportunities, and consequences through which imagination develops into practical understanding. The child constructs temporary worlds, experiences the consequences of decisions, encounters

disagreement, and gradually acquires the knowledge necessary for responsible participation beyond the play environment. The sandbox has genuine value, but that value does not depend upon its remaining the permanent home of the child. Its purpose is fulfilled when the lessons acquired within its boundaries become useful beyond them.

I interpret incarnation through this symbolism. The waters of baptism represent the entrance of consciousness into embodied existence, where limitations establish the conditions through which relative experience becomes possible. The cross represents the body itself, the temporary intersection of Spirit and material conditions through which awareness encounters consequence, responsibility, suffering, and transformation. These symbols reveal why the world of apparent division has educational value without requiring us to regard division as the eternal nature of Being. The temporary environment allows the consequences of ignorance and wisdom to become recognizable, but the completion of the lesson cannot consist in the permanent preservation of ignorance. The purpose of the school is understanding, and the purpose of understanding is the ability to express what has been learned.

Within this sandbox, religious and philosophical traditions serve as instruments of instruction. Their commandments, narratives, images, and rituals provide structures through which developing consciousness may begin recognizing the nature of its experience. Some emphasize moral responsibility, others contemplative awareness, ritual discipline, compassion, self-knowledge, or surrender. Their outward forms differ because they have developed within different cultural and historical circumstances, but their value can be investigated in relation to the understanding they help produce. The mistake occurs when the instrument becomes more important than its purpose. A student who refuses to graduate because he has become attached to the classroom has misunderstood the meaning of education. Likewise, a religious tradition fulfills its highest purpose when the wisdom it preserves becomes realized within the life of the student.

The Boat and the Inward Shore

The ancient Buddhist comparison of spiritual teaching to a raft offers a related image. A traveler encounters dangerous waters and constructs a vessel capable of carrying him to the opposite shore. The raft is valuable because it allows the crossing, yet carrying it indefinitely after reaching land would transform a useful instrument into an unnecessary burden. I recognize the world's traditions as vessels through which humanity approaches the mystery of inward realization. Each may offer genuine assistance, and the traveler need not condemn another person's boat merely because it differs from his own. Yet the destination cannot be reduced to the preservation of the vessel. The purpose of crossing is to reach the shore.

The outer shore is necessary because the journey begins within the world of distinctions. We require language before discovering the limitations of language, symbols before recognizing what the symbols signify, and experience before understanding what inherited belief cannot independently provide. The outward world supplies the conditions of education, while the traditions provide means of navigating them. The inward shore is the recognition of the Kingdom, the realization that the Source of Being was not separated from the traveler during the journey. What appeared to be a movement toward an absent reality becomes the discovery of what was present beneath the assumptions of division. Once this

recognition has matured, the boat may be set aside without contempt for the teaching or for those who continue to require it.

Leaving the boat does not mean that scripture, philosophy, and ritual have become worthless. It means that the symbols no longer need to substitute for the reality they have helped disclose. A person who understands generosity does not require endless reminders that giving is good before responding to another's need. A person who has genuinely recognized Unity need not continue defending religious superiority as though the value of one tradition depended upon diminishing every other. The completed student can honor the instruments of learning while recognizing that they were never intended to become permanent obstacles to realization. The boat has succeeded when the traveler can stand upon the shore, and the tradition has fulfilled its purpose when the truth it carries becomes visible through the life of the one who received it.

From Realization to Service

The true work begins when inward realization becomes outward expression. Spiritual understanding is incomplete when it remains confined to private contemplation, intellectual achievement, or the satisfaction of possessing an unusual interpretation. If First Cause is Love, and if every relative being participates in the same greater Unity, then the recognition of that relationship must transform the manner in which we treat one another. The light discovered inwardly is not meant to remain hidden within the temple of personal consciousness. It must become visible through generosity, compassion, forgiveness, education, and the restoration of divided relationships. What begins as the investigation of scripture becomes the practical expression of the nature scripture was intended to reveal.

This is the underlying purpose of Bow With Unity, the vision of Benefactors of Orphans and Widows. The orphan, widow, stranger, poor, and forgotten represent those whose circumstances reveal the responsibility of the Whole toward its members. Service is not an activity performed merely to earn spiritual favor or demonstrate superiority. It is the natural consequence of recognizing that the life present within another cannot be absolutely separated from the life through which we ourselves exist. When we give freely, we participate in the expression of a goodness that does not require the permanent deprivation of one being to establish the worth of another. When we restore dignity to those who suffer, we demonstrate that unity is not merely an attractive theological proposition but a principle capable of becoming visible through action.

The completion of the journey therefore does not involve withdrawing from the world in search of a more sacred existence. The traveler who has reached the inward Kingdom returns to the relationships of ordinary life with a transformed understanding of their purpose. The sandbox is recognized as an environment of learning rather than an eternal prison, and the boat is remembered as a means of crossing rather than an object of permanent dependence. The student becomes capable of assisting others without demanding that they follow an identical path. This is where the apparent distinction between spiritual knowledge and practical goodness begins to disappear. Wisdom becomes fruitful through service, Truth becomes visible through integrity, and Love reveals its nature through giving.

How to Read My Books

When you encounter a passage in my writing that challenges your inherited beliefs, I invite you to examine the discomfort rather than immediately defending the position that has been questioned. Consider what the passage actually says, what symbolic relationships it suggests, what assumptions are exposed by its apparent contradictions, and what inward significance may emerge through sustained investigation. Compare the teaching with other scriptures and traditions without assuming that disagreement automatically establishes the worthlessness of either perspective. Distinguish the author's intention from your own expectations, and remain willing to discover that a familiar doctrine may have been interpreted through a framework narrower than the mystery it attempts to describe.

At the same time, do not accept my conclusions merely because they seem elegant, provocative, or spiritually satisfying. Test them. Ask whether the reasoning is coherent, whether the symbols are being interpreted responsibly, whether the historical claims are adequately supported, and whether the resulting understanding remains consistent with Truth, Love, Unity, and Wisdom. A beautiful metaphor cannot establish a historical fact, and an inward realization does not eliminate the necessity of intellectual honesty. The purpose of my pedagogy is not to escape examination through mystical language. It is to make examination an indispensable part of the movement toward realization.

You may discover that I challenge a doctrine in one chapter and approach its symbolic significance from another direction elsewhere. This is often intentional, because the meaning of a teaching cannot always be disclosed from a single angle. The koan introduces tension, PaRDeS allows interpretation through different dimensions, and maieutics brings the reader into active participation in the discovery. The rainbow invites recognition of wisdom across nations, while the inward test prevents that recognition from becoming indiscriminate agreement. The entire method seeks to cultivate a form of discernment capable of honoring the value of traditions without surrendering the responsibility to distinguish truth from error.

Conclusion: The Beginning of Understanding

The purpose of my books is not to establish a new orthodoxy or gather followers around a collection of conclusions attributed to my authority. I am investigating the mystery of Being through scripture, philosophy, language, symbolism, and the experiences of consciousness. I regard the contradictions encountered along the way as opportunities for discovery, the traditions of the nations as varied expressions through which wisdom may be preserved, and inward realization as the essential movement from inherited belief toward genuine understanding. The reader is invited to participate in this investigation with the courage to question, the humility to recognize error, and the willingness to preserve Love even when familiar interpretations must be reconsidered.

The final measure of understanding is not the ability to win theological arguments or defend a preferred system against every competing tradition. It is the capacity to recognize the greater Unity expressed through the many and to act consistently with the nature of that recognition. The waters of incarnation provide the conditions of learning, the cross of the body provides the instrument of experience, the traditions supply vessels of understanding, and the inward Kingdom reveals the Source that was never truly absent. When the student reaches that recognition, the purpose of the symbols becomes clear.

Their highest value lies not in keeping humanity permanently dependent upon them, but in helping consciousness develop the wisdom necessary to express Love freely.

I therefore ask you to read my books neither as unquestionable declarations nor as attacks upon the faith you already possess. Read them as invitations to investigate what faith is capable of becoming when it no longer fears sincere examination. The paradox is the question, the contradiction is the mirror, and doubt is the instrument through which hidden assumptions may be brought into the light. The reward is not merely another explanation of the mystery, but a greater capacity to recognize its presence within the life you are already living. Once understanding becomes realization, the journey does not end in the isolation of private enlightenment. It opens into the work of giving, restoring, teaching, and serving the Whole.

The end of the investigation is therefore the beginning of its fulfillment. We enter the world to learn through the distinctions of relative existence, and we discover through those distinctions the unity that gives them meaning. The different colors of the rainbow are gathered into the recognition of one light, and the truths preserved among the nations become valuable strands of a wisdom larger than any single inherited description. The student is no longer required to defend the sandbox as the whole of reality or carry the boat after reaching the inward shore. What remains is the knowledge acquired through the journey and the responsibility to express that knowledge through Love. This is the pedagogy behind my work, the reason I test the spirits, and the purpose for which I continually return the reader to the right division of Truth. Without great doubt, there can be no great faith, but when the investigation has fulfilled its purpose, faith becomes recognition, recognition becomes understanding, and understanding becomes the living expression of Unity.

Stephen T. McClard

Bow With Unity — Benefactors of Orphans and Widows