

## **Act IV: What are we?**

**Scene I: Chuck and Dan put on their parkas, boots, gloves and hats. They go outside in the clear cold night of winter. As they stroll through the trees, glimpses of the night sky filled with sparkling stars appear. To the right side of the scene pictures of animals flicker in and out of a collage of animalistic human behavior. To the left of the scene pictures of the vastness of space flicker in and out of a collage of altruistic human behavior.**

**Characters: Dan and Chuck**

**Dan:**

You previously stated and then asked:

"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.'

Webster's definition of an 'entity' does not state an entity is confined or that an entity is contained. The definition you give states: an entity: 1a Being, Existence, esp: independent, separate, OR self contained existence. As such The Singularity, by definition, can exist as an entity while being 'unbound.' The only parameter placed upon the existence of The Singularity is that it be 'separate', 'independent.'

The Singularity exists as an entity, if it is 'separate', 'independent'.

The universe exists as an entity, if it is 'separate', 'independent'.

The Individual exists as an entity, if it is 'separate', independent'.

You also stated:

'Truth: Individuals exist - poly-solipsism, multiplicity

Truth: The universe exists.

Truth: Singularity exists.'

I am not suggesting The Singularity exists and as such The Singularity IS an entity in and of itself. The universe is an entity in and of itself. The Individual is an entity in and of itself. It is from these three statements that the three truths emerge.

So do we exist? No, seriously, Do we exist? If we, the Individual, poly-solipsism, don't exist then we cannot determine what we are.

### **Chuck:**

I believe our differences are in our comprehension of the definition of "Entity."

We both dug out Webster's words on 'entity,' but I think we are both placing emphasis on different aspects of the definition in our conceptualization of what an entity is.

We started using the word without coming to an agreement on its usage.

Entity: Something that has a separate and distinct existence and objective or conceptual reality.

Are you comfortable with this definition?

I am not.

I must confess I have always been of the opinion that an Entity must contain awareness, or at least consciousness. It must be 'alive' or once alive to be an Entity. A rabbit is an entity, a spirit is an entity, but according to this definition any thing or object; even a rock, is an entity.

I am not comfortable with this definition, but I will acquiesce if this is your understanding of the term.

For something to exist as an entity I have also placed emphasis on its "Distinct" existence.

Distinct as in definite, precise, and well-defined.. Something that exists as an entity must exist as a whole. An Infinity with no boundaries does not have a well-defined and definite existence. We cannot even say it "Is" because it has no beginning or end. It is in a perpetual state of potential existence, but can never exist as a whole complete "Is."

Does Time exist? We know there is something we call Time, but Time does not have a definite and well-defined existence. Time does not exist as an "Is." Time is not an Entity.

You asked "Do we exist?" Of course we exist. We have already agreed to our existence. "We Exist" is the only thing we really can be certain of. All else is philosophy.

We have also agreed to:

Exist: That which is either tangible or intangible.

With Poly-Solipsism I place the accent on the intangible nature of our existence. With Poly-Solipsism there is only the intangible. With Poly-Solipsism we exist as pure consciousness; pure Thought energy.

The tangible is the embedded and entangled persistent illusion.

Now it is your turn my friend. In your philosophy, what do we exist as?

**Dan:**

I agree with almost everything you have said but unlike you I am fully comfortable with the definition:

***Entity: Something that has a separate and distinct existence and objective conceptual reality.***

As such I would also embrace the concept of 'a' rock being a distinct entity in spite of the fact it was never 'alive'.

You speak of:

***Distinct as in definite, precise, and well-defined. Something that exists as an entity must exist as a whole. An Infinity with no boundaries does not have a well-defined and definite existence. We cannot even say it "Is" because it has no beginning or end. It is in a perpetual state of potential existence, but can never exist as a whole complete "Is."***

Something that exists as an entity must exist as a whole, void the characteristic of 'infiniteness'. The set of whole numbers exists yet it is infinite in nature. I exist, each emotion I 'contain' varies from zero to the infinite in intensity depending upon my state of mind at the time.

This leads me to addressing your question: ***In your philosophy, what do we exist as?***

There are two issues: 'In your philosophy,...' and '...what do we exist as?'

Regarding the first issue: 'In your philosophy,...' You see I am dealing with truth here, not my personal perceptions. Reality is, and as such whole of reality is what it is, not what I want it to be. Now I am not suggesting I do not affect reality, do not make reality what it is, rather I am saying that reality exists and describing the characteristics regarding what reality 'is' is quite different from describing what reality 'contains', describing what I 'add' to reality, describing the 'contents' of reality.

This leads me to the second issue: '...what do we exist as?' We exist as our own unique entities of 'knowing', awareness. Knowing and awareness of what then becomes the question. Knowing and awareness of our personal unique accumulations of interactions we encounter as we travel through the physical.

In short our true essence is intangible in nature 'contained' within the whole of the intangible. We are 'knowing' (verb) of knowledge (noun). We are awareness of our experiencing. Our true essence is not physical/tangible in nature rather our true essence is intangible/spiritual in nature. The physical characteristic is simply a temporary form but a form which is critical to our expanding our very selves.

The whole of the intangible, like ourselves, is both finite and infinite in nature and as such exists as an entity. Now such a statement is not contradictory, rather it only appears to be. The reason an entity of knowing can be both finite and infinite in nature is because the entity of knowing, be it the whole of knowing, i.e. philosophically - 'Being'; religiously - God; scientifically - the whole, or be subunits of knowing i.e. philosophically the individual 'being'; religiously - the individual soul; scientifically - the individual id, they all exist and as such are finite yet they all have infinite potentiality of being more than they 'are'. Time here is not a factor, rather the factor involved is potentiality itself.

Time is a universal fabric of the physical universe not a universal fabric of the intangible.

In short: '... what do we exist as?' We exist as entities of knowing.

**Chuck:**

There is so much here that I agree with, and very little that I do not. Yet it is that very little that causes such a chasm between what any two minds perceive as truth. But this is not yet the time to address our very little differences. The time is close at hand, but first we must iron out the wrinkles in 'what we are.' Once that is established as the foundation, we can move on to perceptions of "What is Truth?"

We both agree our corporeal nature is not our true essence. You term our essence as 'entities of knowing,' and I call our essence 'pure consciousness.' We seem to agree here, but do we?

You say entities of knowing "all exist and as such are finite." In other words, we each are 'knowers' of knowledge, but that entity of knowing, and the knowledge it contains is finite; has a beginning and an ending. If this is so, where and when did it begin, and where and when does it end? What happens to the knowledge contained in the entities of knowing?

**Dan:**

You have put forward three questions:

You quote me as saying: ... entities of knowing "all exist and as such are finite." and then you go on to say: '...In other words, we each are 'knowers' of knowledge, but that entity of knowing, and the knowledge it contains is finite; has a beginning and an ending.'

First question: If this is so, where and when did it begin, and

Second question: ... where and when does it end?

Third question: What happens to the knowledge contained in the entities of knowing?

There are two general 'entities of knowing' involved here: First: individual entities knowing less than the whole, i.e., you and I and who knows what other such entities may exist both inside and outside the domain we call the physical universe,

and secondly the whole of knowing and knowledge.

First - the beginning: In terms of the individual entity less than the whole, you and I, some would say

such entities began their accumulation of experiencing the physical, accumulation of knowing the physical when conception took place. Others say the beginning was punctuated by the advent of functional brain waves. Others say our beginning as entities begins at birth. Still others say it happened many times in the past, i.e., reincarnation.

Second - the end: In terms of the individual entity less than the whole, you and I, some would say such entities end their experiencing when the heart stops, others when the brain waves cease, and still others say the end of one physical journey simply is the beginning of another.

I have no problems with any of the above.

Third - what happens to such knowledge and knowing: Knowledge is intangible in nature as such it would seem rational that knowing of knowledge is also intangible in nature. Intangibility unlike tangibility is not subject to the parameters of the tangible. If this were not the case than the intangible would simply be a form of the tangible. The tangible is subject to what makes the tangible, namely: time, space, matter, and energy, i.e., Einstein's equation  $e = mc^2$ .

Knowing and knowledge, once removed from the physical or the physical for knowing and knowledge - whichever, simply remains distinct and separate from other whole entities of knowing and knowledge.

But what of the whole of knowing and knowledge? The whole remains the whole and as such incorporates all including you and I, yet we remain ourselves, separate - distinct - viable entities.

You and I began, we ended, we remain - finite, yet infinite. From the point of view of an entity outside ourselves 'looking in' we appear finite. From the point of view of ourselves we appear infinite. In between our beginning and end - infinite potential.

And what of the whole of knowing and knowledge? Oh I'm sorry that was not one of your questions. I apologize for assuming that would be your next question and after all we did agree not to let personal assumptions cloud our discussions here.

### **Chuck:**

Very Interesting Dan, but it is not quite what I was getting at with my questions.

I believe your "whole of knowing and knowledge" is the same as my whole of consciousness. It is The Singularity.

I describe the essence of The Singularity as pure intangible Consciousness itself. I think your description of "Knowing of Knowledge" is synonymous. So the question I was asking is how does a separate entity

of Knowing/Consciousness become separated and remain separated from the Whole of Knowing/Consciousness?

If we start with The Singularity; The Whole Consciousness of Knowing, how can an entity be separate from the Whole?

We know there is a separation, or else we could not say "We Exist." If there were no separation it would only be "I Exist" and thus be pure Solipsism. But we cannot also be and "remain ourselves, separate - distinct - viable entities." or there would be no entanglement. Every Id would be a complete and separate reality in and of itself with no conformity in perceptions between Ids. No mind would perceive the same Reality at all. We would not witness the same events at the same time, and events in one perception of Reality would not happen in another Reality. In one reality the tree would fall, in another reality there would be no tree at all.

Our minds must communicate, and in doing so the separation between minds begins to blur.

So what does this tell us about "What are We"?

Instead of being completely separate, we become entangled with shared perceptions. Our minds, our consciousness, our knowing of knowledge, entwine, and our perceptions/knowledge of the tangible Universe is transferred between our entangled minds. The same illusion of Reality becomes embedded simultaneously in every entity of knowing. Every tree, every rock, every speck of dust is embedded in every reality. If you break a window, that broken window is instantaneously present in all entangled minds throughout The Singularity. No other mind may consciously be aware of its existence, and no one else may ever visually witness it, but it is there all the same in all our Realities. It is this entanglement that creates continuity in the "persistent illusion."

I believe we agree our essence is not tangible. Our essence is purely intangible Knowing/Consciousness. We are not our tangible Brains, we are intangible Minds. Our essence is the essence of The Singularity. We and The Singularity are one and the same, as such our consciousness is infinite. We are knowing entangled with Knowing. We are thoughts entangled with Thought.

What are We?

We are the Conscience of Consciousness. We are the I in the Id. We are The Soul of The Singularity.

**Dan:**

Oh, Chuck, we agree upon so much. We are so close to understanding each other. Your perceptions are my perceptions except for one difference.

You speak of poly-solipsism and I agree completely yet you merge all consciousness into one and then deny the existence of the many. In essence your 'poly...' becomes one and thus denies its own existence.

My understanding of reality is the existence of all entities of knowing plus one and the one is what you call The Singularity. We both agree there is a summation of all conscience of consciousness. The term ontologists use to describe this existence is omniscience or God.

With this in mind let me address some of the points you made previously:

'I believe your "whole of knowing and knowledge" is the same as my whole of consciousness. It is The Singularity.

I describe the essence of The Singularity as pure intangible Consciousness itself. I think your description of "Knowing of Knowledge" is synonymous.'

I agree completely.

'So the question I was asking is how does a separate entity of Knowing/Consciousness become separated and remain separated from the Whole of Knowing/Consciousness? '

A separate entity of Knowing/Consciousness becomes separate and remains separated from the Whole of Knowing/Consciousness by beginning as an entity with zero knowing and ending at a point of completion. Completion from what is the question? Completing its personal experiencing. In the case of the human entity the experiencing is the process of traveling through a physical existence.

'If we start with The Singularity; The Whole Consciousness of Knowing, how can an entity be separate from the Whole?'

An entity can remain itself while contributing its experiencing to the whole of experiencing and thus making the whole greater than what it was before it incorporated the experiencing of the separate uniquely formed entity as a part of itself. The process is analogous to a duplication and assimilation of the data into the whole data bank while leaving the duplicated disk as a back up.

'We know there is a separation, or else we could not say "We Exist."

Correct.

'If there were no separation it would only be "I Exist" and thus be pure Solipsism.'



Correct.

'But we cannot also be and "remain ourselves, separate - distinct - viable entities." or there would be no entanglement.'

Ah, but the entanglement becomes but one of the functions of the Singularity.

'Every Id would be a complete and separate reality in and of itself with no conformity in perceptions between Ids. No mind would perceive the same Reality at all. We would not witness the same events at the same time, and events in one perception of Reality would not happen in another Reality. In one reality the tree would fall, in another reality there would be no tree at all.'

Herein lays the concept that the physical universe is real. The physical universe exists. The existence, however, lies in the consciousness of the collective of which our consciousness is a part while we ourselves remain separate from one another.

This is why the tree that fell halfway around the world is not a part of my reality, not a part of my experiencing.

'Our minds must communicate, and in doing so the separation between minds begins to blur.'

So what does this tell us about "What are We"?

Instead of being completely separate, we become entangled with shared perceptions. Our minds, our consciousness, our knowing of knowledge, entwine, and our perceptions/knowledge of the tangible Universe is transferred between our entangled minds. The same illusion of Reality becomes embedded simultaneously in every entity of knowing."

Thanks to The Singularity, thanks to the collective to whom we each contribute yet from whom we remain separate.

'Every tree, every rock, every speck of dust is embedded in every reality. If you break a window, that broken window is instantaneously present in all entangled minds throughout The Singularity.'

Not exactly, rather it becomes instantaneously present in The Singularity which acts as the environment within which we function.

'I believe we agree our essence is not tangible.'

We do.

'Our essence is purely intangible Knowing/Consciousness. We are not our tangible Brains, we are intangible Minds.'

I agree.

'Our essence is the essence of The Singularity.'

Again I agree.

'We and The Singularity are one and the same, ...'

Here we disagree. If we are one in the same, poly-solipsism is no longer a valid concept. I agree with poly-solipsism, many entities of knowing, all entities plus the whole/The Singularity.

'...as such our consciousness is infinite.'

Our consciousness is infinite but not to the same degree as the whole. We are 'contained within' the whole of knowing/consciousness/collective consciousness while simultaneously being a 'part of' the whole of knowing/consciousness.

'We are knowing entangled with Knowing. We are thoughts entangled with Thought.'

Agreed.

'What are We?'

We are the Conscience of Consciousness. We are the I in the Id. We are The Soul of The Singularity.'

I agree, but do not deny yourself your own existence, for to do so is to undermine the very concept of poly-solipsism which you have managed to glean from your endless hours of examining the basic concepts of reality.

And what say you now?

**Chuck:**

*"My understanding of reality is the existence of all entities of knowing plus one and the one is what you call The Singularity. We both agree there is a summation of all conscience of consciousness. The term ontologists use to describe this existence is omniscience or God."*

Our difference here is I do not see it as "plus one." I am saying all are equal to one. By saying "all plus one" you separate The Singularity from its own essence. You are saying there is all of us "and" The Singularity. With Poly-Solipsism I am saying there is only us, and we "are" The Singularity.

In doing so, I do not deny my own existence. In doing so I do not deny that I am a 'entity' with individualistic thought. With Poly-Solipsism I elevate the Individual from a mere unit in The Singularity to being The Singularity itself.

Poly-Solipsism is more than "many entities of knowing." It is more than the statement "We Exist" as a Multiplicity. It is in understanding 'what we are' that leads to the answers to who, when, where, why and how we are. Poly-Solipsism embraces the whole of Philosophy, Science and Religion. Within its embrace lay the rational for our different perceptions of Realty.

It is in the realization that we are the essence of The Singularity, and that essence is pure, infinite and unbound consciousness, that we find the answer to "What is Truth."

All roads lead to The Singularity. The Singularity is the source of everything, and the source of all Truth. The Singularity is literally and figuratively "All There Is." The Singularity is Infinite and Unbound Consciousness.

It is in comprehending this one Truth: All is Consciousness, that tells us we, and all we perceive, and all of Reality, is a manifestation of consciousness and cannot be separated from the Consciousness of The Singularity.

Once we grasp the significance that there is only The Singularity, and all else is 'woven' from its essence, and that every "I" in the "We" of Multiplicity is the essence and consciousness of The Singularity, we can understand what "Truth" really is.

There is only The Singularity. After that, there are only Choices in perceptions. After that, Truth is what you choose to Believe.

With Poly-Solipsism I liberate the Individual from being at the mercy of some unknown purveyor of Fate, and enable every mind to control its own destiny.

Reality is not what you consciously wish to believe. Reality is what you subconsciously really believe.

To change Reality, we must change what we subconsciously really believe.

Earlier you stated:

*"Regarding the first issue: 'In your philosophy,...' You see I am dealing with truth here, not my personal perceptions. Reality is, and as such whole of reality is what it is, not what I want it to be. Now I am not suggesting I do not affect reality, do not make reality what it is, rather I am saying that reality exists and describing the characteristics regarding what reality 'is' is quite different from describing what reality 'contains', describing what I 'add' to reality, describing the 'contents' of reality."*

Poly-Solipsism tells us all truth is "personal perceptions," and we cannot 'deal with truth' because all truth is only our own personal perceptions of truth seen from our own universe.

We exist as pure infinite and unbound consciousness, after that, all else is Philosophy; all else is personal perceptions and personal beliefs.

You also stated:

*"First - the beginning: In terms of the individual entity less than the whole, you and I, some would say such entities began their accumulation of experiencing the physical, accumulation of knowing the physical when conception took place. Others say the beginning was punctuated by the advent of functional brain waves. Others say our beginning as entities begins at birth. Still others say it happened many times in the past, i.e., reincarnation.*

*Second - the end: In terms of the individual entity less than the whole, you and I, some would say such entities end their experiencing when the heart stops, others when the brain waves cease, and still others say the end of one physical journey simply is the beginning of another.*

*I have no problems with any of the above."*

*" I have no problems with any of the above."* was very gratifying to hear, but I am not sure if you do not have a problem with any of them because you do not know which is 'true,'or do not care which is true because it does not make any difference to your own philosophy?

*"Of philosophy I will say nothing, except that when I saw that it had been cultivated for many ages by the most distinguished men, and that yet there is not a single matter within its sphere which is not still in dispute, and nothing, therefore, which is above doubt, I did not presume to anticipate that my success would be greater in it than that of others; and further, when I considered the number of conflicting opinions touching a single matter that may be upheld by learned men, while there can be but one true, I reckoned as well-nigh false all that was only probable."*

Rene Descartes ( Discourse on Method :1637)

The failure of Rene Descartes is in believing "...*there can be but one true...*"

Poly-Solipsism tells us they are all true. They are each true to the mind and universe of those who perceive and believe they are true.

Once we attempt to go beyond the Consciousness of The Singularity, everything becomes a matter of personal belief, personal perceptions; personal philosophy.

*"...When I considered the number of conflicting opinions touching a single matter that may be upheld by learned men..."* I reckoned that not only all were possible. I reckoned not only all were probable. I reckoned all were true!

What are we?

We are infinite and unbound Consciousness. After that, all else is Philosophy.

**Dan:**

I agree Chuck.

You have described 'The Singularity' aptly. I think we can safely say we both agree as to what the Singularity is. All is consciousness. But what about ourselves?

Do you think for yourself or does The Singularity think for you?

**Chuck:**

Both.

We are The Singularity.

How do you know everything you already know? Where do beliefs come from? Where do new ideas come from?

We take what is, and from it we create what may be, what can be, what will be.

**Dan:**

Chuck, I agree with everything you are suggesting except the 'plus one'. The concept of 'plus one' is unimportant for now. The 'plus one' allows one to explain the existence of and functionality of 'the discrete', the 'non-discrete', and 'nothingness', but let's leave that for latter.

I am curious about two things:

1. You say you think for yourself while The Singularity simultaneously thinks for you. How do you rationalize this statement and
2. If we exist, what is our purpose for existing?

**Chuck:**

Yes, the small difference between 'all in the one,' and 'all are the one' turns out to make a very big difference in the way we conceptualize everything else. 'All are The One' is of utmost importance to the concept of Poly-Solipsism. In fact, 'all are the one' is the rational for the answer to your first question.

You still are saying "...while The Singularity simultaneously thinks for you." You still think of The Singularity as 'plus one.' In essence you are saying You think, I think, and The Singularity also thinks. We are The Singularity. There are only your thought and my thoughts. When we combine our thoughts together they become the thoughts of The Singularity.

That is the reason I stated earlier The Singularity is not a discrete entity in and of itself.

So to answer:

*"1. You say you think for yourself while The Singularity simultaneously thinks for you. How do you rationalize this statement?"*

Where did you acquire all the information you now possess? Think of all the things you know, and all the things you believe to be true. Where did this information about our shared Universe come from?

One way or another, the information about everything you know and believe came from other minds. Your entanglement with all other minds in The Singularity provided you with the data that you processed into your perception of what is Reality. You, as did we all, used that data to create your own universe.

Before we became discriminating and selective, we added everything to our storehouse of acquired knowledge. Without sufficient information to make an 'informed judgement' all data was accepted as 'true.' The Singularity was thinking for you.

The combined thoughts of The Singularity created your perceptions of our shared Reality. It gave you the basis to start building, selecting, rearranging, and creating your own personal universe, and it continues to do so.

With our entanglement, our illusion of Reality is continually reinforced. Any changes, revisions or new additions are instantaneously shared and encoded in every entangled mind. The Singularity Thinks as a single unit, but each mind has the free will to be selective in how it perceives that information.

Creativity is taking the supplied information and changing it, or using it to create something new. We use these perceptions to create our own personal universe and combine our perceptions with all others to create our shared perception of Reality.

Think of the hologram I mentioned earlier. Our shared perception of our Universe is generated from the combined data points. Each data point is encoded with the whole image within itself, and is free to think for itself and manipulate that data to suit itself. If it changes the encoding, it changes the hologram it is projecting. It is changing the data being transmitted to all other data points, and changes the shared hologram just the slightest bit. If that data change is then accepted by other data points and re-transmitted, it will change the whole hologram.

This is what we do. We take the information we are given, and change it into what we can believe. We then attempt to pass on to others the truth we have created.

*"2. If we exist, what is our purpose for existing?"*

There is no purpose; or if you prefer, there are infinite purposes.

The Singularity is pure infinite and unbound Consciousness. That is 'What we are', and 'Where we are.' Once we attempt to define or describe anything beyond The Singularity, we do so through the lens of our own personal universe. We can only describe the truth that exists in our personal universe. We cannot describe the truth that may exist in any other universe.

Every Philosophy is just one persons description of their own personal universe. They are describing what they see through the hazy lens of their own creation.

What you see as the purpose of your existence was formulated from the choices you made in creating your own universe. You used your storehouse of accumulated knowledge to fashion the lens you are now looking through. What you see as true is only what you have created from that information. We each fashion our own.

We exist. All else is Philosophy.

### **Dan:**

*You imply: 'There is no purpose to life but I cannot tell you why that is so. There are infinite purposes to life but I cannot put it into words as a general statement. We exist but we do not exist. There is no singularity for we are the singularity and the singularity is us. We have nothing to offer the whole of existence for the whole is the whole. There is no such thing as morality. There is only relative morality. Amorality defines morality. The lack of morality is morality. The physical universe exists but does not exist. Physical reality only exists in the conscious mind.'*

I'm sorry Chuck but your description of reality being only 'what you think it is' is typical of post modern philosophy. The ambiguity of the whole thought process, the lack of definition, the inability of the model you describe, like post modernism, has nothing to offer the individual, has nothing to offer our specie, has nothing to offer other species throughout the existence we call the physical universe.

A universal philosophy does not appear to emerge from your perception of reality. Such a perception leaves our specie wallowing in a vacuum of ambiguous behavior and no moral compass to guide us when we encounter other life forms in the universe, to guide us here at home. The result: Survival of the fittest. To your own self be true. Follow the teachings of Machiavelli. History repeating itself from the



times of human genocides of North America, South America, Australia, WWII, The Sudan, Bosnia, Kosovo, Cambodia, ad nauseam. Nothing will change for there is nothing to change our perception of reality. It is after all perception which generates action which in turn generates multiple reactions which in turn generates social ambience and history inevitably repeats itself over and over as we, humans, move throughout the heavens because we rely upon our old perceptions of just what reality is.

Hope does not exist within your model for your model ignores all our scientific observation, all our religious beliefs, and all our philosophical reasoning pre-post modernism.

Philosophy historically had the task of providing an understandable model of reality from which a rational morality would emerge to guide human action and to build social foundations. Philosophy's task was to provide a model of reality which embraced what it is we had learned over the millennia. The process requires us to embrace our past progress, not discard such progress.

Philosophy was a tool developed by humankind to guide us into a new age, not demoralize us as individuals and as a specie as it is doing today.

A philosophical model which embraces nihilism is what has emerged over the last few centuries. The defeatism of present day philosophy is what so desperately needs to be circumvented and the means of doing so appears to be the establishment of universal truths as opposed to being embraced with personal truth. These universal truths must be just that; universal, apply from one end of existence to the other. These universal truths can only be universal if they are supported either directly or indirectly by all three of humanity's perceptual tools, namely: our ability to observe/dominated by the fields of science, our ability to believe/dominated by the fields of religion, and (yes: 'and' not 'or') our ability to reason/dominated by the fields of philosophy.

If a rational purpose cannot emerge from your model of reality then the model has nothing to offer the individual and leaves the individual questioning their very need to exist, questioning: 'Why am I continually facing the daily grind of life when I could simply end the despair I feel and experience.'

We, you and I, are so close to a consensus but if your system has nothing to offer the individual, offer our specie, then what's the point Chuck? The model I am revealing is so similar to yours yet it differs enough that it provides in-depth explanations to concepts such as: Why do I exist? Is there purpose to life? Is there such a thing as 'universal morality'? Does the discrete exist and what is it and what is its function? Ditto: the non-discrete, nothingness, the human specie, intelligent life forms throughout the universe, the soul, the physical body, ....

You say: *'Every Philosophy is just one persons description of their own personal universe. They are describing what they see through the hazy lens of their own creation.'*

Have you ever thought that it is you looking through the hazy lens or your own creation and that what you describe may not be an accurate description of reality, that the reality you describe may be accurate as far as your description goes but that your description may lack a few vital elements which exists as a part of reality?

Now I don't mean to be flogging you but I still don't understand what the point is of spending the energy to develop a model of reality incapable of defining the point of life, of developing a model of reality which has nothing to offer individuals who exist today and who are yet to come, of developing a model of reality which has nothing positive to offer.

Or perhaps I am missing something here. Does your model of reality have something positive to offer me, offer you, offer those desperately attempting to cope with the trials and tribulations life constantly throws across their life's paths?

**Chuck:**

Thank you Dan, a very classic reply by someone who has just had his illusions of Reality challenged.

Your statements confirm the concepts of Poly-Solipsism.

I have challenged the Truths you have created in your own universe. I have challenged your illusions of a rational morally purposeful existence.

That is the truth you believe, or wish to believe, is common to all existence. I have just stated they are not true to my existence; therefore they cannot be common to all.

*"Philosophy historically had the task of providing an understandable model of reality from which a rational morality would emerge to guide human action and to build social foundations."*

Who says?

I have read many long winded essays on what philosophy is. Without exception they all basically described what philosophy was to the author.

I have a very simple description of what Philosophy is. Philosophy is the search for Truth. And just as in Science; our tool, we must follow where the evidence leads us, whether we like what we find or not.

Just because we wish existence had a rational and moral purpose, does not mean there is one.

But you are correct here:

*"These universal truths can only be universal if they are supported either directly or indirectly by all three of humanity's perceptual tools, namely: our ability to observe/dominated by the fields of science, our ability to believe/dominated by the fields of religion, and (yes: 'and' not 'or') our ability to reason/dominated by the fields of philosophy."*

Universal Truths will only be Universal if they are accepted by everyone. There are only two that I know of: We Exist, and all things Change.

*"Have you ever thought that it is you looking through the hazy lens of your own creation?"*

Of course!

*"I still don't understand what the point is of spending the energy to develop a model of reality incapable of defining the point of life?"*

*"Does your model of reality have something positive to offer me, offer you, offer those desperately attempting to cope with the trials and tribulations life constantly throws across their life's paths?"*

I went in search of The Truth. I have found it.

We Exist. We are The Singularity. There are no answers; there are only choices.

I can only offer it to you. Whether or not you find comfort from this truth is up to you.

I know I take great comfort in it, for it liberates me from being a mere pawn at the mercy of fates of which I have no control, to being able to make my own choices and take control of my own destiny.

What does Poly-Solipsism offer you?

It offers you the ability to make your own choices. It offers you the ability to control your own destiny. It offers you control of your own universe.

But we digress from our purpose here. Perhaps all will become clear as we continue?

We agree our essence is pure consciousness. We agree the essence of The Singularity is pure consciousness. We also agree that all else must issue from pure consciousness.

We agree we exist, we agree the Universe exists.

So now we must explain how we get from The Singularity of pure infinite and unbound consciousness to our perception of a Universe of physical Reality.

Are you still game?

**Dan:**

I am not only still game but I am excited about it.

Before you begin, however, let me just say: I agree with everything you stated so far regarding what is. Where I disagree with you lies in the realm of what you have suggested 'is not', what you appear to deny as existing, where you have limited existing in reality. For example, from what I hear you say, you appear to deny the existence of: the discrete, the individual separate from The Singularity, nothingness, functionality of nothingness, purpose for life, etc.

I am not denying your perception of reality. I agree with the concept of poly-solipsism. It's just that I don't understand how we, limited beings, are capable of describing reality based upon limits as opposed to describing reality based upon no limits.

Am I 'game'? Absolutely, not because I want to 'prove' you wrong but because I; like you, seek truth over validation of any specific model of reality revealed by any 'thinker' be they Aristotle, Hegel, Kant, Einstein, Hawking, Hume, you, or myself.

So go for it buddy. Let's see what you have to say.

## **Act IV:**

### **Scene 2:"Something from Nothing"**

#### **Chuck:**

"All roads lead from The Singularity."

Once we examine 'what we are'; pure consciousness, we then know 'where we are'; we are the consciousness of The Singularity, and thus our consciousness is 'in' The Singularity. Since everything that 'is' must issue from its essence, everything is 'in' The Singularity.

The essence of The Singularity is Consciousness; it is Mind, it is Thought, it is Infinite and Unbound Potential Inspiration. Everything that 'is' must begin with consciousness of mind; it must start with Thought, and therefore everything that 'is' must be composed of Thought.

At the very core of all Reality there is nothing but the Consciousness of Mind.

Reality is but a Thought.

Quantum Theory tells us there are no 'particles' in our particles; nothing is really solid; everything is energy, and even our energy is created from "quantum stuff" that is not like, and does not behave like, any of the beloved  $e=mc^2$  energy that forms our Universe. String Theory tells us quantum stuff comes from one dimensional vibrational harmonics of an invisible force.

Our Thoughts are the invisible force that is the cause of these vibrations that form the one dimensional harmonic 'strings.' One thought alone is like spiting in the ocean, but when it entangles with thoughts of

the same frequency they harmonize to create a wave front. The vibrating wave fronts emit their information with what we see as photons. Wave fronts that entangle reinforce and energize each other, and the combined release of photons create the four dimensional Holographic image we call Reality.

What we perceive to exist as tangible is really composed of nothing more tangible than Thought.

**Dan:**

I am confused. I thought we agreed the tangible exists and the intangible exists, so how is it now that the tangible has seemingly disappeared?

**Chuck:**

A refresher:

Chuck:

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

Dan:

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

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

We never agreed the tangible exists. We have agreed that what exists is either tangible or intangible. I would never have agreed to the definition for 'Exist' if it were not for 'Intangible.' I stated before "the tangible exists because the intangible exists. The tangible exists because illusions exist."

Reality; which is everything we perceive as Tangible, is what Einstein called "The persistent Illusion." He knew back then, as did every serious physicist, that the study of the physical was really the study of the metaphysical. There is no-thing tangible in Reality.

I believe it was the Buddhist who maintained "there is emptiness at the heart of all matter." Western Science is discovering Eastern Philosophy.

Early on I asked "If we cannot tell if Reality is an illusion or not, does it really matter?" Knowing "there is emptiness at the heart of all matter" does me little good when that matter hits me broadside. It may be filled with "emptiness," but it's still going to hurt like hell!

That is where we are headed now; to find out why "emptiness" can hurt like hell.

I burned myself the other day on something I did not know was hot. If all of Reality is only an illusion, and illusions are all in my mind, how can that happen? If I did not know the illusion I was perceiving was hot, how could it have been hot?

Hypnosis gives us a clue as to how our Reality works. Hypnosis tells us not only can our minds be "tricked" into believing something is hot when it is not; through the power of suggestion our minds can be manipulated into believing just about anything. What we call the "Placebo Effect" is just another form of hypnosis. Through nothing more than the power of suggestion, a sugar pill can have the same curative powers as the medication it is substituting for. If Reality were "real" and tangible hypnosis should not work. In a real and tangible Reality a cool object could never cause a blister, and a sugar pill could never cure anything but a sweet tooth. Once we accept what Hypnosis is telling us; that our minds control our personal Reality, it is not a big leap, but only a very short step to understanding all of Reality is controlled by the mind.

The only way hypnosis can have any effect on the tangible, is if Reality is located entirely in the Mind.

But not only in my mind.

That is the message of Poly-Solipsism, and where it differs from pure Solipsism.

For the "persistent illusion" to have continuity, the same illusion must be present in all minds simultaneously. For the Illusion to become "real" the information on anything we perceive as tangible must be present in all entangled minds instantaneously. And from what hypnosis is telling us, what the mind is told is 'real,' we will perceive as being Real.

I burned myself on something that I did not consciously know was hot, but subconsciously I did know. Subconsciously I knew because the entangled minds of The Singularity created the hot object and my subconscious mind is entangled with all others.

Some other mind in The Singularity created the illusion the object was hot. That information was embedded in my subconscious mind by the entangled minds of The Singularity. It became a part of my personal universe, but did not intrude into my conscious mind until I actually touched it. My

subconscious mind told my conscious mind "if you touch that object you will be burned."

When I touched it, my conscious mind obeyed what it was told.

That 'object' does not exist as a 'real' and tangible object. It is an illusion composed of 'holecloth' generated by the entangled minds of The Singularity. It is filled with emptiness and fashioned from nothing more tangible than thought. But to all minds entangled in this illusion of Reality the object will 'Exist' and be perceived as a real and tangible object.

Why?

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

Our conscious minds are embedded in this illusion of a real and tangible Reality. Our subconscious minds are telling all our senses what they are supposed to perceive. Our senses will obey what our subconscious minds tell it, therefore for all intent and purposes our Reality is "Real." We cannot tell the difference, therefore there is no difference!

If we cannot distinguish by any means the difference between what is real and what is an illusion, than to the mind there is no difference, and the illusion becomes real. My sense do not tell the conscious mind something is hot, my mind is telling my sense it is hot. An intangible illusion becomes a tangible Reality, and matter filled with emptiness is going to hurt like hell!

**Dan:**

Ah Chuck, why is it philosophy, religion, and science are so adverse to each other that they refuse to communicate to each other in a common language?

It is science which has dedicated itself to the study of the tangible and it is philosophy and religion which have agreed to such a confining set of parameters for science. Then when science proves to be somewhat successful, philosophy and religion turn around and refuse to acknowledge the tangible even exists.

It does not matter if the tangible is or isn't. It does not matter if the tangible is composed of 'atoms' or not composed of 'atoms.'

The tangible is simply what it is and it is the tangible which science examines.



Now you may wish to call the tangible, 'the illusion we can perceive', but it is still the tangible. To suggest the tangible is 'the illusion we can perceive' suggests we have the ability to distinguish the tangible's existence as a separate discrete existence from 'the illusion we cannot perceive', exists as a separate discrete existence which we can distinguish from love, joy, jealousy, exists as the concept of a tree from that of the tree itself. To suggest 'the illusion we can perceive' is capable of being distinguished from 'reality', 'that which is not an illusion', is nothing different than to use the terms tangible versus intangible.

I agree with what it is you are saying regarding singularity and consciousness, but this is a dialogue which is to be open to all. This is a dialogue open to all not just a few isolated thinkers using their own personal vocabulary as opposed to using the common language of humankind.

Now we could suggest we use our own unique vocabulary and educate everyone else to our personal definitions of their language but that would take a tremendous amount of energy considering we would have to educate six billion people. Or we could use the generic English language terms and definitions with the understanding that science will someday come to the end of the path they are taking which will, to their amazement, lead them to the understanding that 'the illusion we can perceive'/the tangible was derived from 'nothingness' itself. Most religions understand this. As an example John 1:1 'In the beginning was the Word and the Word was God.'

In short, I agree with you but we are not here to converse in terms which no one, other than you and I, understands. As such can we not agree that the tangible, that the physical, is as physicists describe it since it is the physicists who are acknowledged as the one's who are the professionals designated to do so by almost one hundred percent of the population of the planet called 'Earth'?

### **Chuck:**

"Ah Chuck, why is it philosophy, religion, and science are so adverse to each other that they refuse to communicate to each other in a common language?"

I am not adverse to any of them. Poly-Solipsism embraces all three.

I have practiced all three at one time or another. I do confess Religion has left a bad taste, but it is not Religions per say, but the current practitioners, and I seem to favor Eastern religious philosophy over Catholicism. I was raised a Roman Catholic. I studied and have followed Science all my life. I love Science. I make my living with Science. As you know I am new to Philosophy. I was never a "Student of Philosophy," and never intended to be a "Philosopher." I pretty much fell into it by happenstance. I started out by wondering why everyone believes so many different, and sometimes contradictory things?

I just wanted to know "The Truth." I blame you for turning me into a philosopher!

I am more comfortable with the language of Science then I am with the esoteric terminology of the 'Students of Philosophy.' I have tried to avoid both here, and I am at a loss to understand your criticism. I thought I was keeping it simple! Could be a little more specific by pointing out which terminology you are finding offensive?

"It does not matter if the tangible is or isn't. It does not matter if the tangible is composed of 'atoms' or not composed of 'atoms.'

The tangible is simply what it is, and it is the tangible which science examines."

Precisely! And it is Science that is telling us Reality is "the illusion we can perceive."

Science can tell us it is an illusion, but science cannot tell us where or how the illusion was generated. Once science runs out of the physical and into the metaphysical they have no place left to go. The metaphysical is the domain of religions and philosophy.

Poly-Solipsism does not tell us what form the Illusion takes, it just tells us where it came from, and how it came to be. Poly-Solipsism is the connection between Science and the Soul.

Once we enter the illusion and describe "What it is," we turn the focus of our minds eye in the direction of the illusion, and away from the domain of The Singularity.

Poly-Solipsism cannot tell us what Truths lies within the illusion, it only tells us how those truths came to be.

But you are correct, "it is what it is," and once we are within the Universe it does not matter if the atoms and sub-atomic particles are made from quantum stuff and that quantum stuff is created by an unknown, unseen, and beyond detection one dimensional vibration of "Nothingness." When we are within the Universe we perceive it as real and tangible, and it makes no difference if it is an illusion or not. Almost!

And that is the purpose of Poly-Solipsism.

Knowing it is an illusion, and knowing how the illusion came to be, allows us to cease being victims at the mercy of an unknown fate. Poly-Solipsism tells us we can manipulate the illusion and regain control of our own universe. It does us no good to have the ability if we do not know we have it. If we do not know, it will go unused.

**Dan:**

You say: 'I am not adverse to any of them.'

Yet you deny the scientist his realm of exploration. To agree the universe is an illusion and exists and can be experienced because it is a 'real illusion' rather than just an illusion is to show respect for all those who study science, believe in science, and practice science. And after all embracing all unique individuals within the robe of respect and tolerance is the fundamental characteristic of 'base' truth since the individual exists.

When you say: 'I thought I was keeping it simple Could you be a little more specific by pointing out which terminology you are finding offensive?'

When one does not acknowledge the work of more than five hundred years of human intellect and the contributions of millions of people, one is not 'keeping it simple'. Now I grant you that all these people may be idiots, however, that does not mean their perceptions are any less real than your perceptions or my perceptions.

I do not take offense to your description of the physical for I agree with you one hundred percent, however, can we not throw a bone to those who do not understand what it is we are referring to when we say the physical universe is not 'real' and just agree to say the physical universe is both real and exists. Between the two of us we will agree the physical universe is not just an 'illusion' but a 'real illusion'.

You say: 'Precisely! And it is Science that is telling us Reality is "the illusion we can perceive."'

So be it. Then we agree the physical universe exists. It is after all not the base composition of the physical universe we are discussing, but rather we are discussing the concept of 'base' truths which will lead us to 'base' moralism versus 'relative moralism', which in turn will lead us to the 'base' purpose for the individuals existence and in our case human purpose.

You say: 'Science can tell us it is an illusion, but science cannot tell us where or how the illusion was generated. Once science runs out of the physical and into the metaphysical they have no place left to go. The metaphysical is the domain of religions and philosophy.'

True science cannot tell us how the 'real illusion' was generated, but someday it will and someday science will have to face the question: What lies 'beyond' the physical? Where does this 'real illusion' we call the physical universe 'lie'?

You say: 'Poly-Solipsism does not tell us what form the Illusion takes, it just tells us where it came from, and how it came to be.'

Agreed. I also agree with your hypothesis regarding poly-solipsism. So what is it we are discussing if we both agree? We are discussing the 'short falls' of poly-solipsism. We are discussing the ingredients poly-solipsism is lacking. Poly-solipsism appears correct as far as it goes but it does not go far enough. It does not answer the question: Why does the individual exist?

You say: 'Poly-Solipsism is the connection between Science and the Soul.'

There is no connection between science and the soul, that's the point. Science deals with the 'real illusion' and the soul is neither an illusion nor a 'real illusion'.

You say: 'Once we enter the illusion and describe "What it is," we turn the focus of our minds eye in the direction of the illusion, and away from the domain of The Singularity.'

I disagree. Religions have proliferated throughout history, thrive today, and will proliferate into the far future. Religions are nothing short of individuals seeking The Singularity and seeking their place within The Singularity, seeking the answer to the question: Why do I exist?

You say: 'When we are within the Universe we perceive it as real and tangible, and it makes no difference if it is an illusion or not. Almost!'

Again I agree. Nuances after all are important, however, not all nuances are important to all people. The scientist, wrapped up in his daily work, could care less about the 'almost' aspect. Our work, however, is immersed in such nuances.

You say: 'And that is the purpose of Poly-Solipsism.'

The purpose of all philosophy and philosophical models is to explain the individuals' purpose for existing. If one does not understand one's purpose in existence one cannot reach to attain one's purpose. Such is the failure of philosophy. Understanding reality leads to understanding the individual's purpose in reality. It is this 'base' understanding you seek and is the very reason you explore poly-solipsism. You may say you are seeking 'truth' but base truth is base truth whether you find it or not. Base truth cannot be created or destroyed, it just is what it is. So it is we seek base truth in order to understand our purpose for existing.

But what is base truth? Base truth is the answer to the questions: Where am I? What am I, and Why do I exist. The answers to these questions emerge from the model of reality we are able to piece together as philosophers.

You say: 'Knowing how the illusion came to be, allows us to cease being victims at the mercy of an unknown fate. Poly-Solipsism tells us we can manipulate the illusion and regain control of our own universe. It does us no good to have the ability if we do not know we have it. If we do not know, it will go unused.'

I would suggest we differ here. I do not think we will, at least within the next few millennia, be able to 'control the universe' through mind control but I do believe we can understand the answers to the three questions I listed and through such answers change both the actions individuals take within the physical universe and change the environment which exists outside the physical universe. Hopefully the change will be for the 'better' or for what most individuals profess to be 'the good'.

Such an action may not be as lofty as yours but it is, I believe, a beginning.

After all this, I assume we agree: The universe exists, the individual exists, and whole exists.

But you wanted to discuss 'nothingness', so tell me about 'something from nothing'.

### **Chuck:**

You said I "deny the scientist his realm of exploration."

I must object! I do not deny scientist their physical play things. After all these years they have simple run out of them. We have peered down as deep as we can go, and have found the metaphysical lurking at the heart of all matter and energy. We have cast our gaze out into the Universe as far as we can see, and have found a metaphysical "Dark Energy" holding everything together.

Science has won its battle to find out what everything is made from. It is made from the Metaphysical.

I can take no credit for their success, and I will take no blame for it either. I simply gathered the results of their labor.

You have also said: "Poly-solipsism appears correct as far as it goes but it does not go far enough. It does not answer the question: Why does the individual exist?"

Poly-Solipsism cannot go there. Poly-Solipsism goes as far as it can go, and then it can go no further. It cannot tell us why the individual exists. But what Poly-Solipsism does tell us is all answers to this question are personal answers, and what you or I may choose as the ultimate answer for each of us, may

or may not be true for any one else.

Any answer you or I may conclude as the reason why we exist is purely our own personal choice. It is what we have found in our own personal universe. Since everyone has the free will to choose their own truth, and exist in their own universe, neither of us have the right to tell anyone else why they exist.

Hmm, "Base truth... it just is what it is....we seek base truth in order to understand our purpose for existing."

Is "Base Truth" the same as "Universal Truth"? I said earlier a Universal Truth is one that cannot be denied by anyone. Simply switching "Base" for "Universal" does not change anything. My answer is still the same. There are only two that I know of: We Exist, and all things Change.

If you know another I would be grateful if you would enlighten me.

You are correct though, I did go in search of many answers, one of which was why do we exist? And I found them. I just did not find what I thought I would find. I found Poly-Solipsism instead.

We exist. There are no answers. There are only Choices. We are The Singularity, after that, all else is philosophy.

"...it just is what it is..." and it does not matter that we would like it to be something else. It does not matter that we wish there to be some sacred or lofty and exquisite purpose for life, if the 'base truth' is: there is none, then that is the answer that must suffice. "It just is what it is." To attempt to make anything more from it is to add our own personal reasons and obscure the base truth in an attempt to deceive ourselves and extend to others a truth that is purely our own.

I am not against seeking such a truth and I am not against seeking a moral code we all can live by. To do so is a noble and admirable cause, and worthy of a lives work. It is a life well spent and in itself a worth purpose to live, but it is not "The Answer" I went in search of, and is not a part of Poly-Solipsism.

You say you disagree and "do not think we will, at least within the next few millennia, be able to 'control the universe' through mind control..."

We already do! We always have. We just did not know that we did. The question here is: now that we do

know, what are we going to do about it?

Perhaps by knowing it is our own thoughts and actions that are the cause of our Reality, we will cease blaming some unknown performer, and begin taking responsibility for our own choices. We go about our daily lives completely oblivious that everything we do and think impacts the Universe we all share. In search for our own happiness we turn a blind eye to how our actions may have repercussion on others. Someone else suffers and we deem ourselves blameless. It was their bad luck, it was their fate, or the act of some pernicious god, but never ourselves, we had nothing to do with it.

In truth, Reality is what is, because we are what we are. Reality is woven from our entangled minds. Everything we do and think causes our Reality to be what it is. To change our Reality we must change our thoughts and our actions; we must change ourselves.

Yes, I think now is the time to discuss "Nothingness."

Previously you have mentioned the functionality of 'nothingness.' I make a mental note of it, but it was not the time to get sidetracked and go off into this discussion. Now seems like a good time, but before I start expounding profusely I would appreciate if you can define what you mean by "the functionality of Nothingness"?

**Dan:**

You say: 'I do not deny scientist their physical play things. After all these years they have simple run out of them. We have peered down as deep as we can go, and have found the metaphysical lurking at the heart of all matter and energy. We have cast our gaze out into the Universe as far as we can see, and have found a metaphysical "Dark Energy" holding everything together.

'Science has won its battle to find out what everything is made from. It is made from the Metaphysical.'

You miss the point Chuck. The job of science is not to find the metaphysical but to examine the physical. Several times throughout history, people had believed science had done all it could to understand the physical. The job will most likely never be fully accomplished by us. No sooner do we begin to understand one level of the physical than we 'discover' another level of physical existence we had no idea existed.

Science: the study of the physical.

I previously stated: "Poly-solipsism appears correct as far as it goes but it does not go far enough. It does

not answer the question: Why does the individual exist?"

To which you replied: "Poly-Solipsism cannot go there. Poly-Solipsism goes as far as it can go, and then it can go no further. It cannot tell us why the individual exists. But what Poly-Solipsism does tell us is all answers to this question are personal answers, and what you or I may choose as the ultimate answer for each of us, may or may not be true for any one else.

Any answer you or I may conclude as the reason why we exist is purely our own personal choice. It is what we have found in our own personal universe. Since everyone has the free will to choose their own truth, and exist in their own universe, neither of us have the right to tell anyone else why they exist."

This is true when taken in light of what it is 'a' unique individual experiences as an individual but not true when taken in light of individuality in and of itself. For example 'a/'each' wolf's unique purpose depends upon the particular wolf and its environment and as such indefinable by an observer isolated from the knowledge regarding that unique wolf's environment. But the purpose of wolves is definable by ecologists. Wolves have the function of thinning out populations of other animal species in order to reduce genetic weakness, the spread of disease, and overpopulation.

The same applies to us as individuals.

Poly-solipsism clearly defines this concept. Poly-solipsism clearly and concisely states individuals exist as unique essences capable of unique experiencing. As you say: '... what Poly-Solipsism does tell us is all answers to this question are personal answers, and what you or I may choose as the ultimate answer for each of us, may or may not be true for any one else.

Regarding the question: Why does the individual exist? You are also correct in stating: 'Poly-Solipsism cannot go there. Poly-Solipsism goes as far as it can go, and then it can go no further. It cannot tell us why the individual exists.'

You are referring to particular individuals whereas I am asking the question as regards individuality itself. This is why poly-solipsism displays only a portion of the complete picture of reality as we are able to conceive of it presently.

We can understand our role in reality, our purpose for existing as 'elements' of individuality. All we have to do is answer the first question: Where are we? Once we understand the answer to this question we can move to the next question: What are we? And from this point we can answer the question: Why do we exist? This is the way ecologists work. Ecologists examine the environment of the organism, then the organism, and then suggest the function of the organism as it relates to the whole of the environment, the overall We have learned much from ecologists now we need to apply the ecologists' process to philosophy. Simple.

You proceed to ask:



'Hmm, "Base truth... it just is what it is....we seek base truth in order to understand our purpose for existing."

Is "Base Truth" the same as "Universal Truth"?

Yes it is.

You then state: 'There are only two that I know of: We Exist, and all things Change.'

I agree with the existence of the two but...

Change may be a truth but it is a verb of action and is to be discussed after one discusses existence/being itself. Do we exist? If we do not exist we can 'change' neither ourselves nor what it is we lie within

Now we both agreed 'we' exist.

I would suggest, however, that there are three universal truths regarding existence itself. The whole exists. The individual/we exist. And the universe exists. Now I have not placed any specific specification upon any of the three at this time. I have not suggested the universe is independent of 'our' thought process nor have I suggested the whole is simply ourselves. I have just stated what it is I have stated: The whole, the individual, and the universe exist. Simple, three universal truths.

You state: 'If you know another I would be grateful if you would enlighten me.' I hope this helps. What emerges from the acknowledgement of the three becomes another issue.

You then state: 'You are correct though, I did go in search of many answers, one of which was why do we exist? And I found them. I just did not find what I thought I would find. I found Poly-Solipsism instead.

We exist. There are no answers. There are only Choices. We are The Singularity, after that, all else is philosophy.'

I am sorry to hear you found no other answers but it is because poly-solipsism does not go far enough that you found no answers. I am not saying poly-solipsism is incorrect, rather I am saying that poly-solipsism is only a piece of the puzzle, a good piece, an important piece, but still only a 'piece' of the puzzle nevertheless.

If a model cannot answer the question, it is not the complete model.

Regarding your statement regarding the purpose of existences of individuals: "...it just is what it is..." and it does not matter that we would like it to be something else. It does not matter that we wish there to

be some sacred or lofty and exquisite purpose for life, if the 'base truth' is: there is none, then that is the answer that must suffice. "It just is what it is." To attempt to make anything more from it is to add our own personal reasons and obscure the base truth in an attempt to deceive ourselves and extend to others a truth that is purely our own.'

You are falling into the trap of present day philosophy. Present day philosophy says we cannot understand universal 'truth' because universal truth does not exist for all truth is 'relative'. Einstein opened up wonderful worlds for the physicist and cosmologist but because philosophers fully embraced the concept of relativism it found itself wrapped in the confines of the physical and as such philosophy sentenced itself to the slow agonizing death of 'meaninglessness'. How sad, philosophy self-sentencing itself to the confines which define the physical. No wonder philosophy is flailing about in the agonizing death rattle of strangulation.

You say: 'I am not against seeking such a truth and I am not against seeking a moral code we all can live by. To do so is a noble and admirable cause, and worthy of a lives work. It is a life well spent and in itself a worth purpose to live, but it is not "The Answer" I went in search of, and is not a part of Poly-Solipsism.'

Isn't the purpose of philosophy, the purpose of finding universal truth the first step in understanding the process, understanding 'how' to affect change as opposed to simply letting change affect us? Isn't the purpose to 'take control' as opposed to just reacting after the fact?

Understanding is not enough. It is what we do with understanding that is of significance.

You ask: 'The question here is: now that we do know, what are we going to do about it?'

Exactly but we do not 'know' yet for we have not answered the three question: Where are we? What are we? And why do we exist? It is only after we 'know' the answers the three questions that we can 'take' control of our environment (you will note I did not specify our 'physical' environment). It is only after we answer the three questions in the precise order given that we, like the ecologist, can determine: 'What it is we are going to do about it?'

At this point I must state: Although we are not capable of 'knowing' anything as an absolute, we are capable of defining truth as best we can and move on from that point. This is what science does and we accept the process for science. Science says the laws of physics apply throughout our galaxy. As such we assume that gravity exists throughout our galaxy and they then move on from there and begin the study of our Milky Way.

Philosophy needs to embrace this method. The first step for philosophy in such a process is to identify universal truths. The next step is to verify. The process of the verification is an examination of the validity of the three universal truths using our three perceptual tools - our ability to observe/science, our ability to reason/philosophy, and our ability to believe/religion.

I have no problems embracing your statement: 'Perhaps by knowing it is our own thoughts and actions that are the cause of our Reality, we will cease blaming some unknown performer, and begin taking responsibility for our own choices. We go about our daily lives completely oblivious that everything we do and think impacts the Universe we all share. In search for our own happiness we turn a blind eye to how our actions may have repercussion on others. Someone else suffers and we deem ourselves blameless. It was their bad luck, it was their fate, or the act of some pernicious god, but never ourselves, we had nothing to do with it.'

In fact, I agree completely.

Regarding your statement: 'In truth, Reality is what is, because we are what we are. Reality is woven from our entangled minds. Everything we do and think causes our Reality to be what it is.'

OK, few problems with this, although I would never suggest 'we' are the only form of sentient being within our universe, nor would I ever suggest that our form of knowing is the only possible form of knowing within the whole of reality as opposed to our physical universe.

Regarding your statement: 'To change our Reality we must change our thoughts and our actions; we must change ourselves.'

Granted. Until we understand the answers to the questions: Where are we? What are we? And why do we exist.', we will remain as we are, a specie questioning, individuals bewildered.

You say: 'I think now is the time to discuss "Nothingness."

Do you think so?

If so let me address your statement: 'Previously you have mentioned the functionality of 'nothingness.' I make a mental note of it, but it was not the time to get sidetracked and go off into this discussion. Now seems like a good time, but before I start expounding profusely I would appreciate if you can define what you mean by "the functionality of Nothingness"?'

Existence as a verb is defined in terms of the passive, existing in and of itself, and the active, having functionality, a role to play in reality.

The functionality of nothingness thus takes on two aspects. Does nothingness exist in and of itself and what is the function of nothingness? What is the role of nothingness in reality? If we cannot answer the two question in the order given then we need to attempt to answer the two questions in reverse order for if there is functionality then there is existence in and of itself.

## **Chuck:**

Ok, my friend. I must agree when you say "Several times throughout history, people had believed science had done all it could to understand the physical. The job will most likely never be fully accomplished by us. No sooner do we begin to understand one level of the physical than we 'discover' another level of physical existence we had no idea existed.

Science: the study of the physical."

Fair enough. Than I shall leave the Study of the Physical to Physical Science, but I fully expect Theoretical Quantum Physicists, String Physicists and those who have an interest in the metaphysical source of our Universe to continue to explore where Physical Science cannot go. We have entered "the next level" of Science; the age of Metaphysical Science. It will be the metaphysical scientist that will be the vanguard for the physical scientist to follow.

You state:"(Why do we exists?)...I am asking the question as regards individuality itself. This is why poly-solipsism displays only a portion of the complete picture of reality as we are able to conceive of it presently."

Yes, you are correct. That is all Poly-Solipsism was ever meant to describe. Poly-Solipsism can only explain How our Reality is created, it was never intended to explain Why.

To enter into the question Why do we exist is to enter into the question Why does The Singularity exist?

The Singularity is Infinite and Unbound. It has no beginning, no ending and no limits. It makes no sense to ask why it exists. It is simply a 'nonsense question' as is: What is in nothing? Whatever answer you or I may make up, is just that; made up, and will not be relevant to anyone but you or I.

The same problem can be said in asking why there are individual minds or egos? I gave this question considerable thought after I traced all of existence back to the First Container: The Singularity. If we start out with "A" Singularity, how did we acquire our individual egos? It gave me some pause until I realized I was attempting to conceptualize The Infinite and Unbound Singularity as a finite spacetime object. There is no correlation between The Singularity and anything that exists within our perceptions of Universe. There is no finite object that exists within Spacetime that we can draw an analogy to image The Singularity.

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

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

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

To understand this a little better lets consider our spacetime Universe. We say we have height, depth, width, and time. We call them Dimensions but this is a misnomer. There is only one Dimension; The Universe, but it has four degrees of freedom. Actually, the last time I checked, the Theorist tell us our Universe has 11 degrees of freedom, but we are only aware of the four. I would add consciousness to the list of fundamental properties of our Universe. We often overlook the very tool we use to study it with.

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

When viewed this way it becomes apparent there is only one dimension of Universe, but it needs to have all its degrees of freedom for it to exist. We can form an image of them in our minds, but very few of us can even imagine the other seven degrees of freedom that form our physical Universe, yet alone the Infinite degrees of freedom of The Singularity. It just does not compute!

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

To ask why we exist is to ask why The Singularity exists. There is no answer.

Ok, you said: "We can understand our role in reality, our purpose for existing as 'elements' of individuality."

That is a whole different ball of wax. We have been talking at cross purposes. I have been discussing the Individual as the Mind/Ego of The Singularity. From this statement you are talking about the physical manifestation of the Individual within our illusion of Reality.

I have been restricting my discussion to The Singularity and Poly-Solipsism, it seems you have been discussing our role within Universe also. You are asking: Why is there a Universe, and Why are we here in this illusion of Universe?

Ok. Lets see what we can come up with from that perspective.

First: Where are we?

We are in The Universe.

It makes no difference whether it is an illusion or not, because once we are within the Illusion we create, we cannot tell the difference. To our senses the Universe exists as real and tangible.

Second: What are we?

We perceive ourselves to be tangible organism possessing awareness and individuality.

Third: Why are we?

We are here to live.

When you said "The whole, the individual, and the universe exist. Simple, three universal truths." you really did mean "Universal" truths, as in: what exists within the physical Universe.

Up until this point, what exists within Universe has not concerned me at all. And to tell the truth, it does not concern Poly-Solipsism all that much either.

Poly-Solipsism is only concerned with the how. That is its only purpose. Once we get into the why, that is a whole different philosophical concept, and is not a part of Poly-Solipsism.

I believe that is why you don't think Poly-Solipsism goes far enough and that it is only a piece of the puzzle. You are looking for a reason and a purpose, and Poly-Solipsism does not provide that answer. It was never meant to.

You said: "If a model cannot answer the question, it is not the complete model.

Isn't the purpose of philosophy, the purpose of finding universal truth the first step in understanding the process, understanding 'how' to affect change as opposed to simply letting change affect us? Isn't the purpose to 'take control' as opposed to just reacting after the fact?"

Poly-Solipsism does tell us that. Within its concepts it tells us how to change our reality. It recognizes that each individual mind is entangled with all others, and to change our shared Reality we must change

the minds of all. It just does not tell us what to change that reality into.

I profoundly agree with you that "Understanding is not enough. It is what we do with understanding that is of significance."

You are correct, Poly-Solipsism is only a part of the answer, but it is the most important and fundamental part.

Poly-Solipsism provides the first essential part of the puzzle by telling us it is our entangled thoughts that create our shared Reality. If we do not comprehend this fundamental truth we are virtually powerless to effect any change.

Without near Universal acknowledgment we will continue to struggle against the twin demons of Ignorance and Intolerance. We will simply continue to wage war with ourselves and persist in persecuting and killing each other over differences in dogma.

Poly-Solipsism provides us with the tool to effect that change. Once its message is accepted, we can then proceed to decide on what we wish to change, and on what Universal Truths we all wish to embrace.

Poly-Solipsism does not provide these Truths, and it never can. It only tells us we have within ourselves the ability to change our Reality to what we wish it to be.

It only tells us we have the Choice to Choose.

Poly-Solipsism is confined to The Singularity and cannot enter into Universe. Anything we discuss from here on, is not Poly-Solipsism itself, but an adjunct to Poly-Solipsism, and on what Poly-Solipsism may have to say about it.

That is the reason I brought back your concept of the "Functionality of Nothingness." The concept of Nothingness is not a principle of Poly-Solipsism, but it does tell us a true "Nothingness" does not exist and has never existed.

**Dan:**

You stated: "Ok, my friend. I must agree when you say "Several times throughout history, people had believed science had done all it could to understand the physical. The job will most likely never be fully accomplished by us. No sooner do we begin to understand one level of the physical than we 'discover' another level of physical existence we had no idea existed.

Science: the study of the physical."

Fair enough. Than I shall leave the Study of the Physical to Physical Science, but I fully expect Theoretical Quantum Physicists, String Physicists and those who have an interest in the metaphysical source of our Universe to continue to explore where Physical Science cannot go. We have entered "the next level" of Science; the age of Metaphysical Science. It will be the metaphysical scientist that will be the vanguard for the physical scientist to follow."

Agreed.

You state:"(Why do we exists?)...I am asking the question as regards individuality itself. This is why poly-solipsism displays only a portion of the complete picture of reality as we are able to conceive of it presently."

Yes, you are correct. That is all Poly-Solipsism was ever meant to describe. Poly-Solipsism can only explain How our Reality is created, it was never intended to explain Why.

To enter into the question Why do we exist is to enter into the question Why does The Singularity exist?"

The two are entirely different. We can answer the one but not the other and there is a reason for this.

The Singularity is Infinite and Unbound. It has no beginning, no ending and no limits. It makes no sense to ask why it exists.

I agree it makes not sense to ask the 'why' for the singularity exists but such is not the case for the individual.

It is simply a 'nonsense question' as is: What is in nothing? Whatever answer you or I may make up, is just that; made up, and will not be relevant to anyone but you or I.

Everything is 'made up' but if the 'made up' answer is confirmable by what it is we can observe or measure (science), what is believable or what it is we believe (religion), and what is we are capable of supporting through reason or what it rational (philosophy) then it is probably closer to 'truth' than anything else we 'make up.'

"The same problem can be said in asking why there are individual minds or egos? I gave this question considerable thought after I traced all of existence back to the First Container: The Singularity. If we start out with "A" Singularity, how did we acquire our individual egos? It gave me some pause until I realized I was attempting to conceptualize The Infinite and Unbound Singularity as a finite spacetime object. There is no correlation between The Singularity and anything that exists within our perceptions of Universe. There is no finite object that exists within Spacetime that we can draw an analogy to image The Singularity."



Agreed, but we are capable of inferring what exists in the nonphysical by removing within our minds the physical completely and then examining what it is that remains. Husserl referred to this as a process of 'reductionism.'

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

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

Agreed, and that is why we cannot discard the concept that The Singularity is capable of generating what is not presently found within it, in essence 'growth.'

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

One of many infinite degrees of freedom of The Singularity.

"To understand this a little better lets consider our spacetime Universe. We say we have height, depth, width, and time. We call them Dimensions but this is a misnomer. There is only one Dimension; The Universe, but it has four degrees of freedom. Actually, the last time I checked, the Theorist tell us our Universe has 11 degrees of freedom, but we are only aware of the four. I would add consciousness to the list of fundamental properties of our Universe. We often overlook the very tool we use to study it with.

We can visualize the four degrees of freedom that we are aware of. We can form an image of them in our minds, but very few of us can even imagine the other seven degrees of freedom that form our physical Universe, yet alone the Infinite degrees of freedom of The Singularity. It just does not compute!

That is why I say we are not 'part' of The Singularity, and we are not 'in' The Singularity. We are the Infinite degrees of freedom of The Singularity. We are The Singularity."

To suggest it is just 'us' is to 'limit' The Singularity and such an action is no less than that generated by fundamentalistic religions. We must never forget that whatever model of reality we develop, it is still 'too small.' Why then build a model of reality at all? Because we are capable of doing so and only after we have done so can we move on and grow our model as we, as our specie, grows. In addition, it is the model of reality we develop that generates our understanding of morals and ethics.

"To ask why we exist is to ask why The Singularity exists. There is no answer."

Perhaps this is true of The Singularity in terms of what we are capable of comprehending but it certainly is not the case in terms of our ability to comprehend an answer to the question: Why does the individual

exist. To simply state 'there is no answer,' and then shut the door on the discussion is no less religious fanaticism than any other form of 'blind' religious actions of faith.

"Ok, you said: "We can understand our role in reality, our purpose for existing as 'elements' of individuality.

That is a whole different ball of wax. We have been talking at cross purposes. I have been discussing the Individual as the Mind/Ego of The Singularity. From this statement you are talking about the physical manifestation of the Individual within our illusion of Reality."

Correct.

"I have been restricting my discussion to The Singularity and Poly-Solipsism, it seems you have been discussing our role within Universe also. You are asking: Why is there a Universe, and Why are we here in this illusion of Universe?"

Correct.

"Ok. Lets see what we can come up with from that perspective.

First: Where are we?

We are in The Universe."

But where is the universe? You see, we are in the universe but we are also 'within' what it is the universe 'lies' within. It is like a sandwich and the universe is what lies between the two slices of bread. The bread is what is eternal, timeless.

"It makes no difference whether it is an illusion or not, because once we are within the Illusion we create, we cannot tell the difference. To our senses the Universe exists as real and tangible.

Second: What are we?

We perceive ourselves to be tangible organism possessing awareness and individuality."

No, we perceive our physical selves to be tangible which in turn provides our true essence, the ability to experience, awareness of the physical, and the capability to grow our very individuality.

"Third: Why are we?

We are here to live."

But why are we here to live? That is the question.

"When you said "The whole, the individual, and the universe exist. Simple, three universal truths." you really did mean "Universal" truths, as in: what exists within the physical Universe."

No, I mean 'truths' which exist within the physical universe AND 'truths' which exist between the myriad of universe which may exist outside our physical universe.

"Up until this point, what exists within Universe has not concerned me at all. And to tell the truth, it does not concern Poly-Solipsism all that much either."

Strange that it does not 'concern' you, after all you are within the physical universe so why wouldn't it 'concern' you?

"Poly-Solipsism is only concerned with the how. That is its only purpose. Once we get into the why, that is a whole different philosophical concept, and is not a part of Poly-Solipsism."

The 'How' is really just a quaint offshoot of the main question which has haunted man. The main question is 'Why?' Why do we exist? Why does the physical universe exist? The answers to the questions 'Why?' are what will lead us to understanding 'absolute' morality versus 'relative' morality, are what will finally put our minds at rest and give us peace.

It is my contention that the way we get to the answer 'why' is through the process used by Ecologists: First understand the ecosystem: Where are we? Second understand the individual organism: What are we? Third understand the function of the individual organism: Why do we exist? What follows is a natural emergence of what it takes to fulfill one's function: ala 'absolute' morality.

"I believe that is why you don't think Poly-Solipsism goes far enough and that it is only a piece of the puzzle. You are looking for a reason and a purpose, and Poly-Solipsism does not provide that answer. It was never meant to."

Then it does not go far enough. That's the point. Poly-solipsism is a piece of the puzzle. Poly-solipsism does not represent the completed puzzle. We must embrace the piece, no doubt, but it is the complete puzzle we must see to understand. It is not just one of the many pieces of the puzzle we must see.

"You said: "If a model cannot answer the question, it is not the complete model.

Isn't the purpose of philosophy, the purpose of finding universal truth the first step in understanding the process, understanding 'how' to affect change as opposed to simply letting change affect us? Isn't the

purpose to 'take control' as opposed to just reacting after the fact?"

You cannot truly 'take control' of what it is one is capable of controlling in one's environment, reality, until one understands the whole picture of reality. It is only then that one is capable of truly understanding.

"Poly-Solipsism does tell us that. Within its concepts it tells us how to change our reality. It recognizes that each individual mind is entangled with all others, and to change our shared Reality we must change the minds of all. It just does not tell us what to change that reality into."

True, but people won't buy into poly-solipsism on a massive scale unless they can understand how it is poly-solipsism fits into the whole picture of reality, in essence understand that poly-solipsism is 'truly' a piece of the puzzle.

"I profoundly agree with you that "Understanding is not enough. It is what we do with understanding that is of significance.

"You are correct, Poly-Solipsism is only a part of the answer, but it is the most important and fundamental part."

No, I don't agree, every part of the puzzle is equally important. There is no hierarchy in matters of 'truth'.

"Poly-Solipsism provides the first essential part of the puzzle by telling us it is our entangled thoughts that create our shared Reality. If we do not comprehend this fundamental truth we are virtually powerless to effect any change.

Without near Universal acknowledgment we will continue to struggle against the twin demons of Ignorance and Intolerance. We will simply continue to wage war with ourselves and persist in persecuting and killing each other over differences in dogma."

Correct. And therefore I will say it again: ... people won't buy into it on a massive scale unless they can understand how it is poly-solipsism fits into the whole picture of reality, in essence understand that poly-solipsism is 'truly' a piece of the puzzle.

"Poly-Solipsism provides us with the tool to effect that change. Once its message is accepted, we can then proceed to decide on what we wish to change, and on what Universal Truths we all wish to embrace."

Correct.

"Poly-Solipsism does not provide these Truths, and it never can. It only tells us we have within ourselves the ability to change our Reality to what we wish it to be."

That is why it is only a piece of the puzzle, a portion of the model of reality.

"It only tells us we have the Choice to Choose.

Poly-Solipsism is confined to The Singularity and cannot enter into Universe. Anything we discuss from here on, is not Poly-Solipsism itself, but an adjunct to Poly-Solipsism, and on what Poly-Solipsism may have to say about it."

I agree, so where do we proceed from here?

"That is the reason I brought back your concept of the "Functionality of Nothingness." The concept of Nothingness is not a principle of Poly-Solipsism, but it does tell us a true "Nothingness" does not exist and has never existed."

Again statements of negativity, denial, closing one's mind before the discussion has even begun. Nothingness not only exists in the passive form but exists in the active form, exists in the form of functionality.

### **Chuck:**

Hmm, in response to my statement:

"To enter into the question Why do we exist is to enter into the question Why does The Singularity exist?"

You replied; "The two are entirely different. We can answer the one but not the other and there is a reason for this. I agree it makes no sense to ask the 'why' the singularity exists but such is not the case for the individual."

You are suggesting a Dualistic existence for something that cannot be dualistic.

There could be no Singularity without the "I," and there could be no "I" without The Singularity.

Poly-Solipsism does contain the illusion of dualism because we can distinguish between what is 'T'; the mind that does the thinking, and what is an illusion of 'I,'; the thought the mind is thinking, but in essence there is no distinction between the mind and the illusion the mind contains. It is just the difference between the act of thinking and the thought itself, which cannot be separated from each other since each is created from the other.

You said:"Everything is 'made up,' but if the 'made up' answer is confirmable by what it is we can observe or measure (science), what is believable or what it is we believe (religion), and what is we are capable of supporting through reason or what it rational (philosophy) then it is probably closer to 'truth' than anything else we 'make up.' ...but we are capable of inferring what exists in the nonphysical by removing within our minds the physical completely and then examining what it is that remains. Husserl referred to this as a process of 'reductionism.'

I do agree that "everything is made up," but once we affirm this, then we must include "Everything"! That "Everything" must also include our own thoughts on "what exists in the nonphysical."

If we say reality is an illusion, then what becomes of any truth we perceive? What then is the definition of truth? And how can we know truth if we can not rely on any observations? We cannot say anything is confirmable by observation or rational reasoning because we are basing our observations and reasoning on an illusion. GIGO! Garbage In, Garbage Out!

If everything is an illusion and we cannot start with anything we consider to be true, then we cannot logically take from that and construct anything else that is true. If we start with a lie, and attempt to logically construct anything based on that lie, any conclusions we reach must then also be lies. We can never be certain the conclusions we have arrived at are true.

Observations are wholly in the mind of the observer, and we cannot confirm what one mind perceives is identical to what another mind may perceive.

Our Science and reasoning are based on "If this...Then this!." If given this, and it is true, than this must also be true. If we start with a lie, than all that follows will also be lies.

Both Buddhism and Quantum Theory are telling us our Reality is a lie; it is all an illusion. Once we accept this we then must also accept that Buddhism and Quantum Theory are also part of the illusion and therefore are also lies.

They both describe the Reality they are themselves a part of as an illusion. If they are part of Reality themselves, then they are also part of the illusion.

If all is illusion, then what becomes of Truth? By reductionist reasoning, if we reduce everything we perceive to be an illusion, then any truth we can perceive must also be an illusion.

The Science of Science is wholly based on Faith. A Belief in Science itself.

Without faith that Science is portraying a true description of Reality, Science itself is then rendered an Illusion., and the Reality it portends no more genuine. Once we accept that all is an illusion, then science becomes and illusion investigating an illusion. Any truth it may find will also be illusion.

Quantum Physics takes Reality and reduces that reality to an illusion, but then fails to recognize itself as part of that same illusion.

We are just as guilty of doing the same. We affirm that all is illusion, but then fail to recognize that we are part of the illusion ourselves, and everything we perceive must also be an illusion of our own mind.

We cannot say in one breath that Everything is an illusion, and in the next breath say what truth we perceive about it is not also an illusion.

If "Everything" is Illusion, then all truth is also an Illusion. Once we reduce everything to an illusion we must then admit to ourselves that any truth we ourselves perceive must also be an illusion that only exists in our own minds.

You suggested as much yourself when you said: "To suggest it is just 'us' is to 'limit' The Singularity and such an action is no less than that generated by fundamentalistic religions. We must never forget that whatever model of reality we develop, it is still 'too small.'..."

All Illusions are Infinite and Unbound, and any truth we can ascribe to an illusion attempts to place a limit on that which can have no limits.

We can perceive our own illusion, and we can perceive the truth we used to create our own illusion, but we cannot then limit all illusion by ascribing that truth to all infinite and unbound illusions. We can only know the bounds we have placed on our own.

No matter what Truth we perceive, "it is still too small"!

When I stated:"Up until this point, what exists within Universe has not concerned me at all. And to tell the truth, it does not concern Poly-Solipsism all that much either."

You replied: "Strange that it does not 'concern' you, after all you are within the physical universe so why wouldn't it 'concern' you?"

I think you missed my point. I do have my own personal philosophy concerning the What and the Why, but before we could discuss any of these we had to first determine the How. That is the purpose of Poly-Solipsism. Anything concerning the who, what, when, where and why that may exist within our reality is immaterial unless we can confirm How they exist.

The How of Reality infiltrates into all other answers.

When you said: "I mean 'truths' which exist within the physical universe AND 'truths' which exist between the myriad of universe which may exist outside our physical universe."

You are stating something that you perceive may be true in your personal universe, and then assigning your personal perceptions as being true in all other perceptions. What about those who do not perceive there is any other Universe but the one they exist in? What do you say to them?

You also stated; "It is my contention that the way we get to the answer 'why' is through the process used by Ecologists: First understand the ecosystem: Where are we? Second understand the individual organism: What are we? Third understand the function of the individual organism: Why do we exist? What follows is a natural emergence of what it takes to fulfill one's function: ala 'absolute' morality."

That is very good, so lets start with the ecosystem as being an illusion. If we start with an illusion, what becomes of all other 'pieces'? What becomes of the Where and the Why?

To understand what becomes of the Where and the Why once we know the How is an illusion, we must examine our concepts of Where and Why and see how these concepts are effected by the How.

Basically we can start just about anywhere with either concept of Where or How, but I believe if we are constructing a reality from an Illusion, then we should start from scratch; we should start with 'Nothing.' So once again I am bringing back your concept of the "Functionality of Nothingness" to begin the discussion.

You stated: " Nothingness not only exists in the passive form but exists in the active form, exists in the form of functionality."

Since in my mind I perceive The Singularity to be Infinite and Unbound, and therefore to have always existed, I am perplexed to understand your statement.

If The Singularity has always existed, how could there ever be a true Nothingness?

**Dan:**



Wow Chuck, where to begin? Again it seems we have so much to say over so little.

You say: 'You are suggesting a Dualistic existence for something that cannot be dualistic.'

Are you not being as dogmatic and closed as most religions which adamantly proclaim and then refuse to discuss the issue openly?

Then you say: 'There could be no Singularity without the "I," and there could be no "I" without The Singularity.'

Oh? And just who proclaims such a position? Could it perhaps be the Great One known as CC Keiser? Your modesty previously verbalized appears to be a sham. Why is that Chuck?

Then you say: 'Poly-Solipsism does contain the illusion of dualism because we can distinguish between what is 'T'; the mind that does the thinking, and what is an illusion of 'I,'; the thought the mind is thinking, but in essence there is no distinction between the mind and the illusion the mind contains. It is just the difference between the act of thinking and the thought itself, which cannot be separated from each other since each is created from the other.'

For one to create the other, does not necessarily nullify each existing as a discrete entity. Symbiotic relationships exist wherein each element is interdependent one upon the other but that does not mean the two are one in the same.

You then proceed to quote me as saying: You said:"Everything is 'made up,' but if the 'made up' answer is confirmable by what it is we can observe or measure (science), what is believable or what it is we believe (religion), and what is we are capable of supporting through reason or what it rational (philosophy) then it is probably closer to 'truth' than anything else we 'make up.' ...but we are capable of inferring what exists in the nonphysical by removing within our minds the physical completely and then examining what it is that remains. Husserl referred to this as a process of 'reductionism.'

To which you reply: 'I do agree that "everything is made up," but once we affirm this, then we must include "Everything"! That "Everything" must also include our own thoughts on "what exists in the nonphysical.

If we say reality is an illusion, then what becomes of any truth we perceive? What then is the definition of truth? And how can we know truth if we can not rely on any observations? We cannot say anything is confirmable by observation or rational reasoning because we are basing our observations and reasoning on an illusion. GIGO! Garbage In, Garbage Out!"

No, no, no, Chuck. To say that everything is 'made-up' does not mean it does not exist. Therefore to say that everything is 'made-up' it is not GIGO! Garbage In, Garbage Out! To say everything is 'made-up' does not mean truth does not exist for if one agrees that 'everything' is 'made-up' and if that is correct

then the statement is a 'truth'.

When I said 'everything was made-up' did not mean to imply that there is no truth. What I meant, when I said 'everything is made-up' is that we cannot 'know' anything we suggest is, as a matter of fact 'truth' and that is being perfectly honest. We don't even know for a 'fact' that you and I are interacting. The interaction could be a figment of some being's imagination.

Having said that, I then explained that by using our three means of perceiving reality - observation/measurability, reasoning/rationalizing, and faith/believability - we can define truth as best we are able. If the truths we state are confirmable by all three aspects of our perceiving reality then what I am saying is that such truths are more likely to actually be truths than ones supported by only two, one, or none of our perceptual tools.

You then say: "If everything is an illusion and we cannot start with anything we consider to be true, then we cannot logically take from that and construct anything else that is true. If we start with a lie, and attempt to logically construct anything based on that lie, any conclusions we reach must then also be lies."

True, and that is why our statements of truth become most acceptable as truths if they are confirmable by three of our perceptual tools as opposed to confirmable by none, or one, or for that matter only two of them.

Then you say: "We can never be certain the conclusions we have arrived at are true."

This is true in terms of absolute knowing, however, it is not true in terms of some statements appearing to be more true than others confirmed by reason, observation, and believability. In essence confirmed by all three of the means we use to perceive reality.

Then you say: "Observations are wholly in the mind of the observer, and we cannot confirm what one mind perceives is identical to what another mind may perceive."

In a sense that is true, however, we also know that in some form or another they are also shared and that is why we must confirm truth through using all three of the tools we use to perceive reality.

You say: "Our Science and reasoning are based on "If this...Then this!." If given this, and it is true, then this must also be true. If we start with a lie, then all that follows will also be lies."

Again true, however, this does not imply that everything we 'start with' is a 'lie'. Something's are truths or so it appears to the best of our ability to define such 'truths'.

Then you paraphrase Eastern religion: "Both Buddhism and Quantum Theory are telling us our Reality is a lie; it is all an illusion. Once we accept this we then must also accept that Buddhism and Quantum

Theory are also part of the illusion and therefore are also lies."

And so it is we fall into the trap of accepting a hypothesis when just one small segment of religion and one small segment of science appear to agree. Have we forgotten the tool of believability and the tool of rationality? I am not saying that Buddhism and Quantum Theory are incorrect but rather I am suggesting that they may be correct but they may also have the picture of reality slightly skewed.

Just because a segment of philosophy, religion, or science on their own proclaim this and that to be true while that and this are lies, does not make philosophy, religion, or science correct nor does it make it incorrect. It is when we explore truth based upon more than one tool of perception that we are more likely to discover just what truth is and what truth is not.

You go on to say: "They both describe the Reality they are themselves a part of as an illusion. If they are part of Reality themselves, then they are also part of the illusion.

If all is illusion, then what becomes of Truth? By reductionist reasoning, if we reduce everything we perceive to be an illusion, then any truth we can perceive must also be an illusion."

Correct and that is why it is not advantageous for us as individuals to cling to the concept that we are but an illusion. To hold such a view is self-defeating not only to ourselves as individuals but to ourselves as a specie. We either have free will or we don't. If we do not have free will and are meant to 'believe' we are an illusion then we will cling to the concept that we do not exist as a reality and are but an illusion. If on the other hand we have free will then we can choose which to believe: We exist or do not exist, which leads to if we are or are not significant, if we have a purpose or no purpose for existing, and what is moral and what is not moral, etc.

We have been making these decisions throughout history so what is different now? In the past we have answered the questions based upon one perceptual tool or another but never using all three simultaneously. Now we are on the verge of leaving our home, the planet earth. Now we are capable of destroying our entire specie. If we are to change our past history of global violence, to change our tendency to annihilate our own specie or wiping out entire cultures or species we encounter in space then we need to universally define ourselves. The means of universally defining ourselves is to come to a consensus as to what we are and why we exist. The process of answering such questions begins with understanding our reality, the whole of our reality not just the physical aspect of reality should there in fact be more to reality than the physical. The tools we use to initiate the process of defining ourselves are our three means of understanding reality namely: reason, observation, and believability. We cannot pick and choose which perceptual tools. To be universal in nature we have no choice but to use all three tools.

You say: "The Science of Science is wholly based on Faith. A Belief in Science itself."

No, science is based upon observation and measurably which in turn is what is accepted through Faith,

accepted through a Belief in Science Itself.

Then you say: "Without faith that Science is portraying a true description of Reality, Science itself is then rendered an Illusion., and the Reality it portends no more genuine.

Once we accept that all is an illusion, then science becomes and illusion investigating an illusion. Any truth it may find will also be illusion."

Again, no, for just because we, humans, perceive it to be so does not make it so.

You proceed and say: "Quantum Physics takes the illusion of Reality and reduces that reality to an illusion, but then fails to recognize itself as part of that same illusion."

Hmmmm, what can I say.

You continue to describe the problems with 'illusion': "We are just as guilty of doing the same. We affirm that all is illusion, but then fail to recognize that we are part of the illusion ourselves, and everything we perceive must also be an illusion of our own mind.

We cannot say in one breath that Everything is an illusion, and in the next breath say what truth we perceive about it is not also an illusion.

If "Everything" is Illusion, then all truth is also an Illusion. Once we reduce everything to an illusion we must then admit to ourselves that any truth we ourselves perceive must also be an illusion that only exists in our own minds.

You suggested as much yourself when you said: "To suggest it is just 'us' is to 'limit' The Singularity and such an action is no less than that generated by fundamentalistic religions."

But I am not suggesting the physical is an illusion, you are. I am not suggesting The Singularity is the only truth, you are. I am not suggesting the individual does not exist, you are.

Regarding reality, you say: "We must never forget that whatever model of reality we develop, it is still 'too small.'..."

It is not myself that is placing limits, you are. I am suggesting physical reality is limited by it's infinite (unlimited) expanse of both space and time. I am suggesting that what lies beyond the physical is infinite and Unbounded but by what parameters I do not know. As we expand our knowledge base we may, may I say, possibly expand our understanding of the reality beyond the physical. If such turns out to be the case, then at that point we will have to admit: Yes our previous perception of reality was too small. Admitting that our present perception of reality is 'too small' is what we are unwilling to do presently at our present point of historical development and thus emerges a consensus regarding humanity's

understanding of an existence 'beyond the physical'.

You then expand upon your ideas by saying: "All Illusions are Infinite and Unbound, and any truth we can ascribe to an illusion attempts to place a limit on that which can have no limits."

Perhaps, I do not know at this point nor do I have the wherewithal to understand all The Singularity's limits or limitlessness. What I do believe to be reasonable, supported by science, and believable, again supported by science, and observable, again supported by science, is that if the physical universe is limited by the infiniteness of space and time that such limits do not apply to what lies beyond the physical for such an existence, and existence void a universal fabric of space and time, is not limited by space and time.

You speak of 'illusion's: "We can perceive our own illusion, and we can perceive the truth we used to create our own illusion, but we cannot then limit all illusion by ascribing that truth to all infinite and unbound illusions. We can only know the bounds we have placed on our own."

We cannot equate everything including all our perceptions and all our conceptual concepts to be illusions or we speak of nothing but GIGO as you say.

You then say: "No matter what Truth we perceive, "it is still too small"!"

There are truths which do not embrace 'size' and thus not restricted by physical existence.

You go on to limit the discussion and I am appreciative of that. You say: "I think you missed my point. I do have my own personal philosophy concerning the What and the Why, but before we could discuss any of these we had to first determine the How. That is the purpose of Poly-Solipsism. Anything concerning the who, what, when, where and why that may exist within our reality is immaterial unless we can confirm How they exist.

The How of Reality infiltrates into all other answers."

Here we disagree. I would suggest that we cannot understand the answer to the questions regarding what and why until we understand the where. We need to see the whole model of reality to understand the dynamics of system.

When you said: "I mean 'truths' which exist within the physical universe AND 'truths' which exist between the myriad of universe which may exist outside our physical universe."

You are stating something that you perceive may be true in your personal universe, and then assigning your personal perceptions as being true in all other perceptions. What about those who do not perceive there is any other Universe but the one they exist in? What do you say to them?"

I say: Let's examine the core perceptions of science, philosophy, and religion to establish which 'truths' are most widely held by all three for the three are the basic perceptual tools available to us as a 'knowing' specie. We can define a consensus as being positions all three have in common. To arrive at such a consensus we will have no choice but to do the best we can to allow each to retain its own vocabulary, since doing otherwise would most probably invoke a turf war we cannot overcome. The vocabulary can, however, with effort and co-operation be equated one to the other.

You proceed with: You also stated; "It is my contention that the way we get to the answer 'why' is through the process used by Ecologists: First understand the ecosystem: Where are we? Second understand the individual organism: What are we? Third understand the function of the individual organism: Why do we exist? What follows is a natural emergence of what it takes to fulfill one's function: ala 'absolute' morality."

That is very good, so lets start with the ecosystem as being an illusion. If we start with an illusion, what becomes of all other 'pieces'? What becomes of the Where and the Why?"

I am unable to concede there is any illusion in the sense that 'somethings' do not exist. Everything exists or we wouldn't be speaking of those very things. Now it may be true that vampires do not exist in the sense that we think of them existing but one cannot deny that they do exist at the very least in one's mind or in one's imagination.

That is why I begin with three basic truths: The Singularity/the whole exists. The individual exists. The physical universe exists. But here to we have not truly come to a consensus within our specie let alone between you and I.

You suggest: "To understand what becomes of the Where and the Why once we know the How is an illusion, we must examine our concepts of Where and Why and see how these concepts are effected by the How.

Basically we can start just about anywhere with either concept of Where or How, but I believe if we are constructing a reality from an Illusion, then we should start from scratch; we should start with from 'Nothing.' So once again I am bringing back your concept of the "Functionality of Nothingness" to begin the discussion."

I am open to such a beginning but it still ignores what I would suggest is the most metaphysically friendly question: Where are we? (And no the final answer to the question is not: We are in the physical universe.) Act IV, however is not about the 'where'. We have tried to attack the problem from the 'where' standpoint and failed.

We may be failing to resolve the problem from the 'what' aspect as the name of Act IV suggests. But perhaps it will help to take look at the least of what it is that exists.

You end by saying: You stated: " Nothingness not only exists in the passive form but exists in the active form, exists in the form of functionality."

Since in my mind I perceive The Singularity to be Infinite and Unbound, and therefore to have always existed, I am perplexed to understand your statement.

If The Singularity has always existed, how could there ever be a true Nothingness?"

Great Question Chuck, so let's end our discussion there and begin our new emphasis with your question.

## **Act IV: What are we?**

### **Scene III: What Is Nothingness?**

#### **Characters: Dan and Chuck**

**Center Stage: Dan and Chuck are in their overstuffed worn leather chairs. Off to the side a fire's embers are fading fast. A round rug, void the dog, lies between the two**

**Outside is a dark moonless winter's night. The snow is piled high. In the darkness, faint shadows of deciduous trees and pine trees can be seen laden down with blankets of snow A soft spotlight shines upon an old dog far in the distance, backside hunched over, defecating in the snow.**

**The spotlight fades out as the embers of the fire slowly die, leaving the scene in total darkness except for the light provided by the starlit night.**

#### **Chuck:**

You stated: " Nothingness not only exists in the passive form but exists in the active form, exists in the form of functionality."

Since in my mind I perceive The Singularity to be Infinite and Unbound, and therefore to have always existed, I am perplexed to understand your statement.

If The Singularity has always existed, how could there ever be a true Nothingness?

#### **Dan:**

Again the question: How?

Before I answer I would like to ask a question or two. Do you perceive the existence of nothingness to be an impossibility?

**Chuck:**

Yes.

Nothingness is the definition of non-existence.

**Dan:**

So you are saying that non-existence cannot exist in and of itself? Are you so sure of yourself that you are closed to discussing the concept of nothingness both existing and having functionality?

**Chuck:**

Yes I am saying non-existence cannot exist in and of itself; not without changing the definition. But I am not closed to a discussion, in fact I would love to hear what you have to say. I have been waiting since Act II, to hear all about Nothing!

I am always open to new ideas, I am just stating what I believe, but I am not beyond being convinced otherwise.

So my friend, convince me otherwise!

**Dan:**

I agree with you that 'nothingness' is defined as non-existence. Such a definition, rather than suggesting 'nothingness' does not exist, suggests 'nothingness' is in fact non-existence in and of itself.

But what does 'non-existence' in and of itself imply? To suggest that non-existence, 'nothingness' in and of itself exists is to suggest that non-existence in and of itself, 'nothingness' is the existence of the lack of all, is the void of all, is the purest form of a 'void'.

Are we ok with this so far?

**Chuck:**

To avoid confusion, I would avoid the use of "Void"!



A Void is a hole in something. For there to be a void something must exist for there to be a hole in it. With a true "Nothingness," there is no room for even a hole!

I would also rephrase your statement to read: "To suggest that non-existence; 'nothingness' in and of itself exists, is to suggest *there is* non-existence in and of itself, 'nothingness' is the *Non*-existence of all, *it is a state of existence devoid* of all."

I believe it is less confusing when stated this way.

If I understand you correctly, what you are saying is: The absence of all things, is the state of nonexistence. Or in mathematical jargon; the "Null Set."

So mathematically speaking, if we take away everything and we are left with Nothing, then we are left with the state of "Nothingness." The Null Set represents Nothingness, or the existence of Nothing.

A state of Nothingness thus implies that Nothingness exists.

Am I correct in my assumption this is what you were implying?

**Dan:**

Chuck, you say it so much better than I, and yes you are correct, that is what I am saying.

**Chuck:**

Thank you Dan, but I have had some practice discussing Nothing with Mathematicians, so your statement was not completely unexpected.

Is absolute Silence a Sound?

If the absence of all things can exist as Nothingness, then the absence of all reverberations can exist as Sound.

Can we say when there is no Sound that it exists as a state of Silence? Only poetically. And Nothingness can only exist poetically as a mathematical concept.

Remember, "the map is not the territory."

But whether Nothingness can exist or not is a moot point if there never was a true Nothingness. Which is actually The Point.

Which brings me back to my previous question: If The Singularity always existed, how could there ever be a true nothingness?

**Dan:**

First of all, Chuck, other than the first and last paragraphs, everything you just said, although it may be interesting, is a lot of bunk, GIGO, and has nothing to do with the subject at hand. It is your last questions however, which does deserve some discussion.

You ask: *If The Singularity always existed, how could there ever be a true nothingness?*

Regarding your question, you assume that I agree that The Singularity always existed. I don't know if such a position will always hold but I do agree, based upon what we can presently conjecture (based upon what is believable, measurable, and rational) about The Singularity, that The Singularity has always existed (Voluminous details supporting such a theory can be found on my web site at panentheism.com)

To say The Singularity arose from nothingness (In essence, for The Singularity to have emerged from nothingness.) makes as much sense as the old scientific theory regarding maggots appearing out of thin air - 'spontaneous generation'.

For this reason, as well as for the Ontological argument that The Singularity is unbounded and limitless, for nothingness to exist, it would appear necessary for nothingness to be found 'within' The Singularity Itself as opposed to nothingness existing 'beyond' The Singularity

Would you agree?

**Chuck:**

You are correct, I did assume you agreed The Singularity has always existed. Since I find it an inescapable conclusion, I assumed you did as well. I am happy to see you agree.

But are we talking about the same meaning of Nothingness?

Perhaps we need to agree on the definition before we proceed?

Webster defines Nothing (pron) as not any thing : No Thing.

Nothing (adv) as : not at all

Nothing (n) as: a: something that does not exist. ( I have a bone to pick with this one! If it does not exist

it cannot be a 'something.!) b: the absence of all magnitude or quantity.

Webster than goes on to define Nothingness as : the quality or state of being nothing: nonexistence. 3: a : Void : Emptiness, and b; a metaphysical entity opposed to and devoid of being and regarded by some existentialists as the ground of anxiety.

I found that last definition interesting and I am assuming the use of "anxiety" here is not the same anxiety of common usage. It's a good word though and I appreciate its connotations.

It would seem there are two different concepts contained in these definitions.

There is the No-Thing concept of No physical Thing, and the concept of absolute Nothing or Nothingness, which would also exclude all the metaphysical.

To avoid confusion I have taken to using no-thing when speaking of the absence of the physical composed of  $e=mc^2$  type of energy, but which still leaves the metaphysical. If we removed all matter and energy from the physical Universe and removed space itself, we would have no-thing, but not a true Nothingness; there would still be the metaphysical Singularity.

When I speak of a true Nothingness I mean even the absence of the metaphysical and The Singularity. Since The Singularity has always existed there could never be a state of true Nothingness.

That is why I maintain we can say we have No-thing; which means we do not have any quantity of something, but we cannot have Nothing. We cannot have what does not exist.

So when you state "...for nothingness to exist, it would appear necessary for nothingness to be found 'within' The Singularity Itself as opposed to nothingness existing 'beyond' The Singularity." I take it you mean a 'void' of the physical existing within The Singularity, and not a region or zone within The Singularity that is void of The Singularity itself.

I agree with the former, but not the latter. There is no-thing( no physical thing) within The Singularity, but there cannot be any "place" that is void The Singularity.

If this is what you mean, then I can agree. If this is not what you intended to say, then we need a more fundamental discussion on our concepts of The Singularity.

**Dan:**

Your initial reiteration of what nothingness is, expressed my perception of nothingness exactly but then you went and threw the discussion into complete chaos by adding your personal definition of nothingness into the discussion. We cannot discuss basic metaphysics if you continually interject your personal definitions of language into the discussion. Therefore let's stick with Webster's definition of

'nothing'.

Nothing:

'Webster defines Nothing (pron) as not any thing : No Thing.

Nothing (adv) as : not at all

Nothing (n) as: a: something that does not exist. ( I have a bone to pick with this one! If it does not exist it cannot be a 'something.!) b: the absence of all magnitude or quantity.

Webster than goes on to define Nothingness as : the quality or state of being nothing: nonexistence. 3: a : Void : Emptiness, and b; a metaphysical entity opposed to and devoid of being and regarded by some existentialists as the ground of anxiety'.

You then proceeded to say: I found that last definition interesting and I am assuming the use of "anxiety: here is not the same anxiety of common usage. It's a good word though and I appreciate it connotations.

You assume incorrectly. The word 'anxiety' is used in the common usage form. If you wish to understand the concept of nothingness and the anxiety it generates amongst existentialists in detail you might read the book: Zero: The Biography of a Dangerous Idea by Charles Seife.

You then say: It would seem there are two different concepts contained in these definitions.

There is the No-Thing concept of No physical Thing, and the concept of absolute Nothing or Nothingness, which would also exclude all the metaphysical.

You are making assumptions here that you should not be making. There is only one definition of nothing and it is more than adequately defined by Webster. I grant you that as humans some of us are phenomenologist and some of us are existentialists and as such may define nothing in slightly different manners according to our perception of what exists but when one gets to the heart of it, nothing is just that nothing, the void of all.

Then you say: To avoid confusion I have taken to using no-thing when speaking of the absence of the physical composed of  $e=mc^2$  type of energy, but which still leaves the metaphysical.

Here is where you went wrong. Nothing is the void of all including the metaphysical.

You proceed along the same line by then stating: If we removed all matter and energy from the physical Universe and removed space itself, we would have no-thing, but not a true Nothingness; there would still be the metaphysical Singularity.

You are correct so when we speak of nothing, speak of the void of all, we will be speaking of the void of the metaphysical also.

Then you say: When I speak of a true Nothingness I mean even the absence of the metaphysical and The Singularity. Since The Singularity has always existed there could never be a state of true Nothingness.

Here you are placing your personal limits upon The All, placing your personal limits upon The Singularity. Why do you do this Chuck? Placing limits upon The All, placing limits upon The Singularity is what religions do. Are you trying to make poly-solipsism a religion?

You say: That is why I maintain we can say we have No-thing; which means we do not have any quantity of something, but we cannot have Nothing. We cannot have what does not exist.

I will grant you that 'we', that you and I, that individuals, probably cannot 'have Nothing' although there are some groups who attempt to attain this state.

You then make a false assumption when you state: So when you state "...for nothingness to exist, it would appear necessary for nothingness to be found 'within' The Singularity Itself as opposed to nothingness existing 'beyond' The Singularity." I take it you mean a 'void' of the physical existing within The Singularity, and not a region or zone within The Singularity that is void of The Singularity itself.

First of all there are no 'regions' within The Singularity as we perceive of physical regions since time and space are most probably not innate characteristics of The Singularity, are not part of the 'universal fabric' of The Singularity. (See The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception found in the library of my site: panentheism.com

And yes I mean just that: nothing: a region (both metaphysically and physically speaking) or zone (both metaphysically and physically speaking) within The Singularity that is void of The Singularity itself.

You then create a religion by stating: I agree with the former, but not the latter. There is no-thing( no physical thing) within The Singularity, but there cannot be any "place" that is void The Singularity.

Webster defines religion as: religion: supernatural constraint, sanction, religious practice, 2: a **personal set** or institutionalized system of religious attitudes, beliefs, and practices.

I cannot argue against your personal beliefs or any constraints you place upon The Singularity. To do so pits reason against belief. If you 'believe' 'there cannot be any 'place' (physically and/or metaphysically) that is void The Singularity then you believe it. Your personal perception is your personal perception and cannot be denied. For me to argue you do not have such a perception is ludicrous but that being said, I still can question your reasoning for such a 'belief'.

I do not understand the reasoning which basically states The Singularity is unbounded and all knowing yet suggests that we, humans, can conceive of 'nothing', conceive of the void and then we as humans can extensively apply/use the concepts as a fundamental element of our mathematical (abstractual/metaphysical/intangible) thinking and then we, humans, turn around and deny such an ability to The Singularity, to The All.

You then say: If this is what you mean, then I can agree. If this is not what you intended to say, then we need a more fundamental discussion on our concepts of The Singularity.

I grant you we will need to examine the functionality of nothing, of the void, as it may relate to The Singularity Itself but I don't understand why we need a more fundamental discussion on our concepts of The Singularity. Such a discussion would seem to take us off task from our examination of nothing but if that would help you so be it, ask your questions.

### **Chuck:**

The problem with using Webster's is not all definitions also take into account philosophical concepts. What is a "Thing"? Generally speaking a Thing is an object, something that is 'real' in a physical Reality. A Thing is tangible and composed of matter and energy. Since the metaphysical is neither, can it be termed a 'thing'? If not, how do we address the metaphysical? So when we talk of "Nothing" do we mean 'No physical Thing,' or do we mean a true Nothing devoid of even the metaphysical?

To prevent future confusion can we agree to these definitions and usage?

No-Thing( hyphenated ) : No physical thing.

Nothing and Nothingness: The absence of all, both physical and metaphysical.

I know you can appreciate the nuance between the two.

First you state: "First of all, there are no 'regions' within The Singularity as we perceive of physical regions since time and space are most probably not innate characteristics of The Singularity, are not part of the 'universal fabric' of The Singularity."

Which I totally agree with and is also my perception, but then you also state: "And yes I mean just that: nothing: a region (both metaphysically and physically speaking) or zone (both metaphysically and physically speaking) within The Singularity that is void of The Singularity itself."

We can not have it both ways. You cannot state there are no regions, and then state "...nothing: a region (both metaphysically and physically speaking) or zone (both metaphysically and physically speaking) within The Singularity that is void of The Singularity itself."

Where I stated: When I speak of a true Nothingness I mean even the absence of the metaphysical and The Singularity. Since The Singularity has always existed there could never be a state of true Nothingness.

You came back with: "Here you are placing your personal limits upon The All, placing your personal limits upon The Singularity."

How am I "placing limits upon The All"? If The Metaphysical Singularity has always existed, there can never have been a time when there was a true Nothingness. We cannot have The Singularity and have a true Nothingness. I will attempt to logically explain why this is so, and why I maintain it cannot be denied.

And later you state:

"I cannot argue against your personal beliefs or any constraints you place upon The Singularity. To do so pits reason against belief. If you 'believe' 'there cannot be any 'place' (physically and/or metaphysically) that is void The Singularity then you believe it. Your personal perception is your personal perception and cannot be denied. For me to argue you do not have such a perception is ludicrous but that being said, I still can question your reasoning for such a 'belief'"

I do not understand the reasoning which basically states The Singularity is unbounded and all knowing yet suggests that we, humans, can conceive of 'nothing', conceive of the void and then we as humans can extensively apply/use the concepts as a fundamental element of our mathematical (abstractual/metaphysical/intangible) thinking and then we, humans, turn around and deny such an ability to The Singularity, to The All."

I can state the same for your personal beliefs and your perception of the Nothingness existing. To me the existence of Nothingness pits belief against reason.

Poly-Solipsism tells us that within our own universe what ever we wish to believe in becomes our reality, and any reality is just as good as any other. The same can be said for the fundamental truth of The Singularity itself. The Singularity is Infinite and Unbound. What ever truth we wish to write to it will always be "to small" with infinite room left over to write more.

This is why I stated we need a more fundamental discussion on our concepts of The Singularity. Since we are here attempting to reach agreements; let us see if we can reach an agreement on The Singularity.

Throughout our discussion the discord between us has all been over our perceptions of The Singularity. Because we perceive it differently we tend to perceive everything that emanates from The Singularity differently.

When you said there was Voluminous details supporting such a theory on your web site you were not

kidding! I have spent hours trying to ferret out those details, but unfortunately was not very successful. So if you are agreeable, I would like to start at the very beginning and describe the logic path I took that led me to reduce all existence to The Singularity, and then finish by describing how this path effects how I perceive what The Singularity is. You can then critique each step in my logic chain.

I think in this way we can reach a common understanding, or at least understand each others different point of view.

**Dan:**

By jove, Chuck, I think we have come to a consensus. I agree with your definition of no-thing, nothing, and nothingness completely. As such we can now answer not only the question: What is nothingness? But we can answer the questions: What is nothing? And What is no-thing?

Nothing and Nothingness can both be defined as: The absence of all, both physical and metaphysical.

No-Thing( hyphenated ) can be defined as: No physical thing.

The process of coming to a consensus regarding the question: What is nothingness? Was much easier than I thought it would be. In fact, you might say there was "nothing to it!"

Having come to a complete consensus regarding no-thing, nothing, and nothingness lets proceed with your suggestion and discuss the question: What is The Singularity?

I hope I did not offend you by stating that your position was religious in nature. Therefore as a sidebar I thought it might help if I addressed just a few of the multiple issues you brought up in your last communication.

Regarding religious beliefs/convictions: There is nothing wrong with having religious convictions. I pointed out that your position regarding nothingness was religious in nature as defined not by me but rather as defined by Webster:

religion: supernatural constraint, sanction, religious practice, 2: a **personal set** or institutionalized system of religious attitudes, beliefs, and practices.

You then responded with:"Here you are placing your personal limits upon The All, placing your personal limits upon The Singularity. How am I "placing limits upon The All"?"

You are limiting The All to what it is minus the potential of an existence of nothingness contained within The All. That is a limit and you are adamant about such a position. The stand you take is



Supernatural, a constraint, a sanction, a personal set of 'religious' attitudes (you appear to be unbending to this), beliefs (you place the constraint), and practices (your writings)

Then you say: "If The Metaphysical Singularity has always existed, there can never have been a time when there was a true Nothingness."

That is not a fact, this is your opinion. Just because you cannot conceive of the concept of nothingness existing within The All does not mean nothingness cannot exist within The All, yet you state it as an absolute supported by neither science, philosophy, or religion.

Then you say: We cannot have The Singularity and have a true Nothingness. I will attempt to logically explain why this is so, and why I maintain it cannot be denied.

You can do so in Act IV Scene IV: What is The Singularity?

Then you go on to say:

"I can state the same for your personal beliefs and your perception of the Nothingness existing. To me the existence of Nothingness pits belief against reason."

My stating that nothingness could exist with The All is not my personal belief and that is the difference. If I had said The All is The All but does not do this or does not do that, does not contain this concept or does not contain that concept, is metaphysically void this or metaphysically void that, then I would be placing a form of 'limit' on The All. Since my position did not limit The All, my position was not a 'constraint', as Webster suggests formulates a religion.

Now you must understand that I am not denying the possibility that nothingness does not exist but neither am I adamantly stating that nothingness does exist. What I am suggesting is that nothingness can be discussed rationally as existing in terms of religion/faith, science/observation, and philosophy/reason whereas the non-existence of nothingness cannot be discussed rationally in terms of religion/faith, science/observation, and philosophy/reason.

The point is: My statements regarding the existence of nothingness do not place constraints upon The All and thus are not religious in nature as defined by Webster and that is what distinguishes religion from non-religious/Ontological discourses.

**Chuck:**

No Dan, you did not offend me in the least. Being 'offended' by statements or words is not a luxury I allow myself, it leads us astray from the subject of concern. I try to ignore perceived slights and attempt to stay focused on what is really significant.

You called it a 'personal set of beliefs' which cannot be supported by facts or logic. My reply is an attempt to supply that logic, thus removing it from a personal belief.

**Act IV: What are we?**

**Scene IV: What Is The Singularity?**

**Characters: Dan and Chuck**

**Center Stage: Dan, Chuck and the dog are shrouded in glow of pure white light. There appear to be multiple shadows of less intense light floating about. A shadowy path meanders through silhouettes of trees and along the faint outline of a stream**

**The dog romps gleefully as Chuck and Dan amble down the shadowy path. Chuck, like Dan, is dressed in all white.**

**Chuck:**

So what is The Singularity, and how do we know it exists?

We first start with the only thing we can be certain of: We Exist!

In order for anything at all to exist, 'something' must have always existed. The reason is we cannot have a true Nothingness that evolves into Somethingness unless there is a 'something' to disturb Nothingness into evolving. A true Nothingness would be completely satisfied, and being devoid of any and all properties is completely beyond entropy or perturbation ( anxiety ).

The Null Set is the most stable of all probabilities.

Since we know we exist, logically it must follow, the Null Set; Nothingness cannot have ever been the state. We cannot get 'something' from 'nothing' because there is no-thing in nothing to begin with, and thus there is no-thing to evolve into 'something.'

For anything at all to exist, 'something' must have always existed!

But what is that "Something"?

Since we exist, Where do we exist, or What do we exist in?

We can start by saying we exist on this planet, in this solar system, this galaxy, and in this Universe.

But what does the Universe exist in?

No matter what your Religion or Belief is, sooner or latter you must arrive at the First Container that contains everything else, but is not itself contained in anything.

If the First Container is not 'contained,' it has no boundaries. No Boundaries means not only is it Unbound, but it has no beginning and no ending. Therefore, it must be Infinite, Unbound, and Eternal. If it is Infinite, Unbound and Eternal, it must be a Singularity.

But not just 'a' singularity, it must be The Singularity. Since it is Infinite there can not be any other singularities. The Singularity must be Singular in its existence. All other so called singularities are only anomalies that exist within The Singularity.

An Infinite Unbound and Eternal Singularity must then be the answer to First Cause, and because The Singularity is 'Something' it answers the Fundamental Question why is there 'Something' and not 'Nothing'! Because if Nothingness had ever been the case, by its very unnature, Nothingness would always be the case.

I must point out the absence of  $e=mc^2$  energy that makes up our Universe is not 'Nothingness.' Quantum Physics tells us all our energy emanates from the UnReality of the Quantum Universe. So if all our  $e=mc^2$  energy reverted back into metaphysical quantum energy, there would be 'No-Physical-Thing' in our Universe, but it would not be absolute Nothingness. There would still be The Singularity.

But now we run into a slight problem. An Infinite, Unbound, and Eternal Singularity is an Infinity. An Infinity cannot 'exist' as an "Is"! It has no beginning and no ending, and it is unbound, therefore it does not, and cannot exist as a complete Whole. It is condemned to an eternal state of Potential existence.

It is this Potential existence that give us a clue as to the fundamental properties of what The Singularity is. It is Potential, and Potential is a yet to be realized Reality.

But where does this Potential come from?

All we can know about The Singularity is what we perceive to be "in it," but because it is a Singularity, no-thing can be "in" it, all things must be woven from it. There cannot be anything that is not The Singularity, so Everything 'is' The Singularity.

Since the only thing we can be certain of is We Exist, then We do not exist in The Singularity, we are not a part of The Singularity. We are The Singularity.

And since we exist as The Singularity anything we can ascribe to ourselves must by default be an attribute of The Singularity.

The only thing we know for certain is we Think; we are conscious. Consciousness must then be an attribute of The Singularity.

This is where Occam's Razor comes into play.

If we do not try to complicate anything more than necessary, and avoid making unnecessary assumptions, then We Exist and Consciousness as The Singularity are all that is necessary. Anything we attempt to add is only an unnecessary complication. The Singularity is composed of Consciousness, and We are the Consciousness of The Singularity.

And what is Consciousness?

Consciousness is Mind, it is Thinking, it is Thought itself; which metaphysically fulfills the quality of Infinite and Unbound Potential.

Thoughts are infinite and unbound, and portends what is yet to be.

So what then becomes of Reality and Nothingness within The Singularity of Consciousness?

First of all, as you have also stated, there are no regions within The Singularity. The Singularity is consciousness and does not exist as an object in our four dimensional Universe. It is purely metaphysical and devoid of spacetime dimensions or degrees of freedom. It has no height, width, or depth as we would envision a finite object to have. Being pure metaphysical The Singularity does not even exist as a 'point existence' which would require it to have a substance to be a point in a physical Reality. Metaphysically it is no more tangible, and has no more physical dimensions, or degrees of freedom than a Thought.

Within our thoughts we can envision a four 'dimensional' object such as a box. We can envision a cardboard box 3 feet long, two feet high, and one foot wide. If we give it a lid we can envision the dimension of time by opening and closing that lid. We can envision volume, by placing 'objects' into it.

That box now exists as a four dimensional object in a zero physical dimensional illusion. That box exists in our thoughts, which have infinite degrees of metaphysical freedom, but does not actually exist in four spacetime dimensions. Those spacetime dimensions are part of the manifestation, and do not actually exist. They exist in our Thoughts only.

Now let us completely eradicate the box from our minds so that it no longer exists. In fact let us cleanse our minds of everything. What is left is No-Thing, but not Nothing. We can envision a state of Nothingness, but that concept of Nothingness can only exist as a concept in our thoughts; our thoughts still exist.

Since The Singularity is infinite and unbound there are no boundaries outside. It is not an object with physical dimensions so there are no areas or zones to border off and create a boundary between itself and a void of Nothingness, so it cannot have boundaries inside.

In order for there to be a true Nothingness there can be no Thought, or consciousness to carry that thought, and if there is no consciousness, there is no Singularity.

In the First Act I stated "The Void that I see exists in the only place it can exist: in the deepest recesses of the mind. ...In my philosophy Nothingness cannot exist and therefore there is no place for me to go 'into.' Once everything else is gone, what is left is only the Mind, and the Mind cannot exist in "Nothingness.""

**Dan:**

Chuck, In terms of The Singularity, I agree with everything 'positive' you have stated and nothing

'negative' you have said.

You say: In my philosophy Nothingness cannot exist and therefore there is no place for me to go 'into.'

When you state that Nothingness has no place for you. I'm cool with that and respect your perceptions as being your perceptions. The operative word here, however, is 'my' and I can accept your lack of understanding nothingness as being a personal limit 'you' are incapable of overcoming,

Blanket statements regarding The Singularity which limit The Singularity run rampant throughout discussion of nothingness. Your deep desire to constrain The Singularity are clearly demonstrated by your profuse use of negativity terms, negative concepts, and negative statements. Statements such as:

It is purely metaphysical and devoid of spacetime dimensions or degrees of freedom.

It has no height, width, or depth as we would envision a finite object to have. Being pure metaphysical

The Singularity does not even exist as a 'point existence'

Metaphysically it is no more tangible, and has no more physical dimensions, or degrees of freedom than a Thought.

Those spacetime dimensions are part of the manifestation, and do not actually exist. They exist in our Thoughts only.

We can envision a state of Nothingness, but that concept of Nothingness can only exist as a concept in our thoughts; our thoughts still exist.

Since The Singularity is infinite and unbound there are no boundaries outside.

It is not an object with physical dimensions so there are no areas or zones to border off and create a boundary between itself and a void of Nothingness, so it cannot have boundaries inside.

In order for there to be a true Nothingness there can be no Thought, or consciousness to carry that thought, and if there is no consciousness, there is no Singularity."

I must ask you why it is you place such restraints upon The Singularity when you profess to be 'open' to a discourse regarding The Singularity.

The initial question was: What is The Singularity? I must say you express your and my thoughts regarding the question eloquently but then you proceed to add personal limits, personal constraints, you 'believe' to be true regarding The Singularity.

This is exactly where religions took their most dramatic errors in their rush to define The All, The Singularity, God if you will. It was these errors which lead religions along the paths of violence of one individual against the other, the denigration of diversity if human individuality found within this amazing specie we call Homo sapiens. Religions stated: God will not allow ..., God cannot contain..., God will not embrace the ..., ad nauseam.

So again I say: In terms of The Singularity, I agree with everything 'positive' you have stated and nothing 'negative' you have said.

So where do we go from here Chuck? It appears we can go nowhere because you have closed your mind to further discussions since, as you yourself state: '*In my (Chuck's) philosophy .....* '

### **Chuck:**

Sorry Dan, your response is insufficient.

Under normal circumstances I would allow such a reply to pass, and move on to more fertile territory, but I am holding you to a higher standard than normal.

We attempted this dialog because I requested your assistance to exposition Poly-Solipsism. I came to you because not only were you already intimately familiar with the philosophy entailed in Poly-Solipsism, but you also hold a different point of view. Informed criticism, rather than blind opposition, is what I envisioned as the best instrument to illustrate the concepts contained in Poly-Solipsism. With your intimate knowledge of philosophical concepts, you could ask the most pertinent questions and offer the most relevant critique. In supplying you with the appropriate answers, the whole concept of Poly-Solipsism could be articulated.

I could sit alone an attempt to do this, but because I am so intimate with the concept, and it is so clear in my own mind, I cannot foretell what may not be so clear to others. It is through criticism a concept gains validity.

To say you agree with my chain of logic, yet do not agree with the conclusions which results from that chain, is to ignore reason in favor of your belief. Rather than discuss your own logic to support your own assumptions, you simply restrict further discourse by stating: "It appears we can go nowhere because you have closed your mind to further discussions ..."

May I suggest it is yourself that has 'closed your mind' by refusing to present your own logic as to why you disagree with my conclusions and why you believe Nothingness can exist?

I have not closed the discussion, on the contrary, I have initiated it by presenting my chain of logic for discussion.

From where I am standing it appears to me your mind has entered into a state of denial, and rather than consider something which does not support your own belief, you simply cast stones at it and hope it will go away.

I am disappointed, as I would have considered such a reaction beneath you, and as a friend, I will not allow you to get away with it!

You asked: "I must ask you why it is you place such restraints upon The Singularity when you profess to be 'open' to a discourse regarding The Singularity."

Because of: "If This, Then This!"

If this is true, then Logically this must also be true!

Here is the list of conclusions you choose to disagree with. Can you please logically tell me why you disagree with them, and illustrate the error in my logic? I am too close to it to see it for myself!

Take them one at a time, or all at once, whichever you deem the most effective.

1-It is purely metaphysical and devoid of spacetime dimensions or degrees of freedom.

2-It has no height, width, or depth as we would envision a finite object to have. Being pure metaphysical

3-The Singularity does not even exist as a 'point existence'

4-Metaphysically it is no more tangible, and has no more physical dimensions, or degrees of freedom than a Thought.

5-Those spacetime dimensions are part of the manifestation, and do not actually exist. They exist in our



Thoughts only.

6-We can envision a state of Nothingness, but that concept of Nothingness can only exist as a concept in our thoughts; our thoughts still exist.

7-Since The Singularity is infinite and unbound there are no boundaries outside.

8-It is not an object with physical dimensions so there are no areas or zones to border off and create a boundary between itself and a void of Nothingness, so it cannot have boundaries inside.

9-In order for there to be a true Nothingness there can be no Thought, or consciousness to carry that thought, and if there is no consciousness, there is no Singularity.

I have placed before you how I logically arrived at the existence of The Singularity, and how that chain of logic led me to conclude what The Singularity is, what we are, and also why logically I concluded Nothingness cannot exist. I am now asking you to do the same. How did you logically conclude the existence of The Singularity, what it is, and how did you logically conclude that Nothingness exists?

**Dan:**

First of all Chuck, do not ignore the fact that I also said: 'Chuck, In terms of The Singularity, I agree with everything 'positive' you have stated and nothing 'negative' you have said. '

For now, in order to keep my response relatively short, I will, for now, ignore the nine items you suggested I address and instead focus upon the last question you asked, namely: How did you logically conclude the existence of The Singularity, what it is, and how did you logically conclude that Nothingness exists?

If you wish to have me address the nine items later, please feel free to ask but try one item at a time.

There are really three questions here:

- a. How did you logically conclude the existence of The Singularity?
- b. How did you logically determine what The Singularity is?
- c. How did you logically conclude that Nothingness exists?

I do not need to address questions 'a' and 'b' since we both basically came to the same conclusion regarding the concept of The Singularity existing as well as regarding the concept of what The

Singularity is.

We differ in terms of part 'c', in terms of the existence of nothingness. Heidegger took the exact position as you do. He stated this position in his paper he published which began with the question: Why is there essents rather than nothing?

I have addressed this issue in detail in the library section found in panentheism.site, Volume II, Tractate 10: The Error of Heidegger: Resolving the problem of the Void of the Void. The long and short of the tractate comes down to this: The question should really be: Why is there essents and nothing.

Now how is it possible for nothing to exist when nothing/nothingness is the lack of all the physical and the lack of all metaphysical?

A rough analogy lies in an intangible field of study, namely: Geometry. A point is non-existent. It has no dimensions, yet it exists as a 'point of existence' as you say. How then is it possible to have an infinite number of such discrete existences contained within a line, which itself is non-discrete in terms of its continuity of length. Within the line no one point is adjacent to another despite the understanding that 'nothing' separates the two and thus the existence of nothingness itself.

To discuss such a concept as existing is not inappropriate since we ourselves are in essence 'thought' beings, 'conscious' beings, beings composed of the same substance and essence as The Singularity and as such are no less intangible in nature than The Singularity, no less intangible than the intangible concept of geometry. In the case of geometry and ourselves, geometry is the known entity and we are the knowing entity.

In actuality what helped me understand the concept that it is possible that nothingness could exist came from a astrophysicist and mathematician who put forward a theory he had which explained how the tangible universe could be reduced to nothingness itself, which in turn implies that the tangible universe could logically arise from nothingness. Such a theory suggests The Singularity might be able to create nothingness and use such a creation for its own ends.

Now I don't want to get too windy here so I will stop my droning here but if my explaining how the universe could reduce to nothingness and thus emerge from nothingness would help you understand nothingness, I would gladly paraphrase the theory for you.

**Chuck:**

Thank you Dan, I do appreciate you followed the same line of reasoning to arrive at the same Singularity. To me the chain of reasoning seemed inescapable, but like I said, I am so close to it I realized I may have created my own blind spot and was unable to see beyond it. That is always the

danger we face when we become too enamored of our own concepts. The only cure is to present them to others with opposing views, and then try with an open mind to defend them logically.

I was not aware Heidegger held the exact position as I do. As you know I have read little philosophy beyond a few excerpts that others have directed me to since conceiving Poly-Solipsism. All of which seem to support, at least in some way, the concepts contained in Poly-Solipsism. I will see what I can find on Heidegger beyond the little contained in the Routledge encyclopedia you sent me. I thank you for sending it, I consult it frequently. It is a very handy reference for acquiring 'snap shots' of philosophical ideas, but not for anything in detail, which suits me fine in most circumstances.

Ok, I know I am about to commit Mathematical Heresy here, but I would like to offer a critique of the following statements from a different perspective. I will attempt to present it with as much false humbleness as I can muster in hopes I do not completely alienate you, and you will at least consider it from my perspective.

*"Now how is it possible for nothing to exist when nothing/nothingness is the lack of all the physical and the lack of all metaphysical?"*

*A rough analogy lies in an intangible field of study, namely: Geometry. A point is non-existent. It has no dimensions, yet it exists as a 'point of existence' as you say."*

My I suggest the problem here is in converting the non-existent to a point existent to allow geometry to deal with it. Conceptually we grant no-thing an existence by bestowing on it a existence as a point, when metaphysically it does not even have a point existence.

In essence for geometry to manipulate a metaphysical entity with no physical attributes we must visualize it as a point. In doing so we convert it into a symbol; the point, which it really is not. I understand the nuance is very subtle, but the effect of such subtle difference can lead to drastic differences in interpretations when later extrapolated to arrive at conclusions. Such as in:

*"How then is it possible to have an infinite number of such discrete existences contained within a line, which itself is non-discrete in terms of its continuity of length. Within the line no one point is adjacent to another despite the understanding that 'nothing' separates the two and thus the existence of nothingness itself."*

Because we can now visualize the symbol of the point as having a discrete existence, we can then extrapolate it onto a line, which is yet another discrete symbol for a non-discrete metaphysical concept. Intellectually we assure ourselves the discrete symbols we are using only represent non-discrete concepts and are not actually discrete, but we then manipulate them dimensionally as if they were discrete. In essence we have now drawn a map of a territory, where there actually is no territory. We then proclaim the map with its imaginary discrete symbols dispersed across an imaginary three dimensional landscape represents the metaphysical territory.

Mathematically we have no other option, if we are to manipulate them we must first symbolize them, but what I am asking is if this is truly a valid exercise, or does it lead us down a path to false conclusions? Is the math used by quantum theorist any less prone to misinterpretation, or do we need to develop a new kind of math to deal specifically with metaphysical entities?

*"In actuality what helped me understand the concept that it is possible that nothingness could exist came from a astrophysicist and mathematician who put forward a theory he had which explained how the tangible universe could be reduced to nothingness itself, which in turn implies that the tangible universe could logically arise from nothingness. Such a theory suggests The Singularity might be able to create nothingness and use such a creation for its own ends."*

May I suggest here the mentioned astrophysicist and mathematician's theory reduced the Universe to No-Thingness, and not a true Nothingness devoid of even the metaphysical. As I do not know whom you are speaking of, so I am only assuming here, that since he/she was an astrophysicist with a mind immersed in the physical, to such a mind the absence of all physical 'things' would be considered the same as a true Nothingness because they would not consider the metaphysical to exist. Without knowing who the person is, or reading the theory myself, I can only assume based upon the facts you provided.

*"Now I don't want to get too windy here so I will stop my droning here but if my explaining how the universe could reduce to nothingness and thus emerge from nothingness would help you understand nothingness, I would gladly paraphrase the theory for you."*

If you don't mind, I would appreciate whatever you could provide. I am not beyond changing my mind if presented with logic I cannot fault to back it up.

### **Dan:**

Bear with me as I proceed through the process of reducing the physical to nothingness itself. The process is based upon principles present day physicists hold dear and as well as based upon speculation immersed within reasonable assumptions.

As such the hypothesis is just that a hypothesis. The point of emplaning the theory is not so much to prove that nothingness does exist and have functionality but that nothingness could possible exist and have functionality on the physical level and not just on an abstractual level although I think we both agree, but for different reasons, that the physical may be simply a manifestation of The Singularity of which we, individuals, play a role.

Understanding the Creation of The Physical Universe from a void/nothingness begins by going backward from where we are, going backward from the point of the physical universe existing.

The physical universe exists. The physical universe is composed of matter and energy. Perhaps one of the most sacred principles of physics is the concept of symmetry. We know antimatter exists. Matter and antimatter satisfy the theory of symmetry held by physicists. If anti-matter exists then perhaps a bubble offshoot of this universe is a physical universe composed of anti-matter and energy. We now that when matter and anti-matter collide one gets pure energy. If the universe of matter and energy merged with the universe of anti-matter and energy one would get the dissolution of all forms of matter and anti-matter leaving nothing but pure energy.

Now move the concept of two universes existing in parallel with one another to four universes existing in parallel to each other. The four universes would take on an appearance of four balloons tied together. One universe would be composed of matter and energy, the second universe would be composed of antimatter and energy, the third universe would be composed of matter and anti-energy, the fourth universe would be composed of anti-matter and anti-energy. Bring universes one and two together and one gets pure energy. Bring universes three and four together and you get pure anti-energy. Bring energy and anti-energy together and you get pure nothingness.

Create pure nothingness, split it through symmetry and you get four physical universes within which potentiality can begin at zero knowing and through the process of experiencing move to being discrete entities of unique knowing.

Now I grant you that this is but a hypothesis and I concede the fact that we have as yet to introduce the concept of anti-energy into the field of physics. But if we, individuals limited in our knowledge as we are, could conceive of such a possibility for nothingness, then how much greater is the possibility for The Singularity to do so?

I will concede that if the universe were in fact created from nothingness than it is nothing and as such is simple another form of the state of mind, state of consciousness, and state of knowing of The Singularity.

The point is, perhaps we are being too cocky and too arrogant to assume that we know as a fact that nothingness could not exist let alone have functionality.

### **Chuck:**

Actually I think I have heard that theory sometime ago. My complaint is it is all physical matter and energy with no mention of the metaphysical. We say it is anti-matter, but it is not really, it is matter with a different polarity. We call a positron an anti-electron, it is just an electron with a positive charge. Theoretically a thriving Universe could be composed of such 'anti' matter and energy, and look no different than our own. Therefore what we call anti-matter and energy is simple matter and energy with a opposite charge. But where did the energy come from in the first place? It still must issue from the

metaphysical, and if energy and anti-energy meet and annihilate each other the result will not be Nothingness, it will be No-Thingness, where the charges cancel each other out, and the physical energy returns to its metaphysical state.

Ok, you got my interest with: "...if the universe were in fact created from nothingness than it is nothing, and as such is simply another form of the state of mind, state of consciousness, and state of knowing of The Singularity."

But I am not quite sure if I understand what you mean. Are you suggesting a Nothingness state of Consciousness? What would that be exactly?

**Dan:**

The concept of 'nothingness' actually existing, let alone suggesting it has functionality in terms of Reality's dynamics is a unique concept and I want to address it the best I can before I say anything.

I'm not sure how to explain this so I'll just say it flat out.

You seem to have a problem comprehending just what it is I am saying. I think this is because the concept is so alien. You say: 'Ok, you got my interest with: "...if the universe were in fact created from nothingness than it is nothing...'

The short of it is, that is correct. Present day religious, philosophical, and scientific perceptions tend to imply the universe might have been created from nothingness and could thus dissolve into 'nothingness' and as such the universe would simply be another form of 'nothingness'. The universe would then exist 'within' the fabric of timelessness and spacelessness yet 'within' the universe we would find a universal fabric of time and space. As such time and space would emerge from 'nothingness' and as such would themselves simply be another form of 'nothingness'. We on the other hand, individuals, would experience uniquely within this realm and we would be capable of experiencing uniquely, experience untainted by The Singularity Itself because we are separated from The Singularity by this existence we call 'nothingness'. This 'nothingness' separates us from The Singularity just as it separates one geometric point from another, just as it separates one grain of sand on a beach from another, ... This 'nothingness' is what provides the means by which multiplicity itself exists, provides the means by which discrete elements could exist as just that 'discrete' elements.

You seem to block everything I am saying from entering your consciousness. You seem to want to refuse what it is I am saying. I am not saying 'nothingness' is simply another form of the state of mind, state of consciousness, and state of knowing of The Singularity. I am saying 'nothingness' is just that 'pure' nothingness', the lack of even The Singularity, the lack of all consciousness, the lack of all states of knowing.

You then seem appalled and aghast as you ask: 'But I am not quite sure if I understand what you mean. Are you suggesting a Nothingness state of Consciousness?'

Yes that is exactly what I am saying. Why does such a thought seem so alien to you? We use the concept of 'nothingness' in all areas of advanced mathematics. Present day science, while belittling the concept that 'nothingness could exist, would not exist without the ability to use 'nothingness' in science's myriad forms of present day diversity. Most religions reject the concept of 'nothingness' yet embrace the concept of God creating the universe from the void. Philosophy, while openly refusing to embrace the existence of 'nothingness', openly embraces philosophical concepts leading to nihilistic models.

If we can be so bold as to prolifically use 'nothingness' in our daily lives, why do we deny The Singularity the ability to do so?

You then ask: What would that ['nothingness'] be exactly?

Why nothingness' would be just that, 'nothingness', a void, a lack of all, the lack of all that is tangible, intangible, and the lack of whatever else may exist other than 'nothingness' itself.

In short, 'nothingness' would appear to not only exist but exist with functionality.

### **Chuck:**

No fair Dan!

I had offered a choice between Nothingness and The Singularity. You could choose either or, but no... You chose Both!

Before there was a Universe, there was a Nothingness within The Singularity. From that Nothingness the Universe was created; thus giving functionality to Nothingness!

Do I understand you correctly?

**Dan:**

Regarding my choosing both as opposed to one or the other: It is my contention that existing philosophical paradoxes are paradoxes only because philosophy has insisted its participants choose the 'either/or' scenario when discussing philosophy. It is my contention that philosophical paradoxes can, for the most part, all be resolved through the process of eliminating the 'either/or' scenario and replace the 'either/or' scenario with the 'and' scenario. Keep this in mind for it lies at the heart of what we will be discussing in the near future.

Now regarding your questions as to whether or not you understand me correctly.

You are close, very, very, very, close, Chuck, but no cigar.

What I am suggesting is that 'before' there was a universe, 'before' there was a 'nothingness' there was The Singularity and The Singularity, recognizing a need (being a 'knowing' entity) and recognizing Its ability to fill or not to fill that need (having free will) and having deduced how to create the mechanism (being all knowing - Omniscient) and having the presence 'within' which the need could be accomplished (being all present - Omnipresent) and having the means of satisfying the need (being all powerful - Omnipotent) may, I say may, have created the 'nothingness' from which the universe was 'supposedly' created.

The difference between what I am saying and what you asked is that I am suggesting The Singularity may have 'created' the 'nothingness' for a reason and the physical universe may have been the result.

Now go ahead and make my day by asking me why The Singularity would possibly want to 'create' a physical universe.

**Chuck:**

Your wish is granted!

Of course, logically, that would be my next question!

Why did we create the illusion of a tangible Universe?

**Dan:**



Before I answer that question let me briefly explain why I changed a few words:

I used the word 'might' as opposed to 'did' because: 'We cannot 'know' as an absolute but rather we can logically infer 'The Singularity might have created the tangible Universe' based upon what we have learned from our three perceptual tools: science, religion, and philosophy.

I used the term 'The Singularity' rather than 'we' because: 'We cannot 'know' as an absolute but rather we can logically infer 'The Singularity is more comprehensive than 'we/you and I' based upon what we have learned from our three perceptual tools: science, religion, and philosophy'.

And lastly I used the term 'real illusion' rather than the term 'illusion' because: 'We cannot 'know' as an absolute but rather we can logically infer 'the illusion' is a 'real illusion' based upon what we have learned from our three perceptual tools: science, religion, and philosophy'.

I am not asking you to embrace the changes rather I would like to ask that we, if need be, discuss these issues at a future time.

Now as to: Why might The Singularity create the real illusion of a tangible Universe?

The answer is: Creating a tangible Universe, be it 'real', 'an illusion', or a 'real illusion' could provide The Singularity the means by which it could circumvent Nietzsche's philosophical dilemma which he described as the All Knowing (The Singularity) having to undergo 'eternal recurrence', 'Groundhog Day' if you wish.

### **Chuck:**

It also satisfies the Potential aspect of an Infinity. Since an Infinity has no beginning and no ending, it cannot exist as an "Is" and is predestined to a perpetual Potential existence. It is forever in a state of Transformation. Since it is also Unbound, that transformation is equally perpetual and undefinable.

Our need to discuss the difference between Illusion and Real Illusion, and what we can logically infer, will present itself as we continue.

So please do.

### **Dan:**

Did I miss something here? So please do what?

**Chuck:**

Create the Universe.

**Dan:**

Well, I cannot create a universe nor am I smart enough to 'know' just how The Singularity would create 'nothingness' from which a Universe might emerge, but I can speculate in general terms. I have no doubts that someday science will develop a clearer picture of the process; perhaps string theory is the beginning of the process. Having said that let me do some speculation based upon the reverse of the process of reducing a universe to 'nothingness'.

Speculation:

The Singularity exists. The Singularity decides to circumvent 'eternal recurrence', create awareness, create knowing, create experiencing to add to its knowing, create knowing which had never existed, create knowing/experiencing which could emerge untainted by existing knowing. The only way to create untainted knowing/experiencing/uniqueness would be to find a means by which such knowing could develop 'untouched' by existing knowing. The only 'place' to create this untainted knowing would be 'within' The Singularity since The Singularity is The All. To create such knowing would require a buffer separating knowing 'that is' from the 'uniquely developing' knowing.

But what could possibly comprise the barrier between knowing 'that is' and knowing 'that is to be' The barrier 'nothingness' itself. The process, discrete entities of knowing traveling though an illusion, traveling through a 'real illusion', traveling through a 'tangible universe' created from 'nothingness' itself and 'located' within The Singularity itself.

But how to 'create' such an existence, create a physical universe? The process: reverse the order we discussed previously when I explained how it is the physical universe could reduce to 'nothingness'. The process: create a void, create 'nothingness' and then perhaps by using the catalyst of symmetry stimulate the 'nothingness' to split into an 'illusionary' existence of energy and an 'illusionary' existence of anti-energy. Then stimulate the existence of energy to become two existences: one of matter and energy and the other of anti-matter and energy. Do the same for the existence of anti-energy. The result: four tangible universes capable of oscillating back and forth from nothingness to tangible universes.

A multitude of results emerge from such a process:

A barrier of 'nothingness' is created.

An isolated 'location' emerges within which entities of uniquely developing knowing can form untainted by existing knowing.

Religion finds satisfaction in understanding that the 'universe' could have logically been created from a void, philosophy finds satisfaction in understanding that the Cartesian (Aristotle) and the non-Cartesian (Kand/Hegel) could logically both exist simultaneously, and science finds satisfaction in understanding how the discrete and non-discrete coexist.

The Singularity's ability to 'use' 'nothingness', just as we use 'nothingness', becomes logical.

A phenomenal number of scientific, religious, and philosophical paradoxes now become resolvable.

Science finds itself capable of defining its turf. Religion finds itself capable of defining its turf. Philosophy finds itself capable of defining its turf.

The 'either/or' scenario becomes the 'and' scenario.

Nothingness now gains formal acknowledgment that it exists and has functionality.

Nothing, literally 'nothingness' separates the individual from The Singularity. Etc.

As for poly-solipsism: The problem of poly-solipsism being based upon the rejection of the existence of 'nothingness', the rejection of an existence we use daily in mathematics, science, religion, philosophy, ..., now becomes a mute point. Poly-solipsism changes not one iota for it has simply added nothing to its theory.

As for you and I, well such a scenario allows us to definitively describe the where/what/ and elementary process of The Singularity, which in turn allows us to revisit our discussion regarding the three questions which have forever haunted our specie, namely: Where are we? What are we? And why do we exist?

### **Chuck:**

*"That's just the thing, there was nothing until it recognized itself and grew defining itself"*

Author Unknown

You have already answered these:

Where are we?

We are in The Singularity.

What are we?

We are entities of Knowing.

Why do we exist.

To fulfill the Potential of The Singularity.

**Dan:**

**And this Chuck is what I call 'symbiotic panentheism'. You and I exist. We, you and I, exist in The Singularity, exist in what others call God,(panentheism). And it is through us, discrete entities of knowing that The Singularity, God if you will, garners and expands upon its very base of knowledge, garners and expands upon its very base of experiencing. The Singularity, the non-discrete, is important to us and we, the discrete, are important to The Singularity (a symbiotic relationship).**

**We, you and I, all individuals have a purpose. Have a function in life.**

[Back to Act III](#)

[Back to Ploy-Solipsism](#)

[D J Shepard](#)

[www.panentheism.com](http://www.panentheism.com)

00000127