

An Ontology Series

Issue 17

**The War and Peace
Of
A
New
Ontological
Perception**



God

*Thinking Too Small
Symbiotic Panentheism*

and

Endless Paradoxes
(Theoretical Metaphysics)



Daniel J. Shepard

Ontology/Theology

Issue 17

God
Thinking Too Small
Symbiotic Panentheism
and
Endless Paradoxes
(Theoretical Metaphysics)




Resolving the Paradox Regarding:


- **Knowledge Having Limits**
- **Reality Having Limits**
- **God Having Limits**

Daniel J. Shepard

Theoretical Metaphysics helps us understand




Symbiotic panentheism helps us understand how a simple understanding of our nature and a simple understanding of God's nature does not limit us to expanding upon God's true nature.




From Tractate 16 we obtain:

Complexity:





Continuing the process of applying Husserl's Reductionism: Removing the superfluous – removing semantics and introducing the dynamics of the system we obtain the illustration of Tractate 17:

Simplicity



Or more simply illustrated:



Theoretical Metaphysics

•
What does 'theoretical' thought now investigate regarding the whole of reality?

Contents:

Part I: The Paradox regarding the existence of paradoxes and a lack of paradoxes

Introduction: You are still thinking too small

The Error of: A lack of Paradoxes

Endless Paradoxes followed by endless answers

Paradox 1

Paradox 2

Paradox 3

Paradox 4

Paradox 5

For whom does '???' exist?

Theoretical Metaphysics as of the dawn of the new millennium

Where we left off

Looking for a pattern

A second look at the pattern formation:

The surprise of nothingness

Revisiting Metaphysical Engineering through Theoretical Metaphysics

Theoretical Metaphysics: The eternally moving horizon of knowledge

Speculative summary possibilities regarding the interrelationships of four 1st truths

Theoretical Metaphysics

Philosophical Progress

Advancing knowledge

Terms/concepts:

Theoretical Metaphysics

Tractate: 17


Theoretical Metaphysics

You are still thinking too small.

It would appear the end can never be found within a foundationless system, can never be found 'outside' a non-Cartesian System. The lack of an end would appear to unequivocally establish the fact that the non-Cartesian is the 'absolute whole'.

The appearance that the non-Cartesian is the 'absolute whole', however, is just that 'an appearance'. You, we, are still thinking too small.

The pre-Zeno concept of a universe composed of the physical led to an understanding espoused by this work, led to an understanding of a non-Cartesian abstract system powered by a Cartesian system located 'within' the non-Cartesian system and as such became the focus of this work, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, as illustrated below:



The understanding of this expanded system, a system religiously and scientifically called – symbiotic panentheism, and philosophically called – the individual acting within God, is the point of tractates one through sixteen of this work.

It is this tractate, Tractate 17, which details why it is metaphysics, at the point of a new millennium, is capable of being divided into three subject areas of study: Metaphysical Engineering, Practical Metaphysics, and Theoretical Metaphysics.

Tractates one through sixteen, the Conclusion, and the Postscript validate the subject areas of Metaphysical Engineering and Practical Metaphysics.

Practical Metaphysics is a subject, which explores, expands, generates, analyzes, critiques, and debates knowing, the noun, and knowing, the verb, as they relate one to the other.

Metaphysical engineering is a subject, which applies the implication regarding our models of reality to social structure, social morality, social ethics, social justice, social issues,

Tractate Seventeen substantiates the concept that our understanding reality is an 'organic' process, a process in constant development.

Tractate Seventeen, points the way for the development of theoretical metaphysical. Although the tractate may, at times, appear to be immersed in hopelessness, such is, in fact, not the case.

The sense of hopelessness, futility, is simply the exemplification of the typically human characteristic of impatience, wanting to 'know', understand, and comprehend now not later.

Having laid the groundwork for patience as opposed to impatience, we can now proceed towards what theoretical metaphysics is to encompass.

First it is important to understand what Theoretical Metaphysics is not:

Theoretical Metaphysics is not the examination regarding the personality of the whole. The examination regarding the personality of the whole is the field of Ontology.

Metaphysics is the examination of three questions:

1. Where: Where is the whole/singularity? Where are the parts/multiplicity/individuality of the whole?
2. What: What is the whole/singularity? What are the parts/multiplicity/individuality of the whole?
3. Why: Why does the whole/singularity exist? Why do the parts/multiplicity/individualities of the whole exist?

The answers to these basic questions, where, what, and why, lead to the immergence of Metaphysical Engineering, Practical Metaphysics, and Theoretical Metaphysics through the process of definition emerging from reason, observation, and belief.

A detailed examination of Metaphysical Engineering is provided in the first trilogy: The complete book - *In The Image of God*, sections of the book: *You and I Together Have a Purpose In Reality*, and tractates one through fifteen of this work.

A detailed examination of Practical Engineering is provided in the first trilogy: the complete book: - *Stepping Up To The Creator*, sections of the book: *You and I Together Have a Purpose In Reality*, and tractates one through fifteen of this work.

What then of Theoretical Metaphysics? It is this tractate, Tractate Seventeen, preceded by the groundwork laid in Tractate Sixteen, which not only outlines the direction in which Theoretical Metaphysics is now to proceed but also lays out the first two principles of Theoretical Metaphysics.

1. The parts/elements of the whole exist for the whole.
2. The whole exists for its parts/elements.

It is the existence of both principles that initiates the descriptive adjective describing the totality of reality: symbiosis.

The War & Peace of a New Ontological Perception

Now one may immediately object to the concept of the whole existing for its parts, but how can one reasonable object since the whole is the whole and as such the whole can by definition have no function to something 'greater' than itself.

One may object on the bases that the whole may have no function at all. To suggest the whole has no function, however, would in essence be the ultimate form of nihilism generating endless trauma and despair on the part of the elements of the whole.

When examining the whole, one must remember that the whole, like truth, is relative to the 'location' within which one makes the statement (See Relativistic 1st Principles: Volume I, Tractate 2: The Error of Aristotle). As such: When one is 'within' the individual the individual perceives itself to be a 'whole individual' comprised of its parts. When one is 'within' the physical universe, the physical universe perceives itself to be a 'whole universe' comprised of its parts. When one is directly 'within' the purity of abstraction, the abstract perceives itself to be the 'whole of abstraction' comprised of its parts. The parts of the individual, the physical, and the abstract have been described in great detail throughout tractates one through fifteen of this work.

In regards to the three questions, where – what – why:

Practical Metaphysics and Metaphysical engineering deal with individuality of the parts/multiplicity as regards our most advanced understanding of the whole of reality.


Theoretical Metaphysics deals with the whole itself:

- Where: Where is the whole?
- What: What is the whole?
- Why: Why does the whole exist?

The Error of: A lack of Paradoxes


What has not been addressed within this work is that the whole/ singularity of existence itself. The understanding regarding: Where is the whole? What is the whole? Why does the whole exist? is the work of Theoretical Metaphysics and as such is the focus of this tractate, the last developmental tractate within the series.

If the whole is now understood to be virgin elements of uniquely developing abstraction existing within the physical being of the individual and the physical being of the individual existing within the physical universe which in turn exists within the abstract of the whole as illustrated by the model:




Then the question for theoretical metaphysics becomes: What lies 'beyond'? What lies 'beyond' the whole of abstraction?

The question can be illustrated as:



The illustration actually becomes:



The War & Peace of a New Ontological Perception

If we determine that existence exists beyond the furthest reaches of our perceptual abilities, beyond the whole of abstractual existence, then surely 'something' would exist beyond abstractual existence. Once we understood the '?' exists, the '?' would begin to reveal itself to us. Again we come back to the Aristotelian concept of existence being a form of onion we peel away not from the outside in but rather filling in the peels from the inside out.

After beginning to understand the physical, the abstractual began to reveal itself to us. After beginning to understand the abstractual, 'nothingness' began to reveal itself to us. Now it may be true that nothingness appeared as 'an element' of the abstract and thus contained within the abstract but as we learned in Tractate 8: The Error of Einstein – Resolving the Problem of Physical Time, 'nothingness' becomes the very boundary separating one peel of the onion of reality from another and as such can only exist as a 'barrier', exist as a boundary separating one layer from another but cannot exist as the ultimate 'outside' barrier since the ultimate 'outer' layer has nothing from which it is to be separated. It is the ultimate 'outer' layer that then becomes the foundationless system 'containing' the inner peels of reality. If such were not the case, and if 'nothingness' were the ultimate of existences, then nihilism trumps existence, disorder supercedes order, despair would dominate hope, ...

This work has espoused the concept that paradoxes exist because we do not have a grasp of the larger reality. If the model presented by this work presents solutions to presently existing paradoxes then it would appear that new paradoxes would arise with our beginning to understand the '?'.

As of yet such paradoxes do not exist and as such we have no idea as to what '?' is but that does not mean the '?' does not exist and in fact that is the very essence of theoretical metaphysics. Theoretical metaphysics is the examination of the potential for '?' to exist and the development and examination that such an existence would create.

Again it must be strongly reiterated that if the metaphysical model of symbiotic panentheism, initiated by this work, eliminates most philosophical paradoxes as it espouses to do that does not imply paradoxes do not exist, will not arise from such a model. What is implied is that paradoxes regarding the three items, the physical, the abstract, and nothingness, will be basically eliminated.

The concept:

Knowledge moves our perceptual understanding of the system into that of being a system filled with paradoxes and a lack of paradoxes. As such, paradoxes and a lack of paradoxes, with the help of knowledge, now have a location within which they can be found. However, the understanding regarding the role of paradoxes and a lack of paradoxes as well as the understanding regarding the interrelationship between paradoxes and a lack of paradoxes not only remain in a state of confusion but even more disconcerting, the existence of such an interrelationship is not recognized as a significant aspect of the 'larger' system.

now becomes the last paradox to be resolved by this work: The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception.

Endless Paradoxes followed by endless answers

The suggestion that having found a metaphysical system which may resolve some of the more outstanding paradoxes and antinomies in no way suggests the end of paradoxes.

The emergence of paradoxes is nothing short of an indication that we are continually learning. If the whole is an active entity then 'newness' is constantly being generated as opposed to simply existing just beyond our reach awaiting our discovery.

If newness were simply existing just beyond our reach awaiting our discovery, then given enough time it is conceivable we could eventually know everything there is to know. This is what is referred to as a passive form of knowledge, a limited form of knowledge, a horizon of knowledge that does not move.

If newness is constantly being generated then given enough time it is inconceivable we could eventually know everything there is to know for the more we observe and learn the more that is created. This is what is referred to as an active form of existence, an eternally moving horizon of knowledge

As we have learned throughout this work, paradoxes have revealed themselves and we have, overtime, with the development and uncovering of knowledge, resolved said paradoxes. For example:


Paradox 1

‘A’ region for seamlessness and ‘A’ region for multiplicity exist simultaneously



Resolved

Paradox 1: Resolving Zeno’s multiplicity and seamlessness does nothing but open up the potential for new paradoxes.




Paradox 2

There is not 'one' 1st truth but there are multiple relativistic 1st truths



Resolved

Paradox 2: Resolving Aristotle's closing of the outer boundary of the physical universe does nothing but open up the potential for new paradoxes.




Paradox 3

Free will and determinism exist simultaneously independent yet dependent upon one another

•

Resolved

Paradox 3: Resolving Boethius' simultaneous existence of divine foreknowledge and free will does nothing but open up the potential for new paradoxes.




Paradox 4

There is a region where Centricism dominates and there is a region where non-Centricism dominates

•

Resolved

Paradox 4: Resolving Copernicus' simultaneous development of the sole existence of Centricism does nothing but open up the potential for new paradoxes.




Paradox 5

Omni-benevolence is not an 'Omni...'



Resolved

Paradox 5: Resolving Leibniz' issue regarding theodicy does nothing but open up the potential for new paradoxes.



The model of symbiotic panentheism demonstrates we exist as a part of the whole and demonstrates that as a part of the whole we have a function to the whole. If the ultimate whole is the physical, as the Empiricists suggest, then we can begin to understand our function and therefore our responsibilities for existing lie in a form of materialism, physical hedonism. . If, on the other hand, the ultimate whole is the abstract, as the model of symbiotic panentheism suggests, then we can begin to understand our function and therefore our responsibilities for existing lie in a form of altruism, abstractual hedonism.

But what if we discover that the ultimate whole is something other than the abstractual or the physical? The concept of the ultimate whole being something other than the physical or the abstractual leads to the question which theoretical metaphysics is created to explore:

Can we know of ‘?’ ?

Can we know what lies beyond what it is we are presently capable of perceiving?

As far as we are aware only the physical, abstraction, and nothingness exists but what of that which we do not know?


If we are composed of abstraction, the physical, and nothingness is it possible to know of that which one is not composed?

Again the answer is yes and no. At this point in time we can know what the ‘?’ ‘is not’ but until we learn what ‘?’ is, we can only know it in the form of what ‘?’ is not. We will have to wait for future developments if we are ever to know of ‘?’ in the form of what ‘?’ is.


Will such an occurrence ever occur? We have known of the physical for a long time. We have known of the abstract for a shorter period of time. We have known of nothingness for an even shorter period of time (See a Zero: The Biography of a Dangerous Idea)

Will a new understanding emerge? Why not? The physical emerged. Abstraction emerged. Nothingness emerged. Why not ‘?’ emerging.

This work has demonstrated to us that it is because the abstract is the ultimate ‘location’ within which we find ourselves to exist that it is the abstract, altruism, abstractual hedonisms towards which we must ultimately aspire.



If '?' does emerge as a 'location within which the whole of abstraction exists:



then we will find ourselves unable to state anything less than: It is the '?' which is the ultimate form of existence towards which we must aspire for we are a part of '?' and '?' is incapable of being the whole without all of its parts. It is '?', '?'-ism, '?' hedonisms towards which we must ultimately aspire for the whole (?) exists for us and we exist for the whole, we exist for the '?'.

The statement that the '?' exists for us and that we exist for the '?' in no way brings us back to the concept of not understanding our purpose for existing. The statement in no way suggests we cannot begin to understand our purpose for existing. It is the philosophical desire to mince words, twist concepts, debate simply for the purpose of debating that leads us to an immediate sense of hopelessness regarding ever knowing the answer to the question: Why do we exist? It is the immediate desire on the part of the philosopher to question the ability to 'know' that traps us as individuals within the seemingly hopeless quagmire of linguistics, which generates the perception that there is nothing we can 'know' and therefore it is impossible to 'know' why we exist.

With the advent of this work, metaphysics not only explains why it is we can 'know' we have a purpose for existing but also explains what that purpose is and what our responsibilities are regarding that very purpose.


The '?' is not a question of uncertainty but rather a simple statement that another layer of reality may exist and there is no reason for us to fear examining such a concept for examining such a concept in no way changes the principles now established by this work:

1. We/multiplicity/individuality exist for the whole/singularity/'Being'
2. The whole/singularity/'Being' exists for us/individuality/multiplicity

Theoretical Metaphysics as of the dawn of the new millennium

Where we left off: Volume II: Tractate 12: 1998 AD Symbiotic Panentheism

A Perceptual Shift for Humankind – A New Perception 2000 AD



The new perception of reality generated by this work establishes much regarding reality including:


1. Nothingness is nothingness and as such both exists and has functionality as nothingness.
Tractate 10: The Error of Heidegger
2. From nothingness matter and energy emerge. Tractate 8: The Error of Einstein
3. From nothingness time and space emerge. Tractate 8: The Error of Einstein
4. Through nothingness, separation through exclusion becomes separation through inclusion.
Tractate 9: The Error of Russell.

This is where we left our undeclared examination of Theoretical Metaphysics and as such, this is where we must begin the process of understanding the method called ‘looking for a pattern’ which can assist us in comprehending the potential whole of reality as opposed comprehending what we wish the whole of reality to be.


Looking for a pattern

We begin the process of looking for a pattern of reality with Tractate 13: Metaphysical System # 28.

As we discovered, model building through the application of Ockham’s Razor provided us with the model of reality illustrated as:



‘being’: individuality




being: action - Process/reality, the physical universe



‘Being’: totality, summation, the whole

Th illustration of the individual existing within the physical universe which in turn is located within the purity of abstraction emerges as the ultimate accomplishment of applying Ockham's Razor and Husserl's reductionism. Attaining such a simplistic model using Ockham's Razor is nothing short of generating the personification of simplicity itself and the beauty the Greeks assigned to such simplicity.


The first step the method 'look for a pattern' requires is to examine the concept of individuality. This step must be taken if we are to expand upon the outer fringes of Being/the Primal Force/the whole itself.



'being': individuality

In order to examine individuality we have no choice but to begin by separating the elements of the model and then strip away parts of this diagram. This process will allow us to examine the model's very core.

First the separation:




Through the process of discarding the outer layers from the fundamental model of reality we obtain the core. We thus obtain:



Which of course is: 'being'/individuality/multiplicity.


In Tractate 8: The Error of Einstein, we found individuality to be a form of experience emerging from existence being wrapped in time generated by the physical. By traveling through the physical, the individual 'became'. 'Became' what? was the question addressed within Tractate 8? The individual 'became' an entity of experience which itself wrapped 'coherent time' within itself. 'Coherent time', through the emergence of the individual became captured as a unique element, versus a universal fabric, of a timeless 'location'. The individual gained a perception of being:




And thus we can take:



And replace it with:



Or for the purposes of simplicity, we now obtain:



Where


..... equals the flow of time

and




equals a unit of individuality from the beginning of its 'virgin consciousness' to the end of it's experiencing 'within' the physical, a form of 'taser' beam (See Tractate 8: The Error of Einstein)


As such:



Becomes:




Which becomes:



In essence, we have a form of abstractual 'constancy of time'/multiplicity of time versus a 'seamlessness' of time. Thus the concept of a 'concrete/physical variability of time'/multiplicity of time emerged and the understanding regarding the multiplicity of time existing within the multiplicity of individuality gained a form of interactive potentiality within a location void universal time itself. In short, timeless existence becomes a rational concept worthy of our attention as philosophers – metaphysicians in particular, scientists – cosmologists in particular, and theists – ontologists in particular.

If we continue the pattern of adding layers to the model, what then would be the next step or diagram added to this sequential flow of ideas?

It would, could, may, and has the potential to be:



Now in fact this may not be the case at all.

We are most likely jumping ahead of ourselves and in our excitement, rushing into a symbolic representation, which has no merit. Now this is not to say the idea of what we wish to draw has no merit. What it says is simply what it says: the drawing, symbolic representation, may have no merit.

Setting aside the issue of merit at this point, we find we have two choices regarding an expanded view of the whole of reality. We can arbitrarily decide what the next drawing should be or we can use reason based upon an understanding regarding our perceptual development of reality. In short, we can use the arbitrary influenced by our personal hopes, emotions, beliefs, desires, personal preferences, ... or we can use a technique known as 'look for a pattern'.


A second look at the pattern formation:

Looking for a pattern is a skill, which makes use of several concepts:


1. Keep it simple
2. Provide enough of the pattern to be sure it is a pattern

With this in mind let's begin to review the pattern:


First we had a perception that we as individual existed within a physical universe:




This led to our sensing there was nothing other than the physical universe within which we existed:




This led to a perception of reality potentially being the physical universe existing and a primal force existing transcendent of the physical universe perhaps being a reality:




This led to the perception that the individual existed within the physical universe and the primal force did in fact (a religious perception of 4 billion living human beings) exist as a separate entity 'overseeing' the physical:




This led to: the individual acting within God as espoused by the concept of emanation but where the whole embraces the physical universe itself and the term - being - is non-italicized to indicate the passivity of the individual as regards the individuals ability to 'change'/impact/affect the whole of 'Being/the whole/summation/the purity of abstractual existence found to exist 'outside' the physical universe:



This in turn led to the concept of 'being' *being* 'Being as espoused by symbiotic emanation, symbiotic panentheism where the whole embraces the physical universe itself and where the term - *being* - is italicized (as opposed to being non-italicised) to indicate the active nature of the individual as regards the individual's ability to 'change'/impact/affect the whole of 'Being/the whole/summation/the purity of abstractual existence found to exist 'outside' the physical universe:



The diagram in its simplest form becomes:




The dotted line becomes a solid line to indicate the furthest boundary of our present perceptual abilities. The arrow is ignored for the system's name embraces the concept of symbiosis as clearly indicated by the system's names: symbiotic emanation, symbiotic panentheism, 'being' *being* (italicized) 'Being'. The names enfold both the passivity and action of individuality - 'being'.


It is at this point in time, the dawn of a new millennium, that the concept of the individual acting within God, the concept of a Cartesian system powering a non-Cartesian system, emerges. It is at this very point in time that one must take pause and use extreme caution, for the concept has not been examined to its fullest. A full examination of the model is an endeavor that does not happen in a matter of years or even decades.

Therefore to assume the model is 'the' model or to assume the model is an 'absolute' incapable of being 'expanded' is getting ahead of ourselves and for this very reason the theoretical speculation regarding an expanding model of symbiotic panentheism is classified as 'theoretical metaphysics'.

We must, therefore acknowledge that:




may, in fact, not be an accurate diagram regarding the whole of reality and thus:




May not be the case.


Therefore, we must recognize that the next diagram:




Or more accurately:



may not be the case and thus we have little choice but to go back to the more simplistic diagram of:



In order to determine where to place:



Just because we found the concept of ‘separation through exclusion’ to be lacking in terms of resolving paradoxes of our past (see Tractate 9: The Error of Russell), does not mean ‘separation through exclusion’ may not, could not, does not exist in regards to the interrelationship existing between the first three metaphysical elements and the new element – ‘?’, the fourth potential element of metaphysics.

But why the dotted line? The line is dotted because at this point we have no idea regarding what this fourth element may be let alone if the dotted line represents a Cartesian system, a non-Cartesian system, or something else altogether.

As such we have no idea regarding where to place this new element in relationship to the integrated system of the first three forms of being: the individual acting within God

We don't even know if this new element, this fourth element, is 'within' any one, any two, or all three of the first three.

Now it would appear that this fourth 'location' could not be 'within' the other three or it would be a part of the other three. This, however, is not necessarily the case. Since we have no idea whatever as to what this fourth element is, should the fourth element in fact exist. We have no conception of the fourth element's characteristics and as such the fourth element, should it exist, has the potential to be anywhere and anything other than what it is we are capable of conceiving at this point in time.

This then brings us back to our question: What is the next diagram in the sequence?

The surprise of nothingness:

We begin with no dimensions. We begin with nothing – no length, no width, no depth, no space, no time, no energy, no matter, no abstractuals of any type.

Zero dimensions




We move to one dimension and when we do so we find the dimensionless point is actually five points:


One dimension




We move from one dimension into two dimensions and find the five points are three entities:




We move from two dimension into three dimensions and find the three entities take form:



We then add the concepts of time and distance and obtain:



and finally we obtain the concept of the individual acting within God



If we reverse the process step by step we reduce the image to its essence, nothing physical, only the singularity of individuality exists. This statement, within the context of symbiotic panentheism, in no way implies only the whole exists for the whole cannot be the whole if nay of its unique parts of knowing dissolve into a state of non-being.

Regarding dimensions 5,6, 7...: Dimensions ...5, 6, 7, ... are dimensions much too involved for us to examine within the scope of a tractate regarding theoretical metaphysics and as such are left to the theoretical physicists and theoretical mathematicians to contemplate.

Revisiting Metaphysical Engineering through Theoretical Metaphysics

The development regarding a fourth element of reality leads us back to Tractate 13: Metaphysical System # 28. Now, however, the title finds itself becoming: Metaphysical System # 257.

With the introduction of a new element, a fourth element, to the basic three elements, the potential number of possible metaphysical models grows exponentially. The potential models grow from 28 to 257. As such Tractate 13 would now take on the following initial appearance:

Regarding metaphysical systems:

Building metaphysical systems is the process of moving forward with what theoretical metaphysics puts into place.

Theoretical metaphysics brings to the building site the materials with which the metaphysical engineer begins the construction of the model itself.

As such, let us examine the building materials which theoretical metaphysics has put before us. Once we have taken this step, let's examine some of the potential models metaphysical engineering could construct.

Since a relatively large number of models will be presented, we will examine only four in detail. We will then take the final model and put it into non-technical language, generalizations.

Preliminary:

Metaphysical systems are systems reduced to their simplest forms. As a preliminary, we will examine visuals of a few metaphysical systems, which could emerge from four basic components: individuality, action, '?', and summation.

We will represent the four through linguistic symbolization and definition as follows:

Linguistic symbolization: Definitions:

1. 'being' n: individuality
2. *being* vb: action, Process/reality
3. '?': ??????
4. 'Being' n: summation, totality


The analysis, which follows, is an examination of individuality and its relationship to the whole as well as the whole to individuality. We will not be discussing 'Being's' significance to 'Being,' to summation. In essence we will be examining the internal dynamics of metaphysical systems rather than the external dynamics of such systems.

We begin by establishing four potential components for a metaphysical system. Having done that, we will diagram, model, two hundred fifty seven systems that could potentially emerge from them.


Metaphysical Engineering:

Metaphysical Concepts:


* You: 'being', Individuality




You: 'being', Individuality – magnified 5x



You: 'being', Individuality – magnified 12x



The Physical Universe: *being* – action, Process/reality




The Purity of Abstraction within which universes lie




The Whole: 'Being', summation, totality

The process of developing the 257 models of reality through metaphysical engineering, then follows the process established within Tractate 13. Due to limited space we will not detail the process here but we will illustrate model # 257.

Metaphysical System # 257:



Which in essence is a replication of the previous model we developed through the process of 'looking for a pattern:



The complete examination regarding what the two hundred fifty seven models imply in regards to the potential purpose and potential responsibilities regarding the individual are not the focus of this Tractate but it can be stated at this point that the fundamentals of Tractates 13 through 16 remain intact and the resultant concepts of purpose generating responsibilities remains intact: It is responsibilities which emerge from purpose not purpose which emerges from responsibilities.

Theoretical Metaphysics: The eternally moving horizon of knowledge

It is possible to model an understanding demonstrating how pure free will can exist uncompromised by 'divine foreknowledge'. In the process of establishing a model where free will and determinism may be interdependent of each other's existence, we will see how it is metaphysics is alive rather than being 'dead' as we presently 'believe'. Even more excitingly, we will observe how it is metaphysics retains an ever-moving horizon, which may well extend infinitely beyond our reach just as a finality to the extent of knowledge itself may extend infinitely beyond our reach.

This tractate and Tractate 13 have demonstrated the understanding that as concepts of singularity increase geometrically in number the models increase exponentially in number.

A metaphysical understanding that 1st truth is simply singular in nature generates a singular metaphysical model.

A metaphysical understanding that two 1st truths exist generates five metaphysical models.

A metaphysical understanding that three 1st truths exist generates twenty-eight metaphysical models.

A metaphysical understanding that four 1st truths exist generates two hundred fifty seven metaphysical models.

The issue and understanding regarding the logic involved regarding the rationality as to the existence of multiple 1st truths was examined in great detail throughout this work. The issue as to the validity regarding multiple 1st truths will therefore not be addressed within this tractate. What is being addressed within this tractate is the concept of theoretical metaphysics, the initial understanding regarding what it is that may lay 'beyond' the whole as is presented within this work, what lies 'beyond' the purity of abstraction within which universes lie.

It is the singularity of 'the' whole, which constantly presents itself within this work. But what of the potential existence of no 'whole' existing? The issue regarding no whole was partially addressed within Tractate 13:

Concepts of multiplicity are no doubt just as much a possibility as concepts of singularity and cannot be ignored.


And just what is a concept of singularity as opposed to a concept of multiplicity? To understand the concept one can take any of the three metaphysical concepts. As an example: Take the concept of unique individuality, in order to be unique it is usually considered to occur only once within the system. Granted there could be an infinite number of unique individualities but in our present understanding of reality it is assumed 'a' particular individuality occurs only once. This need not necessarily be the case, however.

The possibility of 'a' unique individual existing more than once, and for that matter, occurring more than once at the same 'time' 'within' 'a' metaphysical system is not being denied. However, the intricacies of such a possibility are not the issue of this particular tractate.

Systems limited to four metaphysical concepts of singularity:

A metaphysical system incorporating four 1st truths is presently capable of being understood as:
The materials:

'being', *being*, ?, and 'Being',




The system could be:

1. A system less system
2. A system less system of separation through exclusion
3. A system less system of separation through inclusion
4. A system of system ness
5. A system of system ness of separation through exclusion
6. A system of system ness of separation through inclusion
7. ...
8.
9. ...
10. A system

As was discussed in Tractate 8: The Error of Einstein, the symbolic representation of the individual:




can be replaced with:




which in turn can be symbolized as:



The result of redefining a symbol for individuality gives us a fresh look at reality. The model of reality incorporating four 1st truths now takes on the appearance of:



The great desire here is to quickly use Ockham's Razor to avoid complexity. It is for that reason the concept of:



evolves so quickly, but do not forget the lesson of Volume II, A Virgin Consciousness. Philosophers from Zeno through Russell generated irresolvable paradoxes not because the paradoxes were in essence irresolvable but because the paradoxes were perceived to be irresolvable when examining said paradoxes within the restrictions placed upon them perceptually.

So it was paradoxes bloomed and flourished over the last twenty five hundred years of philosophical thought. So it was:

1. The paradox of distance and motion remained unresolved
2. The paradox of 'a' system remained unresolved
3. The paradox of free will vs. determinism remained unresolved
4. The paradox of a centrist system remained unresolved
5. The paradox of 'omnibenevolence' remained unresolved
6. The paradox of limits remained unresolved
7. The paradox of a non-Cartesian system (a system without a beginning – end format) remained unresolved
8. The paradox of a functionless 'nothingness' remained unresolved
9. The paradox of physical hedonism remained unresolved
10. The paradox of time remained unresolved

11. The paradox of monism and dualism remained unresolved
12. The paradox of relative value remained unresolved
13. The paradox of exclusionism/separation remained unresolved
14. The paradox of metaphysical multiplicity remained unresolved
15. The paradox of 'being' *being* separated from 'Being' *being* remained unresolved

So it is the concept of responsibility for:

1. one's 'being'
2. one's *being* – actions, process/reality
3. one's 'Being':

remained riddled with philosophical paradoxes and philosophical choices. So it was society was to be inundated with confusing thought, paradoxical justice, contradictory debate, personal conjectures, emotional principles, wishful delusions, and fanciful theories which would rationalize the actions of intimidation, abuse, domination, submission, personality complexes of superiority as well as inferiority throughout the two thousand five hundred years to come, throughout the centuries of pain, sorrow, agony, and despair not only in terms of the physical body and mind, not only spiritually, but in terms of the very soul, 'being' itself, in terms of perhaps 'Being' Itself.

So it was the concept of taking responsibility for 'being', *being*, and 'Being' could never come to fruition all because we pre-supposed 'what was' rather than waiting patiently for an understanding of 'what might be'.

Let us not do the same thing with the new understanding that a fourth 1st truth may exist. It takes a long, long time to learn from mistakes and it takes even longer to back track and begin anew a development regarding a new perception if in fact it is even possible to develop a new perception based upon a fourth 1st truth..

With this said, lets take what should be our first step and begin the examination of a fourth 1st truth which at this point in time remains totally outside the realm of our discussions regarding reality.




Systems limited to four metaphysical concepts of singularity:

The materials, 1st truths, with which the metaphysical models are built now become:


'being', *being*, ? , and 'Being'




The individual exists – I exist, you exist



The universe exists



The purity of abstraction exists



???? exists


At this point one must not lose track of the concept that 'nothingness' exists but is not the '???' of which we speak. The understanding regarding why it is 'nothingness' is not the '????' is fully addressed within previous tractates and in specific Tractates 1, 2, 8, 9, and 10.

Now, as before, the system/model could be:


- A system less system
- A system less system of separation through exclusion
- A system less system of separation through inclusion
- A system of system ness
- A system of system ness of separation through exclusion
- A system of system ness of separation through inclusion
- ...
-
- ...
- A system

Speculative summary possibilities regarding the interrelationship of four 1st truths :


This fourth metaphysical unit may be what holds 'beng', *being*, and 'Being together




This fourth metaphysical unit may be the pinnacle of a structure based upon 'beng', *being*, and 'Being



This fourth metaphysical unit may be the base of a structure from which 'beng', *being*, and 'Being springs



This fourth metaphysical unit may be altogether different from any of this, altogether separate from 'beng', *being*, and 'Being



Or? 'Or' who at this point knows?

Theoretical Metaphysics:

This process of understanding the unknown that lies ‘beyond’ perceived reality is known as Theoretical Metaphysics. Theoretical Metaphysics is very different from both Metaphysical Engineering and Practical Metaphysics.

Metaphysical Engineering takes concepts theoretical metaphysics puts into play and then proceeds to create functional social solutions to seemingly irresolvable social paradoxes. (For 30 examples see: *In the Image of God*, Book II, Trilogy I).

Practical Metaphysics takes concepts theoretical metaphysics puts into play and examines their validity against knowledge we had, have, and will have in place. (For 30 examples see: *Stepping up to the Creator*, Book III, Trilogy I).

Theoretical Metaphysics with the development of symbiotic panentheism, with the development of the individual acting within God, begins its own unique cutting edge development. Theoretical Metaphysics initiates the speculation as to what it is the whole (the Cartesian found within and powering the non-Cartesian) lies.

With the advent of our understanding the whole of reality, understanding the individual acting within God, we now can begin to understand the age-old questions regarding ‘being’. The questions:

Philosophically:

Where is ‘being’?
What is ‘being’?
And lastly
Why does ‘being’ exist?

Scientifically:

Where is the life?
What is the life?
And lastly
Why does life exist?

Religiously:

Where is the soul?
What is the soul?
And lastly
Why does the soul exist?

With the advent of our understanding the whole of reality, understanding of the individual acting within God, we now can begin to understand the age-old questions regarding 'being'. The questions:

Philosophically:

Where is *being* – action, process/reality?
What is *being* – action, process/reality?
And lastly
Why does *being* – action, process/reality exist?

Scientifically:

Where is *being* – action, process/reality?
What is *being* – action, process/reality?
And lastly
Why does *being* – action, process/reality?

Religiously:

Where is *being* – action, process/reality?
What is *being* – action, process/reality?
And lastly
Why does *being* – action, process/reality exist?

Theoretical Metaphysics is now standing at the cusp of beginning to theorize the answers to the questions never before thought possible, namely:

Philosophically:

Where is 'Being'?
What is 'Being'?
And lastly
Why does 'Being' exist?

Scientifically:

Where is the First Cause?
What is the First Cause?
And lastly
Why does First Cause exist?

Religiously:

Where is God?
What is God?
And lastly
Why does God exist?

How can we possibly know answers to such questions? We can begin at the simplest of steps. We can begin in terms of what it is we 'know' the fourth metaphysical building block is not.

We know the fourth 1st truth is not the physical/the concrete/*being* - action, process/reality. The concept of the physical has already been addressed as one of the three metaphysical building blocks we have in place: 'being', *being*, and 'Being'.

We know this fourth building block of metaphysics is not 'being', individuality, a piece, part of abstraction, for 'being' has already been addressed as one of the three metaphysical building blocks we have in place: 'being', *being*, and 'Being'.

We know this fourth building block of metaphysics is not 'Being', the summation of abstraction for 'Being' has already been addressed as one of the three metaphysical building blocks we have in place: 'being', *being*, and 'Being'.

We know this fourth metaphysical unit is not the means by which 'Being' expands upon itself for *being* in the active sense is accounted for within the metaphysical system of the individual acting within God.

And there is more we know regarding what the fourth metaphysical unit, what the fourth 1st truth, is not. The fourth metaphysical unit, the fourth 1st truth is not 'nothingness' for nothingness, with this work has been fully incorporated as a part of reality, included 'within' reality as a functioning entity unique in and of itself.

What then can we say regarding what this fourth metaphysical unit is? At this point there is only one thing we can say for certain regarding what this fourth metaphysical unit is: The fourth metaphysical unit exists for we have conceived of it.

So when will we 'know' more regarding what this fourth unit of metaphysical existence is?


We are going to have to wait until later for our answers, much later, much much later. We are most likely going to have to wait until after we have answered some additional questions regarding 'being', *being* – action, process/physical reality, and 'Being'. As we answer these questions we will have taken another step towards understanding this fourth unit of metaphysics. We must be patient. We must move forward with the expansion of our understanding regarding 'being' *being* 'Being. We must move forward with our knowledge base that leads to answering pressing questions regarding Metaphysical Engineering and Practical Metaphysics.


And what of the future? In the future we will see another metaphysician come along who will be capable of expanding the understanding of reality beyond the limits created by the perceptual model of symbiotic pantheism, which has expanded upon the perceptual models Aristotle and Kant had put into play. Until such a human, extraterrestrial, or artificial intelligence of some form emerges, there is no need to wait immersed in stagnant anticipation. There is much to do philosophically, scientifically, and religiously until then.


And just how long will we have to wait before such a metaphysician comes along and stumbles across the cusp of another metaphysical insight waiting to expose itself to our curiosity? Who knows? It may not happen until the onset of the next millennium, the approach of the year 3000 AD, but of one thing you can be fairly certain, it will happen for we have dreamed it and as such it is as certain as any potentiality we can conceive.

Philosophical Progress


Philosophical growth regarding the understanding of reality can be illustrated in terms of the distant past, the recent past, the near future, and the far future:







Placing the distant past, the recent past, the near future, and the far future end to end we obtain a timeline of human philosophical knowledge illustrated as:



Advancing knowledge

Why then does the whole exist: The whole exists not for what lies outside itself but rather the whole exists for what lies within itself, exists for its parts just as the environment exists for its parts, government exists for its constituents, society exists for its members, religion exists for the individual.

In essence it is not the individual that exists for the good of the whole but rather it is the whole, which exists for the good of the individual. This work clearly demonstrates the significance of the individual and as such acts as the ultimate philosophical work substantiating the human history vector that intuitively suggests:

1. Human purpose has phenomenal significance.
2. Human responsibility is definable.
3. Neither human purpose nor human responsibilities are to be taken lightly.

Our specie has sacrificed much emotional trauma and spilled much human blood to elevate the significance of the individual. The sacrifice has been freely given to keep the intuitive perception regarding the significance of the individual alive. Now, with this work, an ally of intuition has been developed and that ally is knowledge based upon reason.

This ally of knowledge is more formidable than what it may appear to be at first glance. Knowledge is a stagnant concept when examined from our past perceptions. Our past perceptions of knowledge presented a limit to what we could learn for we could only learn of what exists. The ally developed by this work is an ally of both existing knowledge and developing what 'could exist' but doesn't exist knowledge. This ally is an eternally moving horizon of knowledge.

The eternally moving horizon of knowledge, within the model of symbiotic panentheism will never be reached for by definition it is we, you and I, future souls, all beings within the universe which harbor abstractual thought processes which are the very means by which knowledge is created. It is by definition, we, you and I together, who circumvent the horrors of eternal recurrence faced by God itself, faced by the whole itself, faced by 'Being' itself, faced by you and I ourselves.

We, you and I, are the very means by which nihilism itself is defeated.