

Placed on Blog February 2005

Monday, February 28

Symbiotic Panentheism - Synopsis: Part 3 of 10 - The Soul and Symbiosis

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 28, 2005 01:33PM (EST)

Part 3. The Soul and Symbiosis

1. Humankind exists.
2. Humankind exists in the universe, in "reality."
3. The essence of the individual is not the body nor the brain.
4. The essence of the individual is the soul.
5. **The soul, being within reality, which in turn is within God, is embraced by God.**
6. **The individual is not God.**
7. **The individual is contained within God.**
8. Reality separates the individual from God and lies between the individual and God.
9. Humankind, souls, are creative and can experience.
10. Soul separated from direct contact with God can create and experience untainted by God's knowledge.
11. Souls can learn and grow.
12. God **can learn through the journey of souls.**

Under the "symbiotic" portion of symbiotic panentheism, the significance of the human species, the significance of the individual, is placed at the level of God and given an importance to God. Thus emerges the rationality for respect due to the individual. Symbiotic panentheism places the soul in a symbiotic relationship - a mutually beneficial, close association - with God.

[Comments \(1\)](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Sunday, February 27

Symbiotic Panentheism - Synopsis: Part 2 of 10 - God and Panentheism

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 27, 2005 10:45PM (EST)

Part 2. God and Panentheism

1. Reality exists.
2. The initiating force - causative factor - of reality is "God."
3. God is omnipresent; as such, **all things are in God, including our known reality.**
4. God is bigger than reality.
5. God is omnipotent; **God has the power to create new, original knowledge.**
6. God is omniscient; **God knows how to create more knowledge. God cannot create new, creative, untainted knowledge within Itself.**
7. God is omnipresent; **God cannot create outside Itself.**

Symbiotic panentheism fully addresses the paradox of numbers five, six, and seven. Panentheism accepts the concepts of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience while at the same time acknowledging the full significance of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience by recognizing God's ability to become even more so.

[Comments \(1\)](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Saturday, February 26

Symbiotic Panentheism - Synopsis: Part 1 of 10 - Introduction

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 26, 2005 10:51PM (EST)

Symbiotic Panentheism The Individual Acting Within God 'being' being 'Being'

Part 1: Introduction

Simply put, "symbiotic panentheism" follows the basic, most widely accepted concepts of present day science, religion, and philosophy. The following is the general flow symbiotic panentheism takes when integrated with the most generally accepted concepts held by today's sciences, religions or philosophies. Some items are embraced as basic components by only one of the three fields, some by two, some by all. The concepts in blue are what symbiotic panentheism adds to the general logic flow to cause a perceptual shift for the future of our species, society, and the individual.

[Leave Comment](#) / [Permanent Link](#) / [Cosmos](#)

Friday, February 25

Abstract: Symbiotic Panentheism

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 25, 2005 12:50AM (EST)

Abstract: The individual acting within God – Symbiotic Panentheism - A Perceptual Shift for Humankind

1. The individual acting within God - symbiotic panentheism establishes a metaphysical model that accepts, while at the same time dismantles, the paradoxes of omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence.

2. Symbiotic panentheism is a model that circumvents the state of permanent equilibrium we have assigned to God, a state we often refer to as stagnation.

3. The foundation of panentheism, defining the location of reality in terms of the individuals' location, doesn't appear to be immensely significant, but the subtlety leads to the initiation of enormous perceptual and behavioral shifts for our specie, society, the environment, and the individual.

4. Panentheism addresses the paradox of omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience through accepting the concepts of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience while at the same time acknowledging the full significance of these concepts by recognizing God's ability to become even more so.

5. Under the symbiotic portion of symbiotic panentheism, the significance of the human specie - the significance of the individual - is placed at the level of God and given an importance to God; thus emerges the rationality for the respect due the individual.

6. Symbiotic panentheism places the soul, the individual, in a symbiotic relationship with God.

7. Under the model of symbiotic panentheism, the individual acting within God, nothing, not even annihilation of our reality's physical mechanism, can diminish our purpose for existence.

Under the model of symbiotic panentheism, nothing, not even total annihilation of our reality itself, can destroy our accomplishments as souls, for they transcend reality itself and embrace - fuse - with the very essence of God.

8. Symbiotic panentheism displays its full impact by placing the responsibility for individual actions where it belongs - with the individual.

9. Symbiotic panentheism provides the logic needed to dismantle all hierarchical systems and perceptions of relative worth. The individual acting within God eliminates the most fundamental hierarchical system created by humankind for humankind - the hierarchy system between God and humans.

10. Symbiotic panentheism eliminates status levels between beings.

11. The individual acting within God does not destroy what humanity has; it adds to what humanity has.

The individual acting within God accepts the significance of God to the individual and to the species.

God is significant to humanity.

12. At the same time, symbiotic panentheism adds the significance of the individual and of the species to God.

Humanity is significant to God

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

The Neo-Buddhist and the Metaphysicist: The function of 'perceived truths'

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 25, 2005 12:19AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

: deleted material

[050221 cg] ... I hold that G-d IS, that G-d is fully aware of ALL "things", both physical and non-physical, and that there is no "knowing" that G-d does not know; so ALL "things" arise and pass away, but G-d's knowing is omnipresent and eternal. In other words, our bodies and our minds are born and die, but G-d's knowing of our bodies and our minds is eternal.

[050223 djs] I agree that 'G-d IS, that G-d is fully aware of ALL "things", both physical and non-physical, and that there is no "knowing" that G-d does not know; so ALL "things" arise and pass away, but G-d's knowing is omnipresent and eternal.'

I understand what you are saying, when you say: '... our bodies and our minds are born and die, but G-d's knowing of our bodies and our minds is eternal.'

Such a statement explains G-d but it does not explain the loss of the individuated entity of knowing, the loss of the unique perspective generated by a unique entity of knowing from having experienced the physical in a unique manner. Within such a model the discrete individuated entity of knowing is lost, lost, lost. I don't get how this can be reconciled with the concept that 'nothing is lost'.

[050221 cg] According to sp, the soul is a created, individuated entity composed of the essence of G-d and separated from G-d by "nothingness". According to sp, our bodies emerged from "nothingness" and are composed of "nothingness". So, perhaps our bodies are the "nothingness" that separates our souls from G-d.

[050223 djs] Exactly.

[050221 cg] Our bodies cease to be, so the "nothingness", which was our bodies and separated our souls from G-d, ceases to be and the essence of G-d, which was separated from G-d by "nothingness", merges with G-d.

[050223 djs] Exactly.

[050221 cg] The soul, as an individuated entity, ceases, ...

[050223 djs] No, because this would make the statement, 'nothing is lost', false.

[050221 cg] ... but the essence of G-d returns to G-d and G-d is not diminished.

[050223 djs] The point is not that this causes G-d not to be diminished but rather the process allows G-d to circumvent 'eternal recurrence', provides an understanding of how it is possible for G-d to be knowledgeable enough to expand Its very knowing.

[050221 cg] After all, in the abstract (the non-physical) there is no "nothingness" to separate the essence of G-d from G-d.

[050223 djs] Now you are once again rejecting the concept not only of the existence of 'nothingness' but the very functionality of 'nothingness' and thus rejecting the concept that 'all' existences, including 'nothingness', have a function, that all existences have a purpose, that G-d does not make junk.

: deleted material

[050218 cg] G-d IS the singular self-existent entity.

[050218 djs] Such absolutism, such all knowing, such self-assurance, where does all this come from?

[050221 cg] Does sp agree or not agree with the statement? Do you?

[050223 djs] The model of symbiotic panentheism would not agree. I do not agree

I am well aware that the basis of most religion is the concept: 'G-d IS the singular self-existent entity.'

Such a perception addresses the concept of the non-discrete but leaves open the issue regarding the discrete. G-d is the non-discrete, since G-d is not composed of parts and has no bounds. G-d is the 'Whole' of all. What then becomes of the discrete, that which is composed of parts and which has bounds and that which is not composed of parts and has bounds, which existed at one point? (I specifically omitted the concept of time here.)

What keeps eluding me when I examine the concept, 'G-d IS the singular self-existent entity', is how can the discrete individual, the discrete entity of knowing, the discrete entity composed of the same substance and essence of G-d, simply 'pass away' in light of the statement: 'Nothing is lost.' If the discrete simply 'passes away', 'ceases to be', then it is lost in the sense that it no longer exists as a discrete entity.

I ask you again: How does one rationalize such a contradiction?

: [deleted material]

[050222 cg] Every statement I make, unless designated otherwise, is an expression of my understanding; i.e., a personal statement. While you may speak on behalf of symbiotic panentheism, it is, nevertheless, your expression of your understanding. This is, after all, a "dialogue", a conversation between two or more persons.

[050223 djs] I accept the 'rap on the head'.

: [deleted material]

[050222 cg] If you're willing to settle for "perceived truth", as determined by consensus, then why engage in a dialogue? You should take a vote. Truth is not determined in that manner.

[050223 djs] In essence this is what we, humans do. We accept 'perceived truths' based upon this or that. No one can state truth as absolute 'fact'. We simply define 'truth' as best we can and move on from there. Now some 'truths' are taken to be more likely than others based upon a 'judgment' call on the part of each individual.

What I am suggesting is that we stop making such 'judgment' calls based upon only one of the three tools we use to analyze reality. I am suggesting we use all three tools to analyze reality – observation/science, faith/religion, and reason/philosophy – to generate a more probable model of reality.

What I am suggesting is that a model of reality is too important to leave to any single one of the three tools we use to construct our perception of reality since it is from our understanding of reality that morality and ethics arise.

[050222 cg] Regardless of the reasons, the "perceived truths" of the consensus were not the truth. It is for this reason that we should never settle for anything less than the truth.

[050223 djs] But that is just the point, cg, as long as we are 'confined' within the physical we will never 'know' if what we perceive truth to be is in fact 'truth' itself. That is the very reason we have no choice but to define 'truth' as 'best we are able for any particular point in time' and move on from that point. As we gain more awareness of our existence we must be willing to 'change' the model.

In short, we acknowledge, respect, admit, humble ourselves to, take pride in, our ability to learn and adjust. We are truly marvelous beings.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Thursday, February 24

📄 Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – Miscellaneous Questions

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 24, 2005 11:30AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[Deleted material] ...

[050218 djs] Regarding your question: **'Do physical things have an effect on abstract things ...'** It appears to be the case that if one falls off a ladder, one consciously experiences the event. As such I guess I would have to say: Yes the physical affects the abstract and thus physical things appear to have an effect on the abstract.

[050218 djs] Regarding the remainder of your questions: You know, I have no idea. I am not a biologist. The actual mechanism which provides 'knowing' the ability to experience what the physical senses detect is a subject scientists have, are, and probably will continue to explore for some time to come.

[050220 cg] **There is no help there. A biologist studies the physical body and will not answer the question of how the abstract (mind) experiences. It is for you to explain how the abstract 'knows' the physical.**

[050220 djs] Regarding your comment: **'There is no help there. ...'**

I agree but they are trying nevertheless.

Regarding your comment: **'... A biologist studies the physical body and will not answer the question of how the abstract (mind) experiences. ...'**

Perhaps but isn't the term 'will not' a rather dogmatic and ego-centric position for any limited being to take?

Regarding your comment: **'...It is for you to explain how the abstract 'knows' the physical. ...'**

To suggest that a metaphysicist must understand all the nuances relating to a model of reality they may propose is a little over the edge. Even religions, as conceited and steeped in a history of intellectual thought as they may be, do not profess to have all the answers.

[050218 djs] What we do know, however, is that consciousness is aware of its experiencing. Philosophically the debate revolves around the dualist and the monist. The monist suggests the process is simply molecular in nature. The dualist rejects this concept and suggests consciousness is a form of the abstract experiencing the physical.

[050220 cg] A monist may be materialist or a non-materialist. Or neither a materialist nor a non-materialist. But a dualist is a dualist.

[050220 djs] The point being?

[050218 djs] You and I have agreed the physical and abstract exist. Are we now leading into a dialogue as to whether the physical and the abstract are distinctly different one from the other?

[050220 cg] You have already stated that the physical and the abstract are distinctly different. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of a more stark difference; i.e., you stated the physical emerged from "nothing" and was G-dless (void of G-d) and the abstract was composed of the essence of G-d.

[050220 djs] Yes I did and I stand by those statements in terms of what the model of reality symbiotic panentheism demonstrates. I was not questioning my direction but rather I was clearly questioning your intended direction. Personally I have no desire to jump into dialoguing the pros and cons of monistic and dualistic validity. There appears to be enough of that taking place already.

[Deleted material] ...

[050213 cg] Are you positing a changing G-d?

[050215 djs] Yes. For what purpose does G-d need to change? , one may ask. G-d 'needs' to have

a means to avert eternal recurrence and thus the need for creation, the need for divine sparks to travel untainted by an overpowering G-d presence, the need for a 'location' where 'free will' can exert itself, the 'need' for individuated entities of knowing. We exist for a reason. We have a purpose for being here, being alive. We also have great responsibilities for we are responsible for G-d being what G-d is.

[050217 cg] Why do you believe that G-d needs to avert eternal recurrence?

[050218 djs] I am not saying G-d absolutely 'needs' to do so. What I am saying is that G-d desiring to avoid eternal recurrence makes more sense, is a more rational perception, than the perception that G-d would tolerate finding Itself in the cycle of eternal recurrence.

[050220 cg] So, you're suggesting that G-d has no absolute 'need', but has a preference. Why would G-d have a preference?

[050220 djs] Regarding your comment: 'So, you're suggesting that G-d has no absolute 'need', but has a preference. ...' Correct.

Regarding your comment: '... Why would G-d have a preference?'

Why wouldn't G-d have preferences? If G-d is omniscient and has no time constraints, then why wouldn't G-d have a preference to know more than is known if it should have the ability to do so?

In addition, if G-d is omnipotent, then what leads us to believe that G-d would be incapable of doing so, that is have a means by which It could do so?

[050218 djs] I am also suggesting that it is more rational to argue G-d is capable of avoiding eternal recurrence than to argue that G-d is incapable of doing so.

[050220 cg] It is even more rational not to argue at all at problems one creates in one's mind.

[050220 djs] Hmmmm, I would agree in terms of finding inner peace, in terms of finding personal peace of mind. But the point of developing a model of reality through the metaphysical process of negation, or reductionism as Husserl would suggest, does not attempt to find inner or outer peace of mind for the individual but rather leads to an understanding of reality which provides the logic whereby the individual resolves the haunting desire to rationally understand the answers to the questions: Where am I? What am I? And why do I exist?

Symbiotic panentheism thus becomes one such model, becomes a model of reality immersed in philosophical, scientific, and religious consensus, becomes a model which answers the three questions, becomes a model based upon universal truths, becomes a model from which a

species driven, namely human, universal understanding of ethics and morals can emerge while not impinging upon the integrity of religion, science, or philosophy.

In short the model creates a starting point by which intellectuals, as opposed to myself, can build a model of reality which would act as the foundation for resolving our 'local' conflicts be they inter- or intra- religious, scientific, or philosophical in nature.

Even more concisely, sp acts as a model suggesting how we might globally and universally engage in conflict resolution.

[050218 djs] The model of symbiotic panentheism demonstrated the means by which G-d can do so, can avoid eternal recurrence.

I grant you this only makes sense in terms of our limited ability to understand reality but to take the approach that avoiding eternal recurrence is not a problem because a few prominent individuals have spoken to G-d and been assured, by G-d, eternal recurrence is not a problem is to collapse the dialogue to one of religion versus a dialogue of reason, is to collapse the dialogue to religion versus metaphysics.

[050220 cg] Actually, I was unaware that "a few prominent individuals have spoken to G-d and been assured, by G-d, eternal recurrence is not a problem". How interesting.

[050220 djs] Yes isn't it.

[050217 cg] And even if that is so, it is only the existence of the physical, in space and time, which creates the potential of 'eternal recurrence'. G-d could have easily avoided this by not creating the physical.

[050218 djs] Regarding your comment: '... it is only the existence of the physical, in space and time, which creates the potential of 'eternal recurrence' ...'

What leads you to this conclusion?

Regarding your comment: 'G-d could have easily avoided this (the problem of eternal recurrence) by not creating the physical.'

This statement is only correct if eternal recurrence is a product of space and time.

Knowledge is knowledge, awareness is awareness, experiencing is experiencing and the potential permutation combinations possible is limited by what is known even if what is known is all knowing, is omniscience itself. In an existence of timelessness all possible permutations of knowing can be reached in 'no time' at all and it is at that point (I did not say 'at that time') that recycling begins.

[050220 cg] Is it because you wrote "point" and not "time" that your argument holds? What other meaning does the word "point" have in that context?

[050220 djs] Regarding your question: ' ... Is it because you wrote "point" and not "time" that your argument holds?' Yes. The metaphysical model of symbiotic panentheism demonstrates G-d exists beyond the limits of time and space and as such occurrences, experiences, awareness open to G-d occur not at points of time but rather at points of occurrence, points of experiencing, points of awareness, i.e. discrete individuated entities of knowing plus one. The plus one of course is the non-discrete totality of G-d in and of Itself.

Regarding your question: 'What other meaning does the word "point" have in that context?

Does the above answer this question to your satisfaction?

[050220 cg] Events, including awareness and experience, occur in time.

[050220 djs] I agree if you are stating what you stated: 'Events, including awareness and experience, occur in time.' If, on the other hand, you are implying they 'only' occur in time or that they 'can' occur only in time, then we disagree.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Wednesday, February 23

📄 Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – It is our responsibility to define who we are

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 23, 2005 01:03AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[050218 cg] I You believe that there is a soul; i.e., a created, but immortal personal entity. I believe that there is no soul and that our bodies and minds arise and pass away.

[050220 djs] I respect that but this is not a dialogue regarding what we 'hold to' nor is this a dialogue regarding what we 'believe'. This is a dialogue regarding the composition of reality and the role you and I, the role all individuals, play within such a model. This model is not just a religious model but is the most logical, rational, reasonable model we are able to construct backed by all three tools we have available for us to analyze reality, namely: observation/science, faith/religion, and reason/philosophy.

[050218 cg] When the Buddha was asked, "Is there a soul?", he was silent.

[050220 djs] No denial? Buddha was a wise man.

[050218 cg] When the Buddha was then asked, "Is there not a soul?", he was silent.

[050220 djs] No denial? Buddha was a wise man.

[050218 cg] He was a great and wise teacher.

[050220 djs] I agree.

[050218 cg] I am merely a chatty neighbor.

[050220 djs] I agree, as am I.

[050218 cg] I appreciate, in addition to the philosophical basis, the attraction that one might have for the concept of an immortal soul; i.e., relief from the fear of death and personal extinction. The concept is especially attractive if one believes that one will be in the presence of G-d. How wondrous to be in a community of souls bathed in the light and love of G-d!

[050220 djs] You touch upon an element of the individual that is almost universal. But to reject the idea because it is 'a' hope embraced by individuals does not make any more sense than to accept the idea because it is 'a' hope embraced by individuals.

The model of symbiotic panentheism does hold out the hope and longing as you so eloquently describe but not because its intent was to do so as it developed through the process of 'negation', rather the fact simply appeared after the model emerged in its simplistic entirety.

Now such a perception may appear to give the appearance that the model is attractive to the nature of individualistic 'hope' but in fact the appearance only emerges because of the human nature to look at the brighter side.

When examined in great detail, the model of symbiotic panentheism is extremely burdensome. The model of sp, shoulders the individual with the burden of accepting the concept that their every act becomes absorbed into G-d and causes G-d to be what G-d is. The model shoulders the individual with the understanding that all ripples generated by each action the individual takes or does not take will be a part of eternity for all individuated entities of knowing, including G-d, to observe, feel, experience, examine for eternity. Sp places on the individual the burden of responsibility. This is heavy, heavy, stuff.

[050218 cg] I hold that we are, as we are, bathed in the wisdom and compassion of G-d, right here, right now. I hold that we are in a community of sentient beings who share that experience, right here, right now. If one realizes this, what question remains?

[050220 djs] Regarding your comment: 'I hold that we are, as we are, bathed in the wisdom and compassion of G-d, right here, right now. I hold that we are in a community of sentient beings who share that experience, right here, right now.'

The model of symbiotic panentheism would agree with what you 'hold' to be true, since sp demonstrates that it is only 'nothingness' which separates the individual from G-d.

Regarding your comment: 'If one realizes this, what question remains?'

[050220 djs] The question which remains is: Why do we exist? It is metaphysics which is driven by this question, not religion. That is what makes religion so comforting and metaphysics so brutal.

It is the answer to the question: 'Why do we exist?' that will finally give us the ability to define who we are and it is we, humanity, that should actually define ourselves not some other entity we may encounter as we disperse throughout the heavens.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Tuesday, February 22

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – Hope through universally perceived truths

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 22, 2005 12:13AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

: [deleted material]

[050215 djs] Regarding your statement: 'What does it matter who supports a particular position?' It is critical that we, the human species, understands its true nature for such an understanding leads directly to a form of consensual mission statement our species will take with it as it disperses throughout the heavens.

If we do not develop such an understanding we will eventually disperse throughout the heavens only to find ourselves being defined by other life forms, only to find ourselves susceptible to being pitted one against the other, only to find ourselves riding the same history vector we have been riding throughout our history as we move to explore the heavens. Now if we feel our past is what we would be proud to replicate in the future, then we need not come to a consensus as to what our true nature is. But if we feel our past has its good points but has issues we need to seriously consider shaking before we disperse throughout the heavens, then now is the time to address such issues before we become so widely dispersed that we find it almost, if not, impossible to develop a consensus as to what our true nature is.

[050218 cg] Of course it would be wonderful if all the peoples of the world agreed and lived in harmony. But truth is not determined by consensus.

[050220 djs] Regarding your comment: 'Of course it would be wonderful if all the peoples of the world agreed and lived in harmony.'

I agree.

[050220 djs] Regarding your comment: **But truth is not determined by consensus.**

Here we disagree. (see below)

[050215 djs] Regarding your statement: 'We are discussing what we personally understand, which is as 'local' as one can be. Claiming our understanding is 'universal', does not make it so.'

Perhaps we differ here. Now here I will state: 'It is my position' that we are able to know universal truths, know truths which extend not only to the very edge of our universe but through and beyond such a barrier, extend beyond the very barrier within which our physical universe finds itself confined. Such truths are universal for they apply not only to our universe but they apply to all universes as well as apply to what lies between these very universes.

[050218 cg] We agree that the individual can know 'universal truth', at least that is our mutual hope. Nevertheless, what an individual 'knows' or believes they know is personal, first and foremost. It may be 'universal truth' or it may not, and, even if the individual knows a 'universal truth', the expression of that 'universal truth', in language, will only model reality and not be the reality itself; hence, it will inevitably fall short.

[050220 djs] Regarding: '...the expression of that 'universal truth', in language, will only model reality and not be the reality itself; hence, it will inevitably fall short.'

Such a statement is undeniable, however, such a statement left as it is, alone and isolated, leaves much to be desired.

It is perceived 'truths' which act as the bases upon which human action is generated. Since we cannot 'know' as a 'fact' that a truth is a truth, the best we can hope to do is define truth as best we can and move on from that point. To be true to the concept of any model we build which is based upon such a statement leaves us no rational option but to acknowledge any model of reality we build to be one enveloped in the perception of being an 'organic model', being a model which will either need to be slightly modified with time, significantly modified with time, or be completely dismantled and rebuilt over time.

Having said that, it is also apparent that to build a model of perceived reality based upon a consensus of three perceptual tools we use to analyze reality would help us to understand a common basis upon which we can develop a universal model of morality, a universal model of ethics, a universal model of, action.

It is, after all, perception which generates action, which in turn generates reactions, which in turn eventually generate social ambience.

The concept of developing a consensus through which social ambience emerges is not new and is in fact one of the markers distinguishing human development from that of other animals. The examples of such occurrences are all around us.

[050211 cg] What is the "entity" that you believe you are?

[050212 djs] The metaphysical model of symbiotic panentheism, which emerges from a general consensus of scientific facts, religious beliefs, and philosophical reasoning, (thus not a 'personal belief', i.e. not 'my' belief) would suggest that there are many potential forms of individuated 'entities'. In the case of a human entity, symbiotic panentheism would suggest the individual is a 'consciousness' capable of experiencing the physical at a depth of understanding that reaches the level of just that, understanding that it, in fact, is experiencing the physical and reaches the level of understanding why it is doing so, why it is, in fact, experiencing the physical.

[050214 cg] Careful! A "general consensus" is not truth.

[050215 djs] Again an interesting statement since it is itself a statement of general consensus.

[050218 cg] Actually, it was a personal statement and not presented as, "It is generally agreed that...". That many people hold it to be true may be a fact, but is not pertinent.

[050220 djs] Regarding: 'Actually, it was a personal statement and...' It would help if you would specifically designate personal statements to be such. This will allow us to avoid making assumptions regarding what is and is not a personal statement.

Regarding: '... That many people hold it to be true may be a fact, but is not pertinent.' I agree. If what many people hold to be true were pertinent, this dialogue would be irrelevant if not heretical.

[050215 djs] To suggest a 'general consensus' is not truth is only correct when such a consensus is not truth but when such a consensus is truth then it is in fact 'truth'.

[050218 cg] I did not intend to suggest anything of the sort. As I wrote above, truth is not determined by consensus.

[050220 djs] Perhaps not but perceived 'truth' is determined by consensus and it is such truth, 'perceived truth', which acts as the bases for human behavior. Such being the case, what is so irrational about building 'truths' as best we can, based upon what we know in the moment, as opposed to establishing 'local', 'regional', 'conflicting', 'emotional', 'competitive', 'antagonistic', 'divisive', 'self-deprecating', 'opposing', irreconcilable' truths?

[050215 djs] Having said that let me suggest: Science defines 'truths' as best it can and moves on from there. Such a process has lead to great advances within the field of science. I would suggest we (humans) define a model of reality (from which an understanding of our true nature and purpose emerges) as best we can and move on from that point.

Now I am not suggesting that it is the individual human we use as the measure of having reached a consensus but rather I am suggesting that it is the three perceptual tools we, humans, use to understand reality that come to a consensual description of reality - the three tools: science, religion, and philosophy.

[050218 cg] The counter-examples are so obvious. Here are two examples of science, religion, and philosophy agreeing: that the world is flat and that the Sun and stars revolve around the Earth. That there was a consensus did not make it truth, let alone 'universal truth'.

[050220 djs] Ahhh, yes, but it was the best they could do at the time and the negative results were due in general to the intra- as well as inter- animosity, lack of cooperation, and the power struggles which existed intra- and inter- religious, scientific, and philosophical struggles.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Monday, February 21

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – The concept 'in and of itself'

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 21, 2005 02:51AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[050211 cg] All "things", both physical and non-physical, that exist arise and pass away. Only G-d exists, in and of Itself.

[050212 djs] I understand and respect the model of reality you suggest. In fact I embrace your concept of G-d in and of Itself but this is where our two perceptions diverge. Correct me if I am wrong but your model of reality states: 'Only G-d exists, in and of Itself'.

[050213 cg] Yes, as I stated, "Only G-d exists, in and of Itself."

[050215 djs] Then what of this conversation? Does this conversation exist? If so does it remain eternally a 'known' occurrence?

[050218 cg] Yes, of course this conversation exists as does every "thing", both physical and non-physical, exist, but they do not exist, in and of themselves. All "things" are composite, dependent, and temporary. They are composite because they are made of parts; they are dependent because they rely on conditions; and, they are temporary because they arise and pass away; therefore, they have no self-existence; i.e., they do not exist, in and of themselves.

You asked, "Does it remain eternally a 'known' occurrence?" [Nothing is lost.](#)

[050218 djs] Back to existence 'in and of itself', huh? Well let's discuss that concept.

The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary - 1969:

'in' – prep. – Held by or within the confines of: enclosed by – 'in itself' would then be interpret into 'held by itself', 'within the confines of itself', 'enclosed by itself'

Since the model of symbiotic panentheism demonstrates G-d to be what all, except G-d itself, is found within and since sp demonstrates existing individuated entities of knowing and existing nothingness are found 'within' G-d then sp would agree that individuated entities of knowing and nothingness do not exist exclusively 'in themselves.

'of' – prep. - coming from, originating at or from – 'of itself' would then be interpreted into 'coming from itself', 'originating from itself'

Since the model of symbiotic panentheism demonstrates G-d to be the only existence not originating from elsewhere and since sp demonstrates existing individuated entities of knowing originate from experiencing what lies 'outside' themselves and since sp demonstrates existing nothingness is 'created' then sp would agree that individuated entities of knowing and nothingness do not come from themselves, do not originate from themselves.

Having said this in no way diminishes the concept that individuated entities exist and as such are never lost; do not simply cease to be, 'nothing is lost'. As for 'nothingness' itself, well, I agree with your statement: 'nothing is lost'.

: deleted material

[050215 djs] The question I would put to you is: Which form of G-d is more expansive, more omnipotent, more omniscient, more omnipresent, a perception of only G-d existing in and of Itself or a perception of G-d existing in and of itself as a non-discrete entity within which both discrete functional entities of G-d exist as well as discrete functional entities of nothingness void G-d exist?

[050218 cg] G-d has no form.

[050218 djs] Again I agree. The statement was metaphorical in nature.

[050213 cg] You ask, "Can anything be created and/or destroyed and if so what?" The direct answer is, every "thing", both physical and non-physical, that exists is created and can be destroyed. Every "thing" that exists is composite and arises with and is dependent on conditions. As such, "things" do not exist, in and of themselves. Since individuals (sentient beings) are composite and arise with and are dependent on conditions, therefore, individuals do not exist, in and of themselves.

[050215 djs] If they don't exist in and of themselves, in what way do they exist?

[050218 cg] As I wrote above, every "thing", both physical and non-physical, that exists is

composite, dependent, and temporary, and has no self-existence; i.e., does not exist, in and of itself. So, "things" exist, but they arise and pass away.

[050218 djs] Because a 'thing' does not necessarily exist 'in and of itself' does not mean it does not exist (see above definition of 'in and of itself'). If G-d is abstractual, non-physical, in nature and if G-d is fully aware of a particular apple, G-d's knowing of that apple does not pass away even though the physical apple does pass away.

Now the apple 'passes away' because the apple is physical and emanates from nothingness and as such takes on the characteristics of the physical. The physical apple can be created and can be destroyed. Individuated entities of knowing, however, are composed of the same essence and substance as G-d and as such can be created and cannot be destroyed. Thus unique entities of knowing, once created, cannot 'pass away' any more than G-d can 'pass away'.

050204 cg] Here is an important difference. You understand your awareness as an "abstract entity"; therefore, you argue, it must be eternal. I hold that our awareness is not an 'entity', but is composite and changing.

[050215 djs] I agree with your first statement but to suggest that an existence that is composite and changing is not an 'entity' confuses me. Upon what scientific, religious, and/or philosophical states of rationality do you base such a perception?

[050218 cg] Sorry for any confusion, I meant, 'self-existent entity'. A self-existent entity is not composite, because if it were made of parts, the existence of the entity would depend on "things". A self-existent entity is not dependent, because if it relied on conditions, the existence of the entity would depend on the conditions. A self-existent entity is not temporary, because if it were to arise and pass away, the existence of the entity would depend on time.

[050218 djs] Where do I begin, hmmm. It appears the understanding of time separates us. So perhaps I should approach assisting you in understanding what I am saying through graphics. Unfortunately I don't know how to place graphics on line at this point so let me describe the graphic. A dot, representing an individuated entity of knowing , representing an individuated entity of experiencing, is placed in a circle, representing the physical universe which emanates from the void, the dot and circle are then placed in a rectangle. The rectangle represents the totality of knowing.

The dot experiences uniquely and leaves the physical to move into the 'region' outside the circle. The process moves 'new' unique experiencing and 'new' unique knowing into the totality of knowing which in no way destroys the permutations available to G-d but rather

adds to the potential permutations of knowing and experiencing available to G-d as well as adds to the potential permutations of knowing and experiencing available to all individuated entities of knowing found within G-d, found within omniscience, found within the All.

Space, time, matter, and energy are all interconnected as demonstrated by Einstein's equation, $e = mc^2$. Space, time, matter, and energy are all found within the circle but not outside the circle except within the individuated entities of knowing which have experienced space and time through the process of 'traveling' through the physical. Because space, time, matter, and energy are not found 'outside' the circle, G-d existence is independent of time. The conceptual understanding, the experiencing of space, time, matter, and energy remain within the individuated entities of knowing that have journeyed through the physical.

[\[050218 cg\]](#) **G-d IS the singular self-existent entity.**

[\[050218 djs\]](#) Such absolutism, such all knowing, such self-assurance, where does all this come from?

As for me, well, I am not stating symbiotic panentheism IS the actual model of reality. I am only stating it is a model of reality which may or may not act as the beginning of the process of developing a more accurate model of reality we, humanity, are capable of building for the given moment in order to define our very selves and our very purpose for existing.

I am also emphatically stating 'a few' ground rules for developing such a model, namely:

1. The model must be reached as a consensus of, at minimum, the best philosophical, religious, and scientific minds we can muster. (The three categories mentioned are representative of the three major tools we use to analyze 'reality': reason, faith, and observation.)
2. The model must be organic in nature, that is must be recognized to be 'the best we are capable of developing with the knowledge we have presently at hand. The model is to change as the three major tools we use to analyze 'reality' develop a consensual agreement regarding new knowledge and how it should be used to modify the model.
3. The model must be inter-universal in nature.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Sunday, February 20

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – Avoiding eternal recurrence

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 20, 2005 12:06AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

Deleted material] ...

[050217 cg] Let me re-start this line of questioning.

[050217 cg] I understand how physical things interact with other physical things.

[050217 cg] Do physical things have an effect on abstract things and, if so, how (by what mechanism)? Does the body have an effect on the mind (soul)?

[050217 cg] How (by what mechanism) does the mind (soul), which is abstract, experience the physical?

[050218 djs] Regarding your question: 'Do physical things have an effect on abstract things ...' It appears to be the case that if one falls off a ladder, one consciously experiences the event. As such I guess I would have to say: Yes the physical affects the abstract and thus physical things appear to have an effect on the abstract.

Regarding the remainder of your questions: You know, I have no idea. I am not a biologist. The actual mechanism which provides 'knowing' the ability to experience what the physical senses detect is a subject scientists have, are, and probably will continue to explore for some time to come.

What we do know, however, is that consciousness is aware of its experiencing. Philosophically the debate revolves around the dualist and the monist. The monist suggests the process is simply molecular in nature. The dualist rejects this concept and suggests consciousness is a form of the abstract experiencing the physical.

You and I have agreed the physical and abstract exist. Are we now leading into a dialogue as to whether the physical and the abstract are distinctly different one from the other?

[Deleted material] ...

[050213 cg] Are you positing a changing G-d?

[050215 djs] Yes. For what purpose does G-d need to change? , one may ask. G-d 'needs' to have a means to avert eternal recurrence and thus the need for creation, the need for divine sparks to travel untainted by an overpowering G-d presence, the need for a 'location' where 'free will' can exert itself, the 'need' for individuated entities of knowing. We exist for a reason. We have a purpose for being here, being alive. We also have great responsibilities for we are responsible for G-d being what G-d is.

[050217 cg] Why do you believe that G-d needs to avert eternal recurrence?

[050218 djs] I am not saying G-d absolutely 'needs' to do so. What I am saying is that G-d desiring to avoid eternal recurrence makes more sense, is a more rational perception, than the perception that G-d would tolerate finding Itself in the cycle of eternal recurrence.

I am also suggesting that it is more rational to argue G-d is capable of avoiding eternal recurrence than to argue that G-d is incapable of doing so.

The model of symbiotic panentheism demonstrated the means by which G-d can do so, can avoid eternal recurrence.

I grant you this only makes sense in terms of our limited ability to understand reality but to take the approach that avoiding eternal recurrence is not a problem because a few prominent individuals have spoken to G-d and been assured, by G-d, eternal recurrence is not a problem is to collapse the dialogue to one of religion versus a dialogue of reason, is to collapse the dialogue to religion versus metaphysics.

[050217 cg] And even if that is so, it is only the existence of the physical, in space and time, which creates the potential of 'eternal recurrence'. G-d could have easily avoided this by not creating the physical.

[050218 djs] Regarding your comment: '... it is only the existence of the physical, in space and time, which creates the potential of 'eternal recurrence' ...'

What leads you to this conclusion?

Regarding your comment: 'G-d could have easily avoided this (the problem of eternal recurrence) by not creating the physical.'

This statement is only correct if eternal recurrence is a product of space and time.

Knowledge is knowledge, awareness is awareness, experiencing is experiencing and the potential permutation combinations possible is limited by what is known even if what is known is all knowing, is omniscience itself. In an existence of timelessness all possible permutations of knowing can be reached in 'no time' at all and it is at that point (I did not say 'at that time') that recycling begins.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Saturday, February 19

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – Points of agreement

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 19, 2005 01:20PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[deleted material]

[050216 cg] Let me summarize again.

[050216 cg] We agree that G-d is uncreated and eternal.

[050219 djs] We agree.

[050216 cg] We agree that G-d is omnipresent. However, you hold that "nothingness" is void of G-d (G-d is not present in "nothingness"), while I hold that "nothingness" is void of all "things", but G-d is not a "thing" and is present.

[050219 djs] We agree.

[050216 cg] I hold that "things" (the physical and non-physical) arose with "nothing" and that both "things" (the physical and non-physical) and "nothing" are manifestations of the substance and essence of G-d.

[050216 cg] We agree that the non-physical (the abstract or mind) is the essence of G-d and G-d is present.

[050219 djs] We agree that the non-physical (the abstract or 'mind') is composed of the same substance and essence as G-d.

I don't think we have the same understanding regarding 'G-d's presence'. I hold that individuated entities of knowing are composed of the same substance and essence as G-d and thus are divine by nature but I hold such existences are unique entities.

An analogy might take on the following form. Using the abstract to explain the abstract; the number two is unique. The number two is found 'contained' within the number line. The number line is unique and incorporates the number two while 'allowing' the number two its unique existence. Using this analogy, think of the number line as total knowing and the number two as a unique entity of knowing within total knowing.

In short, G-d may or may not be 'within' unique individuated entities of knowing but unique entities of knowing are definitely 'within' G-d. This is an issue to be resolved by religion and philosophy as opposed to being addressed by the metaphysical model symbiotic panentheism.

[050216 cg] However, you hold that the physical emanated from "nothingness", so the physical is void of G-d, while I hold that the physical is the substance of G-d and G-d is present.

[050219 djs] Close enough for the point of our dialogue. Just as a point of clarification, however, the concept of the physical emanating from nothing is an interesting potential which arises from the model of symbiotic panentheism. It is not, however, absolutely critical in regards to maintaining the validity of the model.

: [deleted material]

[050212 cg] How does "function" and "purpose" arise?

[050214 djs] Function and purpose arise from the desire to satisfy one's 'needs'.

[050216 cg] Are you positing that one's purpose is to satisfy one's needs? If so, from where do one's needs arise?

[050219 djs] In terms of the most primary of purposes, no I am not positing that one's purpose is to satisfy one's needs. The model of symbiotic panentheism unequivocally demonstrates that satisfying one's need's is important to the individuated entity of knowing but Totality. The primary purpose is altruistic in nature for it addresses the 'need' of both G-d and other individuated entities of knowing.

[050212 cg] What is the purpose of a flower?

[050214 djs] Cute.

[050216 cg] Yes, but if you claim that every "thing" has a purpose, then it is fair to ask what is the purpose of "things". So, what is the purpose of a flower?

[050219 djs] You are correct. In terms of the metaphysical model of symbiotic panentheism, the purpose of the physical flower is to act a unique source of experiencing for individuated entities of knowing. Each individuated entity of knowing experiences the flower uniquely.

: [deleted material]

[050212 cg] As I have previously written, I hold that our awareness is composite and changing, is dependent on conditions for arising, and will pass away. We are discrete in the sense that our bodies and minds are discrete, but our bodies and minds have no existence, in and of themselves.

[050214 djs] I agree but what of our non-physical self? What of consciousness, the very substance and essence of G-d?

[050216 cg] We agree that our minds (souls) are composite and changing. However, you hold that our minds (souls) are eternal entities that change, while I hold that our minds are discrete is the same way our bodies are discrete, change as our bodies change, and, pass away as our bodies pass away.

[050219 djs] You have described our differences concisely. Let me add that symbiotic panentheism would agree that our minds are discrete entities but since the mind is composed of the same substance and essence as G-d it cannot be destroyed and thus does not 'pass away'.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Friday, February 18

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – My being inept
by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 18, 2005 01:42AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

: [deleted material]

[050211 cg] Yes, exactly that, we do not exist in and of ourselves!

[050212 djs] I understand that G-d exists and is the totality of all but how can you rationally justify throwing away individuated entities of existence? Rejecting the individual entity's existence goes against everything most sciences, most philosophies, and most religions embrace, argue, substantiate.

[050214 cg] Careful! I did not say that the individual does not exist. Of course it does. I said that the individual does not exist, in and of itself. An instance of a chair exists, but it is composite and dependent on conditions. It has no existence in and of itself. An instance of a cat exists, but it is composite and dependent on conditions. It has no existence in and of itself. You and I exist, but we are composite and dependent on conditions. We have no existence in and of ourselves.

[050215 djs] I concede the point. To suggest the phrase 'in and of itself' be applied to discrete entities of knowing or applied to 'a void/nothingness/physical universe' is an incorrect application of the term.

Symbiotic panentheism would agree the term 'in an of itself' applies only to G-d since the model of sp clearly states it is only G-d which cannot be created and cannot be destroyed and it is only G-d which is not wholly included 'within' another existence.

I also recognize, as I hope you do, that sp is not to blame for my ignorance for it is not sp which is attempting to interpret what it is but rather it is I that is doing so and sometimes very poorly at that.

[050212 djs] My position of individuated entities of existence existing in and of themselves is supported by the vast majority of science, religion, and philosophy. From what I understand your position is supported basically by a few Eastern religions and thus is religious in nature. Now there is nothing wrong with holding either Western or Eastern religious views as long as one acknowledges that such positions are 'religious', 'local', in nature. But we are discussing truth in the universal sense not in the 'local' sense.

[050214 cg] Careful! You said, "My position..."

[050214 cg] What does it matter who supports a particular position?

[050214 cg] We are discussing what we personally understand, which is as 'local' as one can be. Claiming our understanding is 'universal', does not make it so.

[050215 djs] Regarding your statement: 'Careful! You said, "My position..."'

Again you are absolutely correct, I should not have used the phrase 'My position ...' for symbiotic pantheism is not 'my position' for sp is a model of reality which does not 'belong' to me. Sp is an expanded model of reality taken as a whole. Sp is an advanced understanding of reality humankind now has the ability to understand. Let me therefore suggest the [050212 djs] statement above be revised to read: '[050212 djs] The model of symbiotic pantheism demonstrates the concept that individuated entities of existence'

[050215 djs] Regarding your statement: 'What does it matter who supports a particular position?' It is critical that we, the human species, understands its true nature for such an understanding leads directly to a form of consensual mission statement our species will take with it as it disperses throughout the heavens.

If we do not develop such an understanding we will eventually disperse throughout the heavens only to find ourselves being defined by other life forms, only to find ourselves susceptible to being pitted one against the other, only to find ourselves riding the same history vector we have been riding throughout our history as we move to explore the heavens. Now if we feel our past is what we would be proud to replicate in the future, then we need not come to a consensus as to what our true nature is. But if we feel our past has its good points but has issues we need to seriously consider shaking before we disperse throughout the heavens, then now is the time to address such issues before we become so widely dispersed that we find it almost, if not, impossible to develop a consensus as to what our true nature is.

[050215 djs] Regarding your statement: 'We are discussing what we personally understand, which is as 'local' as one can be. Claiming our understanding is 'universal', does not make it so.'

Perhaps we differ here. Now here I will state: 'It is my position' that we are able to know universal truths, know truths which extend not only to the very edge of our universe but through and beyond such a barrier, extend beyond the very barrier within which our physical universe finds itself confined. Such truths are universal for they apply not only to our universe but they apply to all universes as well as apply to what lies between these very universes.

[050211 cg] What is the "entity" that you believe you are?

[050212 djs] The metaphysical model of symbiotic panentheism, which emerges from a general consensus of scientific facts, religious beliefs, and philosophical reasoning, (thus not a 'personal belief', i.e. not 'my' belief) would suggest that there are many potential forms of individuated 'entities'. In the case of a human entity, symbiotic panentheism would suggest the individual is a 'consciousness' capable of experiencing the physical at a depth of understanding that reaches the level of just that, understanding that it, in fact, is experiencing the physical and reaches the level of understanding why it is doing so, why it is, in fact, experiencing the physical.

[050214 cg] Careful! A "general consensus" is not truth.

[050215 djs] Again an interesting statement since it is itself a statement of general consensus.

To suggest a 'general consensus' is not truth is only correct when such a consensus is not truth but when such a consensus is truth then it is in fact 'truth'.

Having said that let me suggest: Science defines 'truths' as best it can and moves on from there. Such a process has led to great advances within the field of science. I would suggest we (humans) define a model of reality (from which an understanding of our true nature and purpose emerges) as best we can and move on from that point.

Now I am not suggesting that it is the individual human we use as the measure of having reached a consensus but rather I am suggesting that it is the three perceptual tools we, humans, use to understand reality that come to a consensual description of reality - the three tools: science, religion, and philosophy.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Thursday, February 17

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: A New Concept – A Changing G-d

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 17, 2005 12:58AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[Deleted material] ...

[050208 cg] Q: Does the physical impinge on the abstract and, if so, how?

[050209 djs] It is through experiencing the physical that the individuated entity of knowing, which emerges from our particular universe, evolves, becomes its awareness of experiencing. It is through this process that the abstract 'changes', 'becomes', 'utilizes' its potentiality. If one considers this process to be a form of the physical impinging upon the abstract, then yes the physical impinges upon the abstract.

[050213 cg] How does the physical, which is void of G-d and not real, impinge on awareness, which is real and the essence of G-d? How can they interact at all?

[050215 djs] First of all, I am not suggesting the physical is not real. In regards to your two questions, I think the dialogues which follow will answer your questions.

[050208 cg] Q: Does the abstract impinge on the physical and, if so, how?

[050209 djs] Hmmm, are you referring to G-d impinging on the physical through the

process of 'entering' the physical and manipulating, circumventing the natural process of physicality, for the purpose of attaining G-d's own end, i.e. miracles? Or are you referring to individuated entities of knowing, consciousness found within physical machines, manipulating, impinging on, physical reality?

[050213 cg] How does awareness, which is real and the essence of G-d, know the physical, which is void of G-d and not real? How can they interact at all?

[050215 djs] The physical is 'real'.

The essence of G-d interacts with the physical through 'divine sparks', through souls, through individuated entities of knowing traveling through the physical. G-d and individuated entities of knowing eventually (simultaneously?) share knowing through their commonality of consciousness which may or may not (depending upon how one perceives the interrelationship of The All, individuated entities of knowing, and the void/nothingness) be absolutely isolated one from the other during the existence of the individuated entities of knowing traveling through the physical universe.

[Deleted material]

...

[050209 djs]

The Soul and Symbiosis

1. Humankind exists.
2. Humankind exists in the universe, in "reality."
3. The essence of the individual is not the body nor the brain.
4. The essence of the individual is the soul.
5. The soul, being within reality, which in turn is within God, is a part of God.
6. The individual is not God.
7. The individual is a part of God.
8. Reality separates the individual from God and lies between the individual and God.

[050213 cg] How does "reality", which is the abstract and the essence of G-d, separate the soul, which is abstract and the essence of G-d, from G-d?

[050215 djs] There are two forms of reality: the abstract and the physical. When one is in the physical the abstract appears to be an illusion but in fact is 'real' or to distinguish it from the physical one is in at the time, we can call it the 'real illusion'. Simultaneously, when one is in the abstract the physical appears to be an illusion but in fact is 'real' or to distinguish it from the abstract one is in at the time, we can call it the 'real illusion'.

Now the abstract existence 'outside' the physical is separated from the abstract existence found 'within' the physical by the physical itself which emanates from the void. In essence individuated entities of knowing found 'within' the physical are separated from G-d, separated from the totality of consciousness by the void, separated from the totality of consciousness by the physical universe which emanates from the void, separated from G-d by, in essence, 'nothing'.

9. Humankind, souls, are creative and can experience.
10. Soul separated from direct contact with God can create and experience untainted by God's knowledge.
11. Souls can learn and grow.
12. God can learn through the journey of souls.

[\[050213 cg\] Are you positing a changing G-d?](#)

[050215 djs] Yes. At this point, one may feel compelled to ask: For what purpose does G-d need to change? A logical answer would be: G-d 'needs' to have a means to avert eternal recurrence and thus the need for creation, the need for divine sparks to travel untainted by an overpowering G-d presence, the 'need' for individuated entities of knowing. We exist for a reason. We have a purpose for being here, being alive. We also have great responsibilities for we are responsible for G-d being what G-d is.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Wednesday, February 16

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: A New Concept – A Changing G-d

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 16, 2005 12:15AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[Deleted material] ...

[050208 cg] Q: Does the physical impinge on the abstract and, if so, how?

[050209 djs] It is through experiencing the physical that the individuated entity of knowing, which emerges from our particular universe, evolves, becomes its awareness of experiencing. It is through this process that the abstract 'changes', 'becomes', 'utilizes' its potentiality. If one considers this process to be a form of the physical impinging upon the abstract, then yes the physical impinges upon the abstract.

[050213 cg] How does the physical, which is void of G-d and not real, impinge on awareness, which is real and the essence of G-d? How can they interact at all?

[050215 djs] To deny the physical is to deny the void, to deny nothingness, to deny mathematics one of its greatest tools, to deny creation, to deny the big bang, to deny the Om, to deny first cause, to deny sequential time, to deny cause and effect, to deny For a further explanation, see the continued dialogues below.

[050208 cg] Q: Does the abstract impinge on the physical and, if so, how?

[050209 djs] Hmmm, are you referring to G-d impinging on the physical through the process of 'entering' the physical and manipulating, circumventing the natural process of physicality, for the purpose of attaining G-d's own end, i.e. miracles? Or are you referring to individuated entities of knowing, consciousness found within physical machines, manipulating, impinging on, physical reality?

[050213 cg] How does awareness, which is real and the essence of G-d, know the physical, which is void of G-d and not real? How can they interact at all?

[050215 djs] The physical is 'real'.

They interact through their commonality of consciousness which may or may not (depending upon how one perceives the interrelationship of The All, individuated entities of knowing, and the void/nothingness) be isolated one from the other during the existence of the individuated entities of knowing traveling through the physical universe.

[Deleted material]

...

[050209 djs]

The Soul and Symbiosis

1. Humankind exists.
2. Humankind exists in the universe, in "reality."
3. The essence of the individual is not the body nor the brain.
4. The essence of the individual is the soul.
5. The soul, being within reality, which in turn is within God, is a part of God.
6. The individual is not God.
7. The individual is a part of God.
8. Reality separates the individual from God and lies between the individual and God.

[050213 cg] How does "reality", which is the abstract and the essence of G-d, separate the soul, which is abstract and the essence of G-d, from G-d?

[050215 djs] There are two forms of reality namely: the abstract and the physical. When one is in the physical the abstract appears to be an illusion but in fact is 'real' or to distinguish it from the physical one is in at the time, we can call it a 'real illusion'. Simultaneously, when one is in the abstract the physical appears to be an illusion but in fact is 'real' or to distinguish it from the abstract one is in at the time, we can call it a 'real illusion'.

Now the abstract existence 'outside' the physical is separated from the abstract existence found 'within' the physical by the physical which emanates from the void. In essence individuated entities of knowing found 'within' the physical are separated from G-d, separated from the totality of consciousness by the void, separated from the totality of consciousness by the physical universe which emanates from the void, separated from G-d by, in essence, 'nothing'.

9. Humankind, souls, are creative and can experience.
10. Soul separated from direct contact with God can create and experience untainted by God's knowledge.
11. Souls can learn and grow.
12. God can learn through the journey of souls.

[\[050213 cg\]](#) Are you positing a changing G-d?

[050215 djs] Yes. For what purpose does G-d need to change? , one may ask. G-d 'needs' to have a means to avert eternal recurrence and thus the need for creation, the need for divine sparks to travel untainted by an overpowering G-d presence, the need for a 'location' where 'free will' can exert itself, the 'need' for individuated entities of knowing. We exist for a reason. We have a purpose for being here, being alive. We also have great responsibilities for we are responsible for G-d being what G-d is.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Tuesday, February 15

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – The individuated entity of knowing

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 15, 2005 11:36PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

: [deleted material]

[050131 cg] Comment: I hold that sentient beings are neither subservient to nor secondary to G-d, but that our bodies and minds are the substance and essence of G-d. We are not G-d, but neither are we separate from G-d, as a wave is not the ocean, but is not separate from the ocean.

[050214 djs] Regarding your comment: 'I (cg) hold that sentient beings are neither subservient to nor secondary to G-d, ...'

As do I.

We are not G-d, but neither are we separate from G-d, as a wave is not the ocean, but is not separate from the ocean.' ...but that our bodies and minds are the substance and essence of G-d.'

Here we disagree, symbiotic panentheism would purport that our consciousness is of the same substance and essence as G-d but that our bodies and brains are physical in nature, emerge from a physical existence which in turn emanated from 'the void' and thus not of the same substance and essence as G-d since symbiotic panentheism embraces the literal definition of the void: the void – the lack of all, the lack of G-d. The physical is here today, gone tomorrow while G-d cannot be created or destroyed.

[050214 djs] Regarding your comment: 'We are not G-d, but neither are we separate from G-d, as a wave is not the ocean, but is not separate from the ocean.'

Symbiotic panentheism would say that we are separated from G-d by the void, separated from G-d by 'nothingness', separated from G-d by nothing and as such both separated yet not separated. In short we are separated from G-d by nothing we cannot overcome, i.e. that is through meditation.

[050205 djs]: I agree with the following disclaimer: Waves are physical entities and just as the physical is not eternal so waves are not eternal. As such waves can be created and destroyed. Individuated entities of knowing, however, are abstractual in nature and as such can be created but not destroyed. The third base aspect of existence, as I stated previously, is The All, is Totality which cannot be created and cannot be destroyed.

[050212 cg] So, if I understand sp correctly, the Totality (G-d) cannot be created and cannot be destroyed, but "individual entities of knowing" can be created, but cannot be destroyed; therefore, G-d is changing and growing by adding new "individual entities of knowing" to the Totality. Is this correct?

[050214 djs] Simply put, yes. Keep in mind, however, that change here is not 'change' as we perceive it occurring in a physical universe, but it is change nevertheless.

[050131 cg] Comment: I hold that 'need' does not apply in the relationship of sentient beings to G-d or G-d to sentient beings. Sentient being, who are the substance and essence of G-d, have no need for what they already are.

[050214 djs] I understand, on the other hand, sp embraces the concept that all existences have a purpose, fill a 'need' of some form or another. This is expressed by the first word of the model: 'symbiotic'. In short, G-d has 'needs' and finds the means by which It can fulfill those 'needs', thus 'creation'.

[050205 djs] Here I would disagree with you. The model of symbiotic panentheism would purport that all existences have by definition the passive as well as active form of being. Or to put it more generically, all existences exist and have functionality, provide a quality

which fills the need of other existences. In other words, every existence has a purpose, G-d does not create junk, there is a purpose for everything which exists....

[050212 cg] How does "function" and "purpose" arise?

[050214 djs] Function and purpose arise from the desire to satisfy one's 'needs'.

[050212 cg] What is the purpose of a flower?

[050214 djs] Cute.

[050212 cg] While I agree that there is no "junk", that every "thing" is necessary, I do not see function or purpose.

[050214 djs] 'Things' are not 'necessary' if there is no 'need' for them.

Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, tenth edition: necessary - 2. absolutely needed.

[050205 djs] Such a perception generated by the model of reality called symbiotic panentheism is supported by all three perceptual tools we have available to us as individuated entities of knowing, humans in this case. Reason suggests this to be the case. Observation suggests this to be the case. Faith suggests this to be the case.

What supports your statement: 'I hold that 'need' does not apply in the relationship of sentient beings to G-d or G-d to sentient beings'

[050212 cg] This was a simple statement based on the definition of "need"; i.e., "a lack of something requisite, desirable, or useful". One does not need what one already possesses and as sentient beings already are the substance and essence of G-d, sentient beings are not lacking G-d, and therefore there is no 'need'. You posit that G-d 'needs' souls

("individuated entities of knowing"). I hold that G-d is not lacking and therefore has no 'needs'.

[050214 djs] Regarding: need – 2a. "a lack of something requisite, desirable, or useful".

I don't understand what the dictionary was indicating here for the other definitions given by the Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary are as follows: need, n, – 1. necessary duty/obligation, 2b. a physiological or psychological requirement for well being of an organism (existence), 3. a condition requiring supply or relief, 4. lack of the means of substance. Need, vb, 1. to be needful or necessary, 2. to be in want, require.

But if G-d has needs then beings composed of the same essence and substance as G-d have needs, likewise if sentient beings have 'needs' and are of the same substance and essence as G-d then G-d has 'needs'.

: [deleted material]

[050131 cg] Q: You assume that we are "individuated entities of knowing", but are we?

[050214 djs] So it would appear religiously, scientifically, and philosophically.

[050205 djs]: I have backed up my position with a 'mountain of verbiage' as you say. If we are not individuated entities of knowing, then it is you who now needs to explain why we are not discrete entities of knowing. Having said this, I invite you to do so.

[050212 cg] As I have previously written, I hold that our awareness is composite and changing, is dependent on conditions for arising, and will pass away. We are discrete in the sense that our bodies and minds are discrete, but our bodies and minds have no existence, in and of themselves.

[050214 djs] I agree but what of our non-physical self? What of consciousness, the very substance and essence of G-d?

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Monday, February 14

 Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – The individuated entity of knowing

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 14, 2005 12:19AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[050204 cg] Here is an important difference. You understand your awareness as an "abstract entity"; therefore, you argue, it must be eternal. I hold that our awareness is not an 'entity', but is composite and changing.

[050207 djs] In a sense we do not differ here. I also look at awareness as being composite and changing so we agree here.

[050211 cg] If your awareness is composite and changing, what is it that is eternal, for things that are composite can be decomposed and things that change exist it time?

[050212 djs] You give me the impression that you believe that existences that do not exist in time do not change. Is this correct and if it is then my question becomes: What leads you to believe that things that do not exist in a universal fabric of time cannot change? (A detailed explanation of non-time related change occurring can be found on the website: www.panentheism.com, library, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Vol. I, Tractate 4: The Error of Copernicus: Resolving the problem of Centricism, see the last four sections: Archimedean Points, Philosophical infinities, A bag of marbles is not dependent upon sequential time, A unit of knowing is not a marble.

[050207 djs] And you say: You understand your awareness as an "abstract entity". Since you say we differ in an important manner, are you suggesting that consciousness is not an abstractual concept? Or are you suggesting, as you say ' ... awareness is not an 'entity'', you and I do not exist in and of ourselves?

[050211 cg] No, awareness is a concept AND it 'really' exists.

[050212 djs] I agree.

[050211 cg] Yes, exactly that, we do not exist in and of ourselves!

[050212 djs] I understand that G-d exists and is the totality of all but how can you rationally justify throwing away individuated entities of existence? Rejecting the individual

entity's existence goes against everything most sciences, most philosophies, and most religions embrace, argue, substantiate.

My position of individuated entities of existence existing in and of themselves is supported by the vast majority of science, religion, and philosophy. From what I understand your position is supported basically by a few Eastern religions and thus is religious in nature. Now there is nothing wrong with holding either Western or Eastern religious views as long as one acknowledges that such positions are 'religious', 'local', in nature. But we are discussing truth in the universal sense not in the 'local' sense.

[050211 cg] What is the "entity" that you believe you are?

[050212 djs] The metaphysical model of symbiotic panentheism, which emerges from a general consensus of scientific facts, religious beliefs, and philosophical reasoning, (thus not a 'personal belief', i.e. not 'my' belief) would suggest that there are many potential forms of individuated 'entities'. In the case of a human entity, symbiotic panentheism would suggest the individual is a 'consciousness' capable of experiencing the physical at a depth of understanding that reaches the level of just that, understanding that it, in fact, is experiencing the physical and reaches the level of understanding why it is doing so, why it is, in fact, experiencing the physical.

[050207 djs] I do not look at the All as being the summation of 'consciousness' or 'awareness'. I simply look at 'consciousness' and 'awareness' as being a 'level' of reality which is the first level of our ability to understand timelessness as opposed to a 'time' existence of physicality. If you read The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Vol. III, Tractate 17: The Beginning - Introducing the problem of the end, you will have a better idea of what I am saying and what I am saying is no different than you are saying.

Where I perceive we differ is: I would suggest 'nothingness' not only exists but has functionality and I would suggest that individuated entities of knowing can never 'cease' once such entities have been created, for they are composed of the same essence and substance as total consciousness which is timeless since the universal fabric of time and space are found in the physical and is not a universal fabric of the abstract.

[050211 cg] We agree that 'nothingness' exists; only you believe that 'nothingness' is void of G-d and I believe that G-d's presence is not absent.

[050212 djs] Correct on all accounts. I think, however, semantics is becoming an issue here. It appears your perception of 'nothingness' incorporates an aspect of G-d. I am taking the literal interpretation of 'nothingness'. I am defining 'nothingness' as the void of all, the very lack of existence itself. This definition precludes G-d's presence for I do not perceive G-d as meaningless and as such G-d's presence, regardless of the form it may take, remains, is still, 'some form of existence.

[050211 cg] We have not yet discussed "functionality" (or "purpose"), but we may.

[050212 djs] OK

[050211 cg] What is this "individuated entity of knowing" that you are?

[050212 djs] The Individuated entity of knowing is composed of the same substance and essence as G-d and as such is G-dly in nature, in all its aspects. The Individuated entity of knowing begins with a 'divine spark', begins as potentiality to know and experience, begins as the passive state of 'being', the state of 'be-ness' as H. P. Blavatsky would say. You are, therefore, an element of G-d while G-d Itself incorporates all including you and as such G-d is the 'plus one' of the equation: the sum of all plus one.

[050207 djs] In short: The model of symbiotic panentheism suggests there are three primal truths: The All exists. Individuated entities of knowing exist. The physical universe (a potential form of nothingness and thus in essence 'nothingness' having functionality) exists.

The All cannot be created and cannot be destroyed. Individuated entities of knowing can be created but cannot be destroyed. Nothingness can be created and can be destroyed.

[050211 cg] How is this "individuated entity of knowing" created?

[050212 djs] The individuated entity of knowing is a 'divine spark' capable of 'filling itself' with its conscious awareness of experiencing. The process of filling itself is accomplished by traveling through the physical which was created by the All for the very purpose of allowing new unique entities of knowing to emerge and add to the totality of knowing in order to circumvent eternal recurrence (which, interestingly enough, circumvents the very concepts generated by human perceptions emerging from the pessimistic understandings of nihilism)

[050211 cg] Does it (Individuated entity of knowing) have any relationship to the act of reproduction?

[050212 djs] Yes and no. Yes, in the sense that one manner of traveling the physical emerges from the act of reproduction, for such acts generate new vehicles capable of carrying the 'divine spark' which 'fills itself' with awareness of experiencing the physical.

No, in the sense that the divine spark does not 'come' from the physical itself since it is not physical in nature. The divine spark is just that 'divine' in nature and therefore comes

from the Divine, comes from 'outside' the physical, comes from G-d, is G-d but is not the whole of G-d.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Sunday, February 13

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – Nothing is lost to G-d

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 13, 2005 03:00PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

SP: The abstract, taken as a Totality, is G-d. The abstract has the characteristics of no-space and no-time. Entities within the abstract are eternal. Ideas are abstract entities.

: [deleted material]

[050204 cg] Does your awareness change from moment to moment?

[050204 cg] I hold that one's awareness is composite and changing. I hold that one's awareness creates the illusion of a static, eternal entity (a homunculus or "I").

[050207 djs] Regarding: ' I hold that one's awareness is composite and changing. I hold that one's awareness creates the illusion of a static, eternal entity (a homunculus or "I")'.

[050207 djs] I agree.

[050211 cg] Are you agreeing that there is no static, eternal entity, no "I"?

[050212 djs] Whew, this sounds like an easy question but its not. To avoid getting too involved here let me simply say:

Regarding: Are you agreeing that there is no static (entity).

Yes

Regarding: , (Are you agreeing that there is no) eternal entity.

No

Regarding: , (Are you agreeing that there is no) 'I'.

No

[050204 cg] I hold that nothing is lost to G-d.

[050207 djs] Regarding: 'I hold that nothing is lost to G-d.'

I agree. The question I would then ask of you is: 'If nothing is lost to G-d', then how is it possible for the individuated perception of knowing, for the individual's unique perception of knowing, to cease to exist?

: [deleted material – djs dialogue]

: [deleted material via cg]

[050204 cg] Just as our bodies, though composed of the substance of G-d, are composite, our awareness, though composed of the essence of G-d, are composite and as our bodies arise and pass away, so too does our awareness arise and pass away.

: deleted material - djs dialogue]

[050204 cg] The passing away of our body does not diminish the physical universe or G-d and the passing away of our individuated awareness does not diminish the non-physical universe or G-d.

: [deleted material – djs dialogue]

[050204 cg] Nothing is lost to G-d.

: [deleted material - djs dialogue]

[050204 cg] I hold that nothing is lost to G-d.

: [deleted material – djs dialogue]

[050204 cg] Nothing is lost to G-d.

[050207 djs]: Again I ask: How does understanding: ' ... so too does our awareness arise and pass away', reconcile itself with your perception: 'Nothing is lost to G-d'?

[050211 cg] I hold that the physical and non-physical are two sides of the same coin. The coin is G-d, and the physical and non-physical are two manifestations, two perceptions, two aspects of the One G-d. Each of our bodies is unique and so is each of our minds. As our bodies are composite and changing, so are our minds. As our bodies pass away and return to the universe and G-d, so our minds pass away and return to the non-physical and G-d. Our "individuality" (uniqueness) as bodies and minds ceases, but nothing is lost,

because our bodies and minds do not exist, in and of themselves. Our bodies and minds are composed of parts and are dependent on conditions for becoming and maintaining existence; therefore, there is no "individuated entity" that exists, in and of itself.

[050211 cg] You write, "... but it [the passing away of individuated awareness] would diminish the concept of Totality (versus totality) which is the summation of all knowing plus all unique individuated entities of knowing." Your concern is with the "concept of Totality", but there is a difference between diminishing "the concept of Totality", which is an idea in your mind, and diminishing G-d.

[050211 cg] All "things", both physical and non-physical, that exist arise and pass away. Only G-d exists, in and of Itself.

[050212 djs] I understand and respect the model of reality you suggest. In fact I embrace your concept of G-d in and of Itself but this is where our two perceptions diverge. Correct me if I am wrong but your model of reality states: 'Only G-d exists, in and of Itself'.

In contrast, the model of symbiotic panentheism states: G-d exists in and of Itself. The individual exists in and of itself. Nothingness exists in and of itself.

This then blossoms into: G-d cannot be created and cannot be destroyed. The individuated entity of knowing can be created but not destroyed. Nothingness/the physical can be created and can be destroyed.

Now if your perception of reality fully explains what we know of reality, then I have two two questions: Can G-d be created and/or destroyed? Can anything be created and/or destroyed and if so what? (I guess that's three questions)

[050204 cg] Here is an important difference. You understand your awareness as an "abstract entity"; therefore, you argue, it must be eternal. I hold that our awareness is not an 'entity', but is composite and changing.

[050207 djs] In a sense we do not differ here. I also look at awareness as being composite and changing so we agree here.

[050211 cg] If your awareness is composite and changing, what is it that is eternal, for things that are composite can be decomposed and things that change exist it (in?) time?

[050212 djs] We are far apart here. If you use a form of what I call macro-observation, standing 'outside' the issue it may help. To do so, imagine placing yourself 'outside' the universe and observing the universe from afar. Then ask yourself: Where am I standing if I am conscious and observing the (sphere? of) physical universe? One answer could be that you are standing in

consciousness for the physical is there, in the universe, and consciousness is intangible, not physical.

I agree that change is a factor of time. Time is found in the physical not outside the physical where you are standing. As such, such if 'newness is 'added' to' the arena in which you stand it is not a 'change' which takes place, it simply is what it is for, within this arena, time does not exist 'outside' the individuated entity but rather time exists 'inside' the individuated entity (or at least 'inside' individuated entities which have themselves experienced, traveled, a physical, a cause and effect, universe.

In short, 'outside' the arena of the physical change does not take place as we conceive of change. Our perception of change is, for most of us, a perception of cause and effect, sequencing, time related.

Regarding 'a/the potentiality of G-d 'decomposing': That is a fascinating concept which the model of symbiotic panentheism fully addresses. The concept, however, is just as complex as the one we are now discussing, namely: What is the true nature of reality? (Perhaps you can paraphrase our dialogue in a more accurate manner.)

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Saturday, February 12

Symbiotic Panentheism - A Model of Reality: Question - What is the 'function' of nothingness?

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 12, 2005 01:07AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[050204 djs] Such a perception would act as an underlying foundation supporting the principles of free will and altruistic hedonism.

[deleted material] ...

[050204 djs] Regarding: If the universe emerged from 'nothingness', which is void of G-d, then is the universe the same substance of 'nothingness'?

[050204 djs] Yes.

[050208 cg] Comment: Then it follows,

SP: The universe is the same substance of 'nothingness'; i.e., not G-d. The universe is void of G-d.

This contradicts an earlier statement that the physical universe is the substance of G-d.

[050209 djs] Regarding my having said earlier: '... the physical universe is the substance of G-d' If I stated this I am not aware of it. If you could extract the paragraph within which the statement is found or tell me where to find it I will look it up. I did add a 'search' tool to the blog site to help you find it. I personally put a search on the site regarding the statement and could not find it. Perhaps you were hallucinating due to the lateness of the hour.

Let me also state: Although 'nothingness is the void of all, nothingness' ability to indirectly impact G-d, its ability to indirectly act as a mechanism by which G-d's potentiality becomes a reality might be argued by some to be the 'proof' needed that 'nothingness' is in fact a 'substance' of G-d. Now just because I take a different view of this perception does not mean I am right and they are wrong nor does it mean they are 'right' and I am 'wrong'. We just view this aspect of reality differently.

See directly below for additional clarification:

[050204 djs] Regarding: Or, if the universe emerged from 'nothingness', which is void of G-d, and the universe is of the same substance of G-d, then the substance of G-d emerged from 'nothingness'?

[050209 djs]: Regarding the quote: '...then the substance of G-d emerged from 'nothingness'?'

Wow, I must have been hallucinating! This goes against everything I have written. I take it back a million times over!!!!

[050204 djs] The model of symbiotic panentheism would purport that 'nothingness' being the void of G-d is not a substance but rather is the void of all 'substance' as such the universe is not made of the same substance and essence as G-d, is not a 'substance' at all, is a lack of substance (for details site search www.panentheism.com, use the terms 'real' and 'real illusion')

[050208 cg] Comment: For clarity, it follows:

SP: "Nothingness" and the physical universe are void of G-d and not 'real'.

If this is so, then I wish to give you a rap on the top of your head.

[050209 djs] I speak of what is 'real' and what is a 'real illusion' in the following sense. If we 'stand' in the physical universe, then the physical appears 'real' and the existence 'outside' the physical appears to be an illusion but in fact is not an 'illusion' but rather is a 'real illusion'. I then go on to explain: For existences of consciousness 'standing' 'outside' the physical universe, the realm of consciousness appears 'real' and temporal existence appears to be an illusion but in fact is not an 'illusion' but rather is a 'real illusion'. (for details go to www.panentheism.com, library, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Index – see 'real' and 'real illusion')

If you are able to wade through the material to which I directed you, and you still want to give me rap on the head, I will graciously accept the rap on the head.

[050127 cg] I hold that the physical (and non-physical) emerges from, is the manifestation of, is the substance of One Mind.

[050204 djs] The physical and the non-physical are two concepts and as such need to be addressed independently.

If one finds in such an examination that both concepts produce the same answers to the same questions, then yes they are the same as each other. It would then have been determined that the two terms are interchangeable.

[050208 cg] Comment: I did not state that the physical and non-physical were identical or interchangeable; only that they, as did every 'thing', emerged from, are the manifestation of, the substance and essence of G-d.

[050209 djs]: Again, I did not suggest, imply, or directly state you did. I used the all encompassing form of the pronoun 'one' which applies to any and all.

[050028 cg] Comment: Lawyer, priests, and philosophers dancing with angels on the head of a pin! Your presentation, of G-d and 'nothingness', is complicated. G-d creates a 'location' which is void of 'location' and 'nothingness', which is void of G-d, is located in the non-location location within G-d; therefore, you posit, that G-d is omnipresent because G-d is located in all locations and 'nothingness' is located in a non-location. So, G-d is not present in non-location locations?

[050209 djs] I can see why you are confused. I think you may be making this more complex than what the model suggests. Maybe it will help if I make a few corrections to your perception. The statement should read:

G-d is not composed of space and time, but, being omnipotent, G-d is quite capable of creating a 'location' within itself which is filled with 'the presence of space/location, i.e. create a physical universe'. G-d could logically, as religions and sciences suggest, use 'nothingness' as the 'material from which It creates space/location/universes. This region of space/location, which we call a universe, is within G-d. Since G-d is omnipresent there is nowhere else for universes to be found.

Now G-d may or may not be 'found' within universes. Whether or not G-d is found 'inside' the universe is not the issue here. What is of interest is, the concept that should G-d not be 'found' 'within' the universe, G-d would logically retain the characteristic of being omnipresent since it could be logically argued that if the physical universe is created from nothingness then G-d's absence 'within' such an existence is simply the 'absence' of G-d from 'nothing' thus omnipresence remains absolute, does not become a 'lesser' concept.

[050028 cg] Comment: I hold that G-d is omnipresent.

[050209 djs] As do I. It is only difficult because it is a different perception of existence and nothingness and as such is alien to our present way of thinking, but it is not complicated. It is just different, that's why its called a 'new' metaphysical perception'.

[050208 cg] Comment: I hold that G-d is without characteristics, so that "knowing and experiencing" are not meaningful.

[050209 djs] The question then becomes: If knowing and experiencing are not meaningful, yet they occur, then why would meaningless experiencing and meaningless knowing have been allowed to emerge at all?

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Friday, February 11

Symbiotic Panentheism - Model of Reality: Question - What is the 'mechanism'?

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 11, 2005 12:55PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

SP: the physical, taken as a whole, is the universe. The universe has the characteristics of space and time. The universe emerged from 'nothingness' and exists within the abstract; i.e., within G-d. [Physical] Entities within the physical are temporary; i.e., physical entities come into existence and cease to exist [as physical entities].

[Deleted material] ...

[050208 cg] Q: What do you mean by "travel" as the abstract does not have the characteristics of space or time?

[050209 djs] In my physical form I appear to travel, from here to there, through both time and space. In consciousness, I am able to travel from here to there without regard to space and time. I can close my eyes and see myself in Italy, New York, or China.

[050208 cg] Q: Does the physical impinge on the abstract and, if so, how?

[050209 djs] It is through experiencing the physical that the individuated entity of knowing, which emerges from our particular universe, evolves, becomes its awareness of experiencing. It is through this process that the abstract 'changes', 'becomes', 'utilizes' its potentiality. If one considers this process to be a form of the physical impinging upon the abstract, then yes the physical impinges upon the abstract.

[050208 cg] Q: Does the abstract impinge on the physical and, if so, how?

[050209 djs] Hmm, are you referring to G-d impinging on the physical through the process of 'entering' the physical and manipulating, circumventing the natural process of physicality, for the purpose of attaining G-d's own end, i.e. miracles? Or are you referring to individuated entities of knowing, consciousness found within physical machines, manipulating, impinging on, physical reality?

[050204 djs] Without such a mechanism or some form of mechanism, The Whole, being omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient, would undergo what Nietzsche described as 'eternal recurrence' or stagnation which in turn acts as the base foundation of despair, hopelessness, and the freedom from responsibility.

[050208 cg] Comment: Was the "mechanism" imagined to avoid an unwanted philosophical result?

[050209 djs] Hmm, first of all regarding '... 'mechanism' imagined': The model of symbiotic panentheism would suggest one of two possibilities exists, either the physical is imagined and thus an existence of mental gymnastics or the physical universe is unique in and of itself and is 'created' from nothingness'. I personally am fascinated with the second concept since it better fits the concept of G-d: 'the being than which non greater can be conceived, ...' St Anselm

Secondly regarding: '... to avoid an unwanted philosophical result?'

I would sooner agree if this aspect of sentence took the form: '... to avoid a result?'

[050204 djs] Such a perception acts as the underlying foundation supporting the principles of determinism and materialistic hedonism.

[050204 djs] The symbiotic panentheistic model of reality introduces 'potentiality' or 'action' into our understanding of G-d and replaces the despair, hopelessness, and freedom from responsibility to purpose, hope, and the burden (there is a trade off and this is it) of responsibility.

[050208 cg] Comment: Where is "potentiality" defined and introduced, and how does it have the effect you state?

[050209 djs] If you run a site search, www.panentheism.com, using the term 'potentiality' you will

find 70 hits. Take your pick. A more generic understanding - The following is found at: www.panentheism.com , home page, overview, section: 'The Soul and Symbiosis'. If you would like a more general understanding go to the specific location mentioned.

The Soul and Symbiosis

1. Humankind exists.
2. Humankind exists in the universe, in "reality."
3. The essence of the individual is not the body nor the brain.
4. The essence of the individual is the soul.
5. The soul, being within reality, which in turn is within God, is a part of God.
6. The individual is not God.
7. The individual is a part of God.
8. Reality separates the individual from God and lies between the individual and God.
9. Humankind, souls, are creative and can experience.
10. Soul separated from direct contact with God can create and experience untainted by God's knowledge.
11. Souls can learn and grow.
12. God can learn through the journey of souls.

Under the "symbiotic" portion of symbiotic panentheism, the significance of the human species, the significance of the individual, is placed at the level of God and given an importance to God. Thus emerges the rationality for respect due to the individual. Symbiotic panentheism places the soul in a symbiotic relationship - a mutually beneficial, close association - with God.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Thursday, February 10

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – Individuated entities of knowing

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 10, 2005 01:01AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[050131 cg] Comment: I hold that sentient beings are neither subservient to nor secondary to G-d, but that our bodies and minds are the substance and essence of G-d. We are not G-d, but neither are we separate from G-d, as a wave is not the ocean, but is not separate from the ocean.

[050205 djs]: I agree, with the following disclaimer: Waves are physical entities and just as the physical is not eternal so waves are not eternal. As such waves can be created and destroyed. Individuated entities of knowing, however, are abstractual in nature and as such can be created but not destroyed. The third base aspect of existence, as I stated previously, is The All, is Totality which cannot be created and cannot be destroyed.

[050131 cg] Comment: I hold that 'need' does not apply in the relationship of sentient beings to G-d or G-d to sentient beings. Sentient being, who are the substance and essence of G-d, have no need for what they already are.

[050205 djs]: Here I would disagree with you. The model of symbiotic panentheism would purport that all existences have by definition the passive as well as active form of being. Or to put it more generically, all existences both exist and have functionality, provide a quality which fills the need of other existences. In other words, every existence has a purpose, G-d does not create junk, there is a purpose for everything which exists....

Such a perception generated by the model of reality called symbiotic panentheism is supported by all three perceptual tools we have available to us as individuated entities of knowing, humans in this case. Reason suggests this to be the case. Observation suggests this to be the case. Faith suggests this to be the case.

What supports your statement: 'I hold that 'need' does not apply in the relationship of sentient beings to G-d or G-d to sentient beings'?

[050131 cg] Comment: I simple stated that, "I think your position is ego-centric."

[050205 djs]: If by 'ego-centric' you mean: The model of sp is centered around the observable truth: I exist as an individuated entity of knowing – after all much of science is centered around investigating the individual body, the individual's environment, improving the individual's health, sending the individual to the heavens, ... The model of sp is centered around reasonable truths: I exist as an individuated entity of knowing – after all much of philosophy is centered around understanding the monistic versus dualistic nature of the individual, the Cartesian reality of the individual, the non-Cartesian reality of the individual, a nihilistic existence of the individual, And lastly, the model of sp is centered around faith based truths: I exist as an individuated entity of knowing – after all much of religion is centered around the after life of the individual soul, the means of the consciousness of the individual attaining ..., reincarnation, hell, heaven, nirvana, ... Then yes sp is ego-centric but it is equally G-d-centric for within the model, both have a role.

[050131 cg] Comment: While I suggested waiting until we had discussed "how discrete individuals exist and their place in reality", without addressing those topics, you wrote the following, rather long polemic, which introduces many concepts and opinions.

[050205 djs] The perception that 'I (anyone) am too 'special' to simply fade away' is a critical ...

[050205 djs] The concept of 'I am too 'special' to 'simply fade away'" may be the result of our ...

[050205 djs] One must not discard the product of this dialogue simply because it may result ...

[050205 djs] In our society today, we often regard any logic, leading to the perception that we, ...

[050205 djs] If the logic leads to our presuming just ourselves, just humanity, just one's self ...

[050205 djs] Groundless humility is just as harmful as is groundless arrogance and as such ...

[050205 djs] In short, to reject the concept of the discrete existing, your existing, ...

[050205 djs] In addition, are we ready to 'diminish' our personal understanding regarding ...

[050205 djs] In short, I am not 'worried' about 'fading away' for what is, is, and as such ...

[050131 cg] Q: You assume that we are "individuated entities of knowing", but are we?

[050131 cg] Q: You assume that we are "individuated entities of knowing", but are we?

[050205 djs]: I have backed up my position with a 'mountain of verbiage' as you say. If we are not individuated entities of knowing, then it is you who now needs to explain why we are not discrete entities of knowing. Having said this, I invite you to do so.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

Wednesday, February 9

■ Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – The wonder of creation from a void

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February , 2005 09:34PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

[050204 cg] Q: Here is an important difference. You understand your awareness as an "abstract entity"; therefore, you argue, it must be eternal. I hold that our awareness is not an 'entity', but is composite and changing.

[050207 djs]: In a sense we do not differ here. I also look at awareness as being composite and changing so we agree here.

And you say: *You (djs) understand your awareness as an "abstract entity"*. Since you say we differ in an important manner, are you suggesting that consciousness is not an abstractual concept? Or are you suggesting, as you say '... awareness is not an 'entity'', that you and I do not exist in and of ourselves?

I do not look at the All as being the summation of 'consciousness' or 'awareness'. I simply look at 'consciousness' and 'awareness' as being a 'level' of reality which is the first level of our ability to understand timelessness as opposed to a 'time' existence of physicality. If you read *The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Tractate 17: The Beginning – Introducing the problem of the end*, you will have a better idea of what I am saying and what I am saying is no different than you are saying.

Where I perceive we differ is: I would suggest 'nothingness' not only exists but has functionality and I would suggest that individuated entities of knowing can never 'cease' once such entities have been created, for they are composed of the same essence and substance as total consciousness which is timeless since the universal fabric of time and space are found in the physical and is not a universal fabric of the abstract.

In short: The model of symbiotic panentheism suggests there are three primal truths: The All exists. Individuated entities of knowing exist. The physical universe (a potential form of nothingness and thus in essence nothing having functionality) exists.

The All cannot be created and cannot be destroyed. Individuated entities of knowing can be created but cannot be destroyed. Nothingness can be created and can be destroyed.

[050204 cg] p.s: My continued wonderment is that you do not see that the physical world before you is truly the substance of G-d and is no less or more divine than your awareness (or the illusion of an entity).

[050207 djs]: I do not usually expound upon the emotional side of my personal perceptions because I do not think they have any relevance in a metaphysical discussion since metaphysical dialogues are supposed to be based upon scientific, religious, and philosophical foundations, and thus void emotions, but you have opened a door I would like to walk through for a moment and then I will walk back out and close the door behind me.

My perception of 'nothingness' being the void of G-d, void of all, is not a perception of nihilistic existence nor a perception void of awe and wonderment. The concept of an entity capable of 'creating' a void is beyond any possible comprehension I, as a limited being, am capable of conjuring up. The concept of an existence being capable of 'creating' a void, being willing to 'create a location void the very essence of existence' causes my ability to comprehend to go into overload.

The poetic descriptions of such an act are beyond my limited intellectual abilities.

I look in unspeakable 'wonderment' and breathless admiration of an All Knowing, All Powerful, All Present Being which willingly gives up 'control' and create such breathless beauty as a physical universe. I am spellbound by the concept of an existence, such as The All, overcoming the apprehension of performing such an act. I see such an act as one of the most remarkable, hopeful, optimistic, beautiful, giving, sharing, benevolent, risky, ... acts I can conceive of an omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent entity performing.

To add to this an understanding that G-d could then mold and form this 'thing' one describes as 'nothingness' into something as exquisite as a physical universe goes beyond comprehension. Humanity has taken the basic elements of nature and formed them into the metals, plastics, fuels, computers, ... which have taken these primal beings called humans beyond their planet and to an extraterrestrial planetoid called the moon. This simple accomplishment pales in light of stars, galaxies, black holes, worm holes, cells, photosynthetic process, tectonic shifts, super volcanoes, super-novas, birth, ...

I am in awe every time I look out to the heavens or gaze upon my children. You know how words just seem to come from my brain like rivers of water pouring into the vast seas of this planet but when it comes to explaining what I feel when I think about the concept of 'creation' from 'nothingness' I find myself at a loss for words.

Now you do not need to fear shattering my model of reality for it is not 'nothingness' itself which leads me to such awe. It is the very concept of reality itself that does so. I am not interested in 'preserving' the concept of 'nothingness' nor in preserving the concept of 'nothingness' having functionality.

I do not stand in awe of an entity the model of symbiotic panentheism has attempted to describe, but rather I stand in awe, magnified a thousand times, by the understanding of an Absolute capable of 'creating' an artistic masterpiece as complex as the physical universe out of a void, out of 'nothing', and not only doing so but doing so willingly and not only doing so willingly but doing so knowing part of the process was to give up 'control', allow free will, knowing it would mean living with the consequences for eternity.

Now what places me an even greater state of awe, if that is even possible, is that I, a mere grain of sand on an infinite beach of sand, may, as described by the model of reality suggested by symbiotic panentheism, actually impact the Absolute, impact G-d, through a process G-d Itself set in place and set in place willingly.

Buat what if the model of symbiotic panentheism is shown to be wrong? If the model of symbiotic panentheism is shown to be wrong, it will not matter for no matter what we find base truth to be, base truth will be far grander than anything our limited understanding could possible perceive today or tomorrow.

Now having exposed my raw emotions to you, I now say, do not be apprehensive about 'attacking' the model for such a process will only lead to grander understandings. As such we should look forward with a form of giddy anticipation as opposed to fearful hesitation of finding base truth, of understanding this thing we call 'reality' and understanding the role we play within it.

Tuesday, *February*

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Dialogue – Individuated entities of knowing

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 8, 2005 09:34PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

SP: The abstract, taken as a Totality, is G-d. The abstract has the characteristics of no-space and no-time. Entities within the abstract are eternal. Ideas are abstract entities.

[050204 cg] Q: For clarity: Are you agreeing that this instance of a (physical) rose changes from moment to moment?

Does your awareness of your senses of this instance of a (physical) rose change from moment to moment (e.g - seeing the rose, smelling the rose, feeling the rose, etc.)? Does your awareness of this instance of a (physical) rose arise? Does your awareness of this instance of a (physical) rose pass away?

Does your awareness change from moment to moment?

I hold that one's awareness is composite and changing. I hold that one's awareness creates the illusion of a static, eternal entity (a homunculus or "I").

[050207 djs]: Regarding: ' I hold that one's awareness is composite and changing. I hold that one's awareness creates the illusion of a static, eternal entity (a homunculus or "I")'.

I agree.

[050204 cg] Q: I hold that nothing is lost to G-d.

[050207 djs]: Regarding: *'I hold that nothing is lost to G-d.'*

I agree. The question I would then ask of you is: 'If nothing is lost to G-d', then how is it possible for the individuated perception of knowing, for the individual's unique perception of knowing, to cease to exist?

[050203 djs] If the atheists are correct, then yes. If the orthodox religious perception of a transcendence embracing separation through exclusion, embracing the concept that souls exist 'outside' G-d, then perhaps. If the model of symbiotic panentheism is correct, then no, for all consciousness is affected by neither time nor space.

[050204 cg] Q: See above regarding awareness ("consciousness") and time.

[050207 djs]: Right back at you: See above question.

[050203 djs] Hmmm, then are you suggesting that The All, G-d is not awareness of any form?

[050204 cg] Q: I hold that G-d is not awareness; G-d is not not-awareness; G-d is not both awareness and not-awareness; and, G-d is not neither awareness nor not-awareness.

[050207 djs]: This gets into the more complex issue regarding the question: What is G-d? I agree with what it is you say, however, in an attempt to keep the dialogue at a level of the general population, might I suggest we simply state that total consciousness is but a sublevel of The All, suggest we simply state that we, limited beings of consciousness, are capable of comprehending at only one level of existence, namely consciousness, and as such leave the discussion of what lies 'beyond' total consciousness for another dialectic.

[050203 djs] If so, are you suggesting that G-d did not 'create man in His image and in the image of G-d created He man'?

[050204 cg] Comment: The language of the second question is highly poetical and not answerable without clarification.

[050207 djs]: OK, I will take that as a 'I will pass for now' statement.

[050203 djs] Also, the essence of the individual appears to be consciousness, knowing, do you hold that the individual is not made of the same 'substance' and 'essence' as G-d?

[050204 cg] Comment: No, I hold that an one's body and mind (awareness) are made of the substance and essence of G-d.

[050207 djs]: OK

[050127 cg] Q: Is awareness an abstract entity? If not, what is it? Is an individuated awareness an abstract entity? What is the relationship between awareness (and/or individuated awareness) and abstract entities, such as ideas?

[050203 djs] Regarding: Is awareness an abstract entity? The model of symbiotic panentheism would state this to be the case.

[050204 cg] Q: See below.

[050203 djs] Regarding: Is an individuated awareness an abstract entity? The model of symbiotic panentheism would say yes. Sp would say the individual is composed of four elements, two of the elements take on a verb form and two of the elements take on a noun form. In speaking of the interrelationship of the four it is probably easiest to use the concept of being. If you would like the details go to: www.panentheism.com, library, Existence In and Of Itself, Chapter 1: The Four Elemental Particles of Existence.

[050204 cg] Q: I hold that awareness is the non-physical medium in which our individuated awareness flashes.

[050207 djs]: This perception appears to be in conflict with the perception: The physical is the medium within which our individuated awareness evolves. In your opinion, are the two perceptions contradictory and if so why?

[050204 cg] Q: Just as our bodies, though composed of the substance of G-d, are composite, our awareness, though composed of the essence of G-d, are composite and as our bodies arise and pass away, so too does our awareness arise and pass away.

[050207 djs]: Again I ask: How does understanding, ' ... so too does our awareness arise and pass away', reconcile itself with your perception: 'Nothing is lost to G-d'?

[050204 cg] Q: The passing away of our body does not diminish the physical universe or G-d and the passing away of our individuated awareness does not diminish the non-physical universe or G-d.

[050207 djs]: I can understand how it is that our physical body passing away does not diminish the physical. The physical being only temporary in essence is non-existent when taken in light of eternal existence. I also agree that the passing away of individuated awareness does not diminish the summation, totality of the non-physical in and of itself but it would diminish the concept of Totality (versus totality) which is the summation of all knowing plus all unique individuated entities of knowing.

[050204 cg] Q: Nothing is lost to G-d.

[050207 djs]: Again I ask: How does understanding, ' ... so too does our awareness arise and pass away', reconcile itself with your perception: 'Nothing is lost to G-d'?

Sunday, February 6

Reflections – Metaphysical dialectics: Human Arrogance – ‘I am too ‘special’ to ‘simply fade away’”

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 6, 2005 09:34PM (EST)

Reflections – Metaphysical dialectics: Human Arrogance – ‘I am too ‘special’ to ‘simply fade away’

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

The following concept, humanity’s perception that it, the individual, is subservient to, secondary to, ... G-d, is a critical issue that must be rejected as a base foundation before an open-ended metaphysical dialogue begins. Such a religious perception, the perception that individuated entities of knowing ‘need G-d’ while G-d does not ‘need individuated entities of knowing’, slams a door to all unbiased exploration of reality and the role we, individuated entities of knowing, play within reality. As such the issue regarding ‘groundless humility’ and ‘groundless arrogance’ need to be addressed now rather than later.

[050131 cg] Comment: Regarding how discrete individuals (I assume you mean sentient beings.) exist and their place in reality, I will leave that for a later discussion. It will be a topic where you (and Chuck) and I will have a significant difference of understanding. I think your position is ego-centric ("I am too 'special' to 'simply fade away'"). But let's wait.

[050204 djs] The perception that ‘I am, that individuated entities of knowing are, too ‘special’ to simply fade away’ is a critical issue that needs addressing. Our dialogue has nothing to do with what it is ‘I’ personally hope is the case, fear may not be the case, think is the case, have been told is the case, have been threatened with ostracism or worse yet ‘eternal hell’ if ‘I’ don’t believe ‘it’ to be the case, ad nauseam.’ Nor does our dialogue have anything to do with what academics, theists, religious beliefs, scientific assessments, or philosophers have established to be ‘facts’

The concept of ‘I am too ‘special’ to ‘simply fade away’” may be the result of our thinking, your thinking and my thinking, but the logic of each step is what we are debating not the result. The product of the debate is simply that: the product of a dialogue based upon rational arguments supported simultaneously by all three of the tools we use to understand reality, namely: science, philosophy, and religion. To rely solely on one of the three at the expense of the other two is what we, in my opinion, should define as ‘faulty’ reasoning for this dialogue is no more purely scientific than it is purely religious or purely philosophical in nature.

One must not discard the product of this dialogue simply because it may result in an understanding that ‘we, you and I, you and I together, all individuated entities found throughout all universes and/or between universes are in fact ‘special’. Although such an understanding may

result in our recognition of the individual being 'special' to G-d, being composed of the same substance and essence as G-d, being deserving of respect for who 'said individuated entities of knowing' are regardless of their religious affiliation, racial composition, cultural background, sexual orientation, gender, age, physical appearance, mental state of mind, should not lead us to reject the logic.

In our society today, we often regard any logic, leading to the perception that we, individuated beings, are special, as being irrational, as being illogical, as being somehow faulty. Such a preconditioned aversion stems from our historical past which has been filled with faulty perceptions of 'being special' resulting in tremendous violence such perceptions have generated. Examples of such violent historical events include: the German WWII perception of a 'Super Race' being special, the European Crusade perception of Christians being 'special', the American Western Expansion perception of Indians being 'savages' as opposed to Europeans being special, the Catholic Inquisition perception of Gnostics being 'evil' as opposed to Roman Catholics being special, ...

If the logic leads to our presuming just ourselves, just humanity, just one's self as being special and thus not applying to all knowing beings found throughout and between all universes then the perception is 'local' and not universal and requires of us that we associate such perceptions with our past historical actions. If, on the other hand, the understanding that diversity is critical to the extermination of 'eternal recurrence' becomes itself a universal principle than the result will not emulate our past and present historical vector of violence and actions of exclusionism but will , instead, redirect our historical vector towards tolerance, acceptance, and pluralism.

Groundless humility is just as harmful as is groundless arrogance and as such the two, groundless humility and groundless arrogance, cause one to build walls intended to shut out logic as opposed to allowing logic to lead wherever it is logic may lead.

In short, to reject the concept of the discrete entities of knowing existing, your existing, my existing, is to reject the validity of all such individuated entities found throughout our personal universes, found throughout all universes which may exist 'within' G-d, found throughout whatever, wherever, however it is such mechanisms 'invented' by G-d were 'created', 'placed', 'allowed to develop' for the purpose of circumventing eternal recurrence.

In addition, are we ready to 'diminish' our personal understanding regarding the very potentiality of The Whole through the development of another form of human limitation we limited beings decide to self-impose upon G-d. We have seen where such limitations led throughout human history. Are we ready to expand our limited perception of The Whole once again in a 'limited' fashion while once again falling short of the very 'size' of G-d as we have done so often throughout our history?

In short, I am not 'worried' about 'fading away' for what is, is, and as such what you and I may say will not change the process, change the base mechanism of G-d. As such let's not worry too much about how 'special' we may perceive ourselves to be but rather concern ourselves with what is logical and then we can discuss the results in detail. Let's let logic speak for itself. Let's let our three perceptual tools, observation/measurement/science, logic/reason/philosophy, and belief/faith/religion, speak as one voice, speak for themselves even if it should result in our understanding that we, individuated entities of knowing, may in be 'special' after all.

Saturday, February 5

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Questions – Miscellaneous

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 5, 2005 09:34PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

SP: the physical, taken as a whole, is the universe. The universe has the characteristics of space and time. The universe emerged from 'nothingness' and exists within the abstract; i.e., within G-d. [Physical] Entities within the physical are temporary; i.e., physical entities come into existence and cease to exist [as physical entities].

[050127 cg] Q: What does "within" mean, when the abstract has the characteristics of no-space and no-time? What is the relationship of the abstract to the physical?

Regarding: What does "within" mean, when the abstract has the characteristics of no-space and no-time?

Reiteration: ' ... That is why the term 'within' is in quotes. To speak of 'within' in terms of time and space is accurate but the manner in which we do so pertains to what we understand of our personal physical universe. But what term can we use to speak of 'being' within' G-d when time and space are found 'within' G-d but not as a universal fabric of G-d but rather are found as 'isolated' 'pockets' of both being 'there' (physical universes) and as universal perceptions of unique diverse entities of knowing which have experienced this 'thing' we call 'physical existence.

What term would better describe 'within' if one eliminates the concept of awareness of the physical? For the purposes of dialogue, I don't know, however, in terms of conceptual knowing, I suppose one could call upon conceptualization. If one thinks of a box and then imagines placing a stone 'within' the box, one can visualize what one has done and what the process as well as the end product of placing a stone 'within' a box produces. The process produces a stone 'within' a box. But is the image of the stone actually 'within' the box? The image of the box one holds within one's awareness takes up not space nor does it occupy time although there is no deny the image of the stone 'within' the box is conceptualized 'within' an entity which in turn occupies time and space. I suppose one could suggest the analogy applies to the totality of knowing.

But what then of 'nothingness'?

It is conceivable that 'nothingness' could have characteristics of time, space, matter, and energy, or for that matter be a morphed form of 'nothingness, but it is 'nothingness nevertheless (see: www.panentheism.com, library, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Volume II, Tractate 8: The Error of Einstein, Part II: The Real and the Real Illusion.)'

Regarding: What is the relationship of the abstract to the physical?

The topic can be as complex as one wishes, however, the essence of the relationship is that the abstract travels through the physical in order to expand upon the very omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience of The Whole.

Without such a mechanism or some form of mechanism, The Whole, being omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient, would undergo what Nietzsche described as 'eternal recurrence' or stagnation which in turn acts as the base foundation of despair, hopelessness, and the freedom from responsibility.

Such a perception acts as the underlying foundation supporting the principles of determinism and materialistic hedonism.

The symbiotic panentheistic model of reality introduces 'potentiality' or 'action' into our understanding of G-d and replaces the despair, hopelessness, and freedom from responsibility to purpose, hope, and the burden (there is a trade off and this is it) of responsibility.

Such a perception would act as an underlying foundation supporting the principles of free will and altruistic hedonism.

[050127 cg] Q: Does it follow: If the universe emerged from 'nothingness', which is void of G-d, then is the universe the same substance of 'nothingness'? Or, if the universe emerged from 'nothingness', which is void of G-d, and the universe is of the same substance of G-d, then the substance of G-d emerged from 'nothingness'?

Regarding: If the universe emerged from 'nothingness', which is void of G-d, then is the universe the same substance of 'nothingness'?

Yes.

Regarding: Or, if the universe emerged from 'nothingness', which is void of G-d, and the universe is of the same substance of G-d, then the substance of G-d emerged from 'nothingness'?

The model of symbiotic panentheism would purport that 'nothingness' being the void of G-d is not a substance but rather is the void of all 'substance' as such the universe is not made of the same substance and essence as G-d, is not a 'substance' at all, is a lack of substance (for details site search www.panentheism.com, use the terms 'real' and 'real illusion')

[050127 cg] I hold that the physical (and non-physical) emerges from, is the manifestation of, is the substance of One Mind.

The physical and the non-physical are two concepts and as such need to be addressed independently.

If one finds in such an examination that both concepts, the physical and then non-physical, produce the same answers to the same questions, then yes they are the same as each other. It would then have been determined that the two terms are interchangeable.

If, however, the two concepts, the physical and the non-physical, produce different answers to the same questions then it would appear the two are different from one another. In this case it would have been determined that the two terms are not interchangeable.

Regarding the void of both the physical and the non-physical: Symbiotic panentheism would put forward the possibility that G-d is so knowledgeable, omniscient, that G-d would be capable of 'creating' a location 'within', omnipresent – there is no 'outside', 'within' which It does not exist. Sp would suggest that to do so, the location, if one wishes to call it 'a location' for perceptual purposes, would be 'located' 'within' as opposed to 'outside' G-d since by definition G-d is omnipresent. This void of The All would be an existence of 'nothingness' thus eliminating the paradox of G-d being Omnipresent while at the same time not being 'there', not being in 'nothingness', since 'nothingness' is, by definition, the void of 'location'. In fact, by definition, 'nothingness' would be the only 'location' where the void of 'location' exists.

For an in-depth description of the concept see: www.panentheism.com, library, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Volume II, Tractate 10, The Error of Heidegger: Resolving the problem of the void of the void.

[050127 cg] Finally, I have dwelt on the differences in our understanding of the nature of reality. We also share many "beliefs". You wrote, "The God who in fact is none other than ourselves and our fellow beings who in essence are us." There is only One Mind.

Ah yes, well this gets to the matter of G-d being G-d in and of Itself. Is such an entity 'a' being? If G-d is 'a' being, is unique in its knowing and experiencing as is the case with the rest of us, then who are we to ostracize G-d from our private club of individuated entities.

This brings us back to your previous question: *[050127 cg] Q: Does it follow that if abstract entities are eternal, then the Totality is comprised of an infinite number of abstract entities? To which I replied: Yes plus one; that is: plus (G-d) Itself.*

Be well,
cg

Thanks cg, you also

djs

Revisit:

[050127 cg] Q: What does it mean that "all characteristics are within and part of G-d"? For example: Is G-d a divine vessel within which all things (abstract and physical) dwell? Is G-d a divine essence (or substance) of which all things (abstract and physical) are made?

Previously I suggested we revisit this issue should some of the implications of this question be left hanging. I think we have fairly well addressed each of these issues. If, however, you do not agree or if you want clarification, feel free initiate the dialogue.

Friday, February 4

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Questions –What does ‘Entities within the abstract are eternal’ mean? Part 2

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 4, 2005 09:34PM (EST)

Symbiotic Panentheism - Model of Reality: Question – What does ‘Entities within the abstract are eternal’ mean?

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

SP: the abstract, taken as a Totality, is G-d. The abstract has the characteristics of no-space and no-time. Entities within the abstract are eternal. Ideas are abstract entities.

[050127 cg] Q: *In addition to ideas, are there other forms of abstract entities?*

I don't know but if you have suggestions I am more than willing to discuss them. On the other hand if your question is: Are there other forms of Totality's ability than simply knowing of abstraction, then the answer again is 'I don't know but to suggest our form of knowing is the ultimate of all abilities possessed by G-d would seem to be rather ego-centric and thus most probably improbable.

[050127 cg] Q: Does the idea ("ideal") of a flower exist and does it include both a rose and lotus? Do both the idea of a rose and the idea of a lotus exist? Do both the idea of a red rose and the idea of a white rose exist? Does the idea of this instance of rose exist? And what of the ideas of this instance of a rose the moment before now and the moment after now; i.e., this instance of a rose in the universe changes from moment to moment, does the idea of this instance of a rose change?

Hmmm, My reply to all these questions is: I would think so but I am more than willing to explore the details regarding what it is you are leading up to.

[050127 cg] Q: Could ideas be the product of awareness and have non-physical, but temporary existence; i.e., an instance of a discrete idea exists while one thinks of it?

Regarding: 'Could ideas be the product of awareness ...'

Why not, is the question?

Regarding: '... and have non-physical (existence), ...'

Again why not?

Regarding '... but temporary existence...' If one means by 'temporary existence', the awareness of such a concept becomes 'lost' forever to any form of knowing there are several answers here.

If the atheists are correct, then yes. If the orthodox religious perception of a transcendence embracing separation through exclusion, embracing the concept that souls exist 'outside' G-d, then perhaps. If the model of symbiotic panentheism is correct, then no, for all consciousness is affected by neither time nor space.

[050127 cg] I hold that ideas, as well as all other objects of awareness, arise and cease with the activity of awareness.

Hmmm, then are you suggesting that The All, G-d is not awareness of any form? If so, are you suggesting that G-d did not 'create man in His image and in the image of G-d created He man'? Also, the essence of the individual appears to be consciousness, knowing, do you hold that the individual is not made of the same 'substance' and 'essence' as G-d?

[050127 cg] Q: Is awareness an abstract entity? If not, what is it? Is an individuated awareness an abstract entity? What is the relationship between awareness (and/or individuated awareness) and abstract entities, such as ideas?

Regarding: Is awareness an abstract entity? The model of symbiotic panentheism would state this to be the case.

Regarding: Is an individuated awareness an abstract entity? The model of symbiotic panentheism would say yes. Sp would say the individuated entity is composed of four elements, two of the elements take on a verb form and two of the elements take on a noun form. In speaking of the interrelationship of the four it is probably easiest to use the concept of being. If you would like the details go to: www.panentheism.com, library, Existence In and Of Itself, Chapter 1: The Four Elemental Particles of Existence.

[050127 cg] Q: Does it follow that if abstract entities are eternal, then the Totality is comprised of an infinite number of abstract entities?

Yes plus one; that is: plus itself.

[050127 cg] I hold that the non-physical (and physical) emerges from, is the manifestation of, is the substance of One Mind.

So to does the model of symbiotic panentheism, however, sp would suggest that it is only logical to conclude that once individuated entities of knowing exist to reduce them to nothing, to destroy their unique individuated awareness in and of itself is to 'diminish' Totality. As such the process of individuated awareness no longer existing as individuated awareness becomes illogical by definition. The definition: Totality, The One, The Absolute, G-d is 'the being than which none greater can be conceived', Dictionary of Philosophy and Religion, William L Reese, p534 (for details see www.panentheism.com, library, Stepping Up to the Creator, Religion, #150 – 159, Ontology)

Thursday, February 3

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Questions –What does ‘within’ G-d mean? Part 1

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 3, 2005 09:34PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

Continued from Part I February 2:

[050127 cg] Q: Is this dualism; i.e., that, fundamentally, there is G-d and there is 'nothingness'.

In a sense there is no duality here. Stating the lack of duality when one states that G-d exists and 'nothingness' exists would appear to be a contradiction in logic but is, in actuality, simply a different perception of the 'or' scenario.

The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Volumes I, II, and III, all orient around changing the philosophical 'or' perceptions into philosophical 'and' perceptions and thus eliminating philosophical paradoxes which in essence are paradoxical simply because of our past perceptions were limited perceptions of reality. It is the very fact that the model, symbiotic panentheism, is capable of resolving philosophical paradoxes which provides validation for the model and which simultaneously allows philosophers to move forward into developing new philosophical paradoxes which in turn will find their resolution through further advancement of our understanding of reality. For instance, philosophers have been debating which scenario, the Cartesian or the non-Cartesian, describes reality. Symbiotic panentheism purports that reality is not an 'or' scenario but rather reality is an 'and' scenario. The symbiotic panentheistic model of reality purports that reality is in actuality: The non-Cartesian powered by the Cartesian through the process of separation through inclusion (versus separation through exclusion describing present day Judeo-Christian perceptions).

As to space and time: Space and time are innate characteristics of physical existence as demonstrated by Einstein's equation relating matter, energy, space, and time: $e = mc^2 = m(d/t)^2$.

This relationship between space, time, matter, and energy establishes the concept of cause and effect which is experienced by unique entities of knowing traveling through this realm of physicality. As such the experiencing of time and space are found to be 'within' G-d i.e. unites of unique awareness which have traveled through, experienced, the physical.

On the other hand, space and time along with matter and energy, being characteristics of the universal fabric of physicality, being characteristics of physical universes causes our universe and

its parallel elements to be unique in and of itself, unique in and of this physical universe in and of itself. Now it is most probable that there could just as well be other universes whose universal fabric's are composed of elements other than space, time, matter, and energy. To deny the possibility is to deny G-d its characteristic of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence. Now should universes based upon other qualities than matter, energy, space, and time exist, and who are we to deny such a possibility, then it would seem rather naive on our part, humanity's part, to suggest G-d's universal fabric favors characteristics of our physical universe as opposed to some other form of universe. Such a perception brings us back to the historic perception that humanity is the center of the universe. In essence it would appear illogical for the universal fabric of G-d to take on the characteristics of one form of universe over that of another not simply because of the perception of 'favoring' but because each universe is limited by its very being what it is.

[050127 cg] I hold (a belief based on contemplation and mediation, reason and intuition, introspection and experience) a non-dualistic understanding that all that exists, both physical and non-physical, and 'nothingness' emerge from, are the manifestations of, are the substance of the unborn, the unbound, without characteristics, the unnamed, so we name it, One Mind.

Symbiotic panentheism would act as a base level of understanding regarding such concepts. Exactly how that would be would be better understood with the clarity provided through the process of defining, as best one is able, the terms you introduce, however let me address the concept of One Mind.

To suggest G-d incorporates 'Mind' characteristics is logical but to suggest 'Mind' is the ultimate form of G-d may be logical for 'mind' beings but because 'mind' itself is limited the suggestion that 'One Mind' characterizes G-d is not logical.

Wednesday, February 2

■ Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Relaiity: Questions –What does ‘within’ G-d mean? Part I

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 2, 2005 09:34PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

SP: There is 'nothing' (or 'nothingness'). 'Nothing' exists within G-d, but 'nothingness' is void of G-d.

[050127 cg] Q: What does "within" mean, when the both G-d and "nothingness" have the characteristics of no-space and no-time?

Hmmm, how to begin ... That is why the term ‘within’ is in quotes. To speak of ‘within’ in terms of time and space is accurate but the manner in which we do so pertains to what we understand of our personal physical universe. But what term can we use to speak of the concept of ‘being’ within’ G-d when time and space are found ‘within’ G-d but not as a universal fabric of G-d but rather are found as ‘isolated’ ‘pockets’ of both being ‘there’ (physical universes) and as universal perceptions of unique diverse entities of knowing which have experienced this ‘thing’ we call ‘physical existence.

What term would better describe ‘within’ if one eliminates the concept of awareness of the physical? For the purposes of dialogue, I don’t know, however, in terms of conceptual knowing, I suppose one could call upon conceptualization. If one thinks of a box and then imagines placing a stone ‘within’ the box, one can visualize what one has done and what the process as well as the end product of placing a stone ‘within’ a box produces. The process produces a stone ‘within’ a box. But is the image of the stone actually ‘within’ the box? The image of the box one holds within one’s awareness takes up not space nor does it occupy time although there is no deny the image of the stone ‘within’ the box is conceptualized ‘within’ an entity which in turn occupies time and space. I suppose one could suggest the analogy applies to the totality of knowing.

But what then of ‘nothingness’?

It is conceivable that ‘nothingness’ could have characteristics of time, space, matter, and energy, or for that matter be a morphed form of ‘nothingness, but it is ‘nothingness nevertheless (see: www.panentheism.com, library, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Volume II, Tractate 8: The Error of Einstein, Part II: The Real and the Real Illusion.)

[050127 cg] Q: Does it follow that G-d is not omnipresent, because 'nothingness' is void of G-d; i.e., G-d is not present in 'nothingness'?

If 'nothingness' is the void of all including 'presence' then how does the void of presence diminish omnipresence? It would seem not.

But what if 'nothingness' could metamorphose into various 'forms' such as a 'physical universe, then would it be possible that G-d would not be present 'within' such a thing as 'non-existence' or on the other hand be present 'within' 'nothingness and would such a presence void the concept of 'nothingness' itself? G-d is most likely not present in 'nothingness', present in 'nothingness' existing in its purest form of non-knowing, non-awareness,

If 'nothingness', however, metamorphosed into a variation of itself such as various levels of vacuum potential (new concept in cosmology), metamorphosed into unique forms of universes, metamorphosed into a physical universe such as our own, then symbiotic panentheism would suggest it is possible for 'divine sparks', entities composed of the same substance and essence as G-d, unique entities of experiencing with awareness of said experiencing, souls if you wish, could potentially enter said forms of 'nothingness' to travel said universes and 'become' unique entities of knowing. A symbiotic panentheistic model of reality would likewise be capable of laying the logic regarding G-d's presence at times and lack of presence at other times, etc.

In short, the symbiotic panentheistic model of reality would also be capable of rationalizing either the potential for G-d itself to enter 'nothingness' in one manner or another or not to do so. The specifics of such speculations would of course be the domain of unique religions. The symbiotic panentheistic model would simply provide the base logic for all such perceptions. The base logic symbiotic panentheism provides religion or lack of religion goes well beyond what I have suggested here but is far too involved to simply state in one sentence or one paragraph.

What good then is the symbiotic panentheistic model of reality if it is capable of providing the base logic of almost any perceptions? The model provides the rationale as to the fact the individual exists, is composed of the same substance and essence as G-d, lays the rational universal foundation for all religions, sciences, philosophies, and social engineering that the individual was specifically designed to be unique for a reason and as such the diversity of individuality is of prime importance. This goes completely against the concept of conformity which emerges from most violent forms of rejection of those that are different, i.e. a super race, 'conversion', ...

Tuesday, February 1

Symbiotic Panentheism – Model of Reality: Questions – Is G-d The sum of all?

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on February 1, 2005 09:34PM (EST)

Symbiotic Panentheism - Model of Reality: Question – Is G-d the sum of all?

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

Dan:

As I noted in my previous e-mail, now that I have a better understanding of the overall structure of symbiotic panentheism, I am better able to organize my thoughts and questions. So, let me summarize my current understanding (and note my questions) of symbiotic panentheism. I'll use SP to indicate a truth as expressed by symbiotic panentheism. As I also wrote previously, I apologize for any misstatement of SP; it is not intentional, but the result of my lack of understanding. Please correct any misstatement of SP.

Now, as you wrote, "I specialize in only four things: The Whole, the individual, the physical universe, and nothingness." I think those are the major topics to explore with the additions of "awareness" and ethics.

Let's (re-)start again with the basics.

SP: There is G-d. God is the Totality of the abstract. G-d is omniscient, omnipresent, and eternal. All characteristics are within and part of G-d.

[050127 cg] Q: Does "G-d is the Totality" mean that G-d is the sum of all abstract entities? If G-d is more than the sum, what is the "extra"?

To state that G-d is the sum of all the abstract entities is correct when taken in its correct context. But what is that context is the question. The context is taken from a metaphysical point of view versus a strictly mathematical view.

If G-d is the summation of all then what becomes of the discrete individual? Is the individual swallowed up into being simply G-d?

To suggest the individual loses their individuality when it becomes a part of summation is to suggest a loss of something very special, suggest the loss of an individual's perception, suggest the loss of an individual's aware from that individual's personal perception.

Such a model of reality would embrace the concept that G-d is less than what G-d could potentially be. Now I grant you that we as humans have little concern with issues that run counter

to our personal 'beliefs' but you and I are not communicating about our 'personal' beliefs. Rather we are communicating about what is logical and what is not logical in terms of G-d.

If G-d is truly omniscient, then it would go against such a perception to suggest the discrete individual, to suggest that you or I simply fade away into the summation of G-d and thus no longer exist as discrete units of knowing, no longer exists as our conscious selves incorporating a unique perception void the knowing of all.

Bearing this in mind, I can now address your question more specifically. G-d is the summation of totality but not in the sense of 'the summation' but in the sense of 'the summation plus infinite discrete entities of knowing. A crude mathematical representation of the concept is located within: www.panentheism.com, library, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Volume II, Tractate 11: The Error of Philosophy, Part I: 3rd Article: Singularity of Multiplicity.

[050127 cg] Q: What does it mean that "all characteristics are within and part of G-d"? For example: Is G-d a divine vessel within which all things (abstract and physical) dwell? Is G-d a divine essence (or substance) of which all things (abstract and physical) are made?

I think these questions will resolve themselves as we proceed with the list of questions you have put forward. As such lets take the questions one at a time and them come back to this question.

Symbiotic Panentheism - Model of Reality: Question – What does 'within' G-d mean? Part I

Dialoguing - A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.

SP: There is 'nothing' (or 'nothingness'). 'Nothing' exists within G-d, but 'nothingness' is void of G-d.

[050127 cg] Q: What does "within" mean, when the both G-d and "nothingness" have the characteristics of no-space and no-time?

Hmmm, how to begin ... That is why the term 'within' is in quotes. To speak of 'within' in terms of time and space is accurate but the manner in which we do so pertains to what we understand of our personal physical universe. But what term can we use to speak of the concept of 'being' within' G-d when time and space are found 'within' G-d but not as a universal fabric of G-d but rather are found as 'isolated' 'pockets' of both being 'there' (physical universes) and as universal

perceptions of unique diverse entities of knowing which have experienced this 'thing' we call 'physical existence.

What term would better describe 'within' if one eliminates the concept of awareness of the physical? For the purposes of dialogue, I don't know, however, in terms of conceptual knowing, I suppose one could call upon conceptualization. If one thinks of a box and then imagines placing a stone 'within' the box, one can visualize what one has done and what the process as well as the end product of placing a stone 'within' a box produces. The process produces a stone 'within' a box. But is the image of the stone actually 'within' the box? The image of the box one holds within one's awareness takes up not space nor does it occupy time although there is no deny the image of the stone 'within' the box is conceptualized 'within' an entity which in turn occupies time and space. I suppose one could suggest the analogy applies to the totality of knowing.

But what then of 'nothingness'?

It is conceivable that 'nothingness' could have characteristics of time, space, matter, and energy, or for that matter be a morphed form of 'nothingness, but it is 'nothingness nevertheless (see: www.panentheism.com, library, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Volume II, Tractate 8: The Error of Einstein, Part II: The Real and the Real Illusion.)

[050127 cg] Q: Does it follow that G-d is not omnipresent, because 'nothingness' is void of G-d; i.e., G-d is not present in 'nothingness'?

If 'nothingness' is the void of all including 'presence' then how does the void of presence diminish omnipresence? It would seem not.

But what if 'nothingness' could metamorphose into various 'forms' such as a 'physical universe, then would it be possible that G-d would not be present 'within' such a thing as 'non-existence' or on the other hand be present 'within' 'nothingness and would such a presence void the concept of 'nothingness' itself? G-d is most likely not present in 'nothingness', present in 'nothingness' existing in its purest form of non-knowing, non-awareness,

If 'nothingness', however, metamorphosed into a variation of itself such as various levels of vacuum potential (new concept in cosmology), metamorphosed into unique forms of universes, metamorphosed into a physical universe such as our own, then symbiotic panentheism would suggest it is possible for 'divine sparks', entities composed of the same substance and essence as G-d, unique entities of experiencing with awareness of said experiencing, souls if you wish, could potentially enter said forms of 'nothingness' to travel said universes and 'become' unique entities of knowing. A symbiotic panentheistic model of reality would likewise be capable of laying the logic regarding G-d's presence at times and lack of presence at other times, etc.

In short, the symbiotic panentheistic model of reality would also be capable of rationalizing either the potential for G-d itself to enter 'nothingness' in one manner or another or not to do so. The specifics of such speculations would of course be the domain of unique religions. The symbiotic panentheistic model would simply provide the base logic for all such perceptions. The base logic symbiotic panentheism provides religion or lack of religion goes well beyond what I have suggested here but is far too involved to simply state in one sentence or one paragraph.

What good then is the symbiotic panentheistic model of reality if it is capable of providing the base logic of almost any perceptions? The model provides the rationale as to the fact the individual exists, is composed of the same substance and essence as G-d, lays the rational universal foundation for all religions, sciences, philosophies, and social engineering that the

individual was specifically designed to be unique for a reason and as such the diversity of individuality is of prime importance. This goes completely against the concept of conformity which emerges from most violent forms of rejection of those that are different, i.e. a super race, 'conversion', ...