

Act II: First Truths

Scene I: Poly-Solipsism

Characters: Dan and Chuck

Center Stage: Dan and Chuck sitting in two wing back leather chairs, feet up on ottoman, coffee table between them, whiskey glasses full of ice and whiskey, and a decanter of whiskies rest on the coffee table between the two of them.

On the multiple screens behind and above the two of them, pictures of people of all ages, nationalities, colors, and genders are reveling in life. Happiness, contentment, enjoyment of life's pleasures combined with close-up profiles and common personal activities fill sequence of slides.

Dan:

Ah, Chuck, the life of a philosopher is not so bad, ay? Quiet, solitude, a little of the happy brew, a good chair, and time to think, what more could a thinking man in his late fifties ask for?

I told you I would come to you and here I am. I must say you are a great host. What a cozy little corner of your mind you have prepared for us.

I feel a little uncomfortable being in your mind but your having granting me my personal existence independent from yourself gives me some comfort. But just to be sure we are on the same page, I have a request.

We seem to have agreed upon the common ground of poly-solipsism. Would you mind granting me a Wittgenstein moment by defining poly-solipsism for me?

Oh and one other thing, since I tend to agree with the ancient Greeks that truth lies in simplicity, would you mind choosing your words carefully and keep the explanation as concise as possible?

Chuck:

We are The Singularity.

Dan:

Cute Chuck, but let's get serious. I can understand the concept of Singularity but let's address the matter of definition in terms of the man on the street. Explain in fifty words what poly-solipsism is such that a

junior high school student can understand what you mean by the concept. If you can't do it then throw the task back to me and I'll give it a try.

Perhaps this will help:

Solipsism is ...

Poly means ...

Thus poly-solipsism is ...

Chuck:

Sorry Dan, I really thought you wanted it "as concise as possible." It seems I can express the essence of Poly-Solipsism in four words, but I am not sure I can define it in under 50!

Ok, the short version.

Solipsism: I Exist.

Poly means Many

Poly-Solipsism: Many "I"s Exist.

With Solipsism only the "I" exists, and Reality is only a delusion in the mind of "I."

With Poly-Solipsism Reality is a shared illusion.

If only one person can see it: it's a delusion. If everyone can see it: it's Reality.

Dan

In general I couldn't agree with you more. It would appear that our common ground lies with the concept of poly-solipsism: The many 'I's' exist. You exist, I exist, unique individuality exists.

In fact it might be stated 'first truth' acknowledges the existence of multiplicity: You exist.

Such a model of reality is essential for the existence of societies. Without the acknowledgment of the 'you' existing there would be no rational argument for 'the rights of the individual'.

Dan:

What of the physical universe? Since the physical universe is 'seen' by all, is the physical universe a 'shared illusion' or is the physical universe the only true Reality void 'illusional' characteristics?

Chuck:

What is the "physical Universe"?

I believe that question is what started us down the path to Philosophy and thus to all the Sciences. What is the physical Universe, and what is Reality are pretty much the same question. It's "The Question" in Philosophy and philosophy's stepchild; Science.

To answer that question we must step out of our imaginative void and enter "First Cause."

No matter what you believe, all roads lead back to The One; they lead to The First Cause. The First Cause is the 'container' of all other containers. As such it cannot be contained by anything else and is therefore Infinite and Unbound.

Theist call this First Cause God. None-theist call it The Singularity. Both names describe the same concept, they only differ is in the attribute of Sentience.

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

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

The only thing we can know about The First Cause is what it caused. Since no-thing can exist 'in' First Cause because everything is part of First Cause, any attributes we can assign to the components of any

system, are by default, attributes of the system itself. A system cannot assign attributes to it's components that it does not manifest itself!

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

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

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

Dan:

Interesting Chuck. It appears we agree that 'first truth' can be stated as: 'We exist.'/'You exist.' First truth is not 'I exist' for such a truth is singular in nature. First truth is verifiable by the principle you put forward regarding the process of identifying reality: If only one person can see it: it's a delusion. If everyone can see it: it's Reality.

So again I come back to my question:

You state: *'With Poly-Solipsism Reality is a shared illusion.'*

Since the physical universe is 'seen' by all, is the physical universe a 'shared illusion' or is the physical universe a true Reality?

Chuck:

"Reality is merely an illusion, albeit a very persistent one."

Albert Einstein

The Universe is a shared illusion.

When everyone sees the very same thing, we no longer call it a delusion, or an illusion; we call it Reality. We don't doubt for a second what we are all seeing may not be real. But as it turns out, nothing we see is really 'real.' it all a trick of the Light.

Why did Einstein say Reality is merely an persistent illusion?

Because of what we have found out with Particle Physics. We have discovered there is nothing solid in solids, and there are no 'particles' in our particles. When we started looking into the fundamental particles that make our Universe we soon realized the study of the physical is actually the study of the Metaphysical.

The fundamental 'particles' that combine to form everything 'physical' in our universe are not particles at all. Matter is basically composed of Quarks, photons and other photon like 'particles' called gauge bosons which only transfer small units (quanta) of energy from one place to another. When they do, they change one form of matter into another form of matter. The gauge bosons are little more than light, and no one really knows what quarks are made of, but I suspect we will find quarks are no more substantial than the gauge particles are.

Matter has the appearance of being something solid, but it's just forces composed of energy, and our energy seems to be composed of nothing more than light.

But wait! It gets even better!

Where do the forces that generate these fundamental 'particles' come from? As it turns out, they don't come from 'anywhere' that we can point to!

Quantum Physics tells us all energy radiates from a very strange place called the Quantum Universe. In the Quantum Universe the dimensions we know and love do not exist. There is no Space/Time. In fact there isn't anything at all that we would recognize. All there seems to be is something called Quantumstuff; 'quon' for short. This quon is not the same type of $e=mc^2$ energy we know, and it doesn't obey any of the rules we assigned to the normal energy in our physical Universe. We are trying to figure out what it is and how it works, but right now we just don't know, and all our theories, though they seem to explain what we are seeing, are unsupported. String Theory is the leading contender right now, with Membrane Theory not far behind, but these are just best guesses and we don't know for sure.

But we do know a few things. We know there isn't enough 'normal' matter/energy to account for the strange happenings we see in our Universe; not enough by over half! Our Galaxies are spinning to fast to

hold together; they should be flying apart, but there is some unseen force holding everything together.

We also know that all our normal energy seems to be connected somehow through the Quantum Universe. There is an unseen interconnection; and entanglement, between pairs of atoms that have coupled pairs acting as if they were opposite sides of the same coin. If you flip one, the other will flip simultaneously, no matter how far apart they appear in our physical Universe. The communication between entangled pairs is super-luminary; Faster Than Light! Which means that any communication in or through the Quantum Universe is instantaneous. We have seen a few of these coupled pairs in the lab, but the fact that they exist at all, leads me to suspect everything in our Universe is entangled. Every atom and fundamental particle is entangled and coupled with every other one somewhere in our Universe.

Everything emanates from the Quantum Universe, and everything is connected to and entangled in the Quantum Universe. Therefore there is super-luminary communication between all things!

We also believe the seat of consciousness itself; our minds, also reside in the Quantum Universe. The microtubules in our brains are considered the most likely suspects for the quantum connection to our physical brains. A recent advance in MRI imaging has tentatively identified just such a quantum coherence. Which would mean our minds; or consciousness, are also entangled in the Quantum Universe.

Where is all this leading?

The way I see it, if consciousness itself is located in the Quantum Universe, everything in our physical Universe emanates from it, everything in the Quantum Universe is all the same quon, and everything is entangled together with instantaneous communication, than we are quon, and all our minds are entangled together in the Quantum Universe allowing us instantaneous communication to all perceive the same illusion of Reality at the same time.

The Universe, and everything we see as 'real' is nothing more than a trick of the light radiating from an invisible dimension and composed of the same thing our minds are composed of.

Reality is an illusion that just won't go away, but is constantly changing.

Dan:

Fine Chuck, but is the universe 'real'? Since the physical universe is 'seen' by all, is the physical universe a 'shared illusion' or is the physical universe a true Reality, real?

Chuck:

I guess we could say a 'persistent illusion' is as real as it gets. It is as 'real' as we believe it to be.

If we cannot tell the difference, does it really matter?

Dan:

It does not matter if the physical universe is as we perceive it, physical, in nature and independent of thought, or if the physical universe is a creation of the collective mind and dependent upon thought. But it does matter if the 'physical universe' is 'real'/exists.

And just what is it that I mean by 'real'/exists. There are two verb forms of the word 'exists': 1. the passive state of being and 2. the active state of being. The passive state of being is that of being real, 'is-ness', and the active form of being is that of being real, functional. Both forms of the verb must exist simultaneously for real-ness to exist

So regarding the question '... does it matter?' Absolutely it matters. It does not matter whether the universe is a function of the collective minds (poly solipsism), a function of 'a' mind (first cause) but it does matter if it has an independent existence of one or the other I .

The reason the answer to the question matters is that if the 'physical' universe is real then by definition the 'physical universe' not only exists but has function.

Previously we agreed you are real. You exist and you have functionality, I exist and I have functionality, the vast multiplicity of individuals exist and have functionality, in short we have agreed that poly solipsism is a truth of reality.

Now I grant you we have not yet defined what the functionality of all these poly solipsist entities is. That discussion will be initiated later. However, I digress and I will refocus again upon what it is I had initiated in this portion of the dialogue.

So again I ask, Is the 'physical universe' real? Does the 'physical universe' exist and does the 'physical universe' have functionality?

Chuck:

Ah, Functionalism, now that's a horse of a different color. The Cause and Effect of an ever changing 'persistent illusion'!

Yes, Functionality is an attribute of Universe.

Our 'Physical Reality' is greatly dependent on our perception of Functionality. And as you say, we must address it shortly; it is what makes the illusion persistent.

But, does functionalism grant independence? That is all a matter of perception.

Dan:

Functionality is an issue in and of itself and deserves time to itself. But for now...

To reiterate again, we agreed earlier to the truth: You exist, I exist, others exist. This truth is generalized by the conceptual terminology, poly solipsism - the existence of multiple entities of knowing.

So it is we come back to the issue regarding reaching a consensus as to whether or not the universe exists. I am not attempting to establish what the function of the physical universe is nor am I attempting to establish whether the physical universe is a creation of collective thought or an existence independent of collective thinking. I am also not attempting to establish who or what may be responsible for the existence of the physical universe.

I am not ignoring the fact that you have answered my question regarding functionality being an attribute of the universe and therefore I could assume this means you agree that the universe exists. It is, however, disrespectful of me to make assumptions regarding your thinking, therefore I will ask the question again: Does the universe exist?

Chuck:

I agree, I too do not wish to be disrespectful and assume I know what you mean by "Exist."

I also do not wish to be disrespectful to the traditions of Philosophy. In Philosophy there are no simple

answers. Philosophers have taken Rene Descartes' 'simple' statement "I am" and turned it into a 400 year discussion on just what "I am" actually means.

We would be negligent and have our Union cards invalidated if we did not at least attempt to clarify between us the meaning of "Exist."

So before I can answer you question: "Does the Universe Exist?" I first must know how you define "Exist."

Dan:

Fair enough Chuck, let's see if we can come to a consensus as to the definition of the term 'exist' and then you can answer the question for me: Does the Universe exist?

Dan moves from his chair to a bookcase highlighted by the light following him as he walks to the region behind his chair. Dan removes six books from the bookcase and proceeds back to his chair. He sets the books down upon the table between Chuck and himself.

The bookcase does not appear until Dan reaches up and removes the first book. It would appear Dan is reaching up and miraculously pulling a book out of thin air, but as soon as the first book materializes the whole bookcase appears.

Let's see what The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy says of the concept 'exist'. Hmmm interesting. It doesn't define the word at all. Excuse me for a minute; I'm curious, let's see what it has to say about 'life'. Hmmm, it doesn't define the concept of 'life' either. You would think it would define both terms since both are such basic concepts and this is after all a basic resource book for philosophy.

Well then let's see what the Dictionary of Philosophy and Religion by Reese says about the term 'exist'. Well what do you know; it also does not define the concept 'exist'.

And the Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy? Hmm nothing.

And The Companion To Metaphysics? Also nothing.

And the Concise Science Dictionary? Nothing again.

It appears, Chuck, that you have stumbled onto something interesting. Even the major academic references skirt the problem of defining very basic concepts. Isn't it fascinating that philosophy and

religions can spend so much time debating what it means to exist and what the purpose of life is when they don't even know what the two are? The irony would be hilarious if it weren't for the fact that so much of human behavior and so much of what is expected of human behavior is based upon how we interpret the two terms when in fact we haven't, as a specie, come to a consensus as to what the two terms mean. So much for the Crusades, the Holocaust, the Inquisition, WW II, ad nauseam.

Well I guess I could define the concept but that would seem a little brazen, so let's see if there is a generic definition given in Webster's Dictionary.

Hmm, exist: to have real being either physical or spiritual.

Perhaps, if you would have no objection, we could clarify the concepts of physical and spiritual as physical/tangible and abstractual/intangible. This would prevent our having to contend with religious concepts while discussing philosophical issues.

If you agree then the definition of 'exists' becomes: to have real being either physically/tangibly or abstractually/intangibly.

Then 'real being' needs defining. Would you have any objection if we substitute your definition of 'real being' as being: perceivable by all as opposed to an illusion, which is perceived only by one's self, after all this was your definition

If we can agree upon these items, then the definition of 'exists' becomes: an entity either physical/tangible or abstractual/intangible in nature which is perceivable by all (the vast majority since some people can't see their own hand when they hold it in front of their eyes).

Chuck:

You missed my favorite dictionary definition: "a continued or repeated manifestation," but to be fair, that definition is under 'existence'!

It is interesting isn't it, that we cannot find a definition for 'Exist' in any reputable Philosophy reference?. Interesting, but no really surprising, after all we are still arguing over what "I am" really means. Its absence speaks volumes.

I will agree to define 'exist' as an entity that is either tangible or intangible, leaving out the 'physical' and 'abstractual' as being repetitious. I will also ask for another little correction and suggest we remove the

'perceivable by all.' I believe it is inconsistent with intangible.

We then are left with the definition of "exist" as: That which is either tangible or intangible.

Of course we can now ask for a definition of 'tangible,' but that will only lead to circular definitions where we must use one unknown quality to define another unknown quality. I will not quibble at this point if you will not.

So if you will agree to Tangible and Intangible as the quality of Exist, then I will agree that the Universe exists.

Dan:

The terms 'exists' and 'existence' are two different issues. Granted the nuance is subtle but subtleties in philosophy are extremely important.

I agree with your changes to the definition of the term 'exists'. It appears that we have then come to a consensus regarding a second definition; the definition of the term 'exists'

Previously you had stated and I had agreed: If only one person can see it: it's a delusion. If everyone can see it: it's Reality.

It appears we have come to a consensus regarding four definitions and two universal/absolute truths:

Definition one: 'delusion': If only one person can see it

Definition two: 'Reality': If everyone can see it

Definition three: 'Exists': That which is either tangible or intangible.

Truth one: You exist, I exist, individuals exist - poly solipsism/multiplicity

Truth two: The universe exists.

Webster's Dictionary purports the meaning of the term illusion is synonymous both to a delusion and to

a false statement, but if we state that a delusion is a form of illusion/false statement and then equate the illusion to that of mass perceptions of reality, are we not suggesting that reality does not exist. Such a statement would seem to contradict Truth Two: The universe exists.

Now Truth Two does not suggest the universe exists as a tangible or an intangible entity but Truth Two does state absolutely: the universe exists either in the tangible form, the intangible form, or some combination of both forms.

You asked me to define 'exists'. Now, in order to attempt to clear up the ambiguities, let me ask you to define a term.

Define: illusion

Chuck:

Precisely why I asked for your definition of Exist. If you had left out the 'Intangible' I would not have agreed. A synonym for Intangible is Metaphysical.

(Chuck picks up the Webster's Dictionary Dan has just replaced on the table between them.)

Lets see what else our distinguished Mr. Webster has to say about Illusion?

Ah, here it is:

1a: The action of deceiving.

1b: the state or fact of being intellectually deceived or misled

2a: a misleading image presented to the vision.

And this is my favorite!

2b: perception of something objectively existing in such a way as to cause misinterpretation of its actual nature!

I agree with all of them, and do not find a contradiction is saying that Reality is a mass Illusion and then stating the Universe exists. The Universe exists because the Intangible exist.

And what about the Tangible nature of Universe? It's Einstein's infamous 'persistent illusion.'

I believe the real question is how does a persistent illusion come to feel tangible?

I am holding Webster's Ninth in my hand. Intellectually I know it is an illusion, but damn it feels 'real'!

If I drop it I know it will fall. If it hits my toe, I know it is going to hurt. That's a pretty damn good illusion!

Dan:

I hope you are not attempting to clutter what it is we have agreed to focus upon, my friend. Our discussion's objective is to describe reality not the 'how' of reality. I will grant you that the question regarding '...how does a persistent illusion come to feel tangible?' is of great interest but to take on such a discourse before one addresses the concept of reality itself is putting the cart before the horse.

So reverting to our original discourse it appears we have reached a consensus regarding:

Definition one: 'Delusion': An Illusion seen by only one person.

Definition two: 'Reality': An Illusion seen by everyone.

Definition three: 'Exist': That which is either tangible or intangible.

Truth one: You exist, I exist, individuals exist.

Truth two: The universe exists.

I think we need to agree to a definition regarding the term 'illusion'.

You suggest your favorite definition of illusion is: '... a perception of something objectively existing in such a way as to cause misinterpretation of its actual nature!' I have no problem using such a definition. Can we agree to embrace this definition for an illusion?

Chuck:

Sorry Dan, It wasn't my intention to lead us off topic. I guess I am trying to second guess where your line of questing is headed. You know how difficult it is for me to keep from expounding on a subject once I build up a good head of steam!

I have no problem with using Mr. Webster's '2b' as the definition either. Are there any other definitions you would like a consensus on?

Dan:

Perhaps it is time to address the issue of direction. It would appear to me that philosophy is wrought with chaos. The discourse emanating from philosophy is like electromagnetic waves, it has no coherency. Electromagnetic waves, taken in their natural state, have great potential but need to be harnessed before they can live up to their potentiality, ala radios, TVs, cell phones, solar cells, lasers, MRIs, GPSs, ...

The same applies to philosophy, but the means of harnessing philosophy is not technology but reason. The fundamental questions haunting our specie have been: What are we? Why do we exist? How did we begin? Where are we? And When did we begin to exist?

Now we assume the questions cannot be answered because we have been unsuccessful in doing so since Western philosophy began asking the questions. In fact the chaotic results of our attempting to answer the questions seem to have accelerated the muddying of the waters of understanding. What has actually happened over the last twenty-five hundred years of philosophy, however, is the solutions to the questions have been found, we just have to be willing to patiently let the mud settle to see our results.

The discussions you and I have been having are, in fact, the undertaking of letting the mud settle. As the mud settled we have come to 'see' the building blocks of a model of reality. These building blocks are called 'truths'.

Truth one: You exist. I exist. Others exist. Poly-Solipsism as you call it. Multiplicity of knowing as I call it.

Truth two: The universe exists. A means of experiencing if you wish.

Now the process of letting the sediment settle to the bottom, leaves the truths exposed. The process of letting go of the secondary questions in order to discuss the primary concepts of reality is no easy task. The secondary debates include concepts such as: What is the universe? Is the universe tangible or intangible? Do we create the universe through collective will or did a 'greater power' create the universe? Do others exist? Are you just a figment of my imagination?

In essence we are letting go of religious debates and scientific debates and focusing upon identifying the rational building blocks of reality.

Once we have identified the building blocks of reality we can assemble the puzzle of reality. The process is similar to assembling a jigsaw puzzle. Then, if we select the order carefully, we can answer three of the five questions that have been haunting humanity, which in turn can help us resolve many of our perplexing social enigmas.

Now it is just as important that philosophy collects all the essential components, truths, regarding reality before assembling them, as it is for science to collect all the components of a laser before assembling the laser. It is then just as important for philosophy to ask and answer the questions haunting humanity in the correct order as it is for science to assemble the components of the laser in the correct order. Should one or the other, philosophy or science, fail to follow this procedure, both fail in attaining their objectives. The only difference between science and philosophy in this regard is that science recognizes this process and applies it and philosophy does neither.

So this, my friend, is where it is we are headed and we, you and I together, have made great advances for we have identified two truths, two building blocks necessary for the understanding of reality and our function within reality:

Truth one: poly solipsism - you exist, I exist, others exist.

Truth two: The universe exists.

And four definitive terms:

Definition one: Illusion: a perception of something objectively existing in such a way as to cause misinterpretation of its actual nature!

Definition two: 'Delusion': An Illusion seen by only one person.

Definition three: 'Reality': An Illusion seen by everyone.

Definition four: 'Exists': That which is either tangible or intangible.

Now I will be the first to acknowledge that we, limited beings, cannot 'know' as an absolute that the truths we acknowledge to be truths are in fact truths. On the other hand I also acknowledge that we, limited beings, are capable of defining truths as best we are able and once having done so can then move on from there.

Do we, two thinkers, agree upon these two truths and the four definitions? If we do we can move on and tackle the concept of whether or not there are any other building blocks of reality, any other truths. If we do not agree, then we need to discuss the points of disagreement before moving on.

So again I ask, do we both agree to the two truths and four definitions?

Chuck:

Very good! I had been thinking the definition for an Illusion should be 'Definition One.' I am delighted to see you thought so also.

Thank you for enlightening me on the direction you wish our discussion should follow. Having a destination in mind I will no longer need to try 'second guess' your intentions.

Truth one: poly solipsism - you exist, I exist, others exist.

Truth two: The universe exists.

Definition one: Illusion: a perception of something objectively existing in such a way as to cause misinterpretation of its actual nature!

Definition two: 'Delusion': An Illusion seen by only one person.

Definition three: 'Reality': An Illusion seen by everyone.

Definition four: 'Exists': That which is either tangible or intangible.

Agreed!

I see you have again mentioned Multiplicity in connection to Poly-Solipsism. Though the name pretty well speaks for itself, I have been waiting to see if you were going to comment a little more on how you

define Multiplicity. How similar is it to Poly-Solipsism?

Do you see The Singularity as a 'basic building block' of Reality?

Act II: First Truths

Scene II: Singularity

Characters: Dan and Chuck

Center Stage: Dan and Chuck sitting in two wing back leather chairs, feet up on ottoman, coffee table between them, whiskey glasses full of ice and whiskey, and a decanter of whiskies rest on the coffee table between the two of them.

On the multiple screens behind and above the two of them, pictures of galaxies, nebula, colliding galaxies, vastness of empty space, The concept of 'a' universe filled with points of tangible existence.

Dan:

You bring up two questions: '...define Multiplicity. How similar is it to Poly-Solipsism?' and 'Do you see The Singularity as a 'basic building block' of Reality? '

I am not sure we see the two, multiplicity and singularity, in the same manner so let's examine the issue of both in order to avoid the unforeseen pitfalls semantics often infuses into philosophical discussions.

My perception regarding multiplicity and singularity can best be understood with an analogy. I look at the concepts of multiplicity and singularity much as a mathematician looks at the geometric relationship of points and a line, or points and a plane, or points and space.

Using the concept of points and a line: A line contains points. Each point is defined as a location void dimension, no length, width, or height. Points are contained within the line. The oft-missed phrase here is the phrase 'contained within'.

The points are not 'a part of' the line, they are 'contained within' the line. The significance here is that should any point be extracted from the line the line does not become any less than what it is, namely a line. The reason for this goes back to the concept of discrete mathematics which is another topic altogether. However, the concept of discrete mathematics addresses the idea that each point is an entity

unto itself. One must not forget that the line also is a unique entity in and of itself.

This analogy describes singularity (lower case 's'): Each point is an entity, which exists in and of itself.

This analogy describes multiplicity: An infinite number of points exist in and of themselves. In the case of poly-solipsism/multiplicity we are speaking of many entities and in particular entities of knowing. Poly-solipsism/multiplicity refers to multiple/many entities of knowing existing in and of themselves. Each knowing entity is unique and each perceives uniquely.

If you agree then we can move to discussing 'truth three':

The geometry analogy alludes to Singularity (Upper case 'S'): The line exists in and of itself.

If one could remove a point, the line would remain a line.

This analogy leads us directly into the discussion regarding the question you ask: Is Singularity a 'basic building block' of Reality? '

I know you fully understand the ramifications emerging from this line of thinking, but try to remain objective. We are not speaking of religion here, nor are we speaking of 'God'. We are speaking of the line only.

Using the parameters of our definitions, would you agree: The line exists?

Chuck:

I will agree to the concept of Multiplicity as being one of the tenets of Poly-Solipsism. Multiplicity is the concept that 'Many I's exist.' It is the 'Poly' in Poly-Solipsism, but I cannot agree that 'the line' exists.

Over the years we have been communicating I have come to think of you as being rational, brilliant, and somewhat sane; at least no more insane than myself, I had almost forgotten you are a retired mathematics professor.

Mathematicians and Theoretical Physicist have this peculiar tendency to believe the symbols and equations they use to describe a concept is the concept itself and actually exist. Because they can manipulate the symbols and balance the equations they begin to believe what we can do with the symbols on the map we can do with the Territory. They forget "The Map is not the Territory."

You are correct my friend, we both can agree on the existence of The Singularity, but we do not 'see' The Singularity in the same manner.

You used the 'line' with infinite 'points' as an analogy. It is a metaphor, a map with symbols used to help describe a territory. It is not the territory itself. The line does not exist.

By reducing concepts to symbols we become confused between 'points' contained 'in the line' and not being 'a part of' the line. If each 'point' is a mind, and the 'line' is The Singularity, then in doing so, we have essentially separated the mind from The Singularity, which cannot be done. You have the points/minds in the Line/Singularity, but not being 'a part of' it. Because we are now dealing with the symbols and not the territory itself, we can theoretically remove the points and still have the line. When we reduce the concepts to symbols and analogies we forget we cannot do the same things with the Territory we can do with the symbols that go into drawing the Map.

Unlike the way we can manipulate symbols, we cannot remove a Mind from The Singularity because The Singularity is Singular, it is all there is, and there is no other 'place' to remove a mind to.

From my point of view, the 'Many I's'/Minds are not '*in*' The Singularity, and they are not '*part of*' The Singularity; they *are* The Singularity.

Together, the Multiplicity of Minds, forms the Consciousness that is The Singularity.

It is the revelation that The Singularity is Consciousness itself that is the foundation of Poly-Solipsism, and the foundation on which all our other 'basic building blocks' are stacked.

Dan:

You are mixing apples and oranges my friend. The 'I's' are entities of knowing/consciousness, beings which exist, beings which exist in both the passive sense and the active sense. Lines are entities of non-knowing, multiple entences having no consciousness, beings which exist but beings which exist only in the passive sense. Lines do not act. Lines do not have consciousness. Lines simply are. The I's of which you speak not only are but have consciousness. You are mixing consciousness with non-consciousness.

I wish to examine the most simplistic form of the concept exist, simply being, before moving onto the concept of consciousness. If mathematics is what separates us perhaps we can use another analogy.

Let us assume it is a hot day and you go to the beach to cool off. You take off your shoes and socks,

stroll on the beach, and feel the cool ocean waters lapping at your feet.

Since we had previously agreed to one truth. the tangible and the intangible exist, the question I have is: Does the beach exist?

Chuck:

Yes Dan, I am mixing consciousness and non-consciousness. It is not a mistake.

It is not mathematics, or even Mathematicians or Physicist, it is analogies I have the problem with. Why do we need analogies?

I do not wish to belabor the point, but by using analogies to represent something that is, we turn it into something that it is not. We can do all kinds of things with what it isn't that we cannot do with what it is. Why say "the 'Thing' is like..." when the 'Thing' already is what it is, and it isn't really exactly like anything else?

Either a thing is or it isn't. If it is, than let us talk about what the 'Thing' really is.

You say: "I wish to examine the most simplistic form of the concept exist, simply being..."

A noble and necessary endeavor, so let us examine the most simplistic state of being, and avoid trying to turn it into an analogy which can lead us astray.

I believe without reservation, or exception, no one can seriously pursue the meaning and origins of the simplest of what exists, whether it be from the Western road, the Eastern route, or even the Theist path, without coming to the same conclusion. For anything at all to exist, there must be a "First Cause."

Due to the very nature of "First Cause" it must be a Singularity. The Singularity/First Cause is the common ground of all Philosophies. It is the 'One Point' that cannot be denied.

You asked "Does the Beach exist?" Yes the Beach exists, but the only thing like a beach covered with

sand is a sandy beach. The Singularity is not like a beach or a line, or 'like' anything else. The only thing The Singularity is like, is The Singularity.

The most simplistic form of the concept exist is The Singularity.

To know what anything is, why it is, where it is, and how everything came to be, we first must know what The Singularity is.

We must know First Cause.

Dan:

Ah, Chuck. How exciting. We appear to be approaching another truth. We have identified two truths so far. Individuals exist - poly-solipsism. The universe exists. And now Singularity exists.

You ask: 'Why do we need analogies?' We need analogies because we are visual creatures and as visual creatures we understand only in the visual sense. Even concepts such as love and happiness bring themselves to light through visual means, symbolization. Words have no meaning without the visual understanding of what lies behind them. The visual understanding of these truths is another story altogether and needs, at this point of our focus, to be avoided like a plague, for such a discussion would only subvert our goal, which is to identify truths.

We have developed within our conversation to date, two perceptions of truth, the universe exists and individuals exist. We developed these truths void visual perceptions. We have not been definitive of these truths in the sense of developing analogies of these truths. We have not defined the universe or individuals to be this or that because both the universe and individuals exist as unique entities unfathomable in the same manner by any two or more entities. In short, no two entities visualize, experience, understand in the same manner due to the very meaning of the term uniqueness itself.

We have been identifying universal truths rather than identifying the entities themselves. For example, we have said individuals exist but we have not yet identified what the individual is. We have said the universe exists but we have not identified what the universe is.

The last truth I believe needs to be established, can be established, is whether or not Singularity with an upper case 'S' exists. It appears we agree upon the issue that Singularity exists but I need to be certain before we proceed with our conversation.

Do you agree: Another truth is: Singularity exists?

Keep in mind that I did not ask you what constitutes Singularity. I did not ask you what you thought Singularity was. I did not ask you for an analogy as to how we might better perceive Singularity.

I simply asked: Does Singularity exist?

Chuck:

(Agreed!)

"The Singularity/First Cause is the common ground of all Philosophies. It is the 'One Point' that cannot be denied."

For anything at all to exist, The Singularity must exist.

Dan:

From your comments it appears that we agree upon four definitions and three truths:

Definition one: Illusion: a perception of something objectively existing in such a way as to cause misinterpretation of its actual nature!

Definition two: 'Delusion': An Illusion seen by only one person.

Definition three: 'Reality': An Illusion seen by everyone.

Definition four: 'Exists': That which is either tangible or intangible.

Truth: Individuals exist - poly-solipsism, multiplicity

Truth: The universe exists.

Truth: Singularity exists.

If we are in agreement, I am ready to move into the arena regarding the order/precedents/substance of truths versus 'truths'

Act II: First Truths

Scene III: Substance - Defining the three truths

Characters: Dan and Chuck

Center Stage: Dan and Chuck have moved to taking a stroll through the woods. They amble along a winding path

The multiple screens have been lowered to their level and now display beautiful deciduous trees and wild life. They approach a small water fall and a clear clean stream. They sit astride the rocks along the bank of the stream and renew their conversation.

Dan:

Since we are in agreement regarding truths - the Singularity exists, the individual exists, and the universe exists,

The issue of definition becomes obviously critical at this point.

If you have no other truths to discuss at this time then I would like to proceed to characterizing the three truths. I hope we can do this slowly, orderly, and deliberately.

Having said this, I would like to ask you a question: How would you define the Singularity vs. the Individual vs the Universe?

Chuck:

The Singularity: The Set of all Sets: First Cause: Infinite: Unbound.

The Individual: One Id in a Multiplicity of Ids: The Essence of The Singularity.

The Universe: Reality: The perception of The Essence.

Dan:

I can accept the characteristics you have attached to the three truths, however, this is a discussion hopefully being followed by individuals who are not philosophers, not metaphysicists, not ontologists, not theists, not quantum physicists, not mathematicians of chaos theory, not cosmologists, ...

As such would you mind fielding a few questions from a layman's point of view?

Chuck:

Of course not!

I would love to answer any questions you or a 'layman' may have. I will attempt to explain it for "The Barmaid."

Dan:

Hmmm, where to begin, where to begin. We identified three truths; perhaps it would behoove us to identify common characteristics shared by the three truths.

We have already, albeit inadvertently, identified a common characteristic shared by all three truths. The three truths - the Singularity, the Individual, and the Universe - exist. As such all three share one thing in common. The three exist in the passive sense, which in turn is a common characteristic shared by all three.

My first question now becomes: Is/are there any other characteristic/s that you think all three truths have in common?

Chuck:

What do you mean by "passive"?

The Singularity is in a perpetual state of 'unending.' It is infinite and unbound, therefore it cannot exist as an "Is" and is in a perpetual state of mutation.

The ego is in a perpetual state of thinking. It cannot stop, and by thinking it adds to and changes itself with every thought.

The Universe is in a perpetual state of changing; even the rocks themselves are in a perpetual state of change.

How can there be anything passive?

Dan:

In regards to your question, how can there be anything passive, for anything to be in a perpetual state of change it must exist, i.e. passive existence.

It appears you would attach a characteristic of perpetual change to 'things' which exist. In other words not only do the three truths exist but they are in a perpetual state of change.

If, therefore you are saying that things exist and simultaneously exist in a perpetual state of change, then I agree.

Are there any other common characteristics which you would say apply to all three truths?

If not, are there common characteristics which you would say apply to two of the three truths which make them unique from the third?

Chuck:

Yes, as I have said before, the Universe exists as a creation of The Singularity and the Ego. I have been discussing them as if they were separate and two different things, but The Singularity and the Ego are One and the same.

Dan:

Now it is you who has moved too fast and made too many assumptions Chuck. This discussion revolves

around two individuals, I's as you refer to them, and 'we' have not yet agreed upon your perception of 'creation', 'separation', 'union', 'collective conscious', ...

We have agreed upon our definition of 'illusion', 'delusion', 'reality', 'exists', and three truths: the Singularity exists, the Individual exists, and the Universe exists.

We have also agreed the three truths exist and exist in a perpetual state of change.

The concept that the three 'exist' (passive) and exist in a perpetually state of change (action) gives the three 'substance', characterizes the common nature of the three.

So again I ask you:

Regarding 'substance': Are there any other common characteristics which you would say apply to all three truths?

If not, are there common characteristics which you would say apply to two of the three truths which make them unique from the third?

Chuck:

Yes, you are right, I did "move to fast."

Sticking to what we have agreed to so far; The Singularity and the Individual are Intangible. Neither exist as a tangible entity within Universe.

Of course I am assuming here by "Individual" we are both referring to the Mind/Ego/Id at this point, and not its corporal existence. I have been attempting to substitute Ego to avoid any possible confusion between the two.

Dan:

Since you did not present any additional characteristics common to all three truths, I must conclude, unless you tell me otherwise, that there are no other characteristics common to all three. If this is your understanding then I agree.

We now appear to be entering the realm of unique characterizations, which distinguish one truth from

another.

You mention that the Singularity and the Individual are intangible in nature if in fact we are talking about the Mind/Ego/Id. I assume you are assigning the characteristic of a tangible versus intangible nature to the Universe. If so, then I agree again.

Things appear to be getting easier in terms of understanding one another.

If we are in agreement up to this point, the next question I have is: Would you say an additional characteristic in common with the Singularity and the Individual lies in their ability to 'know'/being conscious versus the Universe's inability to 'know'/being conscious?

Chuck:

Yes.

We can now add knowing/consciousness to our list of truths.

Dan:

But that is not what I asked, Chuck. My question was:

Would you say an additional characteristic in common with the Singularity and the Individual lies in their ability to 'know'/being conscious versus the Universe's inability to 'know'/being conscious?

In short I am addressing the issue of differentiating between truths, beginning with the means of differentiating the universe from Singularity and Individuality.

Chuck:

Sorry Dan, I thought you would understand that is what my "yes" was for.

I completely agree.

The Singularity and the Individual share the characteristic of 'knowing'/consciousness. The Universe is void this characteristic. But at the same time I also thought it necessary to add 'knowing'/consciousness to our list of Truths.

Truth: 'Knowing'/Consciousness exist.

Dan:

We are not speaking of 'Consciousness' but rather we are speaking of 'knowing/'being conscious'. There is a difference. In terms of 'consciousness', 'consciousness' cannot exist without the noun. 'Consciousness' cannot exist without 'something' existing which is capable of 'being conscious', i.e., the Singularity and the individual.

We now appear to agree that the universe is both tangible and not conscious in nature whereas the Singularity and the individual (in terms of the mind/ego/id) are both intangible and conscious in nature.

We have managed to establish the difference between the universe and the other two truths, the individual and the Singularity.

Question: If the Singularity and the individual are both intangible and conscious in nature, then what characteristic differentiates the individual from the Singularity?

Chuck:

Good Question!

Perhaps we should first listed the characteristics of each, see if we agree, and then compare.

The Singularity:

Infinite

Unbound

Intangible

'Knowing'/Conscious

Singular (There is only One.)

The Mind/Ego/Id:

Infinite

Unbound

Intangible

'Knowing'/Conscious

Poly/Multiplicity (An Indefinite number greater than One.)

Before we go any further, do we agree so far? If so, would you like to add any others?

Dan:

Good summary Chuck.

I agree and have no other characteristics to add at this time, which brings us back to the question:

If the Singularity and the individual are both intangible and conscious in nature, then what characteristic differentiates the individual from the Singularity?

Chuck:

None. The Individual is The Singularity.

The fault is in thinking of The Singularity as if it were a single 'object.' The Singularity is The Singularity because it is infinite and unbound in all dimensions, it has always been a Multiplicity.

The Singularity is Mind.

Dan:

You speak of Singularity as if it is thought composed of thoughts.

Chuck:

Yes, precisely.

Thoughts are infinite, unbound, intangible, and the very definition of 'knowing'/conscious. We, the Individual, are defined by 'We Think,' it is the essence of what we are. Conscious is the essence of The Singularity.

The Singularity is Thought composed of a Multiplicity of Thoughts. Poly-Solipsism illustrates that Multiplicity.

Poly is a chemical term that not only means 'composed of many,' but also refers to a substance that will Polymerize: 'two or more molecules that combine to form a larger molecule with repeating units of the original molecule.'

The Singularity is an infinite Multiplicity of Minds combining to form an Infinite Mind with repeating units of the Individual Minds.

We retain our Individuality, but combined, we form The Singularity of the Infinite and Unbound Mind.

Dan:

How is this different from a line and points 'contained within' the line?

A line is itself and the points do not compose the line, are not 'a part of' the line. Removing a point does not shorten the line, yet removing the line does not annihilate the points. There are, therefore, multiple/infinite points within the line and in addition the line itself exists. the summation of the composition of the line is therefore the sum of its points plus the singularity of the line itself or the summation of 0 to infinity to the infinite power plus one.

Chuck:

Because it is not a 'line', and we are not 'points' within the line. By saying 'it is like' anything other than what it is, we think of it as what it is not.

You say it is like a line then you say "Removing a point does not shorten the line.."! By using an analogy you begin to think as if the line analogy was the same as The Singularity and we can remove a Mind from the Singularity and The Singularity would remain. The Multiplicity of Minds are not 'in' the Singularity, we are not 'part of' Singularity, We 'are' the Singularity.

By using the line analogy you can visualize removing a point. You can visualize removing the line and having the points remain. We cannot do any of this with The Singularity. We cannot remove a Mind, and we cannot remove The Singularity.

Once again because you used an analogy you conclude: "There are, therefore, multiple/infinite points within the line and in addition the line itself exists. the summation of the composition of the line is therefore the sum of its points plus the singularity of the line itself or the summation of 0 to infinity to the infinite power plus one."

You can do this with your line analogy, because you have reduced The Singularity into symbols which you can manipulate, but you cannot do this with The Singularity. There is no 0, and there is no such thing as an "infinite power plus one." We cannot add anything at all to what is already Infinite.

Can you remove a mind from The Singularity? Where would you put it!?

Dan:

The point is not where would you put the mind if one removes it. The concept goes to a more basic fundamental than that. The point is: If one removed a mind would the Singularity be any less for it.

Assuming one could remove all the individual minds from the Singularity, would the Singularity still exist. Keep in mind, I am not suggesting that upon removing 'a' or 'all' the minds that the knowing the Singularity obtained from the individual mind(s) would be simultaneously removed.

The line analogy does not suggest points, locations, are anything like thoughts. Thoughts are thoughts and points are points, but the analogy simply assists us as visual creatures in understanding an aspect as opposed to all aspects of the concept.

In essence the question becomes: If the multiplicity of minds retain their own unique existence, does the Singularity retain its own unique existence as being the summation of the knowing of minds as well as the summation of other concepts and more of which we are incapable of perceiving while confined within a tangible existence.

Chuck:

No. The Singularity is unique in its existence. We have no reference within Universe to draw an analogy. The Singularity is not an 'object' composed of 'parts.' It is Infinite and Unbound, which sets it apart from anything we can imagine within Universe. This is the reason I so desperately labor to avoid drawing analogies; there are none, and any analogy I attempt to draw will be a failure and only confuse. But I will concede to your request and attempt to do so.

I think in images not symbols, therefore I can visualize The Singularity in my mind, but I lack any symbols to define it. The closest analogy I dare to venture would be Holographic, and that does not do it justice.

When thinking of a hologram we can visualize a holographic plate in which every part contains the whole. If we divide the plate in half each will retain the whole image. We can continue halving each part and still retain the whole image; almost. What happens it seems, is every time we half the plate we do lose a small amount of data, continual halving loses so much data the image is degraded and eventually is lost completely. There is still a tremendous amount of data on each segment, but it is insufficient to render a recognizable image.

This is only slightly analogist to The Singularity, but is almost in reverse. The Singularity cannot be halved, and each 'data point' does not contain an image of the whole, each data point is the whole, and each data point is continually mutating changing the whole image. If we could remove a single data point The Singularity would no longer exist; there would be no illusion, because each data point is The Singularity.

The Singularity is not the sum of its parts because it has no parts. Each Mind is not part of the Whole, each part is the Whole.

I fully understand that any mind that thinks in symbols may never comprehend the meaning of my description. I am not to sure anyone else will either. As long as we attempt to reduce The Singularity to

what we are familiar with in Universe we will never be able to visualize that which does not exist within Universe. The Singularity is totally without analogies. It can be comprehended, but not by drawing analogies to something within Universe.

From my experience Mathematicians and Physicists think in symbols, that is the tools of their trade. To them my statement: "The Singularity is not the sum of its parts because it has no parts. Each Mind is not part of the Whole, each part is the Whole." would appear a contradiction. They do not like contradictions, and their mindset is unable to resolve them. It is not because they cannot think, it is because of the way they think. They think in symbols and analogies which only exist within Universe. Maybe Quantum Physicists would fare better, their minds are accustomed to dealing with multiple dimensions, I have my doubts, but I do hope.

Well my friend, did my analogy help, or did I just add to the confusion?

Dan:

Yes your analogy helped immensely. I understand what it is you are trying to explain.

First of all let me assure you that I agree with your concept that we, human entities, entities less than the whole, can never fully understand the whole, can never fully understand Singularity since we are not the Singularity.

I also agree that to state, at any point in our existence, that we now understand the Singularity limits our future ability to be open-minded enough to embrace any future knowledge we develop which could, can, and would enhance our ability to better understand as we mature and learn.

I disagree, however, with several aspects.

First, regarding mathematicians and physicists: Mathematicians are mathematicians. Physicists are physicists. Artists are artists, Musicians are musicians. Idiots are idiots. To deny this fact is to relegate all individuals to the dung heap of un-educatable riff raft incapable of understanding Singularity unless they think in images.

All people think differently and to suggest that no one can understand unless they think like you or I is as nihilistic as phenomenological thought.

One of the greatest tragedies of the last two millennia is that philosophers have relegated serious

philosophical thought to the ivory towers of their own personal domain, namely: philosophical academia. The only way to change that is to willingly use the language of the minds with which one is holding the discourse.

Second: We disagree regarding the Singularity. You say the Singularity is like a holograph, yet you say the Singularity exists. You say if you remove enough of the parts the hologram, the whole no longer exists since some of the data is lost yet you say the whole is not 'composed of' parts.

I agree the whole of Singularity is not composed of parts but rather 'contains parts'. The same goes for a line. Remove all the points and the line remains. The points are but the discrete. The line is the non-discrete. Both exist. The Singularity of the line exists in and of itself. Each point exists in and of itself. Removing one does not eliminate the other.

Each entity of consciousness, the individual, 'contains' experiences but is not composed of the experiences rather the experiences build a whole non-discrete unique portrait. The Singularity 'contains' experiences but is not composed of experiences for all the experiences form a non-discrete experience, form a total unique experience incapable of being identified as a 'summation' of parts. The whole is an experience in and of itself.

In essence, the summation of reality becomes the total unique experiences of individual PLUS one. The one being Singularity.

The hologram does not work for the hologram is physical/tangible in nature and the Singularity is intangible in nature. To cut the hologram in half is to cut the hologram in half and yes part of the data is lost. Eventually the hologram is lost. Such is no more the case with the intangible Singularity as it is with the intangible line.

To draw out individual, individual experiences, 'contained within' the Singularity does not 'reduce' the Singularity for the Singularity exists in and of itself.

In short:

The Singularity exists.

The individual exists.

The universe exists.

Chuck:

"First of all let me assure you that I agree with your concept that we, human entities, entities less than the whole, can never fully understand the whole, can never fully understand Singularity since we are not the Singularity."

I do not see how you can agree with me, since this is not what I have said or believe. I have now stated several times that "We are The Singularity." I have also just stated that we can comprehend The Singularity. Quoting myself: "It can be comprehended, but not by drawing analogies to something within Universe."

I comprehend The Singularity, and though I believe I am 'special' in my own particular way, I do not for a instant believe I am superior in intellect to the rest of humanity as a whole. I am not the pinnacle of human mental evolution. I am a beneficiary of our continual evolution, but I know I am not alone in my comprehension.

If you examine my statement closely I did not say unless everyone else thinks like me they are "all relegated to the dung heap of un-educatable rift raft incapable of understanding Singularity unless they think in images." I very clearly said: " It is not because they cannot think, it is because of the way they think." The point being, that we all think in the manner we have trained our minds to think. If we have spent our life time thinking in the symbols which exist within Universe, then we have trained our minds to think in a certain way; that way of thinking becomes our mind-set. Unless we consciously attempt to change the way we think, we limit ourselves to only being able to perceive things that make sense within that mind-set. Anyone thinking of The Singularity will translate what it is in the manner they have trained their minds to think, and only see it in a manner that makes sense within their mind-set. They will interpret within their mind-set, just as I interpret within my mind-set. What they will see will be different than I will see. We are all products of our experiences.

My words were not intended to be derogatory to anyone. They were simple statements of the facts as I perceive them. A Mathematician will define Singularity in mathematical terms, a Physicist in physical terms, a Theist in Spiritual terms, and a Philosopher in metaphysical terms. Within the context of our mind-sets, The Singularity will mean different things to different minds.

What I am attempting to do here is transfer the image I see to you, but since the words and symbols to adequately describe that image do not exist, I know I am making a terrible mess of it, as your reaction to my attempts confirm.

I am distressed you were offended by my words.

"Phenomenological"!

Over the years I have been 'labeled' just about everything; mostly things I believe the bestower considers derogatory. It cannot be avoided when presenting a concept that attempts to incorporate most, if not all others, but I have never been called a "Phenom" before!!(big smile!)

Thanks Dan, I think I have now been called everything. And to be truthful, from what I have found in researching my labels, I am not any of these things in particular, but must confess to being guilty in one way or another of being all of these things in general.

Is anyone really a total "Whatever"? I believe we are all basically a blend of many philosophical view points. Some may lean more strongly in one direction than in another, but I do not believe anyone is totally committed to only one.

If I am totally one thing, I guess I would say that I am totally a Poly-Solipsist, which would mean I am pretty much a little bit of most things!

"Second: We disagree regarding the Singularity. You say the Singularity is like a holograph, yet you say the Singularity exists. You say if you remove enough of the parts the hologram, the whole no longer exists since some of the data is lost yet you say the whole is not 'composed of' parts."

This is what I feared when surrendering to the temptation to draw an analogy. You are now confusing my description of the analogy; the hologram, with that of The Singularity.

First of all I made a point of stating; "This is only slightly analogist to The Singularity, but is almost in reverse."

A holograph is composed of parts; data points, if we separate the data points, the whole will still exist; it is still represented in each segment, but the image of the whole will no longer be rendered. If we restore the segments, we restore the image. It is The Singularity that is not "composed of parts."

How can it be?

The Singularity is Infinite. Infinite is not a quantity, it is a quality, we cannot attain, reach, or even approach Infinity by adding finite quantities. No matter how many 'parts' are added together, the

quantity can never become the quality of Infinite. Unless of course the quantity also contains the quality of infinite. But since there can only be One Quality of Infinite; The Singularity, any quantity that also contains the quality infinite, must then be one and the same as The Singularity.

The Singularity cannot be composed of 'parts,' it can only be composed of itself.

"In essence, the summation of reality becomes the total unique experiences of individual PLUS one. The one being Singularity."

Ok, I do pretty much agree with you here, except I would leave off the "PLUS one." I maintain all is one, and one is all.

"The hologram does not work for the hologram is physical/tangible in nature and the Singularity is intangible in nature. To cut the hologram in half is to cut the hologram in half and yes part of the data is lost. Eventually the hologram is lost. Such is no more the case with the intangible Singularity as it is with the intangible line."

Yes, that is the failure of the analogy. The information of a hologram is statically imprinted on a tangible substrate, it is incapable of mutating and changing itself. Unlike holographic information distributed amongst individual active entities capable of manipulating and changing the information. Change one quantum of information and you change the whole image. This is the only reason I drew the Holographic analogy.

"To draw out individual, individual experiences, 'contained within' the Singularity does not 'reduce' the Singularity for the Singularity exists in and of itself.

In short:

The Singularity exists.

The individual exists.

The universe exists."

Is the individual Infinite? Is the Universe Infinite?

I agree The Singularity exists, the Individual exists, and the Universe exists, but the Individual and the Universe cannot exist independent of The Singularity?

The Universe is intrinsically imbedded in the essence of Individual, and Individual is intrinsically imbedded in the essence of The Singularity.

Does the Individual contain the quality of infinite? Does the Universe?

The questions boils down to: If both are intrinsically imbedded in the infinite quality of The Singularity, can anything exist in and of itself?

Or am I moving too fast yet again? Am I mistaken in assuming you also agree the Universe is intrinsically imbedded in the essence of Individual?

I have been proceeding with our dialog assuming we were in agreement. Forgive me my friend, I forgot to ask!

Do you perceive the Universe existing independent of the Individual?

Does the Universe exist in the Mind, or does the Mind exist in the Universe?

If there were no minds, would the Universe still exist?

Dan:

Before I continue, let me assure you I did not call you a phenomenologist. What I said was:

'All people think differently and to suggest that no one can understand unless they think like you or I is as nihilistic as phenomenological thought.'

I think we may need to step back and relax a bit. We are both beginning to insert terminology

which has not been defined before being used and the concepts are spilling out from ourselves like water spewing from a breached dam.

Concepts such as infinite, phenomenological, independent, intrinsically, discrete, non-discrete, etc. are being thrown about like nanochips in a whirlpool of philosophical chit-chat.

At the risk of confusing the issue, let me answer your questions. I will answer the first question in terms of the Whole/Singularity (upper case 'S') that I perceive to exist and thus by definition exists as an individual entity in and of itself and then in terms of multiple entities of individuality/multiplicity/singularities (lower case 's') that I perceive to exist.

Does the Individual contain the quality of infinite? In terms of the Singularity, yes. In terms of the individual, yes.

Does the Universe? Yes.

The questions boils down to: If both are intrinsically imbedded in the infinite quality of The Singularity, can anything exist in and of itself? Yes.

Or am I moving too fast yet again? Yes.

Am I mistaken in assuming you also agree the Universe is intrinsically imbedded in the essence of Individual? No, not in its tangible form but and yes in its intangible form.

Do you perceive the Universe existing independent of the Individual? In terms of the Singularity, no. In terms of the individual, yes in terms of the individuals tangible form but not in terms of the individuals intangible form.

Does the Universe exist in the Mind, or does the Mind exist in the Universe? In terms of the Singularity I perceive the universe to exist in the Singularity's mind. In terms of the individual, I perceive the tangible form of the individual and intangible form of the individual to exist within the universe and then the individual's intangible understanding and experiencing of the universe to exist within the Mind of the individual.

If there were no minds, would the Universe still exist? Science through theories such as the universe was created from the primal atom - Big Bang Theory- and the expanding and contracting universe and religion through teachings such as the universe having been 'created' and the universe being created over and over again both substantiate my perception that the tangible form of the universe would not exist without the mind of the Singularity.

Now all this rhetoric is fast muddying the waters of understanding. I think we may be able to clarify the waters if we simplify our dialogue. To begin the process of simplifying our dialogue, I would like to know if you would have any objections to our focusing upon the operative phrase you have introduced repeatedly in your last response, namely: 'intrinsically imbedded in'?

Chuck:

Not at all. How would you like to begin the 'focusing'?

[Act III](#)

[Back to Act I](#)

[Back to Ploy-Solipsism](#)

[D J Shepard](#)

www.panentheism.com

00000125