

Placed on Blog March 2005

Thursday, March 31

Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: Last comments before beginning a unique journey

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 31, 2005 12:24AM (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.

Post March 28, 2005: The previous post ended with the following exchange:

[050325 cg] You must examine Reality directly.

[050326 djs] Exactly.

[050327 djs] Again, exactly my point. We, must examine Reality directly as opposed to examining Reality through the eyes of faith/religion alone.

[050327 cg] Yes, we must drop all our beliefs and models. Then what do you know?

[050328 djs] Good idea. Why don't we take a mental trip together? Let me be the guide and let's see what happens. Are you willing?

Note: cg accepted the concept of taking a unique mental trip and then responded as follows: (out of respect for cg and his analytical insights, I will give cg the last word before we begin our unique journey immersed in a process I call 'macro-observation' – the concept of macro-observation was discussed previously on this site and may be accessed using the search engine found on the home page of this site.)

At cg's suggestion, I will contact cck to see if he would be interested in joining us on our trip.

: [deleted materials]

[050328 djs] I discuss the ONE G-d I am capable of understanding. Symbiotic panentheism demonstrates that this ONE G-d, should IT exist, has both presence and knowing. Would you agree?

[050328 cg] Ah.... That is a real question! Why do I say it is a 'real question'? I say it is a 'real question', because although we can know that the ONE G-d has presence; i.e., the ONE G-d is omnipresent; I do not know if the ONE G-d has "knowing". Why do I say that? I say that because "knowing" requires a 'knower' and a 'thing known' (or 'object of knowing'). This would require that the ONE G-d objectifies Itself. Perhaps you have a different analysis.

: [deleted materials]

[050327 djs] Again I ask: Then how is it that the individuated entity of knowing simply 'ceases to be'? I am seeking a rational explanation here as opposed to one's falling back upon the argument: 'Have faith my brother, there are things of which we cannot conceive. Now go in peace

'[050327 cg] I sense your frustration and I will explain it to you as best I am able:

[050327 cg] The "individuated entity of knowing" is a conditional and composite thing that has no self-existence. You believe it is an elemental (non-composite) abstract thing which, once created, is eternal. You must examine yourself to find your true nature and know, for yourself, that you have no self-existence. That is not faith, but direct experience.

[050328 djs] Regarding your comment: ' ... that you have no self-existence. That is not faith, but direct experience.'

[050328 djs] I have not experienced this. To the contrary, I have directly experienced the vast uniqueness 'individuality of knowing' exhibits. In addition I have found no direct evidence, scientifically - religiously - philosophically, which supports anything other than an existence of the multiplicity of individuality, the existence of a/many wholes, the existence of the physical, and the existence of nothingness.

[050328 djs] My direct experiencing, garnered through observation - believability - reason, garnered through my limited ability to search the thoughts of others as expressed in humanity's vast libraries, garnered through the patient process of listening to others, supports symbiotic panentheism's one of three fundamental premises, namely: you and I both exist - the individual exists.

[050328 cg] Clearly I have not succeeded in explaining, because you still mistake my assertion that we do not have self-existence (an existence not dependent on another) as

an assertion that we do not exist. Let me state: We exist, but we exist as temporary sentient beings. That we are temporary does not diminish the reality of our existence. Rather, that we are temporary gives poignancy to our lives.

: [deleted materials]

[050328 djs] Your argument is based upon the concept that '... **one is not self-existent**, ...', however, this is where we differ. I have explained how I have come to the conclusion that you and I both exist and thus 'we' are not conditional and composite. Upon what do you justify your statement that the individual 'is not self-existent'?

[050328 cg] To your request for justification: You agree that we were "created" at some point in time, so whether one believes our "creation" was purposeful and dependent on another entity that caused our "creation" or one believes our "creation" was simply dependent on conditions that caused our "creation", our "creation" was dependent; therefore, we cannot be self-existent (independent of another for existence).

[050328 cg] Further, your statement that we are "not conditional and composite" is not consistent, because you have posited that we are "created" from the essence of G-d and Nothingness; therefore, our existence is conditional; i.e., it is dependent on G-d and Nothingness without which we would not exist; and our existence is composite; i.e., it is composed of G-d and Nothingness.

[050328 djs] I will grant you, that the theory is interesting but what simultaneous rational arguments, scientific observation, and pluralistic religious teachings support the concept.

[050328 cg] You believe that we are "souls", somehow loosely connected to our bodies, that once "created" are eternal. Please tell me, what scientific observations support your view that a "soul" exists?

[050328 cg] To your request for religious authority and traditions that support the view of "no soul", I can point to the Advaita-Vedanta tradition and Buddhism.

: [deleted materials]

[050328 djs] Regarding your comment: ' ... That Ultimate Reality cannot be wholly captured in words is the nature of Ultimate Reality. Nevertheless, I am doing my best.'

[050328 djs] You are doing well. It is not you, rather it is myself that has the problem, believe me. I have discussed the issues with many people and nobody seems to understand what it is I am trying to say. Either the idea of symbiotic panentheism is faulty or I am totally inept. The task set before me seems to be way beyond my abilities despite my thirty years of teaching.

[050328 cg] Dan, I honestly do think I understand your view, I merely disagree with certain aspects of it. Believe me, it is not important what we believe. Reality is what it is, with or without our consent or understanding.

: [deleted materials]

[050325 cg] You must examine Reality directly.

[050326 djs] Exactly.

[050327 djs] Again, exactly my point. We, must examine Reality directly as opposed to examining Reality through the eyes of faith/religion alone.

[050327 cg] Yes, we must drop all our beliefs and models. Then what do you know?

[050328 djs] Good idea. Why don't we take a mental trip together? Let me be the guide and let's see what happens. Are you willing?

[0503XX cg] OK. Let's return to First Principles, but go slow for my sake.

[050328 cg] p.s: Perhaps CCK would join us. I wonder if the three of us could agree on such matters.

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

Monday, March 28

Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: Buddhistic limits

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 28, 2005 01:17AM (EST)

Dialoguing – Neo-Buddhist and 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 materials]

[050326 djs] As to a discussion of the a Higher Reality than that of which we are capable of comprehending, well that, by definition is beyond our ability to discuss.

[050326 cg] YOU have declared that the ONE G-d ("the Higher Reality") is, by YOUR definition, "beyond our ability to discuss." That is your belief and opinion. I disagree and so do you.

[050327 djs] Regarding your comment: '... I disagree and so do you.'

[050327 djs] Sorry but you are incorrect. I do not disagree. It would appear only logical that there is a more expansive scope to reality than we as limited beings are capable of comprehending. To say otherwise is the ultimate of anthropomorphic thought. The great thinkers who described such a concept understood the 'fact' that we, individuated entities of knowing', are capable of limited, as opposed to unlimited, knowing. As such these thinkers, not I, described the process of understanding this Higher Reality as the process of negation.

[050327 cg] You write, "It would appear only logical that there is a more expansive scope to reality than we as limited beings are capable of comprehending." Why? Where is your logical argument?

[050328 djs] The logic lies in the concept of 'limited beings', however, the discussion is beginning to step into the realm of theoretical metaphysics, is beginning to step into the realm of what lies 'beyond' consciousness, 'beyond' awareness. We are conscious beings.

I would like to keep the discussion in the realm of what we are capable of discussing. Symbiotic panentheism does not deny the existence of ONE G-d. Symbiotic panentheism also does not deny your existence as an entity of consciousness. Symbiotic panentheism

is a metaphysical model which explains the existence of both, ONE G-d and yourself, simultaneously.

[050327 cg] You then write, "The great thinkers who described such a concept ..." . So, if 'great thinkers' were able to describe, then we can discuss the concept of the ONE G-d.

[050328 djs] You are a 'great thinker' and yes we can discuss the concept for you fall into the category of 'great thinkers'.

[050327 cg] You continue that those 'great thinkers' "understood the 'fact' that we, individuated entities of knowing', are capable of limited, as opposed to unlimited, knowing." Yes, I agree, we can't know it ALL, but that doesn't imply that we can't know some of the ONE G-d.

[050328 djs] I agree, and that is why I suggest we address concepts we can comprehend as opposed to dwelling upon the process of negation.

[050327 djs] Having said this, I am more comfortable in discussing those concepts which we are capable of understanding. In addition I am comfortable with calling 'the greatest existence of which we can conceive' G-d.

[050327 cg] OK, it is not my intention to cause you to feel uncomfortable, but I thought we were having a metaphysical ("a division of philosophy that is concerned with the fundamental nature of reality and being", courtesy of Merriam-Webster) discussion. Shall I stop?

[050328 djs] Stop, of course not.

[050326 cg] After stating that the ONE G-d, is "beyond our comprehension", you begin to discuss what the ONE G-d is and is not; i.e., you state that, "omnipresence is not a characteristic of this 'ONE G-d'". You continue and name a method to "begin to understand"; i.e., through "the process of negation".

[050327 djs] Regarding your comment: 'After stating that the ONE G-d, is "beyond our comprehension", you begin to discuss what the ONE G-d is and is not; ...'

[050327 djs] Actually, after having made the statement 'beyond our comprehension' I began to discuss what the ONE G-d is not. I did not introduce what the ONE G-d is because the concept of what the ONE G-d is, is beyond our comprehension and therefore whatever it is we comprehend is not descriptive of such a G-d. This is what is meant by a discussion using the 'process of negation'.

[050327 cg] But it is not beyond your comprehension "what the ONE G-d is not." So, by the process of negation, you are able to comprehend something regarding the nature of the ONE G-d, even if it is what the ONE G-d is not. And, as you write, "I began to discuss ...", so you do discuss the ONE G-d.

[050328 djs] I discuss the ONE G-d I am capable of understanding. Symbiotic panentheism demonstrates that this ONE G-d, should IT exist, has both presence and knowing. Would you agree?

[050327 cg] Do you now maintain that we are not capable of discussing the ONE G-d?

[050328 djs] No.

: [deleted materials]

[050327 djs] Perhaps you can be more explicit in terms of your perception of G-d's composition. Is G-d void duality? Is G-d void individuated entities of knowing? Does the individuated entity of knowing simply 'cease to be'?

[050327 cg] I will do my best, but words cannot capture the Whole Truth, I am still clarifying and expanding my understanding (These discussion have stimulated that process and for that I thank you.), and I am not the best writer.

[050328 djs] Regarding your comment: 'I will do my best, but ... and I am not the best writer.'

As much writing as I do I have consistently had to face two frequent comments: First, people think I am an incompetent writer and second, people think my ideas are ludicrous. I

personally have not seen this to be a problem you exhibit. But should this characteristic begin to expose itself, well, all I can say is: Welcome to the club.

[050327 cg] The ONE G-d is not composite, but is the source of ALL "things" and ALL "things" are not separate from the ONE G-d. The ONE G-d is not void of duality, but is not dual.

[050328 djs] OK.

: [deleted materials]

[050327 djs] Again I ask: Then how is it that the individuated entity of knowing simply 'ceases to be'? I am seeking a rational explanation here as opposed to one's falling back upon the argument: 'Have faith my brother, there are things of which we cannot conceive. Now go in peace'

[050327 cg] I sense your frustration and I will explain it to you as best I am able:

[050327 cg] The "individuated entity of knowing" is a conditional and composite thing that has no self-existence. You believe it is an elemental (non-composite) abstract thing which, once created, is eternal. You must examine yourself to find your true nature and know, for yourself, that you have no self-existence. That is not faith, but direct experience.

[050328 djs] Regarding your comment: ' ... that you have no self-existence. That is not faith, but direct experience.'

I have not experienced this. To the contrary, I have directly experienced the vast uniqueness 'individuality of knowing' exhibits. In addition I have found no direct evidence, scientifically – religiously – philosophically, which supports anything other than an existence of the multiplicity of individuality, the existence of a/many wholes, the existence of the physical, and the existence of nothingness.

My direct experiencing, garnered through observation – believability – reason, garnered through my limited ability to search the thoughts of others as expressed in humanity's vast libraries, garnered through the patient process of listening to others, supports symbiotic panentheism's one of three fundamental premises, namely: you and I both exist – the individual exists.

[050327 cg] If one is not self-existent, then one is conditional and composite. When one ceases, no thing and no information is lost. Why? No thing is lost, because the parts return to their source. No information is lost, because all events and experiences leave a mark.

[050328 djs] Symbiotic panentheism would completely agree with your statement as it relates to one aspect of the ONE G-d. But the metaphysical model, symbiotic panentheism, goes one step further.

Symbiotic panentheism then proceeds to state that although your concept applies to the ONE G-d, the individual remains the individual. The individual cannot be 'lost' because should the individual be 'lost' the unique knowing, the unique awareness of unique experiencing which only the individual is capable of replicating and projecting would be lost which in turn would diminish the ONE G-d.

Your argument is based upon the concept that '... one is not self-existent, ...', however, this is where we differ. I have explained how I have come to the conclusion that you and I both exist and thus 'we' are not conditional and composite. Upon what do you justify your statement that the individual 'is not self-existent'?

I will grant you, that the theory is interesting but what simultaneous rational arguments, scientific observation, and pluralistic religious teachings support the concept.

: [deleted materials]

[050327 djs] First: Thus G-d's reentry into the discussion was a necessity for an understanding of the most expansive model of reality metaphysics can portray, namely: generically - 'symbiotic panentheism', academically - 'A non-Cartesian system powered by a Cartesian system made possible through a process of Separation through Inclusion' or 'the being of 'being' being 'Being''

[050327 cg] OK, let's discuss, ""the being of 'being' being 'Being'". What can you say about it?

[050328 djs] Actually I could and have said a great deal about it. You can find the 1,700 pages and 1,200 diagrams in the library on my web site: www.panentheism.com. Look for the series: The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception.

[050327 djs] Second: I do not wish to 'avoid' anything, but I would like to understand how it is possible for an individuated entity of knowing to pass away without 'something' being 'lost'?

[050327 cg] Yes, I know and I have attempted to explain. See above.

[050328 djs] I appreciate your attempts but again I have to ask: '... what simultaneous rational arguments, scientific observation, and pluralistic religious teachings support the concept.'

[050327 djs] Third, as for: '... believe that the ONE G-d prefers to avoid too.'

[050327 djs] I did not suggest this was 'fact' nor did I state that I 'believed' it but rather I was suggesting G-d has preferences as a 'possible answer' for your question:

: [deleted materials]

[050327 cg] Yes, I stand corrected; it was only a suggestion.

[050328 djs] Thanks

: [deleted materials]

[050327 djs] Regarding your comment: ' ... **My point was my inability to explain how I arrived at my understanding, though I can share that understanding.**'

[050327 djs] Isn't this the description of religion?

[050327 cg] **No, it's a description of my condition.**

[050328 djs] But just because it is 'your condition' does not mean it is not religious in nature. I am not attempting to belittle your religious perception. Symbiotic panentheism is pluralistic in nature and strongly suggest that no religion is less important than another. Symbiotic panentheism strongly purports the idea that all cultures, traditions, religions, ... be respected, tolerated, studied, embraced, ... by all peoples. Buddhism has much to offer the world community of individuals.

What I am asking, however, is that we discuss the composition of reality and working of reality as best we can based upon what we observe/sciences, believe/religions, and reasoning/philosophies.

I am asking you to support your understanding of reality through a process of 'examining Reality directly' and then verbalizing to me what it is you have found which supports your thinking.

I am agreeing with everything you have stated regarding the ONE G-d except for the concepts that the individual then 'simply ceases to be', nothingness does not exist, and the physical universe does not exist. One can thus remain an avid Buddhist and accept the 'addition to' one's belief without rejecting Buddhism. Symbiotic panentheism is a model which abhors one's 'discarding one's beliefs'. Symbiotic panentheism is one of addition not subtraction or rejection. Sp is a model of reality which is capable of becoming a foundation to all religions or lack of religions.

[050327 djs] I thought we were in a metaphysical discussion. I thought we were immersed in a discussion of reason as opposed to a discussion based upon 'faith', after all this site is described as 'adding reason to faith'.

[050327 cg] **I thought a metaphysical discussion should discuss Ultimate Reality and that is what I have been doing and with as much reason as I am able. That Ultimate Reality cannot be wholly captured in words is the nature of Ultimate Reality. Nevertheless, I am doing my best.**

[050328 djs] Regarding your comment: ' ... **I thought a metaphysical discussion should**

discuss Ultimate Reality and that is what I have been doing and with as much reason as I am able...'

Maybe it would help if we could use a different approach for our discussion. See final suggestion to this post.

Regarding your comment: ' ... That Ultimate Reality cannot be wholly captured in words is the nature of Ultimate Reality. Nevertheless, I am doing my best.'

You are doing well. It is not you, rather it is myself that has the problem, belief me. I have discussed the issues with many people and nobody seems to understand what it is I am trying to say. Either the idea of symbiotic panentheism is faulty or I am totally inept. The task set before me seems to be way beyond my abilities despite my thirty years of teaching.

[050326 cg] My point is that Reality is beyond words, thoughts and models.

[050327 djs] Again I ask: So which are we to discuss: That of which we are capable of conceiving or that of which we are incapable of conceiving? Again I will state: 'I am more comfortable in discussing those concepts of which we are capable of understanding. In addition I am comfortable with calling 'the greatest existence of which we can conceive' G-d.'

[050327 cg] Again, it is not my intention to cause you to feel uncomfortable.

[050328 djs] A poor choice of words on my part.

[050325 cg] You must examine Reality directly.

[050326 djs] Exactly.

[050327 djs] Again, exactly my point. We, must examine Reality directly as opposed to examining Reality through the eyes of faith/religion alone.

[050327 cg] Yes, we must drop all our beliefs and models. Then what do you know?

[050328 djs] Good idea. Why don't we take a mental trip together? Let me be the guide and let's see what happens. Are you willing?

Sunday, March 27

Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: G-d's composition

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 27, 2005 02:16AM (EST)

Dialoguing – Poly-Solipsist, Neo-Buddhist and 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 materials]

[050324 djs] Second: In terms of the concept of there being a Higher Reality than G-d. Symbiotic panentheism would state that yes there is a Higher Reality than the G-d of which we can conceive and thus a Higher Reality than the G-d of which we speak. But the question then becomes: Why aren't we discussing the Higher Reality? We are not discussing the Higher Reality because it is beyond our comprehension. Some philosophers, theists, and theologians have speculated that the only way to discuss such a Higher Reality is through the process of 'negation' or what a metaphysicist might term 'theoretical metaphysics'. For details see: <http://www.panentheism.com/Pages/begin01.html>

[050325 cg] MY meaning of the term "ONE G-d" refers to the Ultimate Reality, the Highest of Highs (or Holiest of Holies). Truly nameless, ONE G-d is the omnipresence of pure existence, eternal and infinite.

[050326 djs] If you are speaking of the Higher Reality, if you are speaking of the reality beyond our comprehension, if you are speaking of the reality we can only begin to understand through the process of negation, then omnipresence is not a characteristic of this 'ONE G-d' for the concept of omnipresence is understood by ourselves and as such must be discarded if one uses the process of negation.

[050326 djs] Understanding G-d through the process of negation, by definition, means we must discard all we know in order to begin to understand. Eternity - all concepts of time - and infinity - all concepts of size - must also be discarded.

[050326 djs] The discussion we have been having is, in essence, not about the nameless G-d, but rather the discussion is one of metaphysics - What is the first layer which lies beyond the physical and what is its relationship to the physical and what is the relationship of the physical to it. It is this discussion which has led us to the examination of eternity, infinity, consciousness, awareness, the physical universe, nothingness, the

physical, the soul, the individuated entity of knowing, the whole of knowing, the purpose for the existence of the individual, the purpose for the existence of nothingness, the purpose for the existence of the physical universe, the purpose of discrete consciousness, the discrete, the non-discrete,

[050326 djs] As to a discussion of the a Higher Reality than that of which we are capable of comprehending, well that, by definition is beyond our ability to discuss.

[050326 cg] YOU have declared that the ONE G-d ("the Higher Reality") is, by YOUR definition, "beyond our ability to discuss." That is your belief and opinion. I disagree and so do you.

[050327 djs] Regarding your comment: '... I disagree and so do you.'

Sorry but you are incorrect. I do not disagree. It would appear only logical that there is a more expansive scope to reality than we as limited beings are capable of comprehending. To say otherwise is the ultimate of anthropomorphic thought. The great thinkers who described such a concept understood the 'fact' that we, individuated entities of knowing', are capable of limited, as opposed to unlimited, knowing. As such these thinkers, not I, described the process of understanding this Higher Reality as the process of negation.

Having said this, I am more comfortable in discussing those concepts which we are capable of understanding. In addition I am comfortable with calling 'the greatest existence of which we can conceive' G-d.

[050326 cg] After stating that the ONE G-d, is "beyond our comprehension", you begin to discuss what the ONE G-d is and is not; i.e., you state that, "omnipresence is not a characteristic of this 'ONE G-d'". You continue and name a method to "begin to understand"; i.e., through "the process of negation".

[050327 djs] Regarding your comment: 'After stating that the ONE G-d, is "beyond our comprehension", you begin to discuss what the ONE G-d is and is not; ...'

Actually, after having made the statement 'beyond our comprehension' I began to discuss what the ONE G-d is not. I did not introduce what the ONE G-d is because the concept of what the ONE G-d is, is beyond our comprehension and therefore whatever it is we comprehend is not descriptive of such a G-d. This is what is meant by a discussion using the 'process of negation'.

As to the remainder of my statements which you address, they become intuitively understandable when one grasps the concept of a Higher Reality than the reality we, as limited beings, are capable of discussing.

[050326 cg] While I disagree with your conclusion regarding the lack omnipresence of the ONE G-d and may question your use of "the process of negation", we are capable of discussing the ONE G-d and, in fact, have been. There is nothing that we have examined and discussed that is not an examination and discussion regarding the ONE G-d.

[050327 djs] Regarding your comment: '... we are capable of discussing the ONE G-d and, in fact, have been...'

Actually we have been discussing what we are capable of understanding and as I stated previously: 'I am more comfortable discussing those concepts which we are capable of understanding. In addition I am comfortable with calling 'the greatest existence of which we can conceive' G-d.'

: [deleted materials]

[050326 djs] If we are discussing that of which we are capable of comprehending then I would agree there is only ONE G-d but where we disagree is in the concept regarding G-d's expansiveness. You say there is only singularity and no duality to G-d and I say there is both singularity and duality to G-d.

[050326 cg] Not exactly.

[050327 djs] Oh, then 'exactly' what are you saying?

Post 050324

[050320 djs] Interesting. It appears to me that the two of you, cg and cck, have one thing in common, namely: You both appear to think G-d lacks duality, lacks the characteristic of 'discreteness'.

[050321 cg] Yes, I believe G-d transcends all duality.

[050321 cg] Regarding your statement that, "The discrete exists." Courtesy of Merriam-Webster, the word "discrete" means "constituting a separate entity" and "entity" means "independent, separate, or self-contained existence". There is only G-d (the Singularity), which is independent (uncaused), separate and self-contained existence (unbound and infinite). ...

[050327 djs] Regarding your previous comment: [050305 cg] Why not clearly and fully state the position sp takes on this?

Perhaps you can be more explicit in terms of your perception of G-d's composition. Is G-d void duality? Is G-d void individuated entities of knowing? Does the individuated entity of knowing simply 'cease to be'?

[050326 djs] Again I ask you: Which is the most probable concept of G-d:

[050326 djs] Poly-Solipsism - many 'I's' - G-d is Multiplicity and no duality as cck states

[050326 djs] ONEness - singularity - G-d is only singularity no duality as you state

[050326 djs] Or

[050326 djs] Symbiotic panentheism - G-d is both singularity and duality - singularity and duality existing simultaneously

[050326 cg] The words, "singularity", "duality", and even "multiplicity", have meaning, but they describe ways of understanding reality, not Reality Itself. As you wrote, the ONE G-d (Reality) is beyond our understanding; i.e., the ONE G-d is beyond our thoughts and philosophies. That is not to assert that we cannot understand, in some limited way, the ONE G-d, but that words are not capable of expressing the Whole Truth.

[050327 djs] Regarding your comment: ' ...That is not to assert that we cannot understand, in some limited way, the ONE G-d, but that words are not capable of expressing the Whole Truth.'

Actually we have been discussing what we are capable of understanding and as I stated previously: 'I am more comfortable discussing those concepts which we are capable of understanding. In addition I am comfortable with calling 'the greatest existence of which we can conceive' G-d.'

[050326 djs] Ignoring what you personally believe, or what cck personally believes, or what I personally believe: If we speak of G-d in terms of what we are capable of conceiving then do we define G-d as being limited or do we speak of G-d as being the greatest existence of which we are capable of conceiving?

[050326 cg] The ONE G-d transcends that "which we are capable of conceiving" and is Reality Itself.

[050327 djs] So which are we to discuss: That of which we are capable of conceiving or that of which we are incapable of conceiving? Again I will state: 'I am more comfortable discussing those concepts which we are capable of understanding. In addition I am comfortable with calling 'the greatest existence of which we can conceive' G-d.'

: [deleted materials]

[050326 djs] Symbiotic panentheism would say: What we imagine is real and cannot be destroyed. What we experience is real and cannot be destroyed. The singularity (the Whole) aspect of G-d is Omnipresent. The duality (Individuated entities of knowing) of G-d are not Omnipresent.

[050326 djs] Singularity and duality, both existing simultaneously.

[050326 cg] The ONE G-d is the ALL ("things") and the ALL ("things") is the One G-d.

[050327 djs] Again I ask: Then how is it that the individuated entity of knowing simply 'ceases to be'? I am seeking a rational explanation here as opposed to one's falling back upon the argument: 'Have faith my brother, there are things of which we cannot conceive. Now go in peace'

[050325 cg] ALL (discrete) "things" are conditional. It is the nature of "things" to arise and pass away as conditions warrant. You fear that ONE G-d will suffer a loss if a "thing passes away", but there never was a "thing" to lose. Why? The secret is that ALL (discrete) "things" are composite, so there is no "thing" that has self-existence.

[050326 djs] I 'fear' no such thing. This is not a case of 'fear' versus 'courage'. This is simply a case of having a discussion based upon what is or is not rational, what is or is not observable, and what is or is not believable. If I were concerned with 'fear' I would never have gone down the road of metaphysics. To take the journey of a metaphysicist I was required to discard all I 'believed' and start from scratch.

[050326 cg] No such characterization was meant or implied. You have reacted to the word, "fear", not meant as the opposite of "courage", but meant as "expect with alarm" (courtesy of Merriam-Webster) regarding your belief that if "the discrete individuated entity of knowing" passes away that some "thing" will be "lost", which will ultimately lead to "eternal recurrence" that you wish to avoid and believe that the ONE G-d prefers to avoid too.

[050327 djs] Regarding your comment: ' ... You have reacted to the word, "fear", not meant as the opposite of "courage", but meant as "expect with alarm"

First: I am not 'alarmed'. If I were alarmed I would be embracing G-d as opposed to casting G-d aside as part of the process of establishing a metaphysical, as opposed to a religious, perception of reality. Because G-d has reentered the discussion does not mean G-d was not originally cast aside. G-d's reentry into the discussion was dictated by the simultaneous existence of scientific, religious, and philosophical principles upon which all three depend. Thus G-d's reentry into the discussion was a necessity for an understanding of the most expansive model of reality metaphysics can portray, namely: generically – 'symbiotic panentheism', academically – 'A non-Cartesian system powered by a Cartesian system made possible through a process of Separation through Inclusion' or 'the being of 'being' being 'Being''

Second: I do not wish to 'avoid' anything, but I would like to understand how it is possible for an individuated entity of knowing to pass away without 'something' being 'lost'?

Third, as for: '... believe that the ONE G-d prefers to avoid too.'

I did not suggest this was 'fact' nor did I state that I 'believed' it but rather I was suggesting G-d has preferences as a 'possible answer' for your question:

[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.

You will note, you stated: 'So, you're suggesting ...'

To which I replied: 'Correct'

[050326 djs] I used my free will willingly and cast aside G-d, cast aside religion, cast aside science, and cast aside philosophy, in order to take the path of the metaphysicist for the metaphysicist must start from scratch if they are to understand the structure of reality. Now this is not to say that G-d does not come back into the equation but it does say that G-d does not come back into the equation either. G-d remains out of the equation until the metaphysicist can validate the concept of G-d through the use of all three of our perceptual abilities, namely: what we can observe, what we can rationalize, and what we can believe.

[050326 djs] The road of the metaphysicist is not one to be taken lightly.

[050326 cg] I agree.

[050325 cg] At the top of this post you asked, "Why is it you 'believe' G-d must 'transcend' duality ... ?" I wish I could share and communicate my path, but I am not a philosopher, teacher, or preacher. I'm a simple believer and I can't believe otherwise, because non-existence is not credible and ONE is irreducible.

[050326 djs] I respect your 'beliefs'. But are you also saying that you are incapable of stepping 'beyond' your beliefs and thus incapable of discussing models of reality based upon concepts which might not conform to your 'beliefs'?

[050326 cg] No. To understand symbiotic panentheism, what little I may, required that I dropped my beliefs in order to understand your beliefs. My point was my inability to explain how I arrived at my understanding, though I can share that understanding.

[050327 djs] Regarding your comment: ' ... My point was my inability to explain how I arrived at my understanding, though I can share that understanding.'

Isn't this the description of religion?

I thought we were in a metaphysical discussion. I thought we were immersed in a discussion of reason as opposed to a discussion based upon 'faith', after all this site is described as 'adding reason to faith'.

[050326 cg] My point is that Reality is beyond words, thoughts and models.

[050327 djs] Again I ask: So which are we to discuss: That of which we are capable of conceiving or that of which we are incapable of conceiving? Again I will state: 'I am more comfortable in discussing those concepts of which we are capable of understanding. In addition I am comfortable with calling 'the greatest existence of which we can conceive' G-d.'

[050325 cg] You must examine Reality directly.

[050326 djs] Exactly.

[050327 djs] Again, exactly my point. We, must examine Reality directly as opposed to examining Reality through the eyes of faith/religion alone.

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

Saturday, March 26

Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: The size of G-d

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 26, 2005 12:36AM (EST)

Dialoguing – Neo-Buddhist and 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 materials]

[050321 cg] Yes, I believe G-d transcends all duality.

[050324 djs] I understand that is what you believe but the question is not what do you believe but why do you believe it. Why is it you 'believe' G-d must 'transcend' duality as opposed to G-d embracing duality? Why do you reject G-d interacting with duality? Why do you reject duality being an aspect of G-d?

[050325 cg] Perhaps we have a simple misunderstanding of MY meaning of the term, "ONE G-d". See below.

: [deleted materials]

[050324 djs] The fundamental duality of symbiotic panentheism is the existence of the non-discrete, G-d, and the existence of the discrete, individuated entities of knowing.

[050325 cg] We have a simple misunderstanding of MY meaning of the term, "ONE G-d". See below.

: [deleted materials]

[050324 djs] First of all: The G-d to which you and I refer contains 'non-existence' since non-existence cannot exist 'outside' G-d. We could discuss this concept but that would introduce an entirely different discussion. The discussion of nothingness being 'outside' G-d would, in essence, reduce G-d to being 'lesser' than nothingness and thus, by definition, nothingness would be G-d.

[050325 cg] Again, we have a simple misunderstanding of MY meaning of the term, "ONE G-d". See below.

[050324 djs] Second: In terms of the concept of there being a Higher Reality than G-d.

Symbiotic panentheism would state that yes there is a Higher Reality than the G-d of which we can conceive and thus a Higher Reality than the G-d of which we speak. But the question then becomes: Why aren't we discussing the Higher Reality? We are not discussing the Higher Reality because it is beyond our comprehension. Some philosophers, theists, and theosophers have speculated that the only way to discuss such a Higher Reality is through the process of 'negation' or what a metaphysicist might term 'theoretical metaphysics'. For details see:
<http://www.panentheism.com/Pages/begin01.html>

[050325 cg] MY meaning of the term "ONE G-d" refers to the Ultimate Reality, the Highest of Highs (or Holiest of Holies). Truly nameless, ONE G-d is the omnipresence of pure existence, eternal and infinite.

[050326 djs] If you are speaking of the Higher Reality, if you are speaking of the reality beyond our comprehension, if you are speaking of the reality we can only begin to understand through the process of negation, then omnipresence is not a characteristic of this 'ONE G-d' for the concept of omnipresence is understood by ourselves and as such must be discarded if one uses the process of negation.

Understanding G-d through the process of negation, by definition, means we must discard all we know in order to begin to understand. Eternity – all concepts of time - and infinity – all concepts of size - must also be discarded.

The discussion we have been having is, in essence, not about the nameless G-d, but rather the discussion is one of metaphysics – What is the first layer which lies beyond the physical and what is its relationship to the physical and what is the relationship of the physical to it. It is this discussion which has led us to the examination of eternity, infinity, consciousness, awareness, the physical universe, nothingness, the physical, the soul, the individuated entity of knowing, the whole of knowing, the purpose for the existence of the individual, the purpose for the existence of nothingness, the purpose for the existence of the physical universe, the purpose of discrete consciousness, the discrete, the non-discrete,

As to a discussion of the a Higher Reality than that of which we are capable of comprehending, well that, by definition is beyond our ability to discuss.

: [deleted materials]

[050324 djs] First of all the model is called 'symbiotic' panentheism not panentheism. The 'symbiotic' aspect acknowledges the interaction of each aspect of reality upon the other. There are three such aspects of reality. They could be

referred to as 'G-d / The Singularity' / non-discrete being, 'individuated entities of knowing / discrete beings', and 'nothingness / physical reality / the physical universe / the lack of the discrete and the lack of the non-discrete.

[050325 cg] For you, there is a trinity of elemental essences, G-d, mind and the physical. For me, there is only ONE G-d.

[050326 djs] I am not sure what we are discussing here. Are you discussion the Higher Reality, the reality beyond our ability to comprehend, beyond consciousness, nothingness, and/or physicalness or are you discussing the concepts of which we are capable of perceiving?

If we are discussing that of which we are incapable of comprehending, then, regarding the concept of ONEness, who are we to say?

If we are discussing that of which we are capable of comprehending then I would agree there is only ONE G-d but where we disagree is in the concept regarding G-d's expansiveness. You say there is only singularity and no duality to G-d and I say there is both singularity and duality to G-d.

Again I ask you: Which is the most probable concept of G-d:

Poly-Solipsism – many “I's” - G-d is Multiplicity and no duality as cck states

ONEness – singularity - G-d is only singularity no duality as you state

Or

Symbiotic panentheism – G-d is both singularity and duality – singularity and duality existing simultaneously

Ignoring what you personally believe, or what cck personally believes, or what I personally believe: If we speak of G-d in terms of what we are capable of conceiving then do we define G-d as being limited or do we speak of G-d as being the greatest existence of which we are capable of conceiving?

: [deleted materials]

[050324 djs] You acknowledge the concept of the uncaused and indestructible (non-

discrete / G-d) but again you appear to shrug off the concept of there being 'the caused and indestructible' (discrete / individuated entities of knowing) and 'the caused and destructible' (not discrete and not non-discrete (excuse the double negative) / nothingness / the physical universe)

[050324 djs] Why the limits? What is wrong with considering the boundless? What leads you to think the discrete individuated entity of knowing eventually simply ceases to be, a process which describes the loss of ...?

[050325 cg] For some, "Reality is what we imagine." But for me, nothing we imagine is Reality. What we experience is real, but it is only temporary. The ONE G-d is Omnipresent Reality.

[050326 djs] Symbiotic panentheism would say: What we imagine is real and cannot be destroyed. What we experience is real and cannot be destroyed. The singularity (the Whole) aspect of G-d is Omnipresent. The duality (Individuated entities of knowing) of G-d are not Omnipresent.

Singularity and duality, both existing simultaneously.

[050325 cg] ALL (discrete) "things" are conditional. It is the nature of "things" to arise and pass away as conditions warrant. You fear that ONE G-d will suffer a loss if a "thing passes away", but there never was a "thing" to lose. Why? The secret is that ALL (discrete) "things" are composite, so there is no "thing" that has self-existence.

[050326 djs] I 'fear' no such thing. This is not a case of 'fear' versus 'courage'. This is simply a case of having a discussion based upon what is or is not rational, what is or is not observable, and what is or is not believable. If I were concerned with 'fear' I would never have gone down the road of metaphysics. To take the journey of a metaphysicist I was required to discard all I 'believed' and start from scratch.

I used my free will willingly and cast aside G-d, cast aside religion, cast aside science, and cast aside philosophy, in order to take the path of the metaphysicist for the metaphysicist must start from scratch if they are to understand the structure of reality. Now this is not to say that G-d does not come back into the equation but it does say that G-d does not come back into the equation either. G-d remains out of the equation until the metaphysicist can validate the concept of G-d through the use of all three of our perceptual abilities, namely: what we can observe, what we can rationalize, and what we can believe.

The road of the metaphysicist is not one to be taken lightly.

[050325 cg] At the top of this post you asked, "Why is it you 'believe' G-d must 'transcend' duality ... ?" I wish I could share and communicate my path, but I am not a philosopher, teacher, or preacher. I'm a simple believer and I can't believe otherwise, because non-existence is not credible and ONE is irreducible.

[050326 djs] I respect your 'beliefs'. But are you also saying that you are incapable of stepping 'beyond' your beliefs and thus incapable of discussing models of reality based upon concepts which might not conform to your 'beliefs'?

[050325 cg] You must examine Reality directly.

[050326 djs] Exactly.

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

Thursday, March 24

Dialogue: Neo-Buddhist, Poly-Solipsist, and Symbiotic Panentheist: Duality versus Singularity

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 24, 2005 11:39PM (EST)

[050321 cck] Dan, my dear friend, you are still thinking of god as you do the line. You see your God as The Line, and everything else as 'points' within The Line. In your analogy you can remove the points and still have The Line.

With The Singularity The Line does not exist in and of itself, there are only the points and together the points form The Line.

There is no Divine entity of "GOD" which is greater than all else, and it alone created and controls all else. "All else" together are god. "All else" together create god. If you remove a point there is no line.

cck

[050324 djs] Regarding your comment: Dan, my dear friend, you are still thinking of god as you do the line. You see your God as The Line, and everything else as 'points' within The Line. In your analogy you can remove the points and still have The Line... That is correct.

Regarding your comment: ... With The Singularity The Line does not exist in and of itself, there are only the points and together the points form The Line...

Again, I understand your position.

Regarding your comment: ... There is no Divine entity of "GOD" which is greater than all else, and it alone created and controls all else.

Again, I understand your position. Symbiotic panentheism dismantles the concept of hierarchical relationships. God is not 'greater' than any more than the individual is 'greater' than. Each has a part to play. Each is significant. Each is important to the other.

Regarding your comment: "All else" together are god. "All else" together create god. If you remove a point there is no line.

You can remove all the points you wish from a line and you have not diminished the line.

A line has no parts. A line is a non-discrete entity. A line is in essence the infinite potentiality of 'point-ness'.

If a point were consciousness it would be a discrete individuated entity of knowing. If a line were consciousness it would be the non-discrete entity of the summation of all consciousness. Once the point of consciousness is identified, 'becomes', it cannot be destroyed any more than the concept of the point 'two' can be destroyed once it has been

identified. Once you 'become' you can no more be destroyed than can any other form of consciousness be it a form of individuated discrete consciousness or The Whole of Consciousness. Non-duality, singularity exists but not as the one and only form of existence. Non-duality exists but not as the one and only form of existence.

Symbiotic panentheism does not deny The Singularity. Symbiotic panentheism does not deny the multiplicity. Symbiotic panentheism does not deny 'nothingness'. Symbiotic panentheism is a model, and as far as I know the only model, which not only acknowledges the existence of the non-Discrete, the discrete, and nothingness but does so while demonstrating the symbiotic relationship which exists between all three.

In short, symbiotic panentheism embraces and includes, while other systems reject and exclude.

Symbiotic panentheism has two fundamental premises:

Nothing is lost.

Everything has meaning.

[050319 cg] I agree that there is ONE G-d (another name for the Singularity) and ALL that is, is the substance and essence of the ONE G-d. The 'illusion' is OUR belief in the separateness of 'things'. The ONE G-d is and we call this 'the Universe', and this 'our mind', and this 'another', etc. And still there is only ONE G-d.

: [deleted materials]

[050319 cck] The problem mankind as failed to resolve is how can "Something" issue from "Nothing"? We cannot explain how the Discrete came into existence from a void of Nothingness.[050319 cck] Poly-Solipsism dispenses with the problem of both by recognizing there is no-thing discrete and there never was a void of Nothingness.

[050320 djs] Interesting. It appears to me that the two of you, cg and cck, have one thing in common, namely: You both appear to think G-d lacks duality, lacks the characteristic of 'discreteness'.

[050321 cg] Yes, I believe G-d transcends all duality.

[050324 djs] I understand that is what you believe but the question is not what do you believe but why do you believe it. Why is it you 'believe' G-d must 'transcend' duality as opposed to G-d embracing duality? Why do you reject G-d interacting with duality? Why do you reject duality being an aspect of G-d?

[050320 djs] It is here that I diverge from you both. Symbiotic panentheism is a model of the whole of Reality, a model of G-d, which demonstrates that G-d is both discrete in nature and simultaneously non-discrete in nature.

[050320 djs] Symbiotic panentheism embraces the attributes you both make regarding what is but disagrees with your adamant statements of what is not. In short: Where the two of you reject characteristics of G-d, symbiotic panentheism understands such characteristics exist and exist for a reason. For example, symbiotic panentheism specifically states: Nothingness exists and G-d uses nothingness. Individuated entities of knowing exist, are divine in nature, and interact in a symbiotic manner with G-d. Duality exists. The discrete exists.

[050321 cg] Then is it accurate to state that symbiotic panentheism is a dualistic philosophy; i.e., "a theory that considers reality to consist of two irreducible elements or modes" (courtesy of Merriam-Webster) and that the fundamental duality of symbiotic panentheism is an existent G-d and "nothingness"; i.e., non-existence? How does "non-existence" exist? And if there is G-d and non-existence, then is there is a Higher Reality than G-d that contains both G-d and non-existence?

[050324 djs] Regarding your comment: Then is it accurate to state that symbiotic panentheism is a dualistic philosophy; ... That is correct.

Regarding your comment: i.e., "a theory that considers reality to consist of two irreducible elements or modes" ... That is correct.

Regarding your comment: ... and that the fundamental duality of symbiotic panentheism is an existent G-d and "nothingness"; i.e., non-existence? ... No, that aspect is not correct.

The fundamental duality of symbiotic panentheism is the existence of the non-discrete, G-d, and the existence of the discrete, individuated entities of knowing.

Regarding your comment: ... How does "non-existence" exist? ... You are asking me to explain how G-d could possible 'create' non-existence. I cannot. I could speculate but I am not G-d. What I am stating is that G-d is all knowing and as such is all powerful and as such would not only have the ability to 'create' non-existence but would have the knowledge to do so. In short I am not limiting G-d to what it is 'I believe' G-d is capable of being, is capable of accomplishing, or is capable of knowing.

My work, www.panentheism.com, does examine the concept of nothingness in great detail but it never stipulates that the speculation it purports is absolute truth. Its intent is to begin the process of cultivating 'out of the box' thinking and examine the possibility that

perhaps we are minimizing the capabilities of G-d or in short: Our G-d may be too small for our present day awareness.

Regarding your comment: ... **And if there is G-d and non-existence, then is there is a Higher Reality than G-d that contains both G-d and non-existence?**

First of all: The G-d to which you and I refer contains 'non-existence' since non-existence cannot exist 'outside' G-d. We could discuss this concept but that would introduce an entirely different discussion. The discussion of nothingness being 'outside' G-d would, in essence, reduce G-d to being 'lesser' than nothingness and thus, by definition, nothingness would be G-d.

Second: In terms of the concept of there being a Higher Reality than G-d. Symbiotic pantheism would state that yes there is a Higher Reality than the G-d of which we can conceive and thus a Higher Reality than the G-d of which we speak. But the question then becomes: Why aren't we discussing the Higher Reality? We are not discussing the Higher Reality because it is beyond our comprehension. Some philosophers, theists, and theosophers have speculated that the only way to discuss such a Higher Reality is through the process of 'negation' or what a metaphysicist might term 'theoretical metaphysics'. For details see: <http://www.pantheism.com/Pages/begin01.html>

[050321 cg] Regarding your statement that, "The discrete exists." Courtesy of Merriam-Webster, the word "discrete" means "constituting a separate entity" and "entity" means "independent, separate, or self-contained existence". There is only G-d (the Singularity), which is independent (uncaused), separate and self-contained existence (unbound and infinite).

[050324 djs] Regarding your comment: "discrete" means "constituting a separate entity"...
Yes

Regarding your comment: ... **and "entity" means "independent**, Courtesy of Merriam-Webster, the word 'independent' means 'not dependent', 'not subject to control by others', 'self governing' ...

First of all the model is called 'symbiotic' pantheism not pantheism. The 'symbiotic' aspect acknowledges the interaction of each aspect of reality upon the other. There are three such aspects of reality. They could be referred to as 'G-d / The Singularity' / non-discrete being, 'individuated entities of knowing / discrete beings', and 'nothingness / physical reality / the physical universe / the lack of the discrete and the lack of the non-discrete.

Regarding your comment: ... **or self-contained existence" ... Yes**

Regarding your comment: ... **There is only G-d (the Singularity), which is independent (uncaused), separate and self-contained existence (unbound and infinite).**

...

You acknowledge the concept of the uncaused and indestructible (non-discrete / G-d) but again you appear to shrug off the concept of there being 'the caused and indestructible' (discrete / individuated entities of knowing) and 'the caused and destructible' (not discrete and not non-discrete (excuse the double negative) / nothingness / the physical universe)

Why the limits? What is wrong with considering the boundless? What leads you to think the discrete individuated entity of knowing eventually simply ceases to be, a process which describes the loss of ...?

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

Monday, March 21

Dialogue: Neo-Buddhist, Poly-Solipsist, and Symbiotic Panentheist: Duality versus Singularity

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 21, 2005 12:05AM (EST)

Dialoguing – Poly-Solipsist, Neo-Buddhist and 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.

ccKeiser is an original metaphysical thinker and is developing a concept known as 'poly-solipsism'. For more information regarding ccKeiser and 'poly-solipsism' or to contact ccKeiser go to: www.poly-solipsism.com

[050319 cg] I agree that there is ONE G-d (another name for the Singularity) and ALL that is, is the substance and essence of the ONE G-d. The 'illusion' is OUR belief in the separateness of 'things'. The ONE G-d is and we call this 'the Universe', and this 'our mind', and this 'another', etc. And still there is only ONE G-d.

I agree that there is ONE G-d (the Singularity), but I do not ascribe the characteristic of consciousness to G-d. We, sentient beings, hold consciousness in high regard (and our egos as supremely important) and project that onto G-d. I am not arguing that G-d is material, nor am I arguing that G-d is not consciousness. I am stating that G-d is beyond the duality of materiality/consciousness, that G-d is the foundation of all 'things', both physical and mental.

[050319 cck] I am not sure I can agree with you that your One God is another name for what I call The Singularity. It all depends on how you define your god.

If you will agree that the only definition of god is "First Cause," without describing any other attributes, then your God and The Singularity are the same. But if you add attributes beyond Consciousness then you are leaving the confines of The Singularity and describing only the god that exists in your own mind. The god you have created for yourself to believe in. Any attributes assigned to your god, are the attributes you have assigned. And that is the problem.

You and Dan; and just about everyone else, argue over the attributes of god. You all disagree because you are each arguing about a different god. You and Dan are not talking about the same god. You each envision different attributes for the god you each have

chosen to believe in. They are not the same god, each is the god you perceive in your own minds, and each of your gods only exists in your own minds.

There are no answers. There are only choices.

From Act II: page 3:

First Cause:

For us to know what Reality is, we must first know what The First Cause is, but because First Cause; whether you call it God or The Singularity, is both Infinite and Unbound it cannot ever be fully defined. An Unbound Infinity can be anything and everything at anytime, or at 'everytime.'

We cannot say what it is, and we cannot say what it is not, because it can always be more than what we say.

The only thing we can know about The First Cause is what it caused. Since no-thing can exist 'in' First Cause because everything is part of First Cause, any attributes we can assign to the components of any system, are by default, attributes of the system itself. A system cannot assign attributes to it's components that it does not manifest itself!

The only thing we know for certain is We Exist. We do not exist in First Cause, everything is woven from the essence of First Cause, and therefore any attributes we can assign to ourselves are by default also attributes of First Cause.

If we wield Occam's Razor on its sharpest edge by not complicating anything more than necessary, anything we try to append to We Exist is only a further complication and is not necessary. 'We Exist' is not only all we are certain of; it is all that is necessary to explain everything else. The only thing we know exists is the only thing that needs to exist. We are First Cause.

Reality and the Universe thus become an extension of our own attributes. And what are our attributes? The one attribute that defines us is the same attribute that grants us knowledge of our own existence: Consciousness: We Think.

With Poly-Solipsism there is no Duality because there are no "Physical Things." There is only the Consciousness of Mind.

The problem mankind as failed to resolve is how can "Something" issue from "Nothing"? We cannot explain how the Discrete came into existence from a void of Nothingness.

Poly-Solipsism dispenses with the problem of both by recognizing there is no-thing discrete and there never was a void of Nothingness.

[050320 djs] Interesting. It appears to me that the two of you, cg and cck, have one thing in common, namely: You both appear to think G-d lacks duality, lacks the characteristic of 'discreteness'.

It is here that I diverge from you both. Symbiotic panentheism is a model of the whole of Reality, a model of G-d, which demonstrates that G-d is both discrete in nature and simultaneously non-discrete in nature.

Symbiotic panentheism embraces the attributes you both make regarding what is but disagrees with your adamant statements of what is not. In short: Where the two of you reject characteristics of G-d, symbiotic panentheism understands such characteristics exist and exist for a reason. For example, symbiotic panentheism specifically states: Nothingness exists and G-d uses nothingness. Individuated entities of knowing exist, are divine in nature, and interact in a symbiotic manner with G-d. Duality exists. The discrete exists.

In short, symbiotic panentheism would agree with the positive statements you both make as to G-d's attributes but symbiotic panentheism would argue against the negative statements you both make as to G-d's attributes.

It makes me think: Which understanding of G-d would most likely be correct, an understanding of G-d with limits defined by man or an understanding of G-d with no limits? Hmmm, perhaps the two of you can clarify for me how it is both of you are so sure the limits you place on G-d are in 'fact' an accurate description of G-d.

Regarding: **If you will agree that the only definition of god is "First Cause.**

I don't know about cg but symbiotic panentheism would not agree that the only definition of G-d is 'First Cause'.

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

Sunday, March 20



by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 20, 2005 12:05AM (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.

[050305 cg] What is a "point of awareness"? Does awareness, such as the awareness of the experience of the bouncing ball, occur in time? Does the awareness have a beginning and end?

[050313 djs] A 'point of awareness' is the conscious awareness of having experienced an event.

[050316 cg] It seems that, according to sp, a 'point of awareness' is the awareness of a memory of "having experienced an event". Is that accurate?

[050317 djs] Yes, however we are speaking of more than just a 'memory'. We are speaking of awareness in all sense of the word.

[050313 djs] The awareness of the experiencing of the bouncing ball occurs in time when we are within the physical. When we are not in the physical, when we are located outside the physical universe, the awareness of the bouncing ball does not occur in time but rather occurs in the lack of time. In both cases, however, the awareness of the bouncing ball includes the concept of the bouncing ball taking place in time and thus the 'point of awareness' incorporates time as an aspect of the 'point of occurrence'.

[050316 cg] When are you 'within the physical'? When are you 'outside the physical'?

[050317 djs] There are most probably multiple means of being 'within the physical' but in terms of this discussion I am inside the physical when my self-awareness is confined by a physical body found within the physical universe or when my self-awareness is confined within the physical void a physical body.

In terms of this discussion, I am 'outside the physical' when my self-awareness no longer is confined by a physical body and no longer confined within the 'bounds/limits' of the physical.

[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.

[050305 cg] Why not clearly and fully state the position sp takes on this?

[050313 djs] OK, let me try to do that.

1. The individual exists.
2. The physical universe exists - its universal fabric is composed of time, space, matter, energy, ...
3. An outside of the universe exists. - its universal fabric is 'knowing'
4. The physical universe exists inside G-d, inside All Knowing
5. When the individuated entity of knowing is inside the physical universe that entity experiences physical events and thus time becomes a part of its knowing.
6. Time is not a part of the universal fabric outside the physical universe.
7. When the individuated entity of knowing is 'outside' the physical universe, the entity is aware of its having experienced a 'sequence of time' in the form of 'events'.

This is stated in detail and diagrammed in detail within the site www.panentheism.com.

[050316 cg] So, according to sp, there is an "inside the physical universe" and an "outside the physical universe". Where are you now? When are you 'inside' and when are you 'outside' the physical universe?

[050317 djs] Well, at this point in time I am in time and therefore I am inside the physical communicating with you. Regarding, 'when are you 'outside' the physical universe', I'm not sure. When am I 'freed' of the bonds of time? I'm not sure. Do I experience multiple lives? I'm not sure. Will I ever be freed of the bounds of the physical? I'm not sure. Will I ever experience the purity of G-d? I'm not sure. Will ... ? I'm not sure.

What about symbiotic panentheism? How would the model of symbiotic panentheism answer these questions? It would not.

These are questions to be addressed by religion, not by myself and certainly not by the model. Is religion still a necessity in the life of the individual if one understands the model of symbiotic panentheism? For some yes, for some no, and as such the need for religion does not change.

[050316 cg] What experiences, if any, occur 'outside' of time? What awareness, if any, occurs 'outside' of time? (Examples please.)

[050317 djs] Question 1: All experiences to which you contributed while your essence was 'inside' time. Torture a man and you can empathize with his agony. Question 2: All awareness involving events to which you were connected. Torture a man and you become aware not only aware of the agony you caused the man but you become of the agony you created for his family, friends, and ...

Symbiotic panentheism uses the term, ripple effect, to describe what one would experience 'outside' time, what one would experience when immersed in a realm of 'All Knowing'.

[050316 cg] It seems that, according to sp (#5 above), experience occurs 'inside' and that, according to sp (#7 above), memory occurs 'outside' the physical universe. Is that accurate?

[050317 djs] It is not a case of simple memory occurring 'outside' the physical universe, it is total awareness in all aspects of the word. You do not just remember it you experience it in all sense of the word.

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

Saturday, March 19



by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 19, 2005 01:37AM (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 materials]

[050313 djs] I look around me and I see fabulous sights. I feel the movement of the wind which moves the clouds which bring the rain to water the flowers. I smell the fragrance of flowers and know it attracts the bees which in turn carry the pollen which fertilizes the egg. I savor the sweet taste of honey which provides the energy I use to mate with my spouse which conceives my child, G-d's child. I mentor my child, G-d's child who appears to gain knowing which appears to be an intangible form of existence which is independent of time, space, matter, and energy. I do all this as I sit in the shade and watch and listen and think and I wonder at it all. As I think about it and take it all in the thought keeps coming back to me that the cycle surely exists for a reason. I look at my children, I look at all individuals, and I am in awe. I cannot shake the understanding that these knowing entities, that these seeming sparks of the divine, that the individuated entities of knowing, have been created and cannot be destroyed for they all appear to be of the same substance and essence as G-d.

: [deleted materials]

[050313 djs] Until I 'see' existence in some form or other which does not have a function, does not have a purpose, does not have meaning, what else am I to think other than the physical universe and all existences within it have a function, have a purpose, have meaning? As such the question just naturally emerges: Why do I exist?

[050316 cg] Reality is interdependent on every 'thing' and not one 'thing', not an atom, not stone, not a star, not a flower, not a person, not a thought, not one 'thing' can be eliminated, for Reality could not exist lacking even the smallest of 'thing'. That is the "purpose" of every 'thing', including you. Is that "purpose" enough?

[050317 djs] Regarding your first statement: The model of symbiotic panentheism would concur, nothing is meaningless.

Regarding your second question: Is that 'purpose' enough?

No, humanity has long sought the answer to the question: Why does the individual, why do I, exist? To answer the question: You exist for the same reason a rock exists, has never been accepted, by the majority of humans, to be a satisfactory answer.

One may then ask the question: Is it rational for humans to assume they have a different function in reality than a rock or an atom?

Symbiotic panentheism would say: Yes, it is rational for humans to assume they have a different function in reality than a rock or an atom since they are 'obviously' (theologically, scientifically, and philosophically) different than a rock or an atom.

Symbiotic panentheism demonstrates how it is that 'different' forms of existence have different functions, different generic purposes.

[050313 djs] Having asked the question, it then seems only natural to deduce that if I am able to understand my purpose for existing I, like all individuals, would understand how to fulfill that purpose.

[050316 cg] **What do you believe is your purpose for existing?**

[050317 djs] As a unique entity whose base essence is awareness, 'I' 'believe', as the model of reality outlined by symbiotic panentheism demonstrates, my purpose lies in experiencing uniquely which in turn acts as the process whereby Total Awareness, G-d if you will, circumvents the negative impact of eternal recurrence.

[Deleted material] ...

[050305 cg] **What is a "point of experiencing"? Does an experience, such as the perception of the bouncing ball, occur in time? Does the experience (perception) have a beginning and end?**

[050313 djs] A 'point of experiencing' is the conscious awareness of experiencing an event. In the case of the bouncing ball, the point of experiencing is the conscious visual experiencing of such an event, or if inside the ball itself, the conscious experiencing of the ball bouncing while you are within the ball itself, etc.

[050313 djs] In the case of ourselves, the perception of the bouncing ball occurs in time for we, as discrete entities of knowing, are presently 'within' a time existence, 'within' the

physical, experience the physical.

[050313 djs] As discrete beings we understand the event to have had a beginning and an end.

[050316 cg] It seems that, according to sp, a 'point of experience' is the awareness of an experience (a perception) of an event and occurs 'within' the physical and 'within' time. Is that accurate?

[050317 djs] Yes, but the model of symbiotic panentheism also demonstrates experiencing occurs in 'regions' other than within the physical and within time.

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

Friday, March 18



by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 18, 2005 01:24AM (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.

Note: This interchange jumps ahead of previous unattended blog questions cg has submitted. I may go back and address previously unanswered questions but these submissions on the part of cg have specifically caught my attention and will therefore take up my immediate attention.

[Deleted material] ...

[050305 cg] I fail to understand how a preference for one thing over another thing could arise in G-d, who is whole and perfect. G-d entertaining a preference sounds anthropomorphic and such beliefs ("G-d is on our side.") have resulted in the deaths of millions of sentient beings.

[050313 djs] Regarding your comment: 'I fail to understand how a preference for one thing over another thing could arise in G-d, who is whole and perfect.'

[050313 djs] 'G-d is on our side' - I just love Bob Dylan's music. But back to the discussion.

[050313 djs] What does being 'whole and perfect' have to do with preferences? If G-d is The All, is The Whole, is omniscient - all knowing, then surely this would imply G-d is not only capable of understanding the individuals plight but empathizing with it. If this is the case then would it not seem rational to suggest G-d would prefer love over hate, compassion over spite, tenderness over cruelty, brotherhood over racism/genderism/homophobia/...?

[050314 cg] You asked, "What does being 'whole and perfect' have to do with preferences?" G-d being 'whole' means that G-d is not lacking and G-d being 'perfect' means there is no adding to or subtracting from G-d. Because G-d is not lacking, G-d has no needs or wants, and because G-d has no needs or wants, no preferences arise. Because there is no adding to or subtracting from G-d, G-d is not enhanced if A (e.g. - love) happens nor is G-d diminished if not-A (e.g. - hate) happens, and because G-d is neither enhanced nor diminished, no preferences arise.

[050317 djs] Regarding 'perfection': The model of symbiotic panentheism would suggest the concept of 'perfection' is a human value judgement. G-d is what G-d is and that in itself is by definition 'perfection'.

To suggest, however, that G-d is incapable of loving or hating is to suggest we, limited beings, can do what G-d cannot. Symbiotic panentheism would suggest this is not the case.

Regarding 'adding' or 'subtracting' from G-d: If the universal fabric, universal characteristic of G-d is one of timelessness, then the concept of 'addition' is not an issue when G-d 'grows' since G-d is what G-d is and if one 'adds' one's self-awareness to G-d this in no way changes what G-d is, namely: G-d, namely: The Whole, namely: what is.

[050314 cg] You then assert that G-d is all knowing. I agree that G-d is the ALL and the WHOLE. I agree that G-d, as the ALL and the WHOLE, is omnipresent, but I do not agree that G-d is all knowing. An argument to refute 'G-d is all knowing' is: knowing entails a knower and an object known and without the duality of a knower and an object known, there is no knowing; G-d, as the ALL and WHOLE, is without duality, including the duality of subject and object; therefore, G-d is not all knowing.

[050317 djs] The model of symbiotic panentheism would concur with you, however, the model of symbiotic panentheism suggests the concept you outline is but one of many aspects of G-d and the characteristic of 'all knowing' is simply another aspect of being The All.

Regarding the comment: 'An argument to refute 'G-d is all knowing' is: knowing entails a knower and an object known and without the duality of a knower and an object known, there is no knowing; G-d, as the ALL and WHOLE, is without duality, including the duality of subject and object; ...'

Symbiotic panentheism would suggest there are several aspects of 'knower and an object known, ...'

Symbiotic panentheism suggest such a relationship exists and we, 'knowing entities', are but one of many such potential entities.

Symbiotic panentheism would also suggest, G-d is quite capable of performing the same acts as are other forms of 'knowing entities'.

[050314 cg] Finally, you have ascribed to G-d all manner of human preferences and characteristics.

[050313 djs] As for the 'perfection' of G-d, symbiotic panentheism would agree while simultaneously placing 'imperfection' at the feet of the individual.

[050313 djs] Regarding your comment: '...G-d entertaining a preference sounds anthropomorphic ...'

[050313 djs] 'Anthropomorphic': adj. - 1. described or thought of as having human form or human attributes 2. ascribing human characteristics to non-human things: Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Edition.

[050313 djs] I am so glad you brought this topic up. Anthropomorphism is in no way connected to the model of symbiotic panentheism. What sp does is ascribe a characteristic of the non-discrete to G-d while simultaneously ascribing the characteristic of the discrete to G-d.

[050314 cg] It may not seem so to you, but love, compassion, tenderness, brotherhood are "human characteristics" and you have ascribed them to G-d; that is, by definition, anthropomorphism.

[050317 djs] The model of symbiotic panentheism would concur, however, the model of symbiotic panentheism suggests that should such concepts as compassion, love, tenderness, brotherhood, ... not be universal characteristics of individuated entities of knowing found within other beings scattered throughout the physical universe or found within individuated entities of knowing found 'outside' the physical universe would equally be ascribed to G-d's ability to empathize.

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

Wednesday, March 16

 **Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: Why search for meaning?**

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 16, 2005 01:12AM (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 materials]

[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.

[050220 djs] 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.

[050225 cg] **A father and mother looking at their new born child for the first time do not ask why or for what purpose the child exists. Why do you? The creation of stars and life and sentient beings may simply be (to speak metaphorically) what G-d does naturally.**

[050313 djs] Regarding your comment: **A father and mother looking at their new born child for the first time do not ask why or for what purpose the child exists. Why do you?**

I look around me and I see fabulous sights. I feel the movement of the wind which moves the clouds which bring the rain to water the flowers. I smell the fragrance of flowers and know it attracts the bees which in turn carry the pollen which fertilizes the egg. I savor the sweet taste of honey which provides the energy I use to mate with my spouse which conceives my child, G-d's child. I mentor my child, G-d's child who appears to gain knowing which appears to be an intangible form of existence which is independent of time, space, matter, and energy. I do all this as I sit in the shade and watch and listen and think and I wonder at it all. As I think about it and take it all in the thought keeps coming back to me that the cycle surely exists for a reason. I look at my children, I look at all individuals, and I am in awe. I cannot shake the understanding that these knowing entities, that these seeming sparks of the divine, that the individuated entities of knowing, have been created and cannot be destroyed for they all appear to be of the same substance and essence as G-d.

I understand that 'nothing is lost'.

I understand that nothing is meaningless.

[050313 djs] Regarding your comment: [The creation of stars and life and sentient beings may simply be \(to speak metaphorically\) what G-d does naturally.](#)

Until I 'see' existence in some form or other which does not have a function, does not have a purpose, does not have meaning, what else am I to think other than the physical universe and all existences within it have a function, have a purpose, have meaning? As such the question just naturally emerges: Why do I exist?

Having asked the question, it then seems only natural to deduce that if I am able to understand my purpose for existing I, like all individuals, would understand how to fulfill that purpose.

I 'believe' the answer to the question - Why do I exist? - will provide the common foundation needed to change the history vector of human behavior.

It is for this reason that I seek to establish the answer to the question: Why do I exist?

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

Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: Nothing clouds understanding like details

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 16, 2005 12:55AM (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] 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.

[050220 djs] Regarding your question: **'What other meaning does the word "point" have in that context?**

[050220 djs] Does the above answer this question to your satisfaction?

[050305 cg] **What is a "point of occurrence"? Does an event, such as a bouncing ball, occur in time? Does the event have a beginning and end?**

[050313 djs] Within the physical universe a 'point of occurrence' is a specific time frame. The time frame may be only a 'moment' or may be a span of time. A bouncing ball, the action of the physical object itself, occurs in time and has a beginning and end.

The conscious knowing of the bouncing ball, the conscious knowing of the action of the physical object itself, does not occur in time but rather is aware of the cause and effect relationship of the point of occurrence.

[050305 cg] **What is a "point of experiencing"? Does an experience, such as the perception of the bouncing ball, occur in time? Does the experience (perception) have a beginning and end?**

[050313 djs] A 'point of experiencing' is the conscious awareness of experiencing an event. In the case of the bouncing ball, the point of experiencing is the conscious visual experiencing of such an event, or if inside the ball itself, the conscious experiencing of the ball bouncing while you are within the ball itself, etc.

In the case of ourselves, the perception of the bouncing ball occurs in time for we, as discrete entities of knowing, are presently 'within' a time existence, 'within' the physical, experience the physical.

As discrete beings we understand the event to have had a beginning and an end.

[050305 cg] **What is a "point of awareness"? Does awareness, such as the awareness of the experience of the bouncing ball, occur in time? Does the awareness have a beginning and end?**

[050313 djs] A 'point of awareness' is the conscious awareness of having experienced an event.

The awareness of the experiencing of the bouncing ball occurs in time when we are within the physical. When we are not in the physical, when we are located outside the physical

universe, the awareness of the bouncing ball does not occur in time but rather occurs in the lack of time. In both cases, however, the awareness of the bouncing ball includes the concept of the bouncing ball taking place in time and thus the 'point of awareness' incorporates time as an aspect of the 'point of occurrence'.

[\[050220 cg\] 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.

[\[050305 cg\] Why not clearly and fully state the position sp takes on this?](#)

[050313 djs] OK, let me try to do that.

1. The individual exists.
2. The physical universe exists – its universal fabric is composed of time, space, matter, energy, ...
3. An outside of the universe exists. – its universal fabric is 'knowing'
4. The physical universe exists inside G-d, inside All Knowing
5. When the individuated entity of knowing is inside the physical universe that entity experiences physical events and thus time becomes a part of its knowing.
6. Time is not a part of the universal fabric outside the physical universe.
7. When the individuated entity of knowing is 'outside' the physical universe, the entity is aware of its having experienced a 'sequence of time' in the form of 'events'.

This is stated in detail and diagrammed in detail within the site www.panentheism.com.

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

Tuesday, March 15

 Dialogue with a Poly-Solipsist: The 'I' is not the All

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 15, 2005 02:43PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Poly-Solipsist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

ccKeiser is an original metaphysical thinker and is developing a concept known as 'poly-solipsism'. For more information regarding ccKeiser and 'poly-solipsism' or to contact ccKeiser go to:

<http://userweb.nni.com/keiser/42d.html>

050302 djs] Regarding your comment: 'All "Truths" are perceived truths.' On the surface, this statement is correct but its implications are misleading.

In terms of the complete understanding of reality, there are 'perceived truths' that are in fact 'truths' and there are 'perceived truths' which are in fact not 'truths' but which are, instead, misinterpretations we make using either inaccurate observations, beliefs, and/or reasoning or using too much information which in turns clouds the issues or using too little information which in turn provides an incomplete picture of reality.

Regarding your comment: Even "I Exist" is a perceived truth.' The truth 'I exist' is supported by an overwhelming assortment of scientific data, religious beliefs, and philosophical arguments which in turn makes it much more plausible that the statement is not just a 'perceived truth' but in fact represents 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / ...

cck:

None the less "I Exist" is a perceived truth, and all truths are perceived truths. No matter how "overwhelming" they may 'appear', all "evidence;" whether it be scientific measurements, religious faith, or philosophical reasoning, must be perceived within the mind.

We cannot say that which we know no-thing about is true or not. If it is not perceive in some manner, we cannot judge it.

Once it is within the mind it will become as true as we judge it to be.

It will become the truth that we perceive, and therefore we will become blind to anything that does not support that truth.

[050302 djs] Regarding your comment: 'None the less "I Exist" is a perceived truth, ...'

I agree.

Regarding your comment: '... and all truths are perceived truths. ...'

Again I agree, do not forget, however, that we also perceive non-truths and as with truths, non-truths are often perceived to be 'truth's' and thus are false 'perceived 'truths'. Just because these non-truths are perceived to be truths does not make them 'truths'.

Regarding your comment: '**... No matter how "overwhelming" they may 'appear', all "evidence;" whether it be scientific measurements, religious faith, or philosophical reasoning, must be perceived within the mind. ...**'

I agree.

Regarding your comment: '**... We cannot say that which we know no-thing about is true or not. If it is not perceive in some manner, we cannot judge it. ...**'

Again I agree.

Regarding your comment: '**... Once it is within the mind it will become as true as we judge it to be. ...**'

Just because we 'judge it to be true' does not make it so. I may judge one to be 'wrong' but that does not make them 'wrong' in spite of the fact that it is 'within' my mind.

Regarding your comment: '**... It will become the truth that we perceive, ...**'

I agree and disagree. Symbiotic panentheism also demonstrates that what we 'perceive' to be truth does not make it 'immutable truth', does not make it 'universal truth'. Symbiotic panentheism demonstrates there is 'truth' which lies 'outside' ourselves, which is truth in spite of what we as individuals think. Symbiotic panentheism demonstrates there is consciousness beyond the discrete individual and thus 'truth' beyond the discrete individual. This is one arena where I 'perceive' we differ.

Regarding your comment: '**... and therefore we will become blind to anything that does not support that truth.**'

I agree and disagree: Some will therefore become blind to anything that does not support that truth, however, there are others who are not only capable of 'changing' their fundamental understandings and there are also those who not only are capable of doing so but who do so.

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

Monday, March 14

 **Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: Symbiotic Panentheism versus Anthropomorphism**
by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 14, 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] ...

[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.

[050220 djs] Regarding your comment: '... Why would G-d have a preference?'

[050220 djs] 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?

[050305 cg] I fail to understand how a preference for one thing over another thing could arise in G-d, who is whole and perfect. G-d entertaining a preference sounds anthropomorphic and such beliefs ("G-d is on our side.") have resulted in the deaths of millions of sentient beings.

[050313 djs] Regarding your comment: 'I fail to understand how a preference for one thing over another thing could arise in G-d, who is whole and perfect.'

'G-d is on our side' – I just love Bob Dylan's music. But back to the discussion.

What does being 'whole and perfect' have to do with preferences? If G-d is The All, is The Whole, is omniscient – all knowing, then surely this would imply G-d is not only capable of

understanding the individuals plight but empathizing with it. If this is the case then would it not seem rational to suggest G-d would prefer love over hate, compassion over spite, tenderness over cruelty, brotherhood over racism/genderism/homophobia/...?

As for the 'perfection' of G-d, symbiotic panentheism would agree while simultaneously placing 'imperfection' at the feet of the individual.

[050313 djs] Regarding your comment: '[...G-d entertaining a preference sounds anthropomorphic ...](#)'

'Anthropomorphic': adj. – 1. described or thought of as having human form or human attributes 2. ascribing human characteristics to non-human things: Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Edition.

I am so glad you brought this topic up. Anthropomorphism is in no way connected to the model of symbiotic panentheism. What sp does is ascribe a characteristic of the non-discrete to G-d while simultaneously ascribing the characteristic of the discrete to G-d.

In terms of the discrete, sp in no way describes the discrete entity of knowing as taking on only an individual human soul form, but rather sp describes the discrete entity of knowing as taking on the form of all discrete knowing essences. Such entities of knowing are described as those entities of knowing with and without physical form, those entities having physical form found outside the planet earth, those entities described as having the characteristic of the discrete which may be found within other universes be those universes of a physical nature or otherwise, entities of discreteness found 'outside' universes themselves, ...

Sp, through the process of rationality, dismantles the concept of hierarchical relationships existing between individuated entities of knowing be they human or otherwise. Anthropomorphism is therefore an irrational concept within the framework of a symbiotic panentheistic understanding of reality.

Symbiotic panentheism establishes a 'universal morality' / a guideline for interaction based upon a rational understanding of the whole of reality which applies to all entities be they discrete in nature or otherwise.

In short, symbiotic panentheism is not anthropomorphic in nature but is rather sp is truly pluralistic in nature.

[050313 djs] Regarding your comment: '[...and such beliefs \("G-d is on our side."\) have resulted in the deaths of millions of sentient beings.](#)'

Precisely and that understanding is, in itself, the very reason we as a species must find a means of circumventing the repetition of human history. It is my 'belief' that the way to accomplish such a task, is to change the human behavior vector of history. It is also my 'belief' that the means of changing human behavior is by changing human perception

regarding reality, is to expand our understanding of the whole of reality and to establish a rational explanation of our purpose for existing in such a reality.

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

Sunday, March 13

Dialogue with a Poly-Solipsist: Poly-solipsism

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 13, 2005 12:10AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Poly-Solipsist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

ccKeiser is an original metaphysical thinker and is developing a concept known as 'poly-solipsism'. For more information regarding ccKeiser and 'poly-solipsism' or to contact ccKeiser go to:

<http://userweb.nni.com/keiser/42d.html>

Part 3. The Soul and Symbiosis

1. Humankind exists.
2. Humankind exists in the universe, in "physical reality."
3. The essence of the individual is not the body nor the brain.
4. The essence of the individual is the soul.

cck:

What is the "soul"?

If the essence of the individual is the soul; an intangible ethereal entity, how can "Humankind" exist in Reality? If Reality is only what is perceived and therefore only exists in the Mind, and Humankind exists within that Reality, then Humankind also only exists in the Mind.

[050310 djs] Regarding your comment: 'If the essence of the individual is the soul; an intangible ethereal entity, how can "Humankind" exist in Reality (physical reality)? ...'

The question is one which biologists, psychiatrists, physicists, molecular chemists, ... are all attempting to answer, namely: What is consciousness? How does awareness bridge the gap separating it from the physical (dualistic issues) or does consciousness even have a gap to bridge (monistic issues).

Monists fall into two groups: spiritualists and materialists. Regarding the monists: The spiritualists refuse to recognize the existence of the physical and the materialists refuse to recognize the existence of the spirit.

Dualists fall into one group. Dualists accept the overwhelming assortment of arguments which science, religion, and philosophy either indirectly or directly purport, namely: The physical / tangible exists and the spiritual / intangible exists.

As of this date, none of the three groups are able to answer basic questions regarding 'How?'

The model of reality demonstrated by symbiotic panentheism supports the dualistic arguments. The more than four thousand pages of diagrams and rational arguments which support this position and which address the questions regarding how, what, when, where, and why can be found at www.panentheism.com.

[050310 djs] Regarding your comment: '... If Reality is only what is perceived and therefore only exists in the Mind, and Humankind exists within that Reality, then Humankind also only exists in the Mind.'

The model of reality purported by symbiotic panentheism would agree with you since the model demonstrates: God is omnipresent (everywhere) and God is omniscient (a form of mind) and humankind is a limited form of knowing (a limited form of mind) thus humankind exists in the Mind, exists in God.

Symbiotic panentheism, however, also demonstrates the existence of the physical and the existence of humankind within the physical and the existence of the physical within God.

Soliloquy by cck:

The term "truth" means anything the mind of "I" believes to be true.

Yes the "we" is meant as "each of us individually", not "a consensus." BUT, in the shared Reality it is the mind of the consensus. We; each I, do not exist alone in The Singularity. If each I existed alone, there would be no meaning to existence.

The problem of Individuality in a One Consciousness Singularity:

Why are there individual minds or egos? How did a Singularity of One Consciousness evolve to be composed of the Many?

I gave this question considerable thought after I traced all of existence back to the First Container: The Singularity. If we start out with "A" Singularity, how did we acquire our individual egos? It gave me some pause until I realized I was attempting to conceptualize The Infinite and Unbound Singularity as a finite spacetime object. There is no correlation between The Singularity and anything that exists within our perceptions of Universe.

It was while contemplating its Unbound nature that lead me to finally comprehend the infinite degrees of freedom of The Singularity.

It was one of those "Duh!" moments when you realize the answer has been staring you right in the face all along. The Singularity was never "A" Singularity. It is not an Object, it has always been Infinite and *"Unbound"*!

The Singularity has always been a Multiplicity. We are the Infinite degrees of freedom of The Singularity.

To understand this a little better lets consider our spacetime Universe. We say we have height, depth, width, and time. We call them Dimensions but this is a misnomer. There is only one "Dimension;" the Universe, but it has four "degrees of freedom" to exist in. Actually, the last time I checked, the Theorist tell us our Universe has 11 degrees of freedom, but we are only aware of the four.

If they have not done so, I would add consciousness to the list of degrees of freedom of our Universe. We often overlook the very tool we use to study it with.

If we conjure up a mental image of our Universe we can start with a point and then expand that point to include all the degrees of freedom we can mentally envision. In this way we can 'see' our physical Universe is but one "dimension": the point we started with, but for our physical Universe to exist as we know it, we have to allow it the 'degrees of freedom' it requires.

When viewed this way it becomes apparent there is only one dimension of Universe, but it needs to have all its degrees of freedom for it to exist.

Remove any one of these degrees of freedom and the Universe would not exist at all, and if the Universe does not exist, none of the other degrees of freedom could exist. Our Universe is dependent on all of them entangling together to give our Reality the freedom it requires to exist.

It is the same for what we call our minds, our individuality. It is because of the way we view Consciousness that leads to our confusion. We only perceive the 'dimension' of consciousness we are aware of; our own. In trying to consider consciousness from the point of view of an Infinite and Unbound Singularity, we must remember The Singularity has no end, and therefore does not exist as an 'is' and is always in a state of Potential existence. Such a state would entail continual change in its own consciousness. Evolving, as it were, in an attempt to fulfill its own potential. But since it is an infinity with no end, it never can.

I believe to understand Consciousness we must do so from point of view of The Singularity, and not from inside the Universe, which can only give us a partial view, sort of the end results, and not the whole perspective, where we can only view it the same way we view any one of the spacetime 'degrees of freedom' when we call it 'a dimension.' It is not a separate entity existing by itself. It cannot exist in isolation just as Height cannot exist in isolation.

Without all other degrees of freedom entangled together, any single one in isolation has no meaning. We can perceive it separately, but it cannot exist separately.

Our minds and not separate entities existing isolated from all others. Just as Height cannot exist without all the other degrees of freedom, a single mind cannot exist without all other minds entangling to give the One Consciousness the Infinite degrees of freedom it requires to exist.

There is only One Consciousness, but with infinite degrees of Freedom. Our minds are the degrees of freedom of The One Consciousness. And each of our minds provides another, and different, degree of freedom to The Singularity.

It is only our own egotistical nature that presumes one intellect is superior to any other. All are of equal importance to The Singularity, and none would have any meaning without all the others.

That is why I say we are not 'part' of The Singularity, and we are no 'in' The Singularity. We are the Infinite degrees of freedom of The Singularity. We are the Consciousness of The Singularity, and The Singularity is our Consciousness.

We are The Singularity.

Cck

For more information regarding ccKeiser and 'poly-solipsism' or to contact ccKeiser go to:
<http://userweb.nni.com/keiser/42d.html>

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

Friday, March 11

 **Dialogue with a Poly-Solipsist: Regarding basic premises of symbiotic panentheism**
by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 11, 2005 12:51AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Poly-Solipsist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

ccKeiser is an original metaphysical thinker and is developing a concept known as 'poly-solipsism'. For more information regarding ccKeiser and 'poly-solipsism' or to contact ccKeiser go to:

<http://userweb.nni.com/keiser/42d.html>

Part 2. God and Panentheism

1. Reality exists.

cck: How does it "Exist"? Define what exists means. It is how you comprehend the meaning of "exist" that leads you to your perceived "Truth."

Your perceived truth is the only truth you can know. We each erect our edifice to Truth founded solely on our own perceived truths.

For Reality to exist it first must be perceived. Without Perception there is no Reality.

If there is no Reality without perception then Reality can only exist in the MInd.

[050310 djs] Regarding your comment: 'How does it (Reality) "Exist"? ...'

There are two forms of reality: the form of reality which is intangible/abstractual in nature and the form of reality which is tangible/physical in nature.

Regarding your comment: '... Define what exists means.'

I am not using a personal definition of the term exist. I am using the term 'exist' in the generally accepted linguistic form as defined by Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary, tenth edition, 1993: exist *vi* 1a: to have real being either material or spiritual b. reality as presented in experience c. the totality of existent things d. sentient or living being 2a. the state or fact of having being esp. independent of human consciousness and as contrasted with non-existence b. the manner of being that is common to every mode of being ... 3a. continued or repeated manifestation.

After all it is through common linguistics that we communicate

Regarding your comment: 'It is how you comprehend the meaning of "exist" that leads you to your perceived "Truth."

It is not how 'I comprehend the meaning of 'exist' but rather how 'we' comprehend the meaning of the term. If we do not use a common language to communicate we cannot clearly dialogue with each other.

Regarding your comment: **'Your perceived truth is the only truth you can know. ...'**

Ah, the premise for validating the concept of 'relative truth'. The model of reality described by symbiotic panentheism would dogmatically state: Relative truth like relative morality is a concept emerging from a lack of understanding the whole of reality, emerging from an outright rejection of scientific observation, religious faith, and philosophical reasoning which overwhelmingly embrace the concept: Not only does Reality exist but physical reality exists.

To reject the 'consensus' of the three is no less dogmatic than has been the stand of various religious organizations which base their 'beliefs' upon faith alone at the expense of science and philosophy.

In short, such a process, rejecting the 'consensus' of ... establishes the counter process of seeking 'truth' since anyone can, therefore, legitimately state a premise, any premise, and from such a premise conclude their own personal 'truths' to be 'truths' irrespective of any logical arguments, observations, or historical vectors regarding 'beliefs'.

In addition, the statement you espouse suggests there is no hope regarding the establishment of a common understanding of truth, a common understanding of purpose, a common understanding of the interaction of the tangible and the intangible.

Regarding your comment: **'We each erect our edifice to Truth founded solely on our own perceived truths. ...'**

This is only the case for those that refuse to discuss truth in its purest form, for those who hold to the concept that there is no such 'thing' as 'immutable truth / universal truth'

Regarding your comment: **'For Reality to exist it first must be perceived. Without Perception there is no Reality.'**

Perhaps, perhaps not, however that does not negate the possibility of one's being capable of perceiving existences which themselves lack the ability to perceive e.g. nothingness.

Regarding your comment: **'If there is no Reality without perception then Reality can only exist in the Mind.'**

Perhaps, perhaps not. Since we are limited beings, it is possible there may exist ??? of which we, as individuated entities of knowing, will never be able to perceive. The only means we have of understanding such ??? is through the process of negation, knowing it is not of a passive or active form of which we can conceive.

2. The initiating force - causative factor - of physical reality is "God."
3. God is omnipresent; as such, all things are in God, including our known physical reality.
4. God is bigger than physical 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.

cck: 2 to 7 are all based on your first perceived truth: Reality Exists. You constructed your Reality solely based on your own first perceived truth.

[050310 djs] Regarding your comment: ‘... You constructed your Reality solely based on your own first perceived truth.’

To suggest reality exists only because I perceive it to be so is to deny your very existence and your very perceptions. How could I logically do so? Where does morality begin with such a concept?

[050310 djs] Regarding your comment: ‘... Remove their foundation and the edifice you have constructed falls in on itself, and you are left with only the MInd.’

As you and I have discussed before, Reality refers to both the tangible and the intangible. To remove their (items 2 – 7 above) foundation (item 1 Reality exists – see above) does not leave one with only the Mind, to remove their foundation leaves one with simply ‘nothingness’ itself. To suggest all is ‘nothingness’ appears to be illogical for no logical argument can be made for ‘nothingness’ to exist in and of itself or if there is such a logical argument I have yet to come across it.

Perhaps you can enlighten me regarding the logic of such an argument.

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

Saturday, March 12

Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: The soul and the physical body

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

djs:

I realize that the blog has begun your presentation of symbiotic panentheism, but I thought to share this with you anyway. There is no need to respond.

Thank you for attempting to spare me the embarrassment of what you may have perceived to be my inability to address hard-core analysis and questions. It is for a reason that I begin all my blog responses to your questions with:

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.

I truly respect your ability to ask questions going to the heart of the issues and as such I feel a need to address your statements over the course of the next few blogs. I only apologize for having taken so long to get to your issues.

Therefore let me begin.

[Deleted material] ...

[050220 djs] Regarding your comment: '... A biologist studies the physical body and will not answer the question of how the abstract (mind) experiences. ...'

[050220 djs] Perhaps but isn't the term 'will not' a rather dogmatic and ego-centric position for any limited being to take?

[050305 cg] It is by definition that a biologist studies living organisms; i.e., the physical body, and not the (eternal) abstract (mind).

[050311 djs] I agree with your statement regarding '... by definition', however, this does not rule out the possibility that the present day divide separating our understanding of the physical and the intangible will not shrink as specialists examining the abstract /

intangible (philosophers and theists) and the specialists examining the physical / tangible (philosophers and scientists) learn more and more regarding their particular specialties (biologists being one such example).

[050220 djs] Regarding your comment: '...It is for you to explain how the abstract 'knows' the physical. ...'

[050220 djs] 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.

[050305 cg] It is your model and the body-mind relationship is a significant issue, not a 'nuance'. When, why and how is the soul in relationship with a body are issues a model of reality that posits an eternal soul and a physical body ought to address. Specifically, when, why and how is your soul associated with your body?

[050311 djs] Yes, yes, yes I understand. Because I suggest 'it' is a nuance in no way diminishes the significance of the problem, what it does do is place the understanding you wish to address on a back burner until one comes to grip with the more fundamental issue regarding: What is/are truths we must begin to address regarding the composition of reality. The metaphysical model of reality demonstrated by symbiotic panentheism first address more fundamental issue and then moves into addressing the nuances.

As an individual attempting to explain sp let me list the fundamental truths sp would suggest act as the starting point for understanding the whole of reality. They are:

1. What has no beginning and no end exists – The Whole, The Singularity, The Absolute, The All, The non-Discrete, An Omniscient Entity, The All Knowing, G-d ... (I hope you can overlook my ignorance regarding names embraced by Eastern perceptions of this concept)
2. What has a beginning and has no end exists – Individuated entities of knowing, non-omniscient entities of knowing, the soul, individuality, the discrete, ...
3. What has a beginning and has an end exists – Nothingness, the physical

If you allow me the luxury of beginning from this point, I can then begin a primitive form of speculation addressing the issue you bring to the discussion, namely: ' ... When, why and how is the soul in relationship with a body ...'

The issues are fully addressed in a 'mountain of verbiage' in the site: www.panentheism.com. The issues are condensed in the link 'symbiotic panentheism' icon found on the right side of this home page.

Let me very, very briefly and inadequately simplify the answers here and now in order to avoid appearing to run from the issues:

Regarding your question: [‘When ... is the soul in a relationship with a body?’](#)

To tell you the truth, I have no idea, however let me briefly speculate. If society, religion, philosophy, and science accept the concept of the soul having left the body being measurable when the brain wave ends (religious, scientific, and philosophical medical ethics suggest it is morally acceptable to remove live support systems when the brain no longer emits brain waves) than perhaps one might conclude the soul begins its relationship with the body when the fetus begins to emit brain waves (again excuse my ignorance but I think this is approximately 10 weeks into fetal development – science can answer this more precisely)

Regarding your question: [‘Why ... is the soul in a relationship with a body?’](#)

If the All Knowing, if The Omniscient, if The All ‘prefers’ avoiding eternal recurrence as opposed to eternally experiencing eternal recurrence then perhaps, just perhaps, It would and could find the means of doing so. If The All has a means of avoiding the ‘monotony of eternal reruns’, perhaps, just perhaps, individuated entities of consciousness (the substance and essence of The All?) would be one of perhaps many means for The All To do so, to avoid eternal recurrence.

Regarding your question: [‘How ... is the soul in a relationship with a body?’](#)

This is a little tougher (as if the others were not difficult enough) Perhaps, just perhaps, there is some mysterious means by which conscious is able to experience the physical. What we know of consciousness presently would appear to confirm the concept that consciousness can indeed experience the physical.

[\[050305 cg\]](#) Oh, and who is the 'you' that has a soul and has a body?

[\[050311 djs\]](#) The ‘you’ is the individuated entity of knowing. In your case, the ‘you’ is ‘you’. In my case, the ‘you’ is me. In my neighbor’s case, the ‘you’ is my neighbor. In the case of the individual being dominated, raped, tortured, murdered, discriminated against, humiliated, degraded, ..., the ‘you’ is the element of G-d being abused. As I said previously, sp does not come without its heavy, heavy burden of ‘responsibility’.

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

Thursday, March 10

The Neo-Buddhist and the Metaphysicist: 'belief' versus 'understanding'

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 10, 2005 12:45AM (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] 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.

[050225 cg] Whether I preface my remarks with, "I hold", "I believe", etc. or simply utter a statement, it is, nevertheless, my personal understanding and whether the statement is based on observation, faith, and/or reason, it is, nevertheless, my personal understanding. There are no other understandings I can share with you but my own.

[050308 djs] Do not take offense at my respecting while questioning what it is you personally 'believe' or my respecting while questioning what it is you personally 'hold' to be truth. I understand what you are saying but there are many 'understandings' one can share that one does not personally 'hold', 'believe', etc. Teachers, scientists, philosophers, theists, criminals, ... do this all the time. Because a theist shares the logic of an atheist with another theist does not imply the theist is an atheist. A science teacher sharing the concept of evolution with their students may personally 'hold to', believe in' the understanding of 'creationism'.

There are many aspects regarding reality in which I personally 'believe' and to which I personally 'hold' that symbiotic panentheism is incapable of verifying.

There are many aspects regarding reality in which I personally 'believe' and to which I personally 'hold' that cannot be agreed upon by all three - religion, science, and philosophy- and some perceptions I personally 'hold to' and 'believe in' which none of the three, let alone all three, verify.

Symbiotic panentheism is a model of reality built upon 'truths' validated by all three of our perceptual tools, namely: in what we observe / in what we can measure / science, what we determine through reason / what we hold to be rational / philosophy, and in what we believe / in what we have faith / religion.

[050225 cg] I appreciate that you have devoted considerable time and effort to developing a 'model' of reality which you have chosen to call "symbiotic panentheism" and you may claim to speak on behalf of sp, but your utterances are, as long as you believe them to be true, your personal understandings and this remains a dialogue between persons, each expressing their personal understanding.

[050308 djs] Regarding your comment: I appreciate that you have devoted considerable time and effort to developing a 'model' of reality which you have chosen to call "symbiotic panentheism" ...'

First of all I did not 'develop' the model, I simply took the pieces of the model humankind has developed and assembled the pieces. I take no credit for what has emerged. I do, however, feel honored with being allowed to play with the pieces.

Regarding your comment: '... and you may claim to speak on behalf of sp, but your utterances are, as long as you believe them to be true, your personal understandings and this remains a dialogue between persons, each expressing their personal understanding.

Again, I did not 'develop' the pieces nor did I 'develop' the outcome of the model. The model emerges simply through a two-step process, namely: 1. assembling pieces of the puzzle (addition) which are confirmed by our present understanding of reality as provided us through a consensus of both past and present day science, religion, and philosophy and 2. discarding (the process of negation) pieces of the puzzle which are not adequately supported by all three, namely past and present day science, religion, and philosophy.

[050225 cg] For instance, you claim, sp "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", but making the claim doesn't make it true; hence this dialogue.

[050308 djs] Regarding your comment: [For instance, you claim, sp "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", ...'](#)

Yes I did make that claim but I also suggested: If such a model, along with its ramifications of hope, can be constructed by a mere seventh grade math / science teacher such as myself than a coalition of minds greater than mine would most certainly be capable of developing a far more accurate model should they put their minds to it. I then supported my belief in the ability of the human intellect to develop such a model by setting up a challenge to do so.

The modest challenge is located on my second web site: www.wehope.com. 'Wehope' stands for 'world embracing hope' for it is my personal 'belief' that if we construct a 'universal model' of reality we will find the model significantly diminish the influence of relativistic moralism, the pessimism of nihilism, the materialism of physical hedonism, and global violence committed against the individual.

Regarding your comment: ['... but making the claim doesn't make it true; hence this dialogue.'](#) You are correct; making the claim does not make it true ... One does not 'make truth' rather 'truth' is just that, 'truth'. The dialogue is an attempt to get at the heart of the matter regarding what it is that comprises a logical, believable, rational model of reality. The fundamental building blocks of the model of reality must be truth itself.

The point of the dialogue is not to attempt to 'defend' what it is one personally 'believes' or personally 'holds' to be the model of reality.

How then does one distinguish between the two, distinguish between what it is one 'holds' to be true - 'believes' to be true and what it is that is 'true'? The answer more probable lies in what it is all three of our perceptual tools find in common regarding 'truth' as opposed to what it is only one or two of the three suggest 'truth' to be.

Once the three agree upon what it is they perceive truth to be, the process can begin towards building the best the model of reality we are able to construct with the knowledge we have at our disposal. From the model of reality emerges our understanding regarding the answers to the questions: Where are we? What are we? And why do we exist? The answers to these questions in turn lead us to the ideals listed above. It is my 'belief' that the model we construct of reality will transform our present day perception of materialism being our ultimate goal into understanding that it is altruism which is our ultimate goal.

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

Wednesday, March 9

Metaphysicist 1 and Metaphysicist 2: 'Perceived truths' versus 'immutable truths'

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 9, 2005 01:38PM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Poly-Solipsist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

ccKeiser is an original metaphysical thinker and is developing a concept known as 'poly-solipsism'. For more information regarding ccKeiser and 'poly-solipsism' or to contact ccKeiser go to:

<http://userweb.nni.com/keiser/42d.html>

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

by [cckeiser](#) at 03:57PM (EST) on Feb 28, 2005 |

All "Truths" are perceived truths.

Even "I Exist" is a perceived truth.

We cannot know any Truth but the truth we perceive.

"We all believe the Truth we perceive, but we only perceive the Truth we believe."

cck

[050308 djs] Regarding your comment: 'All "Truths" are perceived truths.' On the surface, this statement is correct but its implications are misleading.

In terms of the complete understanding of reality, there are 'perceived truths' that are in fact 'truths' and there are 'perceived truths' which are in fact not 'truths' but which are, instead, misinterpretations we make using either inaccurate observations, beliefs, and/or reasoning or misinterpretations we make using too much information which in turn clouds the issues and causes us to make such misinterpretations or misinterpretations we make using too little information which in turn provides an incomplete picture of reality.

Regarding your comment: [Even "I Exist" is a perceived truth.](#) The fact that science, religion, and philosophy all support the 'perceived truth' 'I exist' suggests the statement is not only a 'perceived truth' but is in fact a 'fundamental truth' / 'universal truth' / 'immutable truth' / ...

On the other hand, the 'perceived truth', 'I do not exist', is supported by very little, if any, assortment of scientific data, religious beliefs, and philosophical arguments which in turn makes it much more plausible that the statement, although being a 'perceived truth' is in fact most likely not a 'fundamental truth' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truth' / ...

Regarding your comment: ["We all believe the Truth we perceive, ..."](#) I have no qualms with this statement but the statement does not address the issue being discussed.

The issue being addressed is the concept of 'truth', the concept of 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / ... as opposed to being simply 'perceived truth'. I grant you we all

have our 'perceived truths' and it is upon such 'perceived truths' that we act but I will not acquiesce to any suggestion that 'truth' - 'fundamental truth' / 'universal truth' / 'immutable truth' / ... - does not exist.

'Perceived truths' can be likened to 'truths' blind men perceive when they are allowed to stand in one place next to an elephant. One man feels the leg and foot, the second the trunk, the third the ear, the fourth the tail, the fifth the belly, the sixth the tusk, the seventh the tongue, the eighth the tree next to the elephant, the ninth the grass beneath the elephant ...

Now if two or three of the nine get together and attempt to construct the complete picture of the elephant the picture will be obscure and only partially correct.

The same applies to reality. In a sense we are the blind attempting to piece together the total picture of reality. The understanding of reality can be obscured by too little as well as too much information, i.e. The confusion blind men eight and nine interject into the process of comprehending the physical elephant itself.

The process of understanding reality thus becomes a process of addition as well as the process of negation.

One begins with a blank slate and adds what is necessary to understand the whole of reality to the best of our ability – addition.

One discards the information unnecessary for the understanding of the basic overall picture of reality - negation.

The physical elephant is real (ignoring, for the purposes of the analogy, the concept: all things are simply conscious apparitions): Likewise, there are 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / ... which are real. There are three such 'fundamental truths' we, limited beings, are capable of identifying. The three 'fundamental truths' are: 1. 'What has no beginning and has no end, i.e. the whole exists. 2. What has a beginning and has no end, i.e. the discrete/individuated entities. 3. What has a beginning and has an end, i.e. the physical, nothingness....

In short, we act upon what we believe to be. We act upon our perceptions of truth, but, whether or not we have a complete understanding or for that matter any understanding of truth, does not change the fact that truth remains truth nonetheless. We cannot change the fact that truth remains what it is namely, truth. It is my contention that we (you and I, humanity, individuated entities of knowing) are capable of pooling out knowledge and are capable of creating a composite of reality based upon 'fundamental truths'. The elephant remains regardless of what the blind men number eight (he who feels the tree) and nine (he who feels the grass) states truth to be.

Regarding your comment: ["... but we only perceive the Truth we believe."](#) There are individuals who do keep an open mind and who thus are willing to entertain the idea of examining all 'perceived truths' with an open mind. The point of such an examination is to discard the superfluous in order to find 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / ... in order

to establish an understanding as to why it is we are all truly brothers which itself emerges from the understanding as to our true essence which in turn emerges from the understanding as to what our common generic purpose/function for existing is.

I would suggest to you:

1. We, you and I, humans are capable of 'knowing' 'truth' as well as knowing 'perceived truths'.
2. We, you and I, humans are capable of identifying which 'perceived truths' are in fact 'truths'.

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

Tuesday, March 8

Symbiotic Panentheism - Synopsis: Part 10 of 10 - Three ultimate paradoxes

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 8, 2005 12:36AM (EST)

Part 10. Three Ultimate Paradoxes

1. Being omnipotent - all-powerful - but not having the power to become more so.
2. Being omnipresent - everywhere - but limited within the confines that already exist.
3. Being omniscient - knowing everything - but not knowing how to learn more.

The Creator of physical reality did not create these paradoxes. We, humanity, defined these paradoxes ourselves.

We, humanity, give them a life of their own. And then, we, humanity, perpetuate our irrationality into absolutisms. Eliminating the paradoxes of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience does not alter or call for the elimination of our rich history of traditions or beliefs. Eliminating these three paradoxes expands our view of our place in the universe, our purpose in the scheme of things, and our tolerance for uniqueness. Expansion of our present concepts of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience into a concept that can become even more so does not bring down the foundations of our society; rather, it provides a foundation to our foundation. Omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience are paradoxes only because we have made them so and continue to perpetuate these concepts.

Panentheism, the picture grows:

A-theism: Our universe, physical reality, is alone.

Pan-theism: Our universe, physical reality, is not alone; something else exists within it.

Pan-en-theism: Our universe, physical reality, is contained within a greater Reality.

Are classical and traditional theisms complete theisms? No, they are just theisms waiting for a prefix.

"Symbiotic" is the portion that provides the significance. It provides the other half to, "God is significant to humanity." The other half is, "Intelligences within realities, humanity, the individual, is significant to God."

We have the free will to recognize our power - our significance - and dismantle the hierarchical and, therefore, oppressive systems we have created. We are all a part of God and continually contribute to God's knowledge and awareness. We create what we choose to create. Indeed, we all have an awesome responsibility.

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

Symbiotic Panentheism: Simply put, Abstract, and Synopsis

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 8, 2005 12:04AM (EST)

A New Metaphysical Perception of Reality: **Symbiotic Panentheism**

Simply Put:

1. We are inside God – Panentheism – Rationale: God is omnipresent, there is nowhere else to be
2. We are of the same substance and essence as God – Rationale: God is omniscient, all knowing, we have knowing
3. We add to God’s knowing – Symbiosis – Rationale: God is omnipotent, all powerful, knowledge is power, we have knowledge, as we gain knowledge so too does God
4. Nothing is lost
5. Nothing is meaningless

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

Synopsis

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 bold face concepts 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.

Part 2. God and Panentheism

1. Physical reality exists.
2. The initiating force - causative factor - of physical reality is "God."

3. God is omnipresent; as such, **all things are in God, including our known physical reality.**
4. God is bigger than physical 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.

Part 3. The Soul and Symbiosis

1. Humankind exists.
2. Humankind exists in the universe, in "physical 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 physical 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. Physical 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.

Part 4. Human Significance

1. Humanity's perceptions of itself as a species and as individuals determine its behavior.
2. The higher the level of significance we have of ourselves, the higher the level of our behavior.
3. Predestination relieves us of responsibility.
4. Free will raises our level of responsibility.
- 5. The highest level of perception we can assign to ourselves is the ability to have the free will to assist God in the one thing God cannot do as God - grow.**

6. The soul being God but separated from God (being non-omnipresent, non-omniscient, non-omnipotent) has the ability to learn, experience, and create isolated from God.

7. The highest level of significance we can assign to ourselves is to help God, ourselves, become even more omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent.

Human significance now becomes something it has never before been. Human significance now becomes defined. Not only does it become defined, it now becomes defined as significant for it becomes significant beyond human needs. Human significance now becomes significant to God Itself.

Part 5. Social Ramifications

1. **The** essence of all individuals is the soul.
2. **The essence of all individuals is contained within God.**
3. **All** individuals are important to God and deserve to be treated as such.
4. **The soul, contained within God, is important to and needed by God.**
5. The individual, contained within God, deserves to be treated with the respect due God.
6. **All** individuals are equally important.
7. **The individual, being of the same essence and substance as God, is not in a hierarchical relationship to itself.**

Symbiotic panentheism provides the logic needed to dismantle all hierarchical systems and perceptions of relative worth. Symbiotic panentheism eliminates the most fundamental hierarchical system created by humankind for humankind - the hierarchy system created between God and humans. It eliminates the status levels between beings. Symbiotic panentheism does not destroy what humanity has; it adds to what humanity has. Symbiotic panentheism accepts the significance of God to the individual and to the species. It also adds the significance of the individual and of the species to this one-way concept of God.

Through the fusion of panentheism and symbiosis, we form symbiotic panentheism, a philosophical, perceptual shift for the new millennium that actually defines a purpose for humanity, for the individual, for the environment, and for our relationship to God. Under symbiotic panentheism, it is our job to see that God grows. We have the free will to determine the direction God grows. This is truly an awesome responsibility, an awesome task for humankind and for the individual.

However, just as children rise to the level of expectations we place upon them, humanity will rise to the level of expectations it places upon itself. There is little doubt that society, families, and individuals could use more human, humane, Godly compassion in their journeys. To begin to understand this logic, one must examine the four forms of theism and their treatment of the three most universally accepted characteristics of God: omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence.

Part 6. Omniscience

Atheism assigns the least knowledgeable form to God. According to atheism, God does not exist and God as an entity has no knowledge. Pantheism enlarges God's knowledge base over atheism. Under pantheism, God and physical reality are one and the same size. God has size and God has knowledge. However, the knowledge has limits. God is limited to the knowledge found within the universe, whatever that size may be. Classical or traditional theism enlarges God's knowledge base over pantheism. Classical and traditional theism, however, hold that God knows everything that has been known, is known or could be known. This places limits on God. Since God knows everything, it closes the door on the possibility of knowing what could be, but isn't, for all things.

Pantheism is in sync with classical or traditional theism in terms of what God knows. But whereas classical and traditional theism puts an end to the concept of omniscience and leaves God in a state of permanent equilibrium, pantheism goes on to expand God's possible knowledge base through accepting the scientific principle that permanent equilibrium is an unnatural state - even for God. Pantheism applies the concept of the growth of knowledge to God. Of the four theisms, only pantheism assigns the complete characteristic of omniscience to God, for it is the only theism to assign the knowledge of how God gains more knowledge to grow.

Part 7. Omnipotence

Atheism basically purports the concept that there is no God. Since God has no size, It has no power. God is powerless. Pantheism magnifies God's power over the perception of atheism. Within pantheism, God and physical reality are one. God has all the power of our universe and no more, for that is all there is. With the concept that God is greater in size than physical reality, it follows that God's power is greater than in the case of pantheism. Classical or traditional theism again increases God's power by stating that God is all-powerful; however, it limits God's power to that of Its total power. Under classical and traditional theism, God is all-powerful but is limited, for It is not powerful enough to become more so.

Pantheism magnifies God's power above all theistic perceptions through incorporating the concept that if God is truly all powerful, then God has the power to use Its knowledge to become even more so. This is not a factor tied to a location in time, for time most probably is a factor of universes and realities - not God. Time is the factor allowing the existence of the beginning-end concepts built into universes. On the other hand, God, by definition, has no characteristic concept of beginning-end. Of the four theisms, only pantheism assigns the complete characteristic of omnipotence to God, for it assigns the ability and power of God to gain more knowledge.

Part 8. Omnipresence

Again, atheism basically purports the concepts that there is no God, God is omnipresent, God is infinitely small, and its nothingness can be found everywhere. God's absence is everywhere. This is clearly the smallest form of God. Pantheism enlarges God over atheism by believing

there is one God and that God and physical reality are one and the same size. God has size and is limited to the size of physical reality, whatever that size may turn out to be. Classical or traditional theism enlarges God over pantheism by stating that there is one God and God is greater in size than physical reality. Classical and traditional theism imply, however, that God and physical reality are separate items from each other. God transcends physical reality. God is everything except physical reality.

Panentheism enlarges God over classical or traditional theism. Panentheism purports that God is omnipresent. God incorporates everything; therefore, God is everything and thus, there is no place for physical reality to be other than within God Itself. Of the four theisms, only panentheism assigns the complete characteristic of omnipresence to God, for it assigns not only an omnipresence incorporating all of our universe, our physical reality, but all realities that may exist and what lies beyond and between them.

Even more significantly, only symbiotic panentheism proceeds to allow for the expansion of the very characteristics of omnipotence and omniscience of God that, in turn, through increased awareness, expands omnipresence itself by definition.

Omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience are three characteristics humanity, in general, wants or appears to want to affix to God. Of the four theisms, only panentheism manages to do so in total. Panentheism is the foundation for symbiotic panentheism, for without the "panentheism" the "symbiosis" becomes illogical. Symbiotic panentheism establishes a metaphysical model that accepts, while at the same time dismantles, the paradoxes of omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence. In addition, it is a model that circumvents the state of permanent equilibrium we have assigned to God, a state we often refer to as stagnation.

Panentheism, defined as the location of physical reality in terms of God's location, is seemingly insignificant, but the subtlety leads to the initiation of enormous perceptual and behavioral shifts for our species, society, the environment, and the individual. Understanding the differences between the four basic perceptions of a causative force (atheism, pantheism, classical or traditional theism, and panentheism) allows us to move forward and begin the examination of symbiotic panentheism in particular.

Part 9. God

Whatever one professes, humans have always oriented their philosophical discussions around God or God. Whatever one's belief, the fact remains that humans have, to our knowledge, always conceptualized God or a form of God in some sense and, therefore, perhaps this small seed, this nugget of the universality of humans, is true. Is God the originator of physical reality? The original force? The source of the beginning? Whatever one's belief, there are only two premises with which to identify: either there is God, an originator, an original force, a source of a beginning, or there is not. In all of our observations within physical reality, there is only one observation at this point in time that we cannot directly tie to having a beginning, an origination, and that is physical reality.

There are two options to consider.

The first option is the premise that if all things, except physical reality, appear to have an identifiable beginning, then physical reality must also have an identifiable beginning and thus, an originator, Creator, God. Another way of saying this is that all things in physical reality appear to be affected by time and thus, it is most probable that physical reality itself is affected by time or, in essence, most probably has a beginning and an end.

The second option is the premise that physical reality itself is different from everything within it and has no origination; in other words, it has no beginning. Thus, one would accept the concept that God, an originator, is illogical. This thought process would allow one to reject the inference to which all of our observations point. It would allow one to conclude and embrace the direct opposite inference that there is no God or originator of physical reality. Physical reality has always existed.

The premise that physical reality had a beginning, that there is a creative originating force, that there is God to physical reality is supported by an almost infinite amount of direct observations and logic. The premise that physical reality had no beginning, that there is no creative originating force, that there is no God, is supported by nothing we have observed before - no observations and no logic. Is the concept of physical reality having no beginning possible? Certainly anything we conjure up in our minds is "possible" but not probable.

Assuming we accept the premise of the existence of an originator of physical reality, an original force, a source of the beginning, we can then move on to examine the concept of physical reality, where physical reality fits into consciousness, and where humanity, as well as other forms of consciously aware beings, fit into all of this. In other words, where you and where I fit into the grand scheme of "it all." The picture we have of God is still out of focus. As time passes and our knowledge expands, we will gain greater resolution regarding our observations. In the meantime, keep in mind that the Creator of physical reality is the Creator of physical reality and will remain so regardless of what we do or wish to believe.

We cannot create a creator. We cannot insist that a creator is whom we have, through time and custom, drawn it to be, but rather, we must understand that whom we have drawn the Creator to be, through time and custom, was what we needed It to be in order to define our niche in physical reality. The Creator is what the Creator is to ourselves because we needed It to be such in order to find comfort in our lack of knowledge and to assuage our fears of what we perceive to be mortality.

Religion and science orient around one universe. Science and religion still have not fully accepted the concept of other life forms and have not done so because they do not know how to fuse them into their doctrines of classical or traditional theism. Symbiotic panentheism can help them with that very problem without destroying their essence, identity or uniqueness. It is only under classical or traditional theism that we could assign a greater significance to ourselves, to our home, and to our planet over other entities and their homes or planets.

With increased knowledge (omniscience) comes increased power (omnipotence) and as knowledge grows, so grows awareness (omnipresence). Growth, equilibrium, decline - three

choices we can comprehend for the state of God. Scientifically speaking, permanent equilibrium appears to be an unnatural state of being. Religiously speaking, an omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent God appears to be a contradiction unless it is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent enough to become even more so. Therefore, permanent equilibrium is not an option. Being tied to God that exists in a state of decline is not a preferable or advantageous choice to bestow upon our Creator. The only state of being we can comprehend for God is that of a growing God.

Thus develops the symbiotic relationship aspect - a mutually beneficial relationship between us and our Creator. We hope it is mutually beneficial, for it could just as well be a mutually destructive relationship depending upon the actions we take under free will. This is precisely where our responsibility lies. We, along with others, have the responsibility to develop the type of God that exists.

In a symbiotic relationship, beneficial or detrimental contributions are two possibilities that could exist between two identities. Understanding our significance in physical reality and to its Creator would definitely help us understand what actions we, humans with freewill, should take while functioning within physical reality. Our actions affect not only God but, in essence, ourselves. Under the model of symbiotic panentheism, nothing, not even the annihilation of our physical reality's physical mechanism, can diminish our purpose for existence. Nothing, not even total annihilation of our physical reality itself, can destroy our accomplishments as souls, for they transcend physical reality and embrace - fuse - with the very essence of God.

Part 10. Three Ultimate Paradoxes

1. Being omnipotent - all-powerful - but not having the power to become more so.
2. Being omnipresent - everywhere - but limited within the confines that already exist.
3. Being omniscient - knowing everything - but not knowing how to learn more.

The Creator of physical reality did not create these paradoxes. We, humanity, defined these paradoxes ourselves.

We, humanity, give them a life of their own. And then, we, humanity, perpetuate our irrationality into absolutisms. Eliminating the paradoxes of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience does not alter or call for the elimination of our rich history of traditions or beliefs. Eliminating these three paradoxes expands our view of our place in the universe, our purpose in the scheme of things, and our tolerance for uniqueness. Expansion of our present concepts of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience into a concept that can become even more so does not bring down the foundations of our society; rather, it provides a foundation to our foundation. Omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience are paradoxes only because we have made them so and continue to perpetuate these concepts.

Panentheism, the picture grows:

A-theism: Our universe, physical reality, is alone.

Pan-theism: Our universe, physical reality, is not alone; something else exists within it.

Pan-en-theism: Our universe, physical reality, is contained within a greater Reality.

Are classical and traditional theisms complete theisms? No, classical and traditional theisms are theisms waiting for a prefix.

"Symbiotic" is the portion that provides the significance. It provides the other half to, "God is significant to humanity." The other half is, "Intelligences within realities, humanity, the individual, is significant to God."

We have the free will to recognize our power - our significance - and dismantle the hierarchical and, therefore, oppressive systems we have created. We are all within God. We all are composed of the same substance and essence as God. We all continually contribute to God's knowledge and awareness. We, having free will, create what we choose to create. Indeed, we all have an awesome responsibility.

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

Monday, March 7

Symbiotic Panentheism - Synopsis: Part 9 of 10 - God

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 7, 2005 12:11AM (EST)

Part 9. God

Whatever one professes, humans have always oriented their philosophical discussions around God or God. Whatever one's belief, the fact remains that humans have, to our knowledge, always conceptualized God or a form of God in some sense and, therefore, perhaps this small seed, this nugget of the universality of humans, is true. Is God the originator of physical reality? The original force? The source of the beginning? Whatever one's belief, there are only two premises with which to identify: either there is God, an originator, an original force, a source of a beginning, or there is not. In all of our observations within physical reality, there is only one observation at this point in time that we cannot directly tie to having a beginning, an origination, and that is physical reality.

There are two options to consider.

The first option is the premise that if all things, except physical reality, appear to have an identifiable beginning, then physical reality must also have an identifiable beginning and thus, an originator, Creator, God. Another way of saying this is that all things in physical reality appear to be affected by time and thus, it is most probable that physical reality itself is affected by time or, in essence, most probably has a beginning and an end.

The second option is the premise that physical reality itself is different from everything within it and has no origination; in other words, it has no beginning. Thus, one would accept the concept that God, an originator, is illogical. This thought process would allow one to reject the inference to which all of our observations point. It would allow one to conclude and embrace the direct opposite inference that there is no God or originator of physical reality. Physical reality has always existed.

The premise that physical reality had a beginning, that there is a creative originating force, that there is God to physical reality is supported by an almost infinite amount of direct observations and logic. The premise that physical reality had no beginning, that there is no creative originating force, that there is no God, is supported by nothing we have observed before - no observations and no logic. Is the concept of physical reality having no beginning possible? Certainly anything we conjure up in our minds is "possible" but not probable.

Assuming we accept the premise of the existence of an originator of physical reality, an original force, a source of the beginning, we can then move on to examine the concept of physical reality, where physical reality fits into consciousness, and where humanity, as well as other forms of consciously aware beings, fit into all of this. In other words, where you and where I fit into the grand scheme of "it all." The picture we have of God is still out of focus. As time passes and our knowledge expands, we will gain greater resolution regarding our observations. In the meantime, keep in mind that the Creator of physical reality is the Creator of physical reality and will remain so regardless of what we do or wish to believe.

We cannot create a creator. We cannot insist that a creator is whom we have, through time and custom, drawn it to be, but rather, we must understand that whom we have drawn the Creator to be, through time and custom, was what we needed It to be in order to define our niche in physical reality. The Creator is what the Creator is to ourselves because we needed It to be such in order to find comfort in our lack of knowledge and to assuage our fears of what we perceive to be mortality.

Religion and science orient around one universe. Science and religion still have not fully accepted the concept of other life forms and have not done so because they do not know how to fuse them into their doctrines of classical or traditional theism. Symbiotic panentheism can help them with that very problem without destroying their essence, identity or uniqueness. It is only under classical or traditional theism that we could assign a greater significance to ourselves, to our home, and to our planet over other entities and their homes or planets.

With increased knowledge (omniscience) comes increased power (omnipotence) and as knowledge grows, so grows awareness (omnipresence). Growth, equilibrium, decline - three choices we can comprehend for the state of God. Scientifically speaking, permanent equilibrium appears to be an unnatural state of being. Religiously speaking, an omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent God appears to be a contradiction unless it is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent enough to become even more so. Therefore, permanent equilibrium is not an option. Being tied to God that exists in a state of decline is not a preferable or advantageous choice to bestow upon our Creator. The only state of being we can comprehend for God is that of a growing God.

Thus develops the symbiotic relationship aspect - a mutually beneficial relationship between us and our Creator. We hope it is mutually beneficial, for it could just as well be a mutually destructive relationship depending upon the actions we take under free will. This is precisely where our responsibility lies. We, along with others, have the responsibility to develop the type of God that exists.

In a symbiotic relationship, beneficial or detrimental contributions are two possibilities that could exist between two identities. Understanding our significance in physical reality and to its Creator would definitely help us understand what actions we, humans with freewill, should take while functioning within physical reality. Our actions affect not only God but, in essence, ourselves. Under the model of symbiotic panentheism, nothing, not even the annihilation of our physical reality's physical mechanism, can diminish our purpose for existence. Nothing, not even total annihilation of our physical reality itself, can destroy our accomplishments as souls, for they transcend physical reality and embrace - fuse - with the very essence of God.

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

Sunday, March 6

Symbiotic Panentheism - Synopsis: Part 8 of 10 - Omnipresence

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 6, 2005 12:04AM (EST)

Part 8. Omnipresence

Again, atheism basically purports the concepts that there is no God, God is omnipresent, God is infinitely small, and its nothingness can be found everywhere. God's absence is everywhere. This is clearly the smallest form of God. Pantheism enlarges God over atheism by believing there is one God and that God and physical reality are one and the same size. God has size and is limited to the size of physical reality, whatever that size may turn out to be. Classical or traditional theism enlarges God over pantheism by stating that there is one God and God is greater in size than physical reality. Classical and traditional theism imply, however, that God and physical reality are separate items from each other. God transcends physical reality. God is everything except physical reality.

Panentheism enlarges God over classical or traditional theism. Panentheism purports that God is omnipresent. God incorporates everything; therefore, God is everything and thus, there is no place for physical reality to be other than within God Itself. Of the four theisms, only panentheism assigns the complete characteristic of omnipresence to God, for it assigns not only an omnipresence incorporating all of our universe, our physical reality, but all realities that may exist and what lies beyond and between them.

Even more significantly, only symbiotic panentheism proceeds to allow for the expansion of the very characteristics of omnipotence and omniscience of God that, in turn, through increased awareness, expands omnipresence itself by definition.

Omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience are three characteristics humanity, in general, wants or appears to want to affix to God. Of the four theisms, only panentheism manages to do so in total. Panentheism is the foundation for symbiotic panentheism, for without the "panentheism" the "symbiosis" becomes illogical. Symbiotic panentheism establishes a metaphysical model that accepts, while at the same time dismantles, the paradoxes of omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence. In addition, it is a model that circumvents the state of permanent equilibrium we have assigned to God, a state we often refer to as stagnation.

Panentheism, defined as the location of physical reality in terms of God's location, is seemingly insignificant, but the subtlety leads to the initiation of enormous perceptual and behavioral shifts for our species, society, the environment, and the individual. Understanding the differences between the four basic perceptions of a causative force (atheism, pantheism, classical or traditional theism, and panentheism) allows us to move forward and begin the examination of symbiotic panentheism in particular.

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

Saturday, March 5

Symbiotic Pantheism - Synopsis: Part 7 of 10 - Omnipotence

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 5, 2005 01:35AM (EST)

Part 7. Omnipotence

Atheism basically purports the concept that there is no God. Since God has no size, It has no power. God is powerless. Pantheism magnifies God's power over the perception of atheism. Within pantheism, God and physical reality are one. God has all the power of our universe and no more, for that is all there is. With the concept that God is greater in size than physical reality, it follows that God's power is greater than in the case of pantheism. Classical or traditional theism again increases God's power by stating that God is all-powerful; however, it limits God's power to that of Its total power. Under classical and traditional theism, God is all-powerful but is limited, for It is not powerful enough to become more so.

Pantheism magnifies God's power above all theistic perceptions through incorporating the concept that if God is truly all powerful, then God has the power to use Its knowledge to become even more so. This is not a factor tied to a location in time, for time most probably is a factor of universes and realities - not God. Time is the factor allowing the existence of the beginning-end concepts built into universes. On the other hand, God, by definition, has no characteristic concept of beginning-end. Of the four theisms, only pantheism assigns the complete characteristic of omnipotence to God, for it assigns the ability and power of God to gain more knowledge.

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

Friday, March 4

Symbiotic Pantheism - Synopsis: Part 6 of 10 - Omniscience

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 4, 2005 12:03AM (EST)

Part 6. Omniscience

Atheism assigns the least knowledgeable form to God. According to atheism, God does not exist and God as an entity has no knowledge. Pantheism enlarges God's knowledge base over atheism. Under pantheism, God and physical reality are one and the same size. God has size and God has knowledge. However, the knowledge has limits. God is limited to the knowledge found within the universe, whatever that size may be. Classical or traditional theism enlarges God's knowledge base over pantheism. Classical and traditional theism, however, hold that God knows everything that has been known, is known or could be known. This places limits on God. Since God knows everything, it closes the door on the possibility of knowing what could be, but isn't, for all things.

Pantheism is in sync with classical or traditional theism in terms of what God knows. But whereas classical and traditional theism puts an end to the concept of omniscience and leaves God in a state of permanent equilibrium, pantheism goes on to expand God's possible knowledge base through accepting the scientific principle that permanent equilibrium is an unnatural state - even for God. Pantheism applies the concept of the growth of knowledge to God. Of the four theisms, only pantheism assigns the complete characteristic of omniscience to God, for it is the only theism to assign the knowledge of how God gains more knowledge to grow.

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

Thursday, March 3

Metaphysicist 1 and Metaphysicist 2 - Dialogue: 'Perceived truth' versus 'real truth'

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 3, 2005 12:15AM (EST)

Dialoguing - A Poly-Solipsist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

ccKeiser is an original metaphysical thinker and is developing a concept known as 'poly-solipsism'. For more information regarding ccKeiser and 'poly-solipsism' or to contact ccKeiser go to:

<http://userweb.nni.com/keiser/42d.html>

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

by [cckeiser](#) at 03:57PM (EST) on Feb 28, 2005 |

All "Truths" are perceived truths.

Even "I Exist" is a perceived truth.

We cannot know any Truth but the truth we perceive.

"We all believe the Truth we perceive, but we only perceive the Truth we believe."

cck

[050302 djs] Regarding your comment: 'All "Truths" are perceived truths.' On the surface, this statement is correct but its implications are misleading.

In terms of the complete understanding of reality, there are 'perceived truths' that are in fact 'truths' and there are 'perceived truths' which are in fact not 'truths' but which are, instead, misinterpretations we make using either inaccurate observations, beliefs, and/or reasoning or using too much information which in turns clouds the issues or using too little information which in turn provides an incomplete picture of reality.

Regarding your comment: 'Even "I Exist" is a perceived truth.' The truth 'I exist' is supported by an overwhelming assortment of scientific data, religious beliefs, and philosophical arguments which in turn makes it much more plausible that the statement is not just a 'perceived truth' but in fact represents 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / ...

On the other hand, the 'perceived truth', 'I do not exist', is supported by very little if any assortment of scientific data, religious beliefs, and philosophical arguments which in turn makes it much more plausible that the statement, although being a 'perceived truth' is in fact most likely not a 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / ...

Regarding your comment: **"We all believe the Truth we perceive, ..."** I have no qualms with what it is you have expressed but the statement does not address the issue being discussed.

What is being addressed is the concept of 'truth', the concept of 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / I grant you we all have our 'perceived truths' and it is upon such 'perceived truths' that we act but I will not acquiesce to any suggestion that 'truth' - 'fundamental truth' / 'universal truth' / 'immutable truth' / ... - does not exist in the purity of itself.

'Perceived truths' can be likened to the blind men who are allowed to stand in one place next to an elephant. One man feels the leg and foot, the second the trunk, the third the ear, the fourth the tail, the fifth the belly, the sixth the tusk, the seventh the tongue, the eighth the tree next to the elephant, the ninth the grass beneath the elephant ...

Now all the men perceive the elephant and its environment but only seven perceive the 'truth' regarding the physical entity of the elephant itself. The 'perceived truths' are not complete and as such are only perceptions of truth as opposed to the fact of the matter, i.e. the elephant exists as an entity itself as opposed to being simply a partial description of the blind mans 'perceived truth' regarding the complete understanding of an elephant.

Now if two or three of the nine get together and attempt to construct the complete picture of the elephant the picture will be obscure and only partially correct. The more input provided, however, the more accurate will be the 'truth' constructed by the blind men.

The same applies to reality. In a sense we are the blind attempting to piece together the total picture of reality. The more information we have the clearer will be the picture. However, the understanding of reality can be obscured by too much information, i.e. blind men eight and nine.

The process of understanding reality then becomes a process of addition as well as the process of negation.

One begins with a blank slate and adds what is necessary to understand the whole of reality to the best of our ability – addition.

One weeds out the information unnecessary for the understanding of the basic overall picture of reality - negation.

The physical elephant is real (ignoring, for the purposes of the analogy, the concept: all things are simply conscious apparitions): Likewise, there are 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / ... which are real. There are three such 'fundamental truths' we, limited beings, are capable of identifying. The three 'fundamental truths' are: 1. 'What cannot be created and cannot be destroyed exists, i.e. the whole exists. 2. What can be created and cannot be destroyed exists, i.e. the discrete/individuated entities. 3. What can be created and can be destroyed exists, i.e. the physical, nothingness....

In short, we act upon what we believe to be. We act upon our perceptions of truth, but, whether or not we have a complete understanding or for that matter any understanding of truth, does not change the fact that truth remains truth nonetheless. We cannot change the fact that truth remains. It is my contention that we, you and I, humanity, is capable of pooling out knowledge and create a composite of reality based upon 'fundamental truths'. The elephant remains regardless of what the blind man states truth to be.

Regarding your comment: **'... but we only perceive the Truth we believe.'** There are a few individuals who do keep an open mind and who thus are willing to entertain the idea of examining all 'perceived truths' with an open mind. The point of such an examination is to weed out the superfluous in order to find 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / ... in order to establish an understanding as to why it is we are all truly brothers which itself emerges from the understanding as to what our common bond truly is which in turn emerges from the understanding as to what our common generic purpose/function for existing is.

I would suggest to you:

We, you and I, humans are capable of 'knowing' which 'perceived truths' are in fact 'fundamental truths' / 'universal truths' / 'immutable truths' / ...'truth' versus knowing only 'perceived truths'.

In short, we, you and I, humans are capable of knowing the difference between the two.

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

Wednesday, March 2

Symbiotic Pantheism - Synopsis: Part 5 of 10 - Social Ramifications

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 2, 2005 01:14AM (EST)

Part 5. Social Ramifications

1. **The essence of all individuals is the soul.**
2. **The essence of all individuals is contained within God.**
3. **All individuals are important to God and deserve to be treated as such.**
4. **The soul, contained within God, is important to and needed by God.**
5. **The individual, contained within God, deserves to be treated with the respect due God.**
6. **All individuals are equally important.**
7. **The individual, being of the same essence and substance as God, is not in a hierarchical relationship to itself.**

Symbiotic pantheism provides the logic needed to dismantle all hierarchical systems and perceptions of relative worth. Symbiotic pantheism eliminates the most fundamental hierarchical system created by humankind for humankind - the hierarchy system created between God and humans. It eliminates the status levels between beings. Symbiotic pantheism does not destroy what humanity has; it adds to what humanity has. Symbiotic pantheism accepts the significance of God to the individual and to the species. It also adds the significance of the individual and of the species to this one-way concept of God.

Through the fusion of pantheism and symbiosis, we form symbiotic pantheism, a philosophical, perceptual shift for the new millennium that actually defines a purpose for humanity, for the individual, for the environment, and for our relationship to God. Under symbiotic pantheism, it is our job to see that God grows. We have the free will to determine the direction God grows. This is truly an awesome responsibility, an awesome task for humankind and for the individual.

However, just as children rise to the level of expectations we place upon them, humanity will rise to the level of expectations it places upon itself. There is little doubt that society, families, and individuals could use more human, humane, Godly compassion in their journeys. To begin to understand this logic, one must examine the four forms of theism and their treatment of the three most universally accepted characteristics of God: omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence.

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

Tuesday, March 1

 **Symbiotic Panentheism - Synopsis: Part 4 of 10 - Human Significance**

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on March 1, 2005 11:38AM (EST)

Part 4. Human Significance

1. Humanity's perceptions of itself as a species and as individuals determine its behavior.
2. The higher the level of significance we have of ourselves, the higher the level of our behavior.
3. Predestination relieves us of responsibility.
4. Free will raises our level of responsibility.
5. **The highest level of perception we can assign to ourselves is the ability to have the free will to assist God in the one thing God cannot do as God - grow.**
6. **The soul being God but separated from God (being non-omnipresent, non-omniscient, non-omnipotent) has the ability to learn, experience, and create isolated from God.**
7. **The highest level of significance we can assign to ourselves is to help God, ourselves, become even more omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent.**

Human significance now becomes something it has never before been. Human significance now becomes defined. Not only does it become defined, it now becomes defined as significant for it becomes significant beyond human needs. Human significance now becomes significant to God Itself.

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