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Region of Passive Complexity:

Complexity in the Passive State
Perfection in the passive sense exists:
The omni’s in the passive state of Complexity
1. Passive Omnipresence
2. Passive Omnipotence
3. Passive Omniscience

Complexity in the Passive State is a non-Cartesian system
Centricism does not exist in the passive state of Complexity
Determinism emerges out of constancy – passive Complexity
Time/distance exists as an abstract functionality ‘within’ individual elements of
Passive Complexity as opposed to being a universal fabric of Passive Complexity
Passive Complexity is an open system

Region of Chaos

Chaos exists actively and passively
The Physical Universe
Time and distance exist as a universal fabric, an innate characteristic of matter and energy
A closed ‘system’ limited by infinite time and infinite distance
Confined within the two edges of chaos

The Two Edges of Chaos

Region of:
Active Complexity
Discussion of such a region is the point of this dialectic
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Introduction

In Tractate 16 and Tractate 17 we established the new direction of theoretical metaphysics. Theoretical metaphysics, with the onset of Volumes I, II, and III of this work, now becomes the exploration of what this work proposes lies outside the physical universe and the exploration of the interrelationship such an existence has to what lies outside itself.

Such being the case we can apply our model of metaphysics to an established field of study namely: Chaos and Complexity.

As with philosophy, mathematicians perceive the problem regarding chaos and complexity to be either/or in nature.

Either
- Complexity arises from chaos
Or
- Chaos arises from complexity.

But just as the philosophers could not come to grips with the solution to their paradox when they perceived the solution to be either/or in nature. Likewise mathematicians may be unable to come to grips with the solution to their paradox as long as they perceive the solution to be either/or in nature.

It is metaphysics, which can provide the solution to the mathematical paradox regarding chaos and complexity. The metaphysical system of ‘being’ God is a model, which can demonstrate the resolution to the mathematicians’ paradox just as it provided a solution to the oldest of philosophical paradoxes.

Because the process involves an application of metaphysics to the ‘real’ world we shall now consider the application of this metaphysical solution to the paradox regarding complexity and chaos to be a ‘practical’ utilization of metaphysics or in short, practical metaphysics.

We shall begin by exploring the concept regarding which system is the most rational of what we now understand may be three options:

1. Complexity emerges from chaos
2. Chaos emerges from complexity
3. Both occur simultaneously

As we explore the issues of which emerges from which, order emerging from chaos or chaos emerging from complexity, we shall begin to understand that there are not just two options nor are there just three options rather there are a myriad of options from which to choose. Due to the lack of space and time, we shall limit our precursory discussion to twenty-eight options and limit our in-depth discussion to four options. As we shall see, the third option of the three listed above emerges as the most rational of the remaining twenty-eight options, which in turn emerge in our precursory discussion.

The outcome of the discussion demonstrates: Complexity/order shows itself to be indispensable to the system as a whole as opposed to being ‘simply’ a product of the whole of the system.

Likewise, chaos/disorder shows itself to be indispensable to the system as a whole as opposed to being ‘simply’ a product of the whole of the system.
The understanding of the relationship regarding chaos/disorder and complexity/order, as might be expected, emerges from philosophical thought and in particular from metaphysical thought.

Applying Ockham’s Razor to metaphysical systems we obtain systems reduced to their simplest forms. Such a form, the simplest form, is the most versatile model format to use when exploring a subject as complex as the interrelationship existing between chaos, complexity, and the whole of reality.

As a preliminary step, we will examine visuals of a few metaphysical/mathematical/scientific systems, which could emerge from three basic components: individuality/order/active complexity, action/chaos/the universe, and summation/order/passive complexity.

We will represent the three, Strange Attractors, Complexity, and Chaos, through linguistic symbolization and definition as follows: Complexity is divided into two forms: Passive and Active. Passive Complexity is defined as Complexity/order that has been established and Active Complexity is defined as Complexity/order that is in the process of being developed/created.

Linguistic symbolization: Definitions:

1. The Strange Attractor – The ‘seat'/soul/nucleus of Active Complexity
2. Active Complexity - ‘being’ n: individuality emerging
3. Chaos - being vb - active: The Universe, action, Process/reality, the region within which creation, development takes place
4. Passive Complexity – ‘being’ n: Individuality complete
5. Complexity/Order - God n: summation, totality, the whole
6. Existence - being vb - passive: the state of being

At this point, a few words regarding Active Complexity are critical to the discussion. Active Complexity can be classified into two distinct types:

Active complexity of active action:
Active complexity of passive action:

Active complexity of active action is the manifestation of a pattern established by a strange attractor (knowing in nature) through the forces of free will/choice.
Active complexity of passive action is the manifestation of a pattern established by a strange attractor (knowing and/or unknowing in nature) through the forces of determinism/no choice.

Distinguishing between these two forms of Active Complexity leads to intuitively obvious conclusions in and of themselves. As such these intuitive conclusions will not be addressed within this dialectic. The full examination of such intuitive conclusions can be found within Volumes I, II, and III of this work: The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception.

It may help to use charts to define linguistic symbolizations in relationship to religious, scientific, mathematical, and philosophical perceptions. The purpose of such charts is to help those with religious, scientific, or philosophical leanings to better understand the discussion.
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The linguistic symbolization charts would appear as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics:</td>
<td>‘B’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Theory</td>
<td>The Universal Set*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>The plane of the circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>The universe and what it is the Universe lies within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>The whole of Reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>The whole of existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphysics</td>
<td>God - noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>‘Knowing’ – noun: Summation of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Universal in this scenario refers to the whole of all that exists as opposed to the whole of the physical universe
### Complexity

#### Active Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics:</td>
<td>‘b’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Theory</td>
<td>an element of …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Inside the circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complexity</strong></td>
<td>Pattern developing caused by the Strange Attractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>System/Life Form/Entity/… emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>The whole of the individual entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphysics</td>
<td>‘meta…’ inward beyond the physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>‘being’ and/or ‘knowing’ – noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A segment of knowledge emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Individual creation of an element</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Complexity

### Passive Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics:</td>
<td>‘B’ - ‘b’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Theory</td>
<td>an element of…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Outside the circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Pattern developed by the Strange Attractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>System/Life Form/Entity/…complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>The whole of the individual entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphysics</td>
<td>‘meta…’ outward ‘beyond’ the physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>‘being’ and/or ‘knowing’ – noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A segment of knowledge complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Individually created element</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Verbose of action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics:</td>
<td><em>b</em> (italicized, not in quotation marks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Theory</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>The Process of creating the circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chaos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>The universe location where the developmental process of ‘being’/multiplicity/individuality can occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chaos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Action/process/reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphysics</td>
<td>‘… physics’ - <em>being</em> - verb of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td><em>knowing</em> – the act of knowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Interaction which occurs between God, creation, and Humans/individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics:</td>
<td>b (not italicized, not in quotations marks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Theory</td>
<td>{ } the set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>The circle itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Chaos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Complexity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>The boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No Chaos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No Complexity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>The boundary of Action/process/reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphysics</td>
<td>being - verb – state of being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>knowing – the potential to know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Existence lacking any form of action(s) and/or interaction (s) which occurs between God and Humans/individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis, which follows, is an examination of individuality/the strange attractor and its relationship to the whole as well as the whole to individuality/the strange attractor. We will not be discussing Gods'/the whole’s/summation’s significance to God/the whole/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 three potential components for a metaphysical system. Having done that we will examine a few potential systems that could emerge from these three components.

**Regarding Metaphysical Systems**

Applying metaphysical system model building to science and mathematics is the process of moving forward with what theoretical metaphysics establishes.

Theoretical metaphysics brings to the building site of model construction, 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 of reality metaphysical engineering could construct from the components of strange attractors, complexity, and chaos.

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**

As a preliminary, we will examine visuals of a few metaphysical systems, which could emerge from three basic components: individuality/strange attractors, action/chaos, and summation/complexity.

We will represent the three through linguistic symbolization and definition as follows:
Linguistic Symbolization: Definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematically</th>
<th>Metaphysical Components</th>
<th>Scientifically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. 'b'</td>
<td>‘being’ n: Individuality</td>
<td>The Strange Attractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. b</td>
<td>being vb: Active action, Process/reality</td>
<td>Chaos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ‘B’</td>
<td>God n: The Whole</td>
<td>Complexity/Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. b</td>
<td>being vb: The state of existence</td>
<td>The state of existing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be said at this point that there appears to be four metaphysical components not three metaphysical components as previously suggested. The fourth component is the initial point/base assumption from which this discourse originates. The base assumption, the original premise, the initial point from which this discourse originates is:

One or more of the first three metaphysical components do in fact exist. Metaphysical component #4, existence, exists. Existence is ‘the’ premise of this discourse. At a minimum, without the existence of, at the very least, passive existence, discussion of any topic becomes a mute activity.

What is the strange attractor? Within The metaphysical model being suggested there are two forms of strange attractors we presently comprehend.

**Type 1**: Strange attractors lacking knowing of abstraction

**Type 2**: Strange attractors knowing abstraction

Type 1 strange attractors known to us and the patterns they establish are confined within a space/time/matter/energy universal fabric. Such a fabric is found within our physical universe.

Type 2 strange attractors known to us, strange attractors of knowing, emerge fully patterned from the confines of physical reality, become confined within the ‘greater’ boundaries of the abstract.

Both the Type 1, non-knowing/deterministic, strange attractors and the Type 2, knowing, strange attractors find an interesting analogy to the nucleus around which a snowflake or a raindrop form.

Type 2 strange attractors are the type of strange attractor to which we can best relate. We are intuitively most familiar with Type 2 strange attractors and the patterns they establish, originate, within a region of chaos, the physical universe, because each individual human/knowing entity originates from a strange attractor of knowing. In addition we are capable of knowing complexity patterns whose strange attractors may or may not be composed of knowing because we find our
knowing to be centered within complexity pattern of physicality called a human body and human brain.

We do not ‘know’ what the strange attractor of non-knowing is even though we are within such a region. It is because we are a strange attractor of knowing that we do not ‘know’ the strange attractor of non-knowing. Will we ever be capable of knowing a non-knowing strange attractor? Perhaps after all our strange attractor based upon knowing builds its pattern using the non-knowing, the physical, as its source of chaos material from which we build our abstractual patterns of complexity.

It is the abstractual world of chaos and complexity with which this work, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, dealt. Such a world is philosophically labeled as metaphysics. The abstractual world is a world within which the physical is located and in turn it is the physical within which the abstract is created. Metaphysically the model is labeled the being of ‘being’ being God. Graphically the model appears as:
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The Passivity of the System

Location of Type 1 Passive Abstractual Complexity
(Abstractual complexity already generated)

Location of Type 1 Active Abstractual Complexity
(Abstractual complexity being generated within the physical)

Location of Space/time/matter/energy
The physical universe
Chaos – the building material for Complexity formation

Location of Type 1 Active Physical Complexity emerging
(Abstractual complexity being generated within the physical)
The region of passive complexity is considered passive not because it has no dynamic consciousness rather it is considered passive because no new abstractual knowing is created within the region void the universe/universes/devices capable of generating ‘new perception’. The region of passive abstractual complexity would in essence be the epitome of Nietzsche’s eternal recurrence if it were not for regions of chaos within which original complexity could emerge.

A more complex version of the model demonstrating the dynamics of the system itself becomes:
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Passive State

Location of
Type 1 Passive Complexity
(Abstractual complexity already generated)

Location of
No Chaos

Completed passive elements of complexity

Location of
Chaos

Location of
Type 1 Active Abstractual Complexity and Active Physical Complexity
(Complexity being generated)

Location of
Space/time/matter/energy
The physical universe
The understanding as to how there can be a region of chaos existing within a region of no chaos while not existing within the region of chaos is fully addressed within Volume I, Tractates 6 and Volume II, Tractate 10 of this work.

Within such a model, complexity becomes dependent upon chaos for its avoidance of eternal recurrence and chaos becomes dependent upon complexity for its emergence from nothingness through the principle of symmetry. The full dialectic of such a process is discussed within Volume II, Tractate 10: The Error of Heidegger.

Since this is a dialectic of metaphysics much of the work is left in a linguistic metaphysical format but the initiation for the discussion of the interrelationship of chaos and complexity are begun with the introduction of terms such as: strange attractor, chaos, complexity, passive complexity, active complexity, edge of chaos, edge of complicity, etc within Part I: Metaphysical Systems – Potential Models.

In addition, this dialectic deals specifically with strange attractors of knowing with free will/choice as opposed to non-knowing strange attractors governed by laws and principles and strange attractors of knowing governed by determinism. The understanding regarding the interrelationships and function of the three types of strange attractors is essential to understanding both the interrelationships and the roles of chaos and complexity one to the other. The interrelationship and function of strange attractors with free will within regions of chaos and complexity is of primary concern to ‘higher order life forms’, ourselves included, since, philosophically speaking, such an understanding addresses the three fundamental philosophical questions:

Where are we?
What are we?
Why do we exist?

The issue regarding the validity of the concept of free will is not what is addressed within this discourse. The issue regarding the validity of free will is examined in great detail throughout the work: The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, and in particular within Volume I, Tractate 3: The Error of Boethius
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1. Metaphysical Systems – Potential Models

Metaphysical Concepts:

Metaphysical Concept - 1

The Materials:
You: ‘being’, Individuality

‘being’
• The Strange Attractor

Metaphysical Concept - 2

Universe: being - action, Process/reality

being (italics)
• Chaos

Noun
being
(italics)
(quotation marks)

Verb
being
state of being
(no italics)
(no quotation marks)

Chaos, Complexity, and Metaphysics

Strange attractor

‘being’
• Complexity specifically Active Complexity

The Materials:
You: ‘being’, Individuality

‘being’
• The Strange Attractor

‘being’
• The Strange Attractor

‘being’
• The Strange Attractor

The Strange Attractor
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Metaphysical Systems

Metaphysical Systems 1 - 28:

Systems limited to one metaphysical concept of singularity:

System - 1
- The Material: ‘being’
  Mathematically ‘being’
  The Strange Attractor is

System - 2
- The Material: being
  Mathematically being
  Chaos is

System - 3
- The Material: ‘Being’
  Mathematically ‘Being’
  Complexity is

The System: ‘being’ is

The System: being - action, Process/reality is

The System: ‘Being’ is
The Strange Attractor separate from Chaos

The Strange Attractor separate from Complexity

The Strange Attractor within Chaos

The Strange Attractor within Complexity

The System: ‘being’, being

The System: ‘being’ separate from ‘Being’

The System: being separate from ‘Being’

The System: ‘being’, being

The System: ‘being’, ‘Being’

The System: being, ‘Being’

The System: ‘being’ separate from being

The System: ‘being’ separate from ‘Being’

The System: being separate from ‘Being’

Systems limited to two metaphysical concepts of singularity:
Systems limited to three metaphysical concepts of singularity:

System - 13

The Materials: 'being', being, 'Being'

The Strange Attractor
Separate from
Chaos
Separate from
Complexity
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The Strange Attractor
Found within Chaos
Separate from Complexity

System - 14

The Strange Attractor
Separate from Chaos
Found within Complexity

System - 15


The System: ‘being’ being separate from ‘Being’

System - 16


The System: being ‘being’ separate from ‘Being’

System - 17


The System: being ‘being’ separate from ‘Being’

Chaos
Separate from The Strange Attractor
Found within Complexity

Chaos
Found within The Strange Attractor
Separate from Complexity
Metaphysical Systems

System - 18

The Materials: ‘being’, being, ‘Being’

The System: ‘being’ separate from ‘Being’ being

System - 19

The Materials: ‘being’, being, ‘Being’

The System: being separate from ‘Being’ ‘being’

System - 20


The System: ‘being’ separate from ‘Being’ - within being

System - 21

The Materials: ‘being’, being, ‘Being’

The System: being separate from ‘Being’ - within ‘being’

System - 22

The Materials: ‘being’, being

The System: ‘being’ separate from ‘Being’ - within ‘Being’
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The System: Complexity
Found Within
Chaos
Found within
The Strange Attractor
System - 23

The Materials: ‘being’, being, ‘Being’

The System: ‘Being’ ‘being’ ‘being’
System - 26

The System: Chaos
Found Within
Complexity
Found within
The Strange Attractor
System - 24

The Materials: ‘being’, being, ‘Being’

The System: being ‘Being’ ‘being’
System - 27

The System: The Strange Attractor
Found Within
Complexity
Found within
Chaos
System - 25

The Materials: ‘being’, being, ‘Being’

The System: ‘being’ ‘Being’ ‘being’
System - 28

The System: Complexity
Found Within
The Strange Attractor
Found within
Chaos

The System: Chaos
Found Within
The Strange Attractor
Found within
Complexity

The System: The Strange Attractor
Found Within
Chaos
Found within
The Complexity
2. The Analysis: Application of Ockham's Razor

Strange Attractors and Chaos

•

Metaphysical Systems #7

'being' being

'b' - Individuality is
being - Action, Process/reality is
‘B’ – The whole is not

‘Identity’:
Individuality/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will
exists as ‘the’ entity
'being' being
2. Mathematically and scientifically speaking:

Strange Attractors and Chaos

Systems #7

'being' being

'b'/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists

being/chaos - action, Process/reality exists

'B'/the whole of complexity does not exist

‘Identity’: Individuality/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists as

‘the’ entity 'being' being

The System

The Strange Attractor within Chaos

Mathematically and Scientifically

The individual/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists either as a

single entity of individuality or multiple elements of individuality

The individual, the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will not only exists in

the passive sense but is capable of its own action

The system:

'being' being – the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will within chaos - The

strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists and creates its own unique

pattern of knowledge

‘Identity’:

Individuality/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will

exists as ‘the’ entity

'being' being
Synopsis

i. ‘being’ establishes a metaphysical system.
ii. ‘being’ exists
iii. being - action, Process/reality - exists
iv. ‘being’ exists ‘within’ being - action, Process/reality

Abstract

The following is the general flow the metaphysical system (‘being’ being) takes when examined against the most generally accepted concepts held by today's sciences, religions or philosophies.

‘being’s’ relationship to being – action, Process/reality

i. Process/reality exists
ii. Process/reality has no initiating force, causative factor
iii. Process/reality is omnipresent; as such, everything that is, is in Process/reality
iv. Process/reality is omnipotent. It contains all power
v. Process/reality is omniscient. It contains all knowledge

Knowledge

i. Process/reality exists
ii. ‘being’ exists
iii. ‘being’ may be Process/reality
iv. ‘being’ may be ‘within’ but separate from Process/reality

In this metaphysical system, there is no ‘outside’ to Process/reality for there is only ‘being’ – what is and being – action, Process/reality

‘being’ being, even if it is Process/reality itself, is within Process/reality for there is nowhere else to be.

being – action, Process/reality, provides the understanding regarding the significance of ‘being’.

‘being’s’ Significance

i. ‘being’s’ perception of itself whether as a combination of many or as singular individuality determines its action
ii. The level of significance ‘being’ places upon itself, defines the parameters of its action towards itself as well as towards other ‘beings’
iii. ‘being’ is a part of Process/reality
iv. Within this metaphysical system, ‘being’ perceives itself as existing
v. Within this metaphysical system, ‘being’s’ ultimate goal is to exist

The significance of ‘being’ now becomes defined.

‘being’s’ defined significance: to exist.
Social Ramifications

i. The essence of all ‘being’ is existence.
ii. Continuation of existence is success.
iii. Termination of existence is failure
iv. being – action, Process/reality generates ‘being’
v. Philosophical label: Physical Hedonism

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) provides the logic needed to prioritize all action.

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) establishes the status levels between ‘beings’ themselves. ‘being’s’ existence takes precedence over all else including the existence of other ‘beings’

Through the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being), we form an understanding regarding the interrelationship between ‘being’ – what is and being – action, Process/reality. Under the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being), it is the responsibility of ‘being’ to manipulate action - Process/reality in order to extend ‘being’s’ existence in time, in order to extend ‘being’s’ existence in Process/reality.

We can begin to understand this metaphysical system by examining three characteristics of being – action, Process/reality, within which ‘being’ is:

Omniscience

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) assigns a location within which the summation of knowledge is confined. It is confined ‘within’ the totality of being – action, Process/reality.

Omnipotence

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) implies a location within which the summation of power is confined. It is confined ‘within’ the totality of being – action, Process/reality.

Omnipresence

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) implies a location within which the summation of ‘location’ itself, ‘within’ which being – action, Process/reality, is confined. Process/reality, being –action is confined ‘within’ itself.

Process/reality, being –action, is confined ‘within’ itself because there is ‘nowhere’ else to be.

Impact Regarding ‘being’, individuality

being – action, Process/reality, defines the location of ‘being’. The location of ‘being’ is seemingly insignificant, but the subtlety initiations enormous perceptual and behavioral actions ‘within’ Process/reality. Understanding the relationship between ‘being’ and being – action, Process/reality, establishes the foundation for the examination of the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) in particular.
**Process/reality, action, being**

At this point in time, there are two options to consider.

**Option 1:**
Process/reality itself is different from everything within it and has no origination. Thus Process/reality had no ‘originator’. Reality, Process/reality has always existed.

The premise that Process/reality had no beginning, had no creative originating force is supported by no observations and no logic. Is the concept of Process/reality having no beginning an option to consider? Certainly it is an option to consider.’ However, the question is not: Is the option of ‘it always was’ an option to consider but rather is it the most logical option.

**Option 2:**
All things within Process/reality appear to have an identifiable beginning, therefore Process/reality, action, being, itself must have an identifiable beginning and thus, an originator, Creator. Since there are only two factors involved in this metaphysical system, Process/reality would have to be the creator of its own ‘being’.

Assuming we accept the premise of Process/reality, action, being, being an originator, the original force, the source of the beginning of itself, we can then move on to examine the concept regarding ‘being’, and its function within this metaphysical system.

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) provides a well-structured understanding as to the rational interrelationships between ‘beings’, to the rational interrelationships between ‘being’ and its own ‘being’, and to the rational interrelationships between ‘being’ and ‘being’s’ environment:

**The Metaphysical System of (‘being’ being) Establishes**

In essence, ‘being’ becomes the focus.

Growth, equilibrium, decay are three choices for the state of ‘being’, which in this particular metaphysical system, is the whole, totality. The rational choice this metaphysical system establishes is decay. Permanent equilibrium is an unnatural state presently found ‘within’ Process/reality. Timeless growth of individuality, any individuality, contradicts what we observe around us.

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) offers us the ‘hope’ of being able to exist a ‘limited’ time. It offers us the despair of certain termination.

As such, ‘being’, has no universal responsibility.

Understanding responsibilities as defined by significance within Process/reality defines actions ‘being’ initiates while functioning within the concept of Process/reality, action, being. Under the metaphysical model of (‘being’ being), the annihilation of being – action, Process/reality’s mechanism, destroys not only our ‘being’ but the home of ‘being’, destroys being – action, Process/reality itself. Under a metaphysical perception of (‘being’ being), the annihilation of Process/reality itself would destroy our actions, our ‘accomplishments, as ‘beings’, for action exists ‘within’ Process/reality and without perceived Process/reality, action – being, there is no perceived ‘being’.
Is the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) a complete system? Yes, paradoxically it is completed through the process of identity. And why is such a system paradoxical? It is paradoxical for being – action, Process/reality creates ‘being’, but without ‘being’ no action can take place.

**Under the Metaphysical System of (‘being’ being)**

i.  being – action, Process/reality generates ‘being’

ii. ‘being’ generates being – action, Process/reality

iii. There is no higher directive than ‘to exist’

‘being’s, individuality’s main directive is physical hedonism: to exist for its own self.

Gods, main directive is nonexistence for Gods’ being is not.

**Type of System**

A Cartesian metaphysical system
3. The Analysis

Chaos and Complexity

Metaphysical Systems # 9

*being* God

'B' - The whole is

*being* - Action, Process/reality is

‘b’ Individuality is not

'Identity':
Action, process/reality/chaos
exists as 'the' Entity

*being* God
3. Mathematically and scientifically speaking:

Mathematically and Scientifically

Chaos exists either as a single entity of individuality or multiple elements of individuality

Chaos not only exists in the passive sense but is capable of its own action

The system:

*being God* – Chaos within the whole of complexity - Chaos exists and creates its own unique pattern of knowledge

‘Identity’:

Chaos exists as ‘the’ element/entity

*being God*
Synopsis

i. *being* God establishes a metaphysical system
ii. God exists
iii. *being* - action, Process/reality - exists
iv. *being* - action, Process/reality – exists ‘within’ Being’

Abstract

The following is the general flow the metaphysical system (*being* God) takes when examined against the most generally accepted concepts held by today's sciences, religions or philosophies.

Gods’ relationship to being – action, Process/reality

i. Process/reality exists
ii. Process/reality has an initiating force, causative factor
iii. God is omnipresent; as such, everything that is in Process/reality is in God
iv. God is omnipotent; It contains all power
v. God is omniscient; It contains all knowledge

Knowledge

i. God exists
ii. Process/reality exists
iii. Process/reality may be God
iv. Process/reality may be ‘within’ but separate from God

In this metaphysical system, there is no ‘outside’ to God for there is only God – what is and *being* – action, Process/reality

Process/reality, even if it is God itself, is ‘within’ God for there is nowhere else to be.

God, provides the understanding regarding the significance of *being* – action, Process/reality.

Process/reality’s Significance

i. Process/reality has no perception of itself
ii. Process/reality is a verb as such it does not exist in and of itself
iii. Process/reality is a verb of action
iv. Process/reality is a part of God
v. Within this metaphysical system, Process/reality, action exists, period

Within this metaphysical system, Process/reality has no ultimate goal for itself for Process/reality is not. Process/reality is action not ‘something’.

The significance of Process/reality now becomes defined.

Process/reality’s defined significance: Expanding God beyond the point of simple existence.
Providing a means of action for God

Social Ramifications
The War & Peace of a New Ontological Perception

i. The essence of Process/reality is action
ii. Continuation of action, Process/reality, is active existence
iii. Termination of action, Process/reality, is permanent equilibrium
iv. There is no higher directive than continuation of Process/reality, action
v. The essence of ‘being’ does not exist ‘within’ Process/reality, action
vi. All action within God is controlled by God, is God
vii. ‘being’ is simply a perceived existence established by God
viii. ‘being’, and God, are not in a hierarchical relationship to each other for all actions of
‘being’ are actions of God itself
ix. All hierarchical relationships derive their template from the ‘being’/’Being’ relationship
x. God generates being – action, Process/reality
xi. Philosophical label: Determinism

The metaphysical system of (being ‘Being) provides the logic needed to prioritize all action.

The metaphysical system of (being ‘Being) establishes the status levels between ‘beings’
themselves. ‘being’ s existence is a ‘ruse’, a false perception of individuality for in truth it does
not exist independent of God. Rather ‘being’ simply exists as a ‘controlled aspect of’ Being.
‘being’, individuality, is a creation of Gods and as such all of ‘being’s perceived actions are
predetermined by God. As such, the interactions between ‘beings is but a preconceived scenario
developed by God

Through the metaphysical system of (being ‘Being), we form an understanding regarding the
interrelationship between God – what is and being – action, Process/reality. Under the
metaphysical system of (being ‘Being), it is the responsibility of God to manipulate action,
Process/reality, in order to act, to function, to expand itself beyond the simple state of existing.

We can begin to understand this metaphysical system by examining three characteristics of God,
within which being – action, Process/reality is:

Omniscience

The metaphysical system of (being ‘Being) assigns a location within which the summation of
knowledge is confined. It is confined ‘within’ the totality of God.

Omnipotence

The metaphysical system of (being ‘Being) implies a location within which the summation of
power is confined. It is confined ‘within’ the totality of God.

Omnipresence

The metaphysical system of (being ‘Being) implies a location within which the summation of
‘location’ itself, ‘within’ which being – action, Process/reality, is confined. Process/reality, being
–action is confined ‘within’ God.
Process/reality, being – action, is confined ‘within’ God because there is ‘nowhere’ else to be.

Impact Regarding ‘being’, individuality

‘being’s’ nonexistence initiations enormous perceptual and behavioral actions ‘within’ Process/reality. Understanding the relationship between God and Process/reality, action - being, establishes the foundation for the examination of the metaphysical system of Process/reality and God in particular.

Process/reality, action, being

At this point in time, there are two options to consider.

Option 1:
Process/reality itself is different from everything within it and has no origination. Thus Process/reality had no ‘originator’. Action, Process/reality has always existed.

The premise that being – action, Process/reality had no beginning, had no creative originating force is supported by nothing we have observed - no observations and no logic. Is the concept of Process/reality having no beginning an option to consider? Certainly it is an option to consider.’ But the question is not: Is the option of ‘it always was’ an option to consider but rather is it the most logical option.

Option 2:
All things within Process/reality appear to have an identifiable beginning, therefore Process/reality, action, being, itself must have an identifiable beginning and thus, an originator, Creator. Since there are only two factors involved in this metaphysical system, God would have to be the creator of its own being – action, Process/reality.

Assuming we accept the premise of God being an originator, the original force, the source of the beginning of its own being – action, Process/reality, we can then move on to examine the concept regarding God, and its function within this metaphysical system.

In terms of understanding the rational interrelationships between ‘Beings’, there is no interrelationship that occurs ‘between’ since God is the whole, summation, totality and as such ‘the’ whole cannot interact with other ‘whole’s since in this system there is only one ‘whole’, totality, summation. In terms of the understanding the rational interrelationships between God and Gods’ environment, there is none since God is the whole and thus has no environment, ‘outside’ itself, in which it can interact.

The metaphysical system of (being ‘Being) provides a well-structured understanding as to the rational interrelationships between God and its own God.

In essence, God becomes the focus.

Growth, equilibrium, decay are three choices for the state of God, which in this particular metaphysical system, is the whole, totality. The rational choice this metaphysical system establishes: Permanent equilibrium. Timeless decay implies the end to the whole, to totality, to the concept of existence without time. Timeless growth contradicts what we observe around us.
(being ‘Being) offers the understanding of ‘being’ not being. It offers us the understanding of ‘being’ having no self-existence, self-control, independence, free will. It offers us the understanding regarding ‘being’ being a non-entity, ‘being’ being something other than what it had considered itself to be. It offers the understanding that all ‘beings’ will experience finality.

Upon further examination, (being ‘Being) offers us the understanding of ‘being’ having, in truth, no finality for ‘being’ is not.

As such, ‘being’, has no universal responsibility, ‘being’ has no responsibility.

Understanding responsibilities as defined by significance within Process/reality defines actions ‘being’ initiates while functioning within the metaphysical concept of (being ‘Being). What are the initiated actions on the part of ‘being’ within the system of (being God)? There are none, for ‘being’s’ actions are not its own but rather they are the actions of God.

Under the metaphysical model of (being ‘Being), the annihilation of being – action, Process/reality’s mechanism, destroys not only ‘being’ but the home of ‘being’, Process/reality. Under a metaphysical perception of (being ‘Being), the annihilation of Process/reality would reduce God to the simple state of existence.

Is the metaphysical system of (being ‘Being) a complete system? Yes, paradoxically it is completed through the process of identity. And why is such a system paradoxical? It is paradoxical for had being – action, Process/reality not always been a part of God, ‘Being would have had to ‘originate’ being – action, Process/reality without the aid of any being – action, Process/reality.

This is not to say such an event ‘could not’ have occurred on the other hand it may say something about the reality of very reality itself. This in itself presents a very interesting topic of discussion in terms of reality being an illusion as opposed to a ‘real illusion’

**Under the metaphysical system of (being ‘Being)**

i. God generates being – action, Process/reality

ii. There is no higher directive than to exist

Gods, main directive is determinism: to exist for its own self.

‘being’s, individuality’s, main, directive is nonexistent for ‘being’s being is not

**Type of System**

A non-Cartesian metaphysical system
4. The Analysis

Complexity, Chaos, and Strange Attractors
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4. Mathematically and scientifically speaking:

**Complexity, Chaos, and Strange Attractors**

**System of Multiplicity**

As opposed To

Systems of Singularity - Systems 1-28

*being* God separate from ‘being’ *being*

'b'/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists

*being/chaos* - action, Process/reality exists

‘B’/the whole of complexity exists

'Identity' through the separation of entities

*being/chaos* exists as Being'/the whole of complexity

separate from

'being'/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will existing as *being/chaos*

---

Chaos exists either as a single entity of individuality or multiple elements of individuality.
The individual/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists either as a single entity of individuality or multiple elements of individuality

Chaos not only exists in the passive sense but is capable of its own action

The individual, the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will not only exists in the passive sense but is capable of its own action

*being* God – Chaos within the whole of complexity - Chaos exists and creates its own unique pattern of knowledge

*being* 'being' – the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will within chaos - The strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists and creates its own unique pattern of knowledge

The system:

'b'/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will does not exist

*being* chaos - action, Process/reality exists

'B'/the whole of complexity exists

'b'/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists

*being* chaos - action, Process/reality exists

'B'/the whole of complexity does not exist

‘Identity’:

Chaos
exists as ‘the’ element/entity

*being* God

‘Identity’:

Individuality/the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will
exists as ‘the’ entity

*being* 'being
The concept of Metaphysical Multiplicity is the existence of ‘a’ Metaphysical concept, a piece of the system, existing within two wholes simultaneously – the duplication: Complexity and Chaos.

The concept of Metaphysical Multiplicity is not the concept of the existence of “a’ whole’ Metaphysical system existing simultaneously.

Such a perception takes on the appearance of rationality when it is a verb of action being examined, for example being - the verb. We recognize being – action occurring in more than one place at time. Now granted time has just been interjected into the equation, but one can just as readily extract time and the concept of multiplicity of action remains. The debate concerning the interconnection of time and action and the debate concerning the rationality of the multiplicity of action are not what is being addressed in this tractate. Such examinations are entirely different topics than the focus of this trilogy.

The voluminous material, On ‘being’ being, is an exercise in Husserl’s reductionism and basic Metaphysics and as such, complexity of argument must be set aside for a later date.

Without setting such debate aside, the trilogy moves from being a single set of three books to being many multiple sets of three books.

The perception of Metaphysical multiplicity of action may take on a sense of rationality but the perception of Metaphysical multiplicity of ‘a’ ‘being’ takes on an appearance of irrationality.

As such, to prevent confusing the issue, we will, in this section of this chapter, examine the Metaphysical multiplicity of action rather than other forms of Metaphysical multiplicity. This in turn will lead us back to the concept of Metaphysical Singularity. (A little patience is needed at this point.)

Metaphysical System of Multiplicity: ‘Identity’ through the separation of entities. ‘being’ being separate from being God

Note

The concept of Metaphysical Multiplicity is the existence of ‘a’ Metaphysical concept, a piece of the system, existing within two wholes simultaneously – the duplication: Complexity and Chaos.

The concept of Metaphysical Multiplicity is not the concept of the existence of “a’ whole’ Metaphysical system existing simultaneously.

Such a perception takes on the appearance of rationality when it is a verb of action being examined, for example being - the verb. We recognize being – action occurring in more than one place at time. Now granted time has just been interjected into the equation, but one can just as readily extract time and the concept of multiplicity of action remains. The debate concerning the interconnection of time and action and the debate concerning the rationality of the multiplicity of action are not what is being addressed in this tractate. Such examinations are entirely different topics than the focus of this trilogy.

The voluminous material, On ‘being’ being, is an exercise in Husserl’s reductionism and basic Metaphysics and as such, complexity of argument must be set aside for a later date.

Without setting such debate aside, the trilogy moves from being a single set of three books to being many multiple sets of three books.

The perception of Metaphysical multiplicity of action may take on a sense of rationality but the perception of Metaphysical multiplicity of ‘a’ ‘being’ takes on an appearance of irrationality.

As such, to prevent confusing the issue, we will, in this section of this chapter, examine the Metaphysical multiplicity of action rather than other forms of Metaphysical multiplicity. This in turn will lead us back to the concept of Metaphysical Singularity. (A little patience is needed at this point.)

Metaphysical System of Multiplicity: ‘Identity’ through the separation of entities. ‘being’ being separate from being God
Synopsis:

i. ‘being’ being separate from being God establishes a metaphysical system
ii. ‘being’ exist
iii. being - action, Process/reality – exists
iv. God exists
v. ‘being’ exists ‘within’ being - action, Process/reality
vi. being – action, Process/reality exists ‘within’ God
vii. ‘being’s being – action, Process/reality exists separate from God
viii. Gods’ being exists ‘outside’ of, separate from ‘being’s’ being
ix. ‘being’ exists separate form God
x. God exists separate from ‘being’

Abstract

The following is the general flow the metaphysical system (‘being’ being separate from being God) takes when examined against the most generally accepted concepts held by today's sciences, religions or philosophies.

(‘being’ being)’s relationship to (being God) – summation, totality

i. ‘being’, individuality, exists
ii. Process/reality exists
iii. ‘being’, individuality exists ‘within’ Process/reality
iv. Process/reality exists separate from God
v. Process/reality exists as a part of God
vi. ‘being’ and God have commonality
vii. ‘being’ and God find commonality in being – action, Process/reality
viii. ‘being’ and God are mirror images through commonality

Knowledge

i. Process/reality exists
ii. ‘being’ exists
iii. God exists
iv. ‘being’ may be a part of Process/reality
v. Process/reality may be a part of God

In this metaphysical system, there is an ‘outside’ to Process/reality for there is ‘being’ ‘within’ being – action and there is being – action, Process/reality ‘within’ ‘Being. The two beings – actions, Process/realities, established by this particular metaphysical system are non-adjacent, separate from each. The non-adjacent characteristic created by this particular metaphysical system, creates the need for a void to act as a buffer between them. The purpose of such a buffer is to keep the two beings – actions, Process/realities separate from one another.

‘Separation’ ‘within’ the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God) provides the understanding regarding the significance of ‘being’.
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The significance of ‘being’ now becomes defined

‘being’s’ defined significance: ‘perfection’, attaining the ‘level’ of God, and if that is unattainable, than as a minimum ‘earning’ the ‘honor’ of ‘standing’ next to ‘perfection’.

Social Ramifications

i. The essence of all ‘being’ is existence
ii. Elevation of existence is perceived as possible
iii. Elevation of existence is success
iv. Demotion of existence is failure
v. There is no higher directive than to reach ‘perfection’

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God) provides the logic needed to prioritize, categorize, establish a hierarchy for all action.

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being ‘Being) establishes the status levels between ‘beings’ themselves. ‘being’s’ attempt to commune with God, attempt to attaining the ‘level’ of God, attempt to ‘stand’ ‘next’ to God, attempt to gain ‘access’ to God, takes precedence over all else.

Through the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God), an understanding regarding the interrelationship between ‘being’ – what is and being – action, Process/reality as well as the interrelationship between ‘being’s’ being and Gods’ being. Under the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God), it is the responsibility of ‘being’ to manipulate being – action, Process/reality, as well as manipulate other entities’ being, manipulate other ‘beings’ being – action, Process/reality in order to acquire ‘perfection’ for perfection is viewed as the ‘ideal’ way to ‘gain access to Gods being – action, Process/reality.

We can begin to understand this metaphysical system by examining how ‘being’ perceives Gods’ being – action, Process/reality. As such it will help to examine three characteristics such a
metaphysical system could generate from the perspective of ‘being’ as it functions ‘within’ being – action, Process/reality.

**Omniscience**

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God) assigns a ‘location’ ‘within’ which the summation of knowledge is confined. It is confined ‘within’ the totality of God, the ‘creator’ of Process/reality, the ‘creator’ of ‘being’.

**Omnipotence**

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being ‘Being) implies a ‘location’ ‘within’ which the summation of power is confined. It is confined ‘within’ the totality of ‘Being, the ‘creator’ of Process/reality, the ‘creator’ of ‘being’.

**Omnipresence**

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God) implies a ‘location’ ‘within’ which the summation of ‘location’ itself, ‘within’ which being – action, Process/reality, is confined. Process/reality, being – action is confined ‘within’ itself.

Now it would appear such a system would lead to the perception that ‘being’ is ‘within’ omnipresence itself but under such a metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God) a second perception arises. Because God is perceived as ‘perfect’ and ‘being’ is perceived as ‘imperfect’, ‘being’ finds itself in a paradoxical dilemma. ‘being’ is unable to rationalize ‘imperfection’ being ‘located’ ‘within’ ‘perfection’. As such, ‘being’ solves the dilemma by developing a model wherein ‘being’ is placed ‘outside’ of God, omnipresence.

Since this contradictory Metaphysical perception takes on a perception of ‘greater’ relative worth, greater relative ‘value’, over that of the contradiction of existing ‘outside’ omnipresence, separation from omnipresence, is accepted over imperfection within perfection.

**Impact regarding ‘being’, individuality**

(‘being’ being separate from being God) establishes a metaphysical model based upon separation. ‘being’s’ location with respect to Gods’ location seems insignificant, but the subtlety leads to enormous perceptual and behavioral shifts.

Gods being – action, Process/reality being separate from a portion of itself, separate from being – action, Process/reality, places both a portion of Process/reality and ‘being’ ‘outside’ God. As such, Process/reality becomes separates from, split from God. Likewise, ‘being’, being a portion of Process/reality, which is separate from God, is separate from God. With the concept of God being ‘outside’, transcendent to a portion of Process/reality there emerges the rationality for respect due God through a concept of hierarchical relationships via relativistic perceptions.

‘being’ being separate from God, rationalizes the hierarchy system between God and ‘being’, which in turn creates the impetus to establish and then to maximize social hierarchy systems of ‘being’ to ‘being’.
The War & Peace of a New Ontological Perception

God becomes defined as ‘the whole’, as the omnipresent God existing. As such God is identified with Process/reality, with what lies ‘outside’ God, omnipresence. Thus, ‘being’ takes on the perception of ‘needing’ God, while God takes on the perception of not ‘needing’ ‘being’ or being – action, Process/reality for that matter. God takes on the perception of not needing ‘being’ for God is all present – omnipresent, all knowing – omniscient, and all powerful – omnipotent.

‘being’ being separate from Gods’ being, defines the location of ‘being’, ‘being is ‘outside’. The location of ‘being’ is seemingly insignificant, but the subtlety initiations enormous perceptual and behavioral actions ‘within’ Process/reality.

Process/reality, action, being

At this point in time, there are two options to consider.

Option 1:
Process/reality itself is different from everything within it and has no origination. Thus Process/reality had no ‘originator’. Process/reality has always existed.

The premise that Process/reality had no beginning, had no creative originating force is supported by no observation and no logic. Is the concept of Process/reality having no beginning an option to consider? Certainly it is an option to consider.’ But the question is not: Is the option of ‘it always was’ an option to consider but rather is it the most logical option.

Option 2:
All things within Process/reality, appear to have an identifiable beginning, therefore Process/reality, action, ‘being’s’ being, itself must have an identifiable beginning and thus, an originator.

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separated from being God) provides a well-structured understanding as to the rational interrelationships between ‘beings’, between ‘being’ and one’s own ‘being’, and between ‘being’ and ‘being’s’ environment:

The Metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God) provides something the Metaphysical system of (‘being’ being) and (being God) did not. It provides an alternative for ‘being’s’ location. ‘being’ could:

i. remain ‘inside’ Process/reality
ii. enter a ‘region’ between Process/reality and God
iii. enter God

Now two possibilities open up for ‘being’. Access to Process/reality is an undeniable option for ‘being’ is already there experiencing Process/reality, manipulating Process/reality.

In fact ‘being’ is ‘affecting’ Process/reality and ‘being’ understands its ability to do so, to ‘affect’ Process/reality evolves from the very fact that it, ‘being’, understands that it exists ‘within’ Process/reality.

At the same time, ‘being’ understands it does not ‘affect’ God for it does not lie ‘within’ Being’.

With ‘being:s’ realization of the reasonableness regarding its ability to ‘affect’ Process/reality while not being able to ‘affect’ God, comes the realization of the reasonableness that
Process/reality most likely did not ‘create’ itself. Spontaneous generation does not correspond to the observed laws of Process/reality.

As such, ‘being’ looks to God as the ‘creator’ of Process/reality. This generates the concept of God possessing the capacity for action. So it is the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from God) naturally evolves into the metaphysical system of ‘being’ being separate from God.

As the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God) unfolds, it leads ‘being’ to the understanding of God being the ‘creator’ of ‘being’.

In terms of the understanding the rational interrelationships between ‘Beings’ there is none since God is the whole, totality and ‘the’ whole cannot interact with other ‘whole’s since in this system there is only one ‘whole’, totality, summation. In terms of the understanding the rational interrelationships between God and Gods’ environment, there is none since God is the whole and thus has no environment, ‘outside’ in which it is immersed, with which it can interact.

The metaphysical system component of the system, (‘being’ being separate from being ‘Being), provides a well-structured understanding as to the rational interrelationships between God and its own God. God is alone. God seeks interaction but only the interaction it desires to let ‘into’ itself. The rejected ‘being’ and being – action, Process/reality, the portion unwanted, must remain ‘outside’

The metaphysical aspect of the system (‘being’ being separate from being ‘Being), provides a well-structured understanding as to the rational interrelationships between ‘beings’, to the rational interrelationships between ‘being’ and its own ‘being’, and to the rational interrelationships between ‘being’ and ‘being’s’ environment:

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God) establishes:

In essence, God becomes the focus, the level ‘being’ attempts to attain.


Growth, equilibrium, decay are three choices for the state of God. The rational choice this metaphysical system establishes: being – action, Process/reality ‘within’ which ‘being’ is ‘located’ is decay. On the other hand, God ‘within’ which being – action, Process/reality is located takes on the aspect of - Permanent equilibrium.

Where then can growth be understood to be? With the understanding of Gods’ omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience, growth is relegated to ‘being’ and as such takes on the same lack of significance as ‘being’ itself, relative to God. Therefore, just as ‘being’ has no significance to God, growth has no significance to God.

(‘being’ being separate from being God) offers the understanding of ‘being’ being ‘less’ than God. It offers the understanding of eternal, timeless existence. It offers the understanding that all ‘beings’ will experience timelessness either ‘within’ the being – action, Process/reality located ‘outside’ God, ‘within’ the ‘location’ between being – action, Process/reality ‘within’ God, or ‘within’ God.

As such, ‘being’, has one responsibility. ‘being’s’ responsibility is to be ‘with’ God, gain access to God, gain ‘entrance to God.
Understanding responsibilities as defined by significance found ‘within’ Process/reality defines actions ‘being’ initiates while functioning within the concept of Process/reality, action, being. Under the metaphysical model of (‘being’ being separate from being God), the annihilation of ‘being’s’ being – action, Process/reality mechanism, destroys not only ‘being’ but the home of ‘being’, the portion of Process/reality found ‘outside’ God. Under a metaphysical perception of (‘being’ being separate from being God), the annihilation of Process/reality would destroy actions, ‘accomplishments, of ‘beings’, for action exists ‘within’ Process/reality and without Process/reality, action – being, there is no perceived ‘being’. Is the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God) a complete system? Yes, paradoxically it is completed through the process of separation.

And why is such a system paradoxical? It is paradoxical for two reasons. First: It is paradoxical for being – action, Process/reality creates ‘being’, but without ‘being’ no action can take place.

Second: It is paradoxical for had being – action, Process/reality not always been a part of God, ‘Being would have had to ‘originate’ being – action, Process/reality without the aid of any being – action, Process/reality.

Under the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being separate from being God)

i. God generates being – action, Process/reality
ii. being – action, Process/reality generates ‘being
iii. There is no higher directive than submission, obedience, compliance, capitulation, surrender, acquiescence, duty, conformity

Regarding ‘being’

‘being’s, individuality’s, main directive is ‘entrance’ into God by whatever means possible.

Regarding God

Gods main directive is transcendence: ‘judgment’ being the means, the being – action, Process/reality by which it will ‘allow’ ‘being’ to enter or not enter its self, God

Type of System

A Cartesian metaphysical system existing separate from a non-Cartesian metaphysical system
5. The Analysis:

Complexity, Chaos, and Strange Attractors

- Metaphysical Systems # 28

'being' being God

'b' - Individuality is
being - Action, Process reality is
'B' - The whole is

Identity through union 'being' being God
5. Mathematically and scientifically speaking:

**Complexity, Chaos, and Strange Attractors**

System # 28

The strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists within chaos, which exists within the whole of complexity, and the whole of the system exists either as both single entities of individuality as multiple elements of individuality.

The strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists within chaos, which exists within the whole of complexity, and the whole of the system exists in the passive sense but is capable of its own action.

The system: ‘being’ *being God* – the strange attractor with free will and/or without free will exists within chaos, which exists within the whole of complexity - exists and creates its own unique pattern of knowledge.

The strange attractor with free will and/or without free will does not exist within chaos - action, Process/reality exists

‘B’/the whole of complexity exists.
‘Identity’:
Chaos
exists as ‘the’ element/entity
being God

Synopsis

i. ‘being’ being God establishes a metaphysical system
ii. ‘being’ exist
iii. being - action, Process/reality – exists
iv. God exists
v. ‘being’ exists ‘within’ being - action, Process/reality
vi. being – action, Process/reality exists ‘within’ God
vii. ‘being’ ‘within’ being – action, Process/reality exists ‘within’ God

Abstract

The following is the general flow the metaphysical system (‘being’ being God) takes when examined against the most generally accepted concepts held by today’s sciences, religions or philosophies.

‘being’s Relationship to God
i. ‘being’, individuality, exists
ii. Process/reality exists
iii. ‘being’, individuality exists ‘within’ Process/reality
iv. Process/reality exists ‘within’ God
v. ‘being’ exists ‘within’ God

Knowledge

i. Process/reality – action, being exists
ii. Individuality, ‘being’ exists
iii. Summation, totality, God exists

In this metaphysical system, there is a perceived ‘outside’ to ‘being’, there is a perceived ‘outside’ to being – action Process/reality, but there is no perceived ‘outside’ to God.

This metaphysical system provides no alternative to ‘being’s’ location. ‘being’ is ‘inside’ God for there is ‘nowhere’ else to be, to go, to be sent.

As the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) unfolds, it leads ‘being’ to the understanding of God being the ‘creator’ of ‘being’.

‘Union’ ‘within’ the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) provides the understanding regarding the significance of ‘being’.

‘being’s significance
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i. ‘being’ exists ‘within’ Process/reality
ii. ‘being’ exists ‘within’ God
iii. ‘being’ perceives itself as a ‘critical aspect of God, totality, summation for totality cannot be totality without all its parts
iv. ‘being’s’ perception of itself whether as a combination of many ‘beings’ or as individuality determines its action
v. The level of significance ‘being’ places upon itself, defines the parameters of its action towards itself as well as towards other ‘beings’
vi. ‘being’ perceiving itself as a part, a portion of God, perceives itself as ‘significant’

Social Ramifications

iv. ‘being’ through being – action, Process/reality understands that it has potential ‘significance’, meaning, importance to God
v. There is no higher directive than to pursue one’s ‘significance’, meaning
vi. God generates being – action, Process/reality; which generates ‘being’

vi. ‘being’ generates being – action, Process/reality which generates ‘Being
viii. Philosophical label: Abstract Hedonism
ix. The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) provides the logic needed to prioritize all action ‘within’ being – action, Process/reality.

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) establishes the rationale for the elimination of status levels between ‘beings’ themselves. The lack of a hierarchical status system between ‘being’ and God provides the rationale for the elimination of all hierarchical systems ‘within’ being – action, Process/reality.

Through the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God), we form an understanding regarding the interrelationship between ‘being’ – what is and being – action, Process/reality as well as the interrelationship between ‘being’s’ being and God. Under the metaphysical system of (‘being’
being God), it is the responsibility of ‘being’ to take control of its own individual potential significance and to fully develop such potential significance. Under the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) it is understood, all ‘beings’ are to control their own potential significance for no ‘being’ is able to understand another ‘being’s potential significance better than that ‘being’ itself.

We can begin to understand this metaphysical system by examining how ‘being’ perceives God. As such it will help to examine three characteristics such a metaphysical system could generate from the perspective of ‘being’ as it functions ‘within’ being – action, Process/reality and God.

Omniscience

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) assigns a ‘location’ ‘within’ which the summation of knowledge is confined. It is confined ‘within’ the totality of God, the ‘creator’ of Process/reality, the ‘creator’ of ‘being’.

Omnipotence

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being ‘Being) implies a ‘location’ ‘within’ which the summation of power is confined. It is confined ‘within’ the totality of ‘Being, the ‘creator’ of Process/reality, the ‘creator’ of ‘being’.

Omnipresence

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) implies a ‘location’ ‘within’ which the summation of ‘location’ itself, ‘within’ which being – action, Process/reality, is confined. Process/reality, being –action is confined ‘within’ God.

The metaphysical system of ‘being’ being God establishes the ultimate form of significance to ‘being’. Within such a system, ‘being’ becomes a part of God and in fact adds to Gods’ being.

Impact

‘being’ being God, defines the location of ‘being’. ‘being’ is ‘inside’. The location of ‘being’ is seemingly insignificant, but the subtlety initiations enormous perceptual and behavioral actions ‘within’ Process/reality.

Process/reality, action, being

At this point in time, there are two options to consider.

Option 1:
Process/reality itself is different from everything within it and has no origination. Thus Process/reality had nor ‘originator’. Process/reality has always existed. The premise that Process/reality had no beginning, had no creative originating force is supported by nothing we have observed before - no observations and no logic. Is the concept of Process/reality having no beginning an option to consider? Certainly it is an option to consider.’ But the question is not: Is the option of ‘it always was’ an option to consider but rather is it the most logical option.
Option 2:
All things within Process/reality appear to have an identifiable beginning, therefore Process/reality, action, being itself must have an identifiable beginning and thus, an originator.

The significance of whether option 1 or whether option 2 is correct loses its importance within the metaphysical system of ‘being’ being God. Rather, significance finds its own significance in the relationship that exists between both ‘being’, the noun, and God, the noun, through being, the verb, action, Process/reality itself.

The metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) provides a well-structured understanding as to the rational interrelationships between ‘beings’, to the rational interrelationships between ‘being’ and its own ‘being’, and to the rational interrelationships between ‘being’ and ‘being’s’ environment:

The Metaphysical System of (‘being’ being God) Establishes

Regarding God
In essence, ‘Being becomes the focus.

Regarding ‘being’
In essence, ‘being’ becomes the focus.

Regarding being
In essence, being – action, Process/reality becomes the means.

‘Attainment’ emerges out of a perception of ‘potential significance’ for both ‘being’ as well as God. ‘Comparisons of one to another’, ‘relative values’ of one to the other, lose their perceived significance through metaphysical system of ‘union’ as opposed to the metaphysical system of ‘separation’.

Growth, equilibrium, decay are three choices for both the state of ‘being’ and the state of God.

The rational choice this metaphysical system establishes for ‘being’ is growth for being – action, Process/reality ‘within’ which ‘being’ is ‘located provides a means by which ‘being’ can do just that, grow.

The rational choice this metaphysical system establishes for God is growth for being – action, Process/reality which is located ‘within’ God provides a means by which God can do just that, grow.

Permanent equilibrium cannot be found ‘within’ such a metaphysical system.

Decay cannot be found ‘within’ such a metaphysical system.

Where then is growth understood to be? With the understanding of Gods’ omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience, growth is change and change is generated by ‘being’s’ being within Gods’ being.
Whether growth is a positive or negative action is relative and up to ‘being’ itself. Does growth become directed, influenced by God? That is not the question of metaphysics that is the question of religion, of Ontology.

‘being’s’ being – action is a part of Process/reality, is ‘within’, is a part of God and as such affects God through being – action, Process/reality. Likewise God containing being – action ‘within’ which ‘being’ can be found affects ‘being’ through being – action, Process/reality.

With the concept of ‘being’ being ‘inside’ Process/reality there emerges the rationality for respect due God by ‘being’ and a respect due ‘being’ by God. The ‘whole’ cannot be ‘a’ whole without all its parts and ‘a’ part cannot be ‘a’ part without the existence of ‘a’ whole ‘being’ God, rationalizes a non-hierarchical system existing between God and ‘being’. ‘being’ being God creates the impetus to establish social systems void of hierarchical concepts.

God becomes defined as the whole as omnipresent. ‘being’ existing within Process/reality, is identified with Process/reality, with what lies ‘inside’ God, omnipresence. Thus, ‘being’, through location, takes on the perception of having significance to God. Simultaneously God, through location, takes on the perception of having significance to ‘being’. being – action, Process reality becomes the intermediary, the means by which the mutual significance is processed.

‘being’ takes on the perception of being a part, while God takes on the perception of being all present – omnipresent, all knowing – omniscient, and all powerful – omnipotent.

Within such a metaphysical system, ‘being’ ‘affects’ God and ‘being’ understands its ability to do so. God evolves from the very fact that it, ‘being’, exists ‘within’ Process/reality. Along with ‘being’s’ realization of the reasonableness regarding its ability to ‘affect’ God comes the realization of the reasonableness that the part of Process/reality ‘within’ which ‘being’ exists, most likely did not ‘create’ itself. Spontaneous generation does not correspond to the observed laws of Process/reality.

As such, within the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) ‘being’ looks to God as the ‘creator’ of Process/reality. This generates the concept of God possessing the capacity for action, Gods’ being. So it is through the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God), an understanding of ‘being’ being one of possibly many means of being God, naturally evolves into the metaphysical system of ‘being’ being God.

(‘being’ being God) offers the understanding of ‘being’ being significant to God. It offers the understanding of the concept of eternal, timeless existence. It offers the understanding that all ‘beings’ will experience timelessness should they ‘exit’ being for there is ‘nowhere’ else to go should one leave being – action, Process/reality than into God itself.

As such, ‘being’, has one responsibility: to fully develop one’s potential significance as best one is potentially able, as best one, as best ‘being’ sees their own individual potential to be rather than as developing it as ‘others’, other ‘beings’ see it to be.

Understanding responsibilities as defined by significance through being – action, Process/reality which is ‘within’ God, initiates respect for ‘beings’ between ‘beings’, initiates respect for ‘being’ towards itself, and initiates respect for ‘beings’ toward their home, the environment, Process/reality. Within the metaphysical model of (‘being’ being God), the annihilation of ‘being’s’ being – action, Process/reality mechanism, does not destroys ‘being’ but rather simply destroys the temporary, the concept of existence immersed ‘within’ time, the home of ‘being’,
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Process/reality itself. Within a metaphysical perception of (‘being’ being God), the annihilation of Process/reality would destroy no action, ‘accomplishments, of ‘beings’, for future action exists ‘within’ Process/reality, but past actions are not ‘to be’ but rather ‘are’. Past actions are actions already taken, they exist as nouns rather than verbs. Without Process/reality, action – being, future actions may not occur but what actions have occurred are no longer in the Process of becoming for they already are. As such past actions have moved from being – action, Process/reality into being a part of God itself.

Is the metaphysical system of (‘being’ being God) a complete system? Yes, ‘being’ being God is completed through the process of union, which in this particular system is absent paradoxes.

Under the Metaphysical System of (‘being’ being God)

i. ‘being’ generates being – action, Process/reality
ii. being – action, Process/reality generates God
iii. God generates being – action, Process/reality
iv. being – action, Process/reality generates ‘being’
v. There is no higher directive than to maximize one’s own potential significance as one sees it rather than as others see it

Regarding ‘being’

‘being’s, individuality’s, main directive is abstract hedonism: to exist for ‘being’s’ self as well as for Gods self.

Regarding God

Gods, main directive is free will: to exist for Gods’ self as well as for ‘being’s’ self.

Type of System

A Cartesian metaphysical system located 'within' a non-Cartesian metaphysical system.

A non-Cartesian system 'powered' by a Cartesian system.
6. Analysis for the Layman

Metaphysical Systems #28

'veing' being God

A Perceptual Shift for 'being'

Symbiotic Panentheism

A Perceptual shift for Humankind

Understanding:

Why we exist
6. Mathematically and scientifically speaking in terms of the layman:

**Complexity, Chaos, and Strange Attractors**
- The whole, the universe, and the individual

*System #28*

The individual is divine and has a function/purpose for existing

**A Perceptual Shift for 'being'/the individual**

Symbiotic Panentheism

A Perceptual shift for Humankind

Understanding:

Why we exist

In lay terms:

The individual exists
The universe exists
An outside to the universe exists
The whole exists

The individual, known within the field of chaos and complexity as the strange attractor with free will, through free will creates its own patterns through the process of action/living/moving through reality. Other patterns can be created out of chaos through the process of the laws of nature, such as the laws of physics, found within the physical universe. Such patterns, whether created with intent, through the use of free will, or created through the process of deterministic actions, actions obeying the laws of nature, the laws of the physical universe, become a part of the whole of complexity.

The realm of chaos is inundated with patterns of complexity, inundated with order. Such patterns of complexity exist as unique entities in and of themselves. Such patterns exist in both the physical form and the abstractual form of being ‘known’ whether known by the myriad individually unique entities of knowing such as the individual human or known uniquely by the whole of knowing, omniscience, God which forms its own entity known within the field of chaos and complexity as the whole of complexity.

The realm of the whole minus the physical universe, minus matter/energy/space/time exists as an abstractual form of knowing. Such a region is composed of the summation of knowing and when combined with the region where new knowing is developed, new complexity is developed, scientifically and mathematically is labeled as the ‘universal set’, philosophically labeled as the whole of existence, religiously labeled as God.

The system:

Scientifically and mathematically: Active complexity within chaos which exists within passive complexity all of which forms an active system in and of itself.

Philosophically: Cartesianism located ‘within’ and acting as the ‘power source’ for non-Cartesianism

Religiously: The soul located within the universe located within God. The soul being the means by which God avoids the ramifications of eternal recurrence.

‘Identity’:

The individual is a part of the whole and has a function within the whole.

Synopsis of the Symbiotic Panentheism Series

i. Volume I. You & I Together: Reality and Existence by Daniel J. Shepard
ii. Volume II. In the Image of God: Free Will and Determinism by Daniel J. Shepard
iii. Volume III. Stepping Up To God: Knowledge and Prophecy by Daniel J. Shepard

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.
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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.

God and Panentheism

i. Reality exists
ii. The initiating force - causative factor - of reality is "God,"
iii. God is omnipresent; as such, all things are in God, including our known reality
iv. God is bigger than reality
v. God is omnipotent; It has the power to create new, original knowledge
vi. God is omniscient; It knows how to create more knowledge. It cannot create new, creative, untainted knowledge within Itself
vii. God is omnipresent; It 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.

The Soul and Symbiosis

i. Humankind exists
ii. Humankind exists in the universe, in 'reality'
iii. The essence of the individual is not the body nor the brain
iv. The essence of the individual is the soul
v. The soul, being within reality which in turn is within God, is a part of God
vi. The individual is not God
vii. The individual is a part of God
viii. Reality separates the individual from God and lies between the individual and God
ix. Humankind, souls, are creative and can experience
x. Soul separated from direct contact with God can create and experience untainted by God's knowledge
xi. Souls can learn and grow
xii. 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.

Human Significance

i. Humanity's perceptions of itself as a species and as individuals determine its behavior
ii. The higher the level of significance we have of ourselves, the higher the level of our behavior
iii. Predestination relieves us of responsibility
iv. Free will raises our level of responsibility
v. The level of perception we can assign to ourselves is to be able to have the free will to assist God in the one thing God cannot do as God - grow
vi. 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
vii. 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.

Social Ramifications

i. The essence of all individuals is the soul
ii. The essence of all individuals is a part of God, a piece of God
iii. All individuals are important to God and deserve to be treated as such
iv. The soul, a piece of God, is important to and needed by God
v. The individual, a piece of God, deserves to be treated with the respect due to God
vi. All individuals are equally important
vii. The individual, 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.

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 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.

Panentheism 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, panentheism goes on to expand God's possible knowledge base through accepting the scientific principle that permanent equilibrium is an unnatural state - even for God. Panentheism applies the concept of the growth of knowledge to God. Of the four theisms, only panentheism 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.

**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 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 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.

Panentheism 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 panentheism assigns the complete characteristic of omnipotence to God, for it assigns the ability and power of God to gain more knowledge.

**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 reality are one and the same size. God has size and is limited to the size of 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 reality. Classical and traditional theism imply, however, that God and reality are separate items from each other. God transcends reality. God is everything except reality.

Panentheism enlarges God over classical or traditional theism. Panentheism purports that God is omni-present. God incorporates everything; therefore, God is everything and thus, there is no place for 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 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 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.

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 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 a God, an originator, an original force, a source of a beginning, or there is not. In all of our observations within reality, there is only one observation a this point in time that we cannot directly tie to having a beginning, an origination, and that is reality.

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

The other option is to reject the logic of option one and embrace option two. The second option is the premise that 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 reality. Reality has always existed.

The premise that reality had a beginning, that there is a creative originating force, that there is a God to reality is supported by an almost infinite amount of direct observations and logic. The premise that 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 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 reality, an original force, a source of the beginning, we can then move on to examine the concept of reality, where 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 mean-time, keep in mind that the Creator of reality is the Creator of 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 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 destroy-ing 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. Rel-igi-ously speaking, an omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent God appears to be a contradiction unless it is om-nipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent enough to become even more so. Therefore, permanent equilibrium is not an option. Being tied to a 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 de-pending 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 reality and to its Creator would definitely help us understand what actions we, humans with freewill, should take while functioning within reality. Our actions affect not only God but, in essence, ourselves. Under the model of symbiotic panentheism, nothing, not even the annihilation of our reality's physical mechanism, can diminish our purpose for existence. Nothing, not even total annihilation of our reality itself, can destroy our accomplishments as souls, for they transcend reality and embrace - fuse - with the very essence of God.

Three Ultimate Paradoxes

i. Being omnipotent - all-powerful - but not having the power to become more so
ii. Being omnipresent - everywhere - but limited within the confines that already exist
iii. Being omniscient - knowing everything - but not knowing how to learn more.
The Creator of 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, reality, is alone
- Pan-theism: Our universe, reality, is not alone; something else exists within it
- Pan-en-theism: Our universe, reality, is part of 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.

This Chapter is intended to lay out the generalities of symbiotic panentheism as seen from the viewpoint of Metaphysical perception and Metaphysical Models. In essence, it is a brief examination of the specialty areas of the broad field of Metaphysics.
Section 7: Specifically

Science and mathematics give a different order of priority to the three fundamental metaphysical questions addressed within this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphysics</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Where is it found?</td>
<td>1. What is it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is it?</td>
<td>2. Where is it found?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Why does it exist?</td>
<td>3. Why does it exist?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not to say the three questions listed for science are the first three questions which science would necessarily address. The change in order of the questions found within this dialectic is initiated for a reason. This dialectic is an application of metaphysics to the practical aspect of reality, practical metaphysics, and not an examination regarding the validity of existence itself. As such we will continue to use the three questions Metaphysics initiates but we will use the sequencing listed for science as opposed to the sequencing listed for metaphysics.

It must be noted at this point that the change in order of the questions in no way implies that the original order of questioning is not significant to metaphysics. It has been strongly suggested repeatedly within this work that the order and topic of the questions poised by metaphysics is critical to understanding reality and understanding our function within reality.

But again, this dialectic is an application of metaphysics to reality as science sees reality and as such the question sequencing is left to the prerogative of science and science first asks ‘what’

A reproduction of the initial diagram of this dialectic will help in understanding specific concepts regarding chaos, complexity, and metaphysics this section of the dialectic is to address.
Region of Passive Complexity:

Complexity in the Passive State
Perfection in the passive sense exists:
   The omni’s in the passive state of Complexity
   4. Passive Omnipresence
   5. Passive Omnipotence
   6. Passive Omniscience
Complexity in the Passive State is a non-Cartesian system
Centricism does not exist in the passive state of Complexity
Determinism emerges out of constancy – passive Complexity
Time/distance exists as an abstract functionality ‘within’ individual elements of Passive Complexity as opposed to being a universal fabric of Passive Complexity
Passive Complexity is an open system

Region of Chaos

Chaos exists actively and passively
   The Physical Universe
   Time and distance exist as a universal fabric, an innate characteristic of matter and energy
   A closed ‘system’ limited by infinite time and infinite distance
   Confined within the two edges of chaos

The Strange Attractor

The Two Edges of Chaos

Region of:
Active Complexity

Discussion of such a region is the point of this dialectic
The Strange Attractor

What are strange attractors?

Strange attractors are the nucleus of complex patterns. Strange attractors are the nucleus around which a pattern of ‘order’ emerges from chaos.

The metaphysical model of symbiotic panentheism, the being of ‘being’ being God, suggests there are two forms of strange attractors:

1. Strange attractors governed by the responsibility of free will
2. Strange attractors governed by no responsibility of action, governed by determinism

Strange attractors governed by the responsibility of free will will develop their unique patterns of complexity from the material available to them within the region of chaos in which they are immersed. Group 1 strange attractors and the patterns they develop are no different than those developed by Group 2 but the laws governing their foundation are different.

Group Strange attractors are the nucleus around which complex patterns emerge through the process of choice/free will. Group 1 strange attractors need not follow a mathematical pattern such as tessellations, mathematical equations such as $n + 1$, biological pattern such as spider web formation, or biological laws such as mimicry.

Group 2 strange attractors, on the other hand, are the nucleus around which complex patterns emerge through predictable/determined mathematical pattern such as tessellations, mathematical equations such as $n + 1$, biological pattern such as spider web formation, or biological laws such as mimicry.

Knowing is not the issue regarding Group 2. Knowing may or may not be present for the strange attractors generating complexity through determined laws, principles, and equations. For such strange attractors the result is predictable in its predictability and/or unpredictability.

Knowing is the issue regarding Group 1. Knowing becomes the means by which ‘choice’/free will is initiated and responsibility becomes the subject of debate. The debate as to what becomes ‘responsible’ behavior then moves into a debate regarding ethics and morals. What is ethical and what is moral? The debate regarding ethics and morals becomes a debate regarding reality for to understand the ethics and morality of action one must understand one’s function within the region one functions. Without an understanding of the reality within which one functions there is no understanding one purpose for existing and thus no understanding ones responsibility.

Where is the strange attractor?

The strange attractor is located ‘within’ chaos. Chaos is the material from which the strange attractors, found within our universe, build their patterns of complexity/order.

The strange attractor is also located within the region of passive complexity and remains the nucleus of the pattern of complexity just as a fully developed raindrop retains its nucleus. The question regarding the life and death of the pattern is not the issue of the mathematical and
scientific fields of Chaos and Complexity. The topic regarding the reality of life and death are the issues which face philosophy and in particular metaphysics and ontology.

The topic regarding the reality of life and death are addressed in great detail within these three volumes.

The strange attractor existing within passive complexity and active complexity have different functions and dynamic than do strange attractors found within chaos.

Strange attractors and the unique pattern of complexity they form/initiate are found within chaos both as passive complexity and active complexity (see diagram). Strange attractors are in the mathematical sense the ‘retainer’ of complexity. In the metaphysical sense the strange attractors are individual elements of knowing. Strange attractors of knowing with free will are in the religious sense individual ‘knowing souls’ that choose what pattern of complexity they wish to form.

Strange attractors, as we ‘know them to be’, and the unique patterns of complexity they are in the process of forming, are found only within the region of chaos.

Why does the strange attractor exist?

Strange attractors and the unique patterns of complexity they generate are found within passive complexity, metaphysically speaking. Strange attractors are found within the model of ‘being’ being God/symbiotic panentheism, Cartesianism located within and powering non-Cartesianism, epitomize the passive verb representing the state of being.

Strange attractors and the unique patterns of complexity they are in the process of generating within the region of chaos, complete the action verb concept of being.

In essence one might say omniscience is all knowing of the complexity that exist and omnipotence is the ability to produce new strange attractors and their corresponding pattern of unique complexity, which does not as yet exist. The full discussion regarding how it is possible for a region to be changing while having the characteristic of no changeability is fully addressed within Tractates 2, 5, 6, and 8. Within these four tractates the issue of time and distance as it relates to the region which lies ‘outside’/beyond the physical is specifically addressed.

To put it more precisely, strange attractors are the means by which ‘newness’ is created and eternal recurrence is avoided.

**Complexity**

What is complexity?

Complexity is the opposite of chaos. Complexity is order.

Where is complexity?

Complexity is the original region from which all evolved/originated. It is not complexity, which arises from chaos but chaos, which arises from complexity.
Why does complexity exist?

Complexity is the source of chaos and nothingness. Complexity is the source of both and both chaos and nothingness play a vital role to the whole.

**Chaos**

What is chaos?

Chaos is the opposite of complexity. Chaos is disorder. In essence chaos appears to us to be ‘real’ because we stand ‘within’ such a region while making such an analysis. The detailed discussion regarding the ‘real’ an the ‘real illusion’ can be found in Volume II, Tractate 9: The Error of Russell.

Where is chaos?

Chaos is the original region from which all evolved/originated. Chaos arises from complexity through the initiation of the functionality of nothingness. The details regarding the existence of nothingness, the functionality of nothingness, and the principle of symmetry emerging as an innate characteristic of nothingness is fully address within Volume 3, Tractate 10: The Error of Heidegger.

Why does chaos exist?

Chaos exists as the means by which passive complexity becomes active/dynamic.

**The Edge of Chaos**

What is the edge of chaos?

The edge of chaos is a ‘location’. The edge of chaos is where passive complexity becomes disorder/chaos and where disorder/chaos becomes unique passive complexity through action..

Where is the edge of chaos?

The edge of chaos is where passive complexity becomes disorder/chaos and where disorder/chaos becomes unique passive elements of complexity through action..

Why does the edge of chaos exist?

The edge of chaos exists to separate the active process of creation, ‘What could be but may not be.’ from the passive state of existence: What was.’, ‘What is.’, and ‘What will be.’
The Edge of Complexity

What is the edge of complexity?

The edge of complexity does not exist as we far as we are able to determine presently. We are presently unable to comprehend of such a concept because we cannot presently conceive of what remains, what exists, if the total summation of the abstract, the physical, and nothingness is removed from the whole of reality.

Where is the edge of complexity?

If the edge of complexity exists, then it is the boundary of the total summation of complexity, nothingness, chaos, and strange attractors.

Why does the edge of complexity exist?

At this point in time we do not know why a concept such as the edge of complexity would exist or would even need to exist. Such a discourse is the very topic of the new field this work, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, initiates. Such a field of study is, with this work, recognized as Theoretical Metaphysics.

Innateness

What is innateness?

Innateness is the strange attractor.

Where is innateness?

Innateness is ‘located’ at the center of complexity.

Why does innateness exist?

Innateness exists to create.

Metaphysics

What is metaphysics?

Metaphysics is the study of what lies outside the physical universe both in terms of the passive state of existence of such a region and in terms of the active state regarding the internal dynamics of such a region.

Metaphysics is a Greek term whose syllables have a distinct meaning:

Meta… – beyond
…physics – the physical
The meaning of the term metaphysics is clear and precise. Metaphysics is the field of study whose function is to study the rationality regarding the ‘outside’ of the physical universe.

The term metaphysics has undergone a transformation regarding its application. This transformation, however, has nothing to do with the meaning of the term in the literal sense.

It is the literal meaning of the term metaphysics which Volumes I, II and III of The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical addresses.

The quibbling regarding the semantics of the term is not the issue of this work.

Some would venture there is no existence ‘beyond’ the physical,. If there is no beyond/outside to the physical than there is no such thing as metaphysics and thus there is only a delusional sense that metaphysics exists. Without an ‘outside’ to the universe the study of metaphysics becomes an act of creative fantasy by a nonexistent being, namely ourselves.

Where is metaphysics?

Metaphysics is a term which identifies a verb of action and as such metaphysics is an abstractual concept not something physical. Because metaphysics is abstractual in nature the question begs to be addressed as: In what state of existence do we presently find the field of metaphysics.

Metaphysics is in a state of semi-consciousness. For the most part philosophy has relegated the field of metaphysics to a subservient state dominated by the field of Epistemology.

The reason for the near demise of metaphysics lies with present day society being dominated by the scientific concept that if there is an outside to the universe, there is no way for us to study such a region and as such we must conclude there is no such region.

Such an argument could have been used against the philosophical atomists but it was not. During the time of the Greek Atomists the debates founded upon reason and rationality were understood to be precursory discussions, which would eventually be resolved.

So it should be with the field of metaphysics. We should understand that the debates, regarding the existence of an outside of the physical and the function such a region has to ourselves as well as the function we have to the ‘outside’ of the universe, is first to be founded upon reason and rationality which in turn is understood to be a precursory discussion to our resolving the issue through scientific discovery. In fact such a precursory analysis is the very means by which the directional beacons of science are established.

Why does metaphysics exist?

As was stated in the question: What is the strange attractor:

Knowing is the issue regarding Group 1. Knowing becomes the means by which ‘choice’/free will is initiated and responsibility becomes the subject of debate. The debate as to what becomes ‘responsible’ behavior then moves into a debate
regarding ethics and morals. What is ethical and what is moral? The debate regarding ethics and morals becomes a debate regarding reality for to understand the ethics and morality of action one must understand one’s function within the region one functions. Without an understanding of the reality within which one functions there is no understanding one purpose for existing and thus no understanding ones responsibility.

Metaphysics then is understood to exist for the sole purpose of using reason and rationality to explore the potential existence of a ‘beyond’ the physical and the dynamics which exists between such a region and the physical of which we are a part.

Either there is a ‘beyond’ the physical or there is not.

If there is no ‘beyond the physical then our ethics emerging from reason and rationality and our morality emerging from reason and rationality will find their base within a region of physicality.

Ethics and morality steeped in physicality are recognized by the fields of philosophy and religion to be physical/materialistic in nature generating materialism, physical hedonism

If there is a ‘beyond the physical then our ethics emerging from reason and rationality and our morality emerging from reason and rationality will find their base within such a region.

Ethics and morality steeped in abstractuality are recognized by the fields of philosophy and religion to be abstractual/altruistic in nature generating altruistic, abstractual/hedonism

The function of metaphysics thus becomes obvious. Metaphysics exists to answer the question regarding the reasoning and rationalization concerning the very foundation of ethics and morality. Is responsible action reasonably and rationally based upon materialism or altruism. The conclusion to such a debate will ultimately decide the primary directions our actions as individuals and our actions as a specie will take as we move through history be it historical actions bound to this planet or historical actions reaching into the vastness of space itself.

**Chaos, Complexity, and Strange Attractors**

Disorder, order, and innateness

being, being, ‘being’, and God

Symbiotic panentheism

Additional material regarding chaos and complexity can be found in the works listed below. Although the works approach the subject areas of chaos and complexity from a metaphysical point of view, the works deal specifically with the region of passive complexity, active complexity, chaos, and the edge of chaos.

**Theoretical Metaphysics:**

You & I Together

Reality & Existence, 385 pages, 1996
Metaphysical Engineering:
In The image Of God:
Free Will & Determinism, 224 pages, 1997

Practical Metaphysics:
Stepping Up To God:
Knowledge & Prophecy, 400+ pages, 1998

Philosophical Analysis:
The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception
   Volume I: Metaphysical System #3
   Volume II: A New Tool For Conflict Resolution
   Volume III: How to Regain the Love of Wisdom
1500 pages, 2002