

Act III: Where are we anyway?

Scene I: Intrinsic Embedment

Characters: Dan and Chuck

Center Stage: Dan and Chuck are back in their overstuffed worn leather chairs. Off to the side a fire is roaring. A round rug lies between the two with an old dog lying there taking in the heat from the fire. Off to the other side is a window framing in a cold winter night. The stars are shining. The snow is piled high. The trees are mixed deciduous and pine laden down with blankets of snow.

Brandy and books sit upon the table between the two philosophers.

The multiple screens behind the two philosophers now show pictures of people of all races, followed by scenes of the earth, sunsets, oceans, followed by scenes of the heavens as seen by the naked eye, followed by scenes of the galactic wonders, followed by scenes of the wonders of the universe, followed by a fade out to a black screen with a wispy white small cloud off to the lower right hand corner.

Dan:

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

We were talking about a new concept which you interjected into our conversation regarding reality. You introduced, namely the concept: 'intrinsically imbedded in.'

'Intrinsically imbedded in' is in terms of our understanding of reality, both a fascinating concept and an extremely revealing one, but before we begin discussing the concept lets make sure we each are talking about the same thing.

So, since you brought up the concept, would you mind defining each word in the phrase?

Chuck:

"Intrinsic": belonging to the essential nature. Indicating a Quality that is inherent.

"Imbedded" or "Embedded": something that has become an integral part in the matrix.

Intrinsic would pertain to the quality essence, while Imbedded would pertain to a quantity that has

become an integral part of the matrix.

The term 'Intrinsically Embedded in' would pertain to 'a thing' that is so entangled with its host essential nature, it has fundamentally become a component of its host.

Dan:

That leaves us with defining 'matrix'

Matrix: 1: something within or from which something else originates, develops, or takes form

Or do you wish to withdraw the word 'matrix'?

Chuck:

Hmmm, I see what you mean, this definition of "Matrix" is close, but doesn't quite do justice to the concept. It leaves too much of a separation between what is imbedded and the host. I was leaning more to the definition of a matrix as being the 'essence' or 'superstructure' of the host, but for want of a more appropriate term, matrix may have to do.

Unless, of course, you have a more appropriate term in mind?

"From which something else originates, develops, or takes form" does describe the process of Universe originating and taking form from the mind, but it leaves the impression then that Universe exists as a separate entity and not just a projection of mind. It does not denote the continual entanglement.

Dan:

Actually, Chuck, the definition of "Matrix: 1: something within or from which something else originates, develops, or takes form" works fine for me.

Being a little more mathematically inclined, I probably would have moved more towards concepts found within set theory such as 'subset of', 'universal set', 'null set', ... or towards discrete and non-discrete mathematics. Be that as it may, the definition of matrix does provide us with a great deal of imagery and simplicity.

I think the definition will be capable of capturing the concept of continual entanglement.

I say let's go for it and see where it takes us.

Chuck:

Ok, it seems we have a place to start defining the essence of our three truths: The Singularity exists, The Individual/Ego exists, The Universe exists, and how each is 'intrinsically embedded' in the other.

If you have no objection, I suggest we begin with:

"Individual is intrinsically imbedded in the essence of The Singularity."

Actually, I would reword this to read: "The Individual/Ego is the Intrinsic quality of The Singularity."

As I see the Individual/Ego and The Singularity to be one and the same, 'embedded' really doesn't work. The Individual/Ego is not embedded in the matrix of The Singularity; it is the matrix of The Singularity.

I believe this concept is the primary difference between Poly-Solipsism and all other philosophies, even the philosophy of Solipsism itself.

Dan:

Hmmm, I think I am beginning to understand where it is we may or may not differ. I agree with your concept: "As I see the Individual/Ego and The Singularity to be one and the same, 'embedded' really doesn't work. The Individual/Ego is not embedded in the matrix of The Singularity; it is the matrix of The Singularity."

But I also agree with your concept: "Individual is intrinsically imbedded in the essence of The Singularity."

I do not see these two concepts as necessarily contradictory. I do not see this as an either/or scenario but rather I see these two concept as an 'and' scenario.

I see The Singularity as being the summation of all knowing/experiencing/awareness/individuality. I would also suggest that just as The Singularity is timeless since time is not a universal fabric within which The Singularity is embedded, the individual is likewise timeless since the individual is 'of' the same form and 'substance' as The Singularity. The essence of this perception would suggest Singularity both is and is timeless 'and' individuality both is and is timeless.

In essence poly-solipsism is plus one. Or to put it another way, the individual exists and The Singularity exists.

The result is a metaphysical system wherein the individual is embedded in The Singularity. Both the individual and The Singularity are unique entities. Immortality exists, experiencing the physical happens to be the manner in which our form of individuality/awareness gains experiencing for now, Thus the universe exists and like the individual is embedded within The Singularity. With such a perception,

responsibility gains meaning. With such a perception life gains meaning, the individual gains meaning, nihilism - a western philosophical concept - is obliterated. With such a system, philosophy gains the high ground over both science and religion. With such a system philosophy removes the weed of indifference and plants the seed of hope arising from action, moral action.

Am I moving too fast?

Chuck:

No my friend, you are definitely not moving too fast!

Yes the Ego is The Singularity, and yes the Individual/Ego is intrinsically embedded in the essence of The Singularity. But not that the Individual/Ego can ever be disentangled from The Singularity. It is not an either/or, and it is not an 'and', it's a "both" at the same time!

"I see The Singularity as being the summation of all knowing/experiencing/awareness/individuality. I would also suggest that just as The Singularity is timeless since time is not a universal fabric within which The Singularity is embedded, the individual is likewise timeless since the individual is 'of the same form and 'substance' as The Singularity. The essence of this perception would suggest Singularity both is and is timeless 'and' individuality both is and is timeless."

YES! Excellent! Since The Singularity is infinite, it not only does not have an end, *it never had a beginning*. The Singularity has always been an intrinsically embedded "Multiplicity"!

"The result is a metaphysical system wherein the individual is embedded in The Singularity. Both the individual and The Singularity are unique entities."

This is our difference. There cannot be a Singularity without the Ego, and there cannot be an Ego without The Singularity. We cannot remove one ego; the whole Singularity comes with it. The Individual and The Singularity are not separate unique entities; they are the same unique entity. That is the difference between your 'and' and my 'both.'

Ok, an analogy, and you know how I hate analogies! Our Space/Time dimensions are not separate dimensions. We cannot remove a dimension and still have the others. If we remove one space/time dimension, space/time no longer exists. I think from the latest estimate I read in quantum theory, there are 11 dimensions all entangled together to create our Universal Reality. Our Reality cannot exist without all of them entangled together. Remove one and the Universe does not exist. Remove one, and the other dimensions no longer exist. Individual/Ego are 'dimensions' of The Singularity.

Remove a single ego and there is no Singularity. All is one, and one is all.

But regardless for now, we both come to this same conclusion:

"Immortality exists, experiencing the physical happens to be the manner in which our form of individuality/awareness gains experiencing for now, Thus the universe exists and like the individual is embedded within The Singularity. With such a perception, responsibility gains meaning. With such a perception life gains meaning, the individual gains meaning, nihilism - a western philosophical concept - is obliterated. With such a system, philosophy gains the high ground over both science and religion. With such a system philosophy removes the weed of indifference and plants the seed of hope arising from action, moral action."

We, as The Singularity, affect everything with our Choices. We are The Singularity; we are The Multiplicity, the choices and actions of one affects all.

But we must be careful with "moral action." Who decides what is "moral"? The Singularity is Amoral; being neither moral or immoral; lying outside the sphere to which moral judgements apply. Morals, like truths, are choices. They are part of Universe, which I think we need to establish before going into the affect of moral choices.

"The Universe is intrinsically embedded in the essence of Individual."

Dan:

"Yes the Ego is The Singularity, and yes the Individual/Ego is intrinsically embedded in the essence of The Singularity. But not that the Individual/Ego can ever be disentangled from The Singularity."

Agreed but ... Sometimes the individual must speculate in order to communicate concepts to others.

"It is not an either/or, and it is not an 'and', it's a "both" at the same time! YES! Excellent! Since The Singularity is infinite, it not only does not have an end, it never had a beginning. The Singularity has always been an intrinsically embedded "Multiplicity"!"

Perhaps, perhaps not. The issue regarding the beginning of The Singularity is not the issue concerning humanity. Humanity's question orients around the question: Where does individuality, not The Singularity, begin and end? Humanity's quest orients around the questions: Where are we, individuals? What are we, individuals? Why do we exist, individuals? When does our existence as individuals begin? How did we begin?

You say it is not an 'either/or' nor is it an 'and' it is both at the same time. I agree, but the concept of 'both' is an 'and' concept.

"This is our difference. There cannot be a Singularity without the Ego, and there cannot be an Ego without The Singularity. We cannot remove one ego; the whole Singularity comes with it. The Individual and The Singularity are not separate unique entities; they are the same unique entity. That is the difference between your 'and' and my 'both.'"

Mathematically 'both' and 'and' are one in the same when referring to two in quantity. Where the terms 'both' and 'and' differ is in the quantitative sense. 'Both' applies to a limited quantity, two. 'And' applies not only to the quantity of 'two' but to any quantity greater than one.

When we spoke previously of what it is that exists we agreed:

1. The Singularity exists.
2. The Individual exists.
3. The Universe exists.

Are you now suggesting that we must begin this discussion once again?

"Ok, an analogy, and you know how I hate analogies! Our Space/Time dimensions are not separate dimensions. We cannot remove a dimension and still have the others. If we remove one space/time dimension, space/time no longer exists. I think from the latest estimate I read in quantum theory, there are 11 dimensions all entangled together to create our Universal Reality.

Our Reality cannot exist without all of them entangled together. Remove one and the Universe does not exist. Remove one, and the other dimensions no longer exist. Individual/Ego are 'dimensions' of The Singularity."

You are correct. This analogy does not come up to the standards of our discussion. The concept of dimensions is not the problem with this analogy is that this analogy deals with only one existence, The Universe.

"Remove a single ego and there is no Singularity. All is one, and one is all."

Remove a single ego and The Singularity would still exist, it would just be a different Singularity and therein lays the understanding regarding the significance of the individual, lays the understanding regarding the responsibility of the individual.

'But regardless for now, we both come to this same conclusion: We, as The Singularity, affect everything with our Choices. We are The Singularity; we are The Multiplicity, the choices and actions of one affect all.'

Basically I think we agree.

"But we must be careful with "moral action." Who decides what is 'moral'?"

In a sense this is true, however, if one accedes to the concept that the individual exists, accedes to the concept that the individual impacts what it is The Singularity is in the process of becoming, and accedes to the concept that not only does one's very self but all individual's lie within The Singularity which one is responsible for creating then one has no choice but to accept the concept that the individual must morally be allowed to develop uniquely. All other 'moral' stands become irrelevant.

Such a perception of reality leads to the Kantonian concept of two categorical/moralistic laws:

1. One has an obligation to protect the right of the individual to develop uniquely, to protect the right of the individual to travel life unimpeded by others.
2. One has an obligation to travel life unimpeded by others.

These two categorical/moralistic principles are listed as numbers one and two because they are listed in priority of importance.

"The Singularity is Amoral; being neither moral or immoral; lying outside the sphere to which moral judgments apply."

Agreed.

"Morals, like truths, are choices."

Here we disagree. If one accepts that the individual exists then that becomes a truth and has nothing to do with morality or with a choice. Either the individual exists or the individual does not exist. If The Singularity exists, It exists. This is a truth not a choice. Either the universe exists or it does not. Truths are Truths, not choices. One may choose to deny the existence of something existing but if that 'thing' exists one's denial does not negate its existence.

The same applies to morality. What is moral is moral.

Now it is true that we as a specie may have erroneously defined morality, i.e. relativistic morality is the only morality which is rational in nature - Christian morality is the only true morality - ..., but such erroneous perceptions do not negate the very existence of morality.

"They are part of Universe,..."

Agreed, morality based upon the limits of 'a' 'physical' 'universe' will ultimately prove to be erroneous if in fact the universe is only a portion of 'knowing'.

"...which I think we need to establish before going into the affect of moral choices."

Agreed. Again I have moved to fast.

"The Universe is intrinsically embedded in the essence of Individual."

Agreed. How do you suggest we begin?

Act III: Where are we anyway?

Scene II: The Universe

Characters: Dan and Chuck

Center Stage: On the multiple screens behind and above the two of them, picture of the Big Bang fading into a spiraling vortex of galaxies.

Chuck:

I am very tempted to get into our differences on truths and morals, but that must wait for there to be a Universe for truths and morals to exist within. Since everything is interconnected, how we perceive our Universe/Reality is created will impact our perceptions of truth and morals.

"When we spoke previously of what it is that exists we agreed:

1. The Singularity exists.
2. The Individual exists.
3. The Universe exists.

Are you now suggesting that we must begin this discussion once again?"

No, not at all. The Individual exists as The Singularity. The Universe exists because it is woven from the essence of The Singularity. The Singularity is consciousness. The Universe is intrinsically embedded in the consciousness of The Singularity/Individual.

A Recap:

"Exist: That which is either tangible or intangible"

"Illusion: The perception of something objectively existing in such a way as to cause misinterpretation of its actual nature."

I believe you will have no trouble agreeing that "Tangible" means Physical, Touchable; and

"Intangible" means Metaphysical, Conceptual?

The revelations of modern physics over the last 50 years has shown us the study of Physics has always been the study of the metaphysical. There is nothing 'tangible' in our Universe.

Everything we perceive as "objectively existing" is a "misinterpretation of its actual nature."

The Universe exists because it is a manifestation embedded in the consciousness of the Individual.

It is purely conceptual. The Universe exists in the Mind of The Singularity.

Dan:

Whew, I'd say you bit off quite a chunk of intellectual conceptualization inherently characteristic of academia. How about taking things a little slower and simplifying this a little for an old goat whose mind is a little slow on the uptake?

I think I agree with much you have said, however, let's begin with the question: Where are we? Keep in

mind when you answer this question that we have agreed upon only three truths:

1. The Singularity exists.
2. The Individual exists.
3. The Universe exists.

Chuck appears quiet and frustrated

Dan:

My apologies Chuck. Perhaps you think I dwell too much upon the concept that the universe exists for I keep coming back to the question: Where are we?

I have no problem with the perception that the universe exists 'within ourselves' as a form of collective thought as opposed to the concept that we exist 'within' the universe.

You see in either case, the universe exists. If the universe exists 'within' our collective selves or if the universe exists 'outside' ourselves but within The Singularity, the universe still exists. Now since The Singularity, be The Singularity our collective selves or be The Singularity an entity in and of itself, creation would most probably not be an act of either insignificance or an act of purposelessness. Thus the universe has a function and since we are an integral element involved with the universe, we in turn most likely have a purpose which in turn would appear to have something to do with this thing we call 'a physical universe'.

So don't be shy, just answer the question as you believe it to be and we will discuss it: Considering the three truths: Where are we Chuck?

Chuck:

It is not frustration my friend. It is contemplation. There are so many thoughts racing through my mind on this subject it is just a bit of a challenge to sort through them all to determine just where to begin.

"Where are we?"

Ok, we shall start here, and see where this will take us.

Western Philosophy: The Mind exists in the Universe.

Eastern Philosophy: The Universe exists in the Mind.

Poly-Solipsism: The Universe exists in the Mind, and the Mind also exists in the Universe.

Unless I have added meaning to your previous reply which you had not intended, I believe you also agree with this concept of Poly-Solipsism.

We are both within the Universe, and the repository of the Universe. Within our illusion of Universe, we have envisioned our own corporeal being.

"Where are we?"

We are The Singularity; we are nowhere and everywhere.

"Where are we?"

We are within our own illusion.

Dan:

Things are beginning to get complicated. Are you suggesting The Singularity is not an entity in and of itself? Are you suggesting the universe is an illusion? Are you suggesting that we being The Singularity are not individual entities? Are you suggesting poly-solipsism is not a reality? Are you suggesting poly-solipsism is an illusion?

I am confused. If The Singularity exists, then such a statement cannot be accurate unless The Singularity is an entity in and of itself. If the individual exists, then such a statement cannot be accurate unless individuals are entities in and of themselves. If the universe exists, then such a statement cannot be accurate unless the universe is an entity in and of itself.

I am in full agreement with the concept of poly-solipsism because I perceive individuals existing as entities in and of themselves. The knowing of an individual may become part of total awareness, The Singularity, but the awareness of the individual remains in and of itself, the knowing of an individual cannot be erased any more than can an idea be erased from the knowing of collective consciousness. To

erase the individual, to wipe out the existence of a unique entity of knowing is illogical since the question then becomes: Doesn't the elimination of any individual as a unique entity of knowing diminish the very concept of omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotence? To erase the individual is to diminish what it was the individual had elevated poly-solipsism into becoming.

Chuck:

"Are you suggesting The Singularity is not an entity in and of itself?"

What is an "entity"?

From our esteemed Mr Webster: entity: [ML entitas, fr. L *ent- ens* existing thing, fr. Coined prp. of *esse* to be-- more at IS] (1596) 1 a : Being, Existence *esp* : independent, separate, or self-contained existence. b : the essences of a thing as contrasted with its attributes.

2 : something that has separate and distinct existence and objective or conceptual reality.

The Singularity is "Infinite": No Beginning and no Ending. The Singularity is "Unbound": Not confined or contained. It has no Limits and cannot be 'quantified.'

The Singularity is *not* an entity.

Is there A Singularity? Yes! Does it 'exist'? Not as an "Is"! Infinite and Unbound precludes The Singularity from existing as an "Is."

We cannot point to where it is: It is 'nowhere.' All of Reality issues from The Singularity: It is 'everywhere.'

The Singularity is the "Tabula Rasa," we write on it what we wish. Yet, no matter how much is written, there is always room for more.

"Are you suggesting the universe is an illusion?"

No Dan, I am not 'suggesting,' I am asserting the Universe is an Illusion!

There is no doubt about it. My senses rebel against it, but intellectually, after following all the evidence, I am resigned to accept that our perceptions of Reality, and our perceptions of Universe are pure Illusions.

I'm sitting here smoking a few too many cigarettes, sipping on a little brandy, and cradling Webster's Ninth in my lap. My senses tell me these things are real, but intellectually I know it is all an illusion. None of these things really exist. Nothing really exists, not my hand holding the cigarette; my lips tasting the brandy, or my lap cradling Webster's Ninth. Illusions all!

I have a toothache right now; thus the brandy, it hurt like hell awhile ago, yet I 'know' it's all in my mind. But knowing it's all in my mind doesn't seem to make a difference. It still hurts.

I'm getting a prescription filled tomorrow. I'm going to take the pills and the pain will stop. Why? Because I believe the pills will stop the pain. More Illusions!

String Theory tells us all our matter is composed of nothing more than a vibrating metaphysical force. Quantum Mechanics tells us all 'things' in our Universe; including ourselves, are composed of nothing more substantial than light, and the forces that compose light issue from a purely metaphysical Quantum Universe in which none of our supposed 'Laws' of physics hold any sway.

There are no 'things' in our things! Everything is metaphysical, and the only thing we really know for certain exists is purely metaphysical: our minds.

Our bodies cannot be more substantial than the metaphysical forces they are generated from. We; our bodies, are an illusion that exists in our illusion of Universe.

We are within our own illusion.

"Are you suggesting that we being The Singularity are not individual entities?"

Yes and no. That sounds contradictory doesn't it? It can't be helped.

A few years ago I was writing one on my many short stories,...well, it wasn't supposed to be a short story, it was supposed to be a novel, but I ran out of story before I ran out of words. In this story I needed a character to do a deed and then begone. Of course I had to work him into the story and make all the ends fit, so I began building 'The Colonel' pretty much from hole cloth. The funny thing is, by the time I was half finished, The Colonel took on a life of his own and started dictating his story to me! He literally, and literarily, took over the whole project. To me he became a 'real' entity. He existed!

The Colonel may not exist in a physical sense, but he does exist in the metaphysical sense. He is an 'entity' composed of thought energy. He has taken on a persona of his own, and has likes and dislikes which I do not share. He is not me, yet he is a part of me.

I have 'created' him, but his existence has also changed my existence. If I pass my story onto you, the Colonel will then also exist in your thoughts and your memory. You will read the words I have written and begin to know the Colonel, and in doing so you will add to his existence thoughts of your own. He will then exist independently in each of our minds, yet be shared by us. His existence in your mind will change your existence. He will not be you, but he will become a part of you, and exist in your metaphysical mind and memory.

I think of myself as "Chuck," and you think of yourself as "Dan," but neither of us exist independent of each other. Even if we forget for the moment we are The Singularity, we are entangled in this physical Universe. Whatever either of us does has an affect on our shared Universe; no matter how slight that affect may seem to be, it is still an affect, and changes the physical Universe we all live in.

Our entanglement with The Singularity embeds us even more intrinsically into each others psyche. I am not only "Chuck," and you are not only "Dan." We each share our psyche with the untold others we are all entangled with. I would like to believe I have independence of thought and action, but my thoughts and actions are affected by the thoughts and actions of all others; just as my thoughts and actions affect all others.

Within this illusion of Universe we perceive our minds to be independent of all others; that is part of the illusion. If we were truly completely independent it would really be Solipsism in which our mind would have complete freedom of thought and action with no restrictions what-so-ever!

But we know that is not the case. We have limits in our thoughts and actions in this illusion of Universe because our entanglement. We have the free will to choose to do good, do evil, or do nothing at all within this illusion of Universe, but even these thoughts and actions are affected by, and also affect, all others. The meanings to the concepts of 'good' and 'evil' are not completely our own, and are affected by our collective perceptions of them. Our minds are not totally our own.

We are The Singularity. We exist *as* The Singularity; we do not exist independently *in* The Singularity. Because we know there is not the one mind of Solipsism, but a multiplicity of minds, we perceive them

to be separate and individual entities endowed with complete freedom independent of all others. In doing so we visualize The Singularity to be an entity composed of separate individual parts. It is not. It is a infinite and unbound consciousness, and we collectively are that consciousness.

We do not exist anymore independently in The Singularity than my dear Colonel exists independently in my mind.

Dan:

Wow, there is so much here I'm not sure where to begin. Would you like me to tackle all the issues at one time and let you respond or would you like me to list all the issues and then we can proceed to discuss each issue in detail one at a time?

Chuck:

Whichever way you think best suits our purpose.

Dan:

It has been said that if one cannot explain themselves in a clear concise statement that rather than speaking truth one is simply camouflaging ignorance of truth. Ignorance of truth does not imply that truth does not exist within verbiage but rather that one simply has not seen, does not see, the truth which lies hidden within the forest of words.

I have given much thought to your soliloquy. I am not suggesting truth cannot be found within the maze of words you have spouted, but rather that we need to attempt to extract the truth from the verbiage.

We are speaking, within our present dialogue, of location, not location in terms of time and space but rather location in terms of the whole of reality. Either we are 'within' the whole of reality or we are not. If we are not within the whole of reality then we do not exist. To say the individual exists and then deny our being 'within' the whole of reality is contradictory to our statement of truth: the individual exists.

Therefore I will assume, since we both agreed the individual exists, that we both agree: We are within the whole of reality.

Now I have not made any suggestions as to 'what' we are, (i.e. We are The Singularity. We are not The Singularity.) nor have I suggested anything pertaining to the distinction separating our individuality from that of The Singularity or from that of the physical universe, both of which we agreed exist.

Regarding the universe: The same argument applies and thus we answer the question: Where is the

physical universe? The Physical universe is inside the whole of reality. (Now I have not suggested that the physical universe is 'outside' our individuality, rather I have simply stated: The physical universe is inside the whole of reality, which leaves open the question as to whether or not the physical universe is simply an aspect of our collective thinking or an aspect of the whole of The Singularity.)

You appear eager to address the question regarding: What are we? You say: We are The Singularity.

I too am ready to address the question: What are we? But before we can address the question of 'what' we must find commonality to the questions regarding 'where' are we.

Am I correct in assuming that we both agree we can now answer the question: Where are we? The answer is simply: We are in the whole of reality.

Chuck:

It has also been said people would sooner believe a comfortable lie than accept an uncomfortable truth.

When confronted with a truth counter to their own belief, they will go into denial and simply refuse to accept its existence.

It will not matter how clear and concise the statement, they will fail to comprehend any truth in it, but the truth they wish to find. The clarity and truth of any statement is not within the statement, but within the mind.

"Either we are 'within' the whole of reality or we are not. If we are not within the whole of reality then we do not exist."

"What are we?"... "But before we can address the question of 'what' we must find commonality to the questions regarding 'where' are we."

I would beg to differ on both counts.

Before we can hope to answer the question "Where are We?," first we must know "What are We?" In doing so we will also answer the question of whether or not we need to be "within the whole of Reality" in order to exist, or if we can be both within "The Whole of Reality" and outside "The Whole of Reality" at the same time. I am assuming here that you are using the definition of Reality which we have already agreed to, or do we need to address what you mean by "The Whole of Reality"?

If we say "We" are nothing more than flesh and bone, and consciousness is nothing more than an electrochemical reaction in a physical brain, than we are confining existence to only that which is within a tangible Reality, and therefore the intangible Mind/ego does not exist because it cannot be 'seen.'

On the other hand, if we say the individual is the intangible Mind/ego, we then have an existence outside of our tangible Reality. "The Whole of Reality" becomes the Illusion, and our tangible presence within the whole of Reality is therefore also an illusion.

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 agree that "Exists" is either Tangible or Intangible we are saying Exists is equal to the Tangible and also that Exists is equal to the Intangible.

As a Mathematics Professor I am sure you know that if T is equal to E and I is equal to E, then I and T must be equal to each other.

In effect, there is no difference between the Tangible and the Intangible. Since Reality is an Illusion, everything which exists within Reality is an intangible illusion. If we maintain "We" exist within

Reality, then we are saying "We"; our tangible presence, is also an illusion.

But since we agree The Singularity exists and the Individual/Ego is intrinsic to The Singularity, we know we Exist outside the illusion of Reality.

We exist both as an illusion within the whole of reality and as the intangible essence of The Singularity from which the illusion of Reality is generated.

Ok, the 'clear' and 'concise' statement:

The Universe is an Illusion. Reality is an Illusion. The Tangible is an Illusion. Our perceived Tangible presence within Reality/Universe is an Illusion. They all 'exist' because Illusions: a perception of something objectively existing in such a way as to cause misinterpretation of its actual nature, exist.

The Individual as the Intangible Mind/Ego is The Singularity, and is the only essence that does exist independent of Illusion.

"Where are We?"

We exist both as an illusion (our tangible presence) within the Illusion of "The Whole of Reality" and 'outside' of the illusion, as the intangible essence of The Singularity.

I had to know What are we before I could figure out Where are we.

Dan:

Ok so it appears I am correct in assuming you wish to move to the question: What are we? It appears you believe we must know what we are before we determine where we are. I have no problem with that approach.

The result should be the same regardless of what road we take to discuss the issue concerning the purpose for our existence. It is, after all, understanding the purpose for our existence that we are involved in this discussion. Purpose leads to an understanding of a universal ethic, a form of universal morality, the categorical imperatives sought by Kant.

Let's change the focus of our discussion to 'What are we?' and come back to the question: 'Where are we?'

[Act IV](#)

[Back to Act II](#)

[Back to Ploy-Solipsism](#)

[D J Shepard](#)

www.panentheism.com

00000126