

The Anamorphic Cycle

COMPLEMENTING KUNZE

Understanding the response to Nihilism within the Western Worldview

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 1632
Orange CA 92856 USA
714-633-9508
kent@palmer.name

Copyright 2007 K.D. Palmer.
All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.
Started 07.07.20; Version 0.5; 07.07.31; knz01a05.doc

Keywords: Anamorphic, Anagogic, Anasemic

Introduction

In this paper we will explore our response to Nihilism. That response is to create the anamorphic cycle. The concept of anamorph relies heavily on the work of Donald Kunze. But we will place that in a wider context by considering the contribution of Nietzsche, Heidegger, Kunze, Hellerstein, Abrahams, Rawlands, and Grove to our understanding of the anamorphic cycle. In this way our own argument will move in a cycle as we explore the nature of the anamorph as a cultural object and its context within our tradition.

The argument in summary will be expressed in the following terms. Our Western worldview has the peculiarity of producing nihilism as its main side effect. Nihilism inundates our lives which we strive to make meaningful in the face of this deluge. Nietzsche was the first to point this out especially in Will to Power, and Heidegger took up the argument in his

exploration of the impact of technology linking it with nihilism. Fandozi in his Technology and Nihilism gives a good rendition of this argument for the linking of the two phenomena. Personally I like the definition of Nihilism of Stanley Rosen in his book by that name the best. He defines Nihilism as the production of artificial extreme opposites which appear to be in conflict but in fact one discovers are exactly the same thing. Good examples are the Democrats and the Republicans, it is really the incumbents of whatever party that rule. Another example is Capitalism and Communism/Fascism where they share the assumption that the meaning of human life is to be found in production. We are surrounded by warring dualisms, all trying to become monisms and thus destroying their dual, which in fact are exactly the same thing looked at from a point of view of wider scope. Nihilism occurs when the meaning is sucked out of our life when we discover that the side we were fighting on is really the same as the enemy. This is what Achilles discovers in the Iliad. The Western worldview has been centered on the problem of nihilism for a very long time. Once we understand what Nihilism is which are extreme artificial opposites that appear to be in conflict but are really the same thing, then we can compare that to natural opposites. As Holbrook says in the Stone Monkey the foundation of life is natural opposites and sickness comes from clinging to the cycle of those opposites and preventing them from rolling over, and in that case the two artificial duals of Yang Splendor and Closed Yin are created. Our illusory world beyond the natural opposites are made up of mixtures of too light and too dark, which is the Zoroastrian vision of the world spoken about by Morris Berman in Coming to our Senses. It is difficult for us to see the natural opposites that are the existential basis of our life though the confusion of nihilism produced by our worldview as culture, as society, as media, as politics, etc. Because of the problem of the intensification of nihilism, i.e. that nihilism keeps getting worse beyond all bounds, even such that the things we think will make things better at first seems to really only make things much worse than we thought they could get,

because of this problem we attempt to create cultural, social, personal solutions to the nihilism. Anamorphism is the major solution that we have found. That solution is to produce cultural objects that incorporate multiple points of view, such that they make it possible to resolve locally the paradox even if we cannot solve it globally. Anamorphism appears as an object which has different point of view on it so that it looks different from the various points of view it was made to be viewed from. An anamorphic object from one point of view looks like a mess, like the chaotic mixture of fusion of contradictories, but from another point of view it takes on a form which is specific and thus resolves itself into a representation where from another angle it is non-representable. The classic example is the Holbine painting of the two ambassadors with the skull, which can only be seen from an obscure angle, rather than the normal angle for viewing a painting. Kunze has shown many examples of these anamorphs in cultural objects such as films, buildings, and has developed a boundary language based on the work of G. Spencer Brown in order to express these relations formally. What we want to show in this article is that the fact that Kunze finds these structural relations is directly related to the structure of the Western worldview and its production of nihilism and it is not merely an oddity of some cultural objects that are anomalous. Rather cultural objects that are anamorphic are the norm, and we find them particularly satisfying because they answer to the problem of nihilism which is rampant in our cultural milieu.

We use the work of Hellerstein the logician to explain the structure of anamorphism. Hellerstein studied the work of G. Spencer Brown and attempted to work out the secret behind his obscure references toward the end of the book to the pair of limits 'i' and 'j.' Hellerstein discovered that what G. Spencer-Brown was ultimately alluding to was the idea that there were possible limits to Boolean Logic that resolved paradoxes. These limits called 'i' and 'j' are interpreted as 'A yet B' and 'B yet A.' Thus paradoxes come in pairs, not alone as most thinkers believe. These pairs

are duals, and the duality is a fusion that gives precedence to one of the duals over the other in each case. So if we have 1 and 0 as the duals, then 'I' is 1 yet 0 and 'j' is 0 yet 1. These are in fact in circuits oscillators, and the only difference between the oscillators is which value they start with in precedence order. Such oscillators can be placed in circuits in such a way so they cancel each other's effect so that one can create simpler circuits than one might otherwise by using these limiting terms. An example of their use would be Tesla's alternating current that allowed the long distance transfer of electric current which would have been impossible otherwise if A.G. Bell's direct current only design had been followed. In other words you can do things by incorporating dual paradoxes that you cannot do otherwise. An exposition of the use of paradox in our culture can be found in Godel Escher and Bach by Douglas Hofstadter. But Hofstadter like most theorists see paradox as a single limit instead of a dual limit. Understanding that it is a dual limit is the key to understanding Anamorphs. After developing the Diamond Logic N Hellerstein realized he could do the same thing with a single term instead of two, we will call that single term the absurd. Absurdity is the combination of two dual paradoxes, and paradoxes are the combination of contradictions, and contradictions are the combination of contraries. The relation of contraries and contradictions is described by the square of oppositions in Logic. The law of excluded middle and non-contradiction is supposed to protect us from falling into contradiction by preventing the duals from interacting. But if the duals do not interact then there is no motion, and thus we get trapped in the world of Zeno where there is no motion, where only the Pure Being of Parmenides exists, and the roads of appearance and non-Being are denied. In order to get into the world of Process Being of Heraclitus one must allow the duals to interact and to overcome contradiction through motion of existing beings. But motion when we calculate it normally runs into singular points, that is points where we cannot move through and where there are discontinuities in our calculations. This is only avoided if we use

quaternions to do our calculation. But normally our calculations run into these discontinuities that show that even if we understand how to calculate motion that motion itself runs into problems that are the discontinuities caused by paradoxical results. Therefore it is necessary to understand the relations between absurdity, paradox and the contradictions and contraries that make them up. Hegel attempts to surpass these problems by developing the idea of synthesis that through “aufhebung” supersedes the thesis and antithesis and thus incorporate contradiction into itself while still allowing movement. An anamorph is an object that incorporates two different views one of which expresses paradox and the other of which resolves that paradox. Absurdities are anamorphs with multiple views some of which are paradoxical and other of which are resolutions. By having absurdities embodied in cultural objects it shows how it is possible to live with paradox and deal with it by resolving it rather than solving the paradox. Thus due to the fact that our worldview produces nihilism in order to have a background on which the emergent event can be recognized, it also produces cultural objects that give a means of resolving these nihilistic absurdities and paradoxes. And this provides some relief from the intensification of nihilism rampant in our culture. The anamorphic cultural objects appear in the media, in architectural monuments, in buildings, in all sorts of cultural manifestations within our environment.

But the interesting point is that made by Abraham and Torok in their metapsychology that we in fact mirror our environment by internalizing the anamorphic relation between our subjectivity and the unconscious. Thus we ourselves become anamorphs internally in order to resolve the contradictions, paradoxes and absurdities in our environment. When this happens we many times produce distortions in our consciousness and our field of experience that we are unaware of. David Grove has developed a form of therapy called Metaphor work by which these anamorphic knots might be resolved within ourselves. That work by Grove is based on the concepts of Rawlands which has been described recently in the article

by the author “On the Places in our Language.” The key is to understand the structure of the lifeworld projected by the subject of the therapy and allow that map, or cosmology to become apparent, and the distortions in it to be seen, and then it will self-re-organize spontaneously to re-scale itself to its environment and get rid of those distortions that were created as it warped to fit an anamorphic field by becoming inversely anamorphic itself, sometimes such a regime of anamorphic fit to a distorted environment is maintained as a state of consciousness or in behavior when the reason for it has disappeared. Unsticking the lifeworld map from its distorted state can cause relief from symptoms that are difficult to explain given what is happening in the persons life at the present time. But these symptomatic pictures can be very resistant to change, and finding good therapies that will allow rebalancing to occur are difficult to come by. I find three particular therapies promising, that of David Grove, that of Peter Levine, and that of Robert Bosnak. All of these therapies seem to be effective in different ways in the rebalancing of the system of the individual so that it loses the traces of the anamorphic environment to which it has taken an inverse anamorphic stance.

This is the anamorphic cycle, it is a cycle that starts with the reality of nihilism production by our worldview which is experienced as an intensification of nihilism. In response to this we create anamorphic cultural objects with a particular structure as pointed out by Donald Kunze. We can understand this structure using his boundary logic, but that boundary logic is explicated by the diamond and delta logics of Hellerstein, who has completely worked out the inner structure of the Spencer-Brown limit logics. Once we understand the relation of the square of contrary and contradiction to the logic of dual paradoxes and of those to absurdity then it is possible to understand the logic of these cultural objects especially given the exposition of them using the boundary logic of Kunze. But Kunze does not go far enough. Rather we need to add the insights of Abraham and Torok to his in order to

understand that the Anamorphic cultural object has its dual within the subjectivity and unconscious of the observer of those objects. Once we understand that we ourselves are not just anagogic observers but are anamorphic as well, but as duals of the anamorphs in our environment, then we can understand better why anamorphs are so powerful in relation to our psychosomatic reality. Dis-entangling those anamorphic distortions in ourselves is much harder than creating anamorphic objects outside us. For that special therapies have been created such as those of Grove based on Rawlands, as well as those of Bosnak and Levine. Each of these therapies get at the unconscious anamorphs within us in different ways which we experience as traumatic distortions of our experience. Grove uses language, Bosnak uses dreams, and Levine uses sensations and gestalt body work, but each of them attempt to circumvent the normal modes of experience in order to get around the blockages that we find there.

In this work we will attempt to understand this anamorphic cycle from nihilism, to anamorphic objects, to the logic of paradox and absurdity, to the internalization of the anamorphic structure, and finally to the therapies that attempt to unblock and allow the self-re-organizations of those internalized anamorphic structures. The cycle allows us to appreciate the nihilism and its intensification in our culture as a reality, it helps us understand how anamorphs are adaptations to this environment of pervasive nihilism and a mechanism of coping. The Diamond and Delta logic of Hellerstein in conjunction with the boundary logic of Kunze allows us to understand the nature of this landscape of anamorphs. But then we realize that we ourselves incorporate those anamorphs within ourselves and we mirror this anamorphic environment and so it is necessary to understand the metapsychology of Abrahams and Torok in order to fully appreciate how the internal structures mirror the anamorphic objects in the environment. However, based on the work of Rawlands we can link this understanding to the work of David Grove who has developed linguistic strategies for

unbinding those anamorphic knots and allowing them to relax and self-organize. Similar things can be seen in the therapies of Bosnak and Levine only in very different modalities. Thus once we undo the anamorphic knots within ourselves, we no longer need the representation of anamorphs in our environment, and we can appreciate them more objectively instead of craving them as an object of desire. Once we release the anamorphic stance within ourselves we are free to understand the nihilism in our environment differently and not be so tied to anamorphic objects within the environment as cultural products. We can realize that there are other ways of looking at the environment other than paradox and absurdity, such as supra-rationality. And thus we open the way for a fundamental shift in our way of looking at our environment and ourselves via the nondual and the supra-rational instead of paradox and absurdity. But before we can move to this other extreme of the divided line we must free ourselves of being locked into the extreme of paradox which our culture seems to revel in and does not seem to be able to avoid as a basic viewpoint on culture. Of course, paradox and absurdity reinforces nihilism while supra-rationality allows for non-nihilistic distinctions that disperse nihilism. Thus we can see that by understanding the anamorphic cycle we prepare ourselves for a more fundamental shift in our understanding of our world. That shift is something we would like to prepare for in the consciousness of the reader. But that shift cannot be undertaken until the spell of the anagogic is broken and the anamorphic cycle is allowed to complete itself.

Nihilism is Anamorphic

Why is it that anamorphic phenomena can occur within the Western worldview. The reason is that the nihilism produced by the Western worldview is itself anamorphic. Anamorphic means that there are two viewpoints on a phenomena. From one viewpoint it looks like a mess and from the other it snaps into place as being a meaningful and significant pattern or formal configuration. Notice that in Nihilism we go from a situation

where there are artificial duals in conflict, i.e. creating chaos through their conflict, to a situation where we recognize that the artificial extreme duals are the same thing. This in effect is a change of perspective. Perspective changes become possible in the Domain Schema. So it is the domain schema that supports anamorphism. What we are saying is that the western worldview creates what appears as a mess, i.e. the nihilistic conflictual landscape between things that only appear to be opposites, but if we shift perspectives we see that these are the same thing, and at that moment meaning is sucked out of the world as it was for Achilles when he discovered that the Achaeans were no better than the Trojans when Agamemnon took his war prize. Notice in anamorphism we move from seeing a mess from the normal perspective to that mess taking on pattern and form so as to have meaning from another odd perspective. So in Anamorphism meaning is generated while in nihilism meaning is lost. In anamorphism a form or pattern or some other schematic organization which was not seen previously appears from the new perspective. Anamorphism is an emergent operation. Nihilism is de-emergent in as much as when it is realized that the two enemies are really the same the meaning is lost which would motivate the hero to continue the conflict. Anamorphism is emergence though change of perspective. But for the anamorphism to occur the meaningful pattern needed to be created in spite of it not being recognized until the perspective changes. So to what can we attribute this idea that a meaningful pattern is created behind the scenes so to say, i.e. from a different perspective than the normal perspective, while we only see a mess from the normal perspective. An example is that of Einstein and his view of Newtonian/Kantian Absolute Space and Absolute Time as a spectrum or interval. Everyone prior to Einstein were looking at dualities at the most basic level in spacetime, but at the same time they were building up a picture in which the duals could be seen as one thing, and when we switched to that other viewpoint with the work of Einstein then the phenomena that looked to be a mess when the duality was in place

become comprehensible when the duality was replaced by an interval in which spacetime was fused. But as soon as Einstein made this breakthrough another dichotomy similar to that appeared between Relativity and Quantum Mechanics. Our belief is that nature is unified such that Relativity and Quantum Mechanics will ultimately be commensurable, even if we do not know how yet. But we are preparing for that realization of how they are commensurable even as we are confronted by the mess of their incommensurability. So we can see by that example that the anamorphism is prepared for even as we are seeing the disorganized and inchoate view and have not yet found the commensurable view. The nihilism that creates the mess we cannot understand between the extreme duals conflict, where each tries to supplant the other as a monism, somehow is encoding the pattern to be seen behind the scenes, and we think that is happening under the auspices of the nondual in each case. The nondual is the secret communication path between the nihilistic duals. That path is used as a way to produce the anamorphic pattern which is comprehensible beyond the veil of incomprehensibility. And so this is the secret connection with the work of Abraham and Torok which deals with cryptonymy and the anasemic in psychology. It is not just that we produce anamorphic objects in our worldview to resolve paradox but we ourselves are anamorphic in the way that we resolve paradox in our lives. Thus anamorphic subjects view anamorphic objects within the realm of absurdity, paradox and contradiction of the contraries. We must have the understanding of Kunze of anamorphic objects, but we must also have the understanding of Abraham and Torok of anamorphic subjects. But together explain how the nihilistic field is built up and transformed into the emergent field between those anamorphic subjects and objects. The normal viewpoint in which things make sense, say of the Holbein painting, has within it an anomaly which does not make sense. One must take another view of the same scene for the anomaly to make sense, and from that other view it is difficult to see the rest of the picture, now converted into a background to the

anomaly that suddenly makes sense. This is like the twin gestalts phenomena of the old woman and the young girl or the two faces and the vase that is standard in psychology texts. In one case there is an anomaly on the ground of a normal picture, and in the other case there is a picture of the anomaly that makes sense on the background of a skewed normal picture. In the case of anamorphism the transition is made by changing perspective, while in the dual gestalt it is by concentrating on some features of the picture while suppressing others. But the two phenomena are similar in as much as one normally snaps into one gestalt and has a difficult time transitioning to the other one, which cannot be seen at first, but one learns to see when one is told that the other way of patterning of the dual gestalt picture exists. What exists between the two gestalt duals or between the two anamorphic perspective is what Kunze calls a Boundary Logic, like the boundary of the Mobius Strip, it looks like two things but it is in fact one thing, just as when one experiences the deflation of nihilism and one finds out that the duals one was caught up in with their conflict are really the same thing.

Kunze explains Boundary logic in terms of Authority A and Participating Subject C. Between them is a relationship B that mediates their interaction. That relationship can be anamorphic. We see the anamorphism by getting outside the Subject C into the small other or the surplus beyond the subject. This small other to the Subject is C' which is the fictum. The fictum is able to view the mediating object B awry and thus see the anamorphic image which makes sense from the skewed viewpoint. And this gives access to the little 'a' or the "object of desire" which is also known as the little frame, i.e. what is framed within the frame.

This cross over or flip construction corresponds to Abraham and Torok's formulation on that is incorporated into the subject. The subject C has a phantom, as split off part of the subject C' which is independent. That split off part of the subject then has access to the Thing 'a' which is a split off part of the unconscious A. In the case of Abraham

and Torok the anamorphic image appears as traces on the interface between the shell and kernel, or between consciousness and unconsciousness. Memory is the trace written, but symptom and symbol which is anamorphic is the trace read. Where Kunze sees the Authority outside, Abraham and Torok see the Authority inside as the unconscious, otherwise the two structures are the same. In one case the anamorphism mediates between us and what is beyond us, Authority, and in the other case the anamorphism mediates between us and what is inside us, i.e. the kernel of the incomprehensible unconscious. In one case the mediating anamorphic objects is a cultural product while in the other case the anamorphic trace is a personal product of experience and the arising of the traces of symptoms and symbols from the unconscious. In one case we are talking about cultural production of anamorphs to ameliorate our relation with nihilism of our cultural environment, and in the other case we are talking about self-organization of our subjectivity in the face of our unconscious and its activities that produce symptoms and symbols that appear to our consciousness.

We can understand this configuration based on the logic of N. Hellerstein who has interpreted the cryptic logic of Spencer Brown and explained that when we move from the square of contraries and contradictions to paradox that these paradoxes come in pairs 'i' and 'j' which are limits. Normally we think of paradoxes as being singular. But if we think of them always as being 'a yet b' or 'b yet a' then we can see that there is always a complementarity between paradoxical limits. Because paradox is dual we can create anamorphic images by oscillating between the two paradoxes. Absurdity is the further fusion of these dual paradoxes described by 'diamond logic' into the 'delta logic.' Thus if we build absurdities then they break down naturally into dual paradoxes which are two ways of combining a pair of contraries in contradictory ways. The nihilism of the Western worldview is that it drives toward absurdity. It is absurdity as an ultimate fused limit of contradiction and paradox that organizes the anamorphic

possibility. In absurdity the two paradoxes are complementary, and therefore there is mutual organization between them, thus what the one lacks the other makes up for, and we can make sense of the gestalt of one on the background of the other and vice versa. Within the domain this compensation occurs in relation to viewpoints. Within the system this compensation occurs in relations between figure and ground so that we see one figure or the other. Thus we hypothesize that a similar phenomena occurs at every schematic level. The means by which the anamorphic transition will occur will depend on the schematic level. So if we consider the form as the background then we are going to see anamorphic patterns, if we consider the pattern as the background we are going to see anamorphic monads, i.e. wave and particle whose anamorphic fusion is the soliton. If the meta-system is the background we are going to see anamorphic systems, if the domain is the background we are going to see anamorphic meta-systems, if the world is the background then we are going to see anamorphic domains, etc. What we are saying is that this phenomena of anamorphism is general across all the schemas, and our worldview creates the anamorphism externally in order to attempt to resolve contradiction, paradox, absurdity produced by nihilism and that is the means of transition to the emergent effect. Nihilism is itself de-emergent and while anamorphic flip, swerve, or awry viewing transitional phenomena is emergent. Thus anamorphism allows us to specify even more precisely the relation between nihilism and emergence. Anamorphism is built into the relation between the nihilistic duals, and into the duality between emergence and nihilism as further meta-nihilistic duals. But this anamorphism is not just external but also incorporated into our selves, by the splitting of the subject and the splitting of the unconscious. This is the insight that Abraham and Torok bring to complement the insights of Kunze concerning cultural production of objects that are anamorphic, such as films. Subjects are also culturally produced in social situations, and they mirror the anamorphic objects in the field of experience through their own anamorphism. And that is why

anamorphism is so pleasing when it is incorporated into a cultural object, because the anamorphism of the self is mirrored by the anamorphism of things in the world that mediate between the nihilistic extreme artificial duals created in the environment. Anamorphic objects salvage meaning that otherwise would be dissipated by the recognition of nihilism. Anamorphic objects are means of transitioning from nihilistic views to emergent views at the various schematic levels. Behind the scenes the unconscious builds a sense-making scene that counteracts the paradox that makes no sense that is seen in the foreground of our experience. When we shift our viewpoint, or whatever the trigger is to get the anamorphic swerve to occur, then suddenly we get a different view that makes sense and thus we see a change of fact, theory, paradigm, episteme, ontos, existence, or absolute which is emergent for us. In a sense this means our incomprehension is our comprehension. And this brings up the idea of Heidegger that we cannot conceive of the problem unless we have conceived of a possible solution already, problems have prepared for solutions already. Our unconscious understand the solution is our consciousness dwells on the problem.

The next step of course is to consider Heidegger's move of attempting to get beyond the subject/object duality and naming that being-in-the-world Dasein. We will instead talk about being-in-the-schema, since we want to generalize and not just speak of one schema. We consider that the schema can be any of the schemas we hypothesize, i.e. facet, monad, pattern, form, system, meta-system, domain, world, kosmos, and pluriverse. But whatever the schema is that is used as a reference, our being 'in' it is not that of subject or object, but our 'being there.' As Nietzsche says subjects are objects turned inside out. And that means that subjects and objects are anamorphic themselves. What is a subject and what is an object is 'subject' to an objective boundary logic, itself. Thus from Heidegger's point of view there is not just the isomorphism between the Abraham and Torok subjective anamorphism and the Kunzian objective

anamorphism, but the subject and object themselves are paradoxes, i.e. limits which are resolved in absurdity. There is a strange mirroring where the interior unconscious becomes wrapped around and becomes the external noumena, Jung called this psychoid. The psychoid is where some external thing is not just a synchronicity because it corresponds to something that happens in consciousness, but rather the psychoid is where the external thing is created by the unconscious acting on the relativistic and quantum mechanical field of physis in order to create some external phenomena. Psychoid phenomena are precisely those phenomena where the logos and physis undergo a flip in their boundary logic. What appeared locally as differentiated as physis and logos separately, globally is the same thing, so that an unconscious phenomena can appear as a Real object in experience coming from the outside through the action of the collective unconscious. Thus Jung and Pauli together discovered the anamorphism of subject and object, and this flip occurs through the exigency of dasein, which is the ground of both prior to the arising of these reifications. But what interests us here is the fact that Heidegger talks about the nexus of this flip in terms of schemas, specifically the world, but we can think of it as being at any schematic level. The reason for this is the fact that anamorphic flips occur in relation to one schema on the background of the next higher schema, so for instance if we consider the world as the ultimate horizon of experience then the anamorphic flip would occur between domains, like the domain of psychology, and the domain of other physical sciences. But in actuality this flip can be seen as occurring at any of the schematic levels, so it can happen between meta-systems in a domain. One meta-system sees one paradox, and when we move to another meta-system situated at a different viewpoint then we see the other paradox. What was paradoxical from one viewpoint is now something that makes sense and what made sense is now paradoxical from the other viewpoint. Viewpoints in meta-systems are stationary. We have to go to the level of the domain to move the focus of the meta-system from one view point to another. If we are

locked into one viewpoint which reveals one meta-system then the other is obscured to us unless we move to a domain level where viewpoints become dynamic, then the flip can occur easily. In moving to that new domain level the meta-system we were stuck in becomes relativized in relation to all other meta-systems and there is a certain loss of meaning but at the same time there is a realization that dynamism brings new experience and that new experience can contain its own realizations and emergences. Thus the loss of meaning from nihilism can flip over into the gain of meaning through emergence and we see that nihilism and emergence are themselves anamorphic as well at whatever schematic level they might appear.

Understanding that dasein is really the nexus of the anamorphic shift between subject and object as paradoxical or absurd reified entities I think helps to make Heidegger's move to define dasein as being-in-the-schema more understandable. It is in-the-schema that the anamorphic shift occurs. Whatever schema is the ground becomes the basis for the reified anamorphic positions to undergo the shift in the boundary logic at the next lower level schematic level. When we say "being there" we are saying at the boundary which can undergo the transformative shift, the boundary which is locally dual but globally one in the mobius strip for example. We say "Being There" because there is no other way to describe that point of anamorphic shift because it is a place where different coordinate systems intersect, and where one leaps from one coordinate system to another, and therefore it is only really "T/here" where ever that is in relation to the changing coordinate systems that are flipping. Dasein is a nexus of that possibility of a boundary flip, and thus it is nondual between the duals of subject and object.

ONCE

There is a recent movie¹ *Once*² which has an

¹ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Once_\(film\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Once_(film))

² <http://oncethemovie.com/>

anamorphic structure. In that movie two young people make music together in a lacune between their other relations with other partners. The Absurdity of the movie is that their relationship itself cannot go anywhere ultimately and is doomed to be brief but meaningful. For the young Irish man³ there is the paradox that he is separate yet joined to his partner, and his music comes out of the pain that he feels for his girlfriend whom he has lost. For the young Cech Girl⁴ we find she has the opposite paradox that she is joined yet separate, because she is married to someone who is absent, and her music expresses the problems of their marriage. Within the first paradox of the Irish boy there is his relation with his father who runs a repair shop for vacuums. The Irish boy creates his songs as he watches videos of his lost girl friend on the screen of his computer. The computer screen is the frame within the frame. The Irish boy's girl friend had an affair with someone else and that led to his disillusionment with their love and his rejection of her. On the other hand the Cech girl has a mother who looks after her daughter, who is there with her in Ireland. The absent other in the one case is the other man the girlfriend of the Irish boy whom she has an affair with. As he gets to know the Cech girl he finds out first that she has a daughter, and then that she is married, and never knows the answer to whether she loves her husband. But in both cases the other lover and the husband are other to the Irish boy. When the Irish boy and the Cech girl first meet he rejects her when she tries to talk to him about his music, but then when she finds out about the fact that he repairs Hoover vacuum cleaners then that becomes the link between them. She is seen going from place to place as they travel together through the city trailing her vacuum cleaner, which is the anamorphic object. She can relate to him as vacuum cleaner fixer first, rather than musician, because he does not want to have anything to do with women in relation to his music at first. But then he finds out that the Cech girl is a musician too and that they can relate though their music and that is the

³ Glen Hansard

⁴ Markéta Irglová

basis of their brief but meaningful relationship. The Hoover is a relation between the Cech girl and the Irish boy though his father the owner of the repair shop. The boy attempts to get the girl to sleep with him, not realizing that she is married and a mother, and they become estranged, but soon they make up. When the boy visits her apartment and meets her mother and daughter then we see the second anamorphic object. The daughter transforms his view of the Cech girl into that of a mother. They continue to make music together, and sing their music to each other. But then the boy steals his father's motorcycle and takes her on a ride so that becomes the third amorphic object. Because on that ride he finds out that she is married, but not whether she loves her husband. He will not let her drive his father's motorcycle, just like he cannot take her away from her husband. Finally they make an album together, and the boy leaves her but buys her own piano as a gift. The piano is the final anaorphic object because it allows her to be a musician. The final frame within a frame is the window we she her looking out of at the end of the movie.

This movie *Once* is a very simple movie. It is interesting because the boy and girl do not resolve their relations with their prior partners nor do they have another than musical relation with each other. It is interesting because the music is so deeply incorporated into the story itself, rather than being added on like a surplus as in a normal musical. And it is interesting because music becomes the means of communication in their Platonic relation with each other. Music is the source of meaning in a world whose backgrounds are empty otherwise. But by looking at this movie from the point of view of anamorphic relations we can see that the high level absurdity of their impermanent platonic relation through music breaks down into paradoxes, which break down into the contraries with their contradictions and within this field of structural relations the anamorphic objects that change our point of view appear. There is the hover, then the daughter, then the motorcycle, and finally the piano. In each case these objects become central to the scenes that are

portrayed between the musical couple and key in transforming their relationship. What is seen is that the entire picture is an opening out of the field between the elements of the absurdity, into the twin paradoxes, and then into the contrary and contradictory elements. Music carries the meaning between them in this field, but the music is about other absent lovers or husbands. So the music that goes between them is a music about someone else for the most part. Ultimately the absurdity and the paradoxes are not resolved. And the open space within the absurdity and paradoxes once structurally set up holds the meaning that is generated between them about others. So the movie is a perfect example of a situation of absurdity and paradox being mediated by anamorphic objects. The anamorphic objects are the keys to the meaning changes in the story. But if there was a novel that went with the film then in the novel of the boy and the novel of the girl we would find the signs of the cryptonyms and the anasemic gaps that correspond internally to the breakup of their subjectivities and the fragmentation of their unconsciousness which in the traces are anamorphic. In other words the absurdity that looms outwardly in their relation must be mirrored inwardly in their personalities and the distortions of their relations with their significant others. Why did his girl friend make love with another boy. Why did her husband abandon her and her child. There are hints but that is not made clear in the picture. That part, the absurdities within are left unresolved. And that is because they are unresolved in us the viewer. When we see a movie we see the characters from the outside, just as we see ourselves in dreams. We do not see things from the eyes of one character, as some experimental movies have shown that is a possible alternative, where the camera is the subject, rather than viewing the subject externally. So when we view a film we can easily project our absurdities, paradoxes, contradictions, and contraries into the variables of the surface of the film. And thus we get the benefit of the anamorphic field and its meaning generation as a surrogate for the absurdity, paradox, contradictions, and contraries in our own lives. When we read a novel we have to

imagine the surface that is given to us in the film. But in the film we cannot have access to what is going on in the character on the screen, so that the background scenes and codes must fill that picture in to generate the moods within the character we are suppose to identify with. Novels and Films are anamorphic opposites with each other, one gives us surface without depth and the other depth without surface. But there are very few novels that successfully are turned into movies and vice versa. It is difficult to realize this anamorphic relation between these media. But a good example is the Lord of the Rings movie trilogy recently released which everyone found satisfying especially in the extended edition. This is a rare event. Part of the problem is that there is little realization that to be successful the anamorphism of the movie and the film must be realized as the anamorphism of the subject and the object. That takes too much artistic control to realize. But the process of turning a novel into a script is precisely the process of transforming the anamorphism of the subject into the anamorphism of objects. And so when we combine Abrahams and Torok's insights with those of Kunze we discover that our culture can be rendered meaningful even within the conflict of the extreme artificial nihilistic opposites, despite the fact that the absurdity and paradox and contradictions are not resolved. What we need to understand is the secret communication though the music despite the nihilistic background that appears in *Once*. We access that music though the anagogic swerve made possible by the anamorphic objects that embody the key points of realization within the narrative. Our viewpoints on the nihilistic environment are transformed and we see meaning within the absurdity, paradox, contradiction and warring contraries. We inhabit a nihilistic environment but we create in that environment anamorphic objects that hold the key to unlock meaning. But we are inhabited also by anagogic subjects which give us views of the thing, i.e. separated parts of the unconscious that are fetishized. When those fetishes are projected on to things we close the anagogic-anamorphic loop, or the cycle and the subject/object dichotomy transforms by boundary logic as we move to

the position of dasein, i.e. being-in-the-wider schema watching the anagogic transformation of our being-in-the-narrower schema.

Anagogic Meta-Places

Next we will consider the primal scene of nihilism in the Western tradition and what it might tell us about the anagogic/anamorphic relations between viewpoints. That primal scene is in the Iliad. It revolves around the taking of Briseis from Achilles by Agamemnon. Briseis was the war prize that Agamemnon gave Achilles. When he lost his own war prize he took that of Achilles. We won't go into the details of the story, which are interesting in this regard, but the upshot of the episode by which the Iliad begins is that Achilles realizes that the Achaeans were no better than the Trojans. In the mind of Achilles Briseis = Helen, Agamemnon = Paris, and Achilles = Menelaus in this situation. Thus why fight the Trojans for stealing a woman and then do the same thing ourselves. Never mind that Briseis was already stolen by the Achaeans in order to be converted into a war prize. So Achilles from that point forward refuses to fight. He realizes the nihilism of the situation, in which the two enemies are essentially alike. Nihilism is exactly that sapping of meaning and thus action from life due to the fact of realizing that the conflicts one once thought real that was motivating were in fact illusory. The production of Nihilism is the most fundamental product of the Western worldview. Nihilism exists almost in every sphere because artificial extreme opposites that are really the same are set up in almost every sphere of endeavor. Thus we experience our worldview primarily through its production of nihilism in every sphere of life which results in alienation and anomie ultimately. Achilles has lost the meaning of the war and suffers from Anomie, but his withdrawal from battle also results in his alienation from his fellow Achaeans who battle on without him and resent his not helping them, because his help gives them such a large advantage in the battle. We have mentioned earlier in this essay that anamorphism and anagogy operates because nihilism itself is anamorphic/anagogic. But let

us take this proposition and look at what the primal scene of nihilism in the tradition, its primal epic, has to say about the anagogic/anamorphic swerve that allows us to move from seeing the confrontation of duals within the worldview as meaningful, to seeing the nihilism of their sameness. What the primal scene says is more complex than either the analysis of Kunze or Abraham and Torok. The Iliad is very precise about the changes of state that Achilles goes through and in fact those changes in state drive the epic. The first change of state is from full cooperation and engagement in the battle to withdrawal. The anamorphic difference is between sameness and difference between Trojans and Achaeans. When he realizes that they are the same, then he withdraws from the fight. But then later Petroclus his male lover and best friend, puts on Achilles armor and pretends to be him, and is killed in the process. At that point Achilles changes from inaction to action, he in effect goes berserk. This state is an over reaction in the other extreme from his withdrawal from the fight, now he is over engaged in the fight to the extent that he is crazy to kill to revenge Petroclus, and he acts as if he himself was nature, inhuman, in its ability to kill massively without caring. The Iliad then tells us two things. First a nihilism that is observed in nature and followed though becomes nihilism in behavior of the person affected. That person goes from an extreme of inaction to an extreme of action that is compensatory as a result of falling into the attractor of the realization of nihilism within a given situation. That means that there is a state which is even more alienated and anomonic that is after the first anagogic state. We must admit based on this analysis the possibility that there is as well as the fictive (phantom) and its inside frame or "thing" as unconscious object there is also an anti-fictive (anti-phantom) with its coupled anti-inside-frame or "anti-thing" of the unconscious as its object. If we look awry, via a anagogic swerve then we will over-compensate and embody an anti-awry glance as well as an anti-anagogic swerve in the opposite extreme. Thus the change in perspective outwardly gets mirrored in behavior, and the nihilism of the duals which

we realize are the same, results in nihilistic behavior which gets worse before it gets better.

Of course, Achilles eventually kills Hector, the real hero of the tale, and after that at a certain point he relents and gives Hector's body back to Hector's father. This scene is widely discussed as the point at which Achilles leaves his berserker rage behind and reenters his humanity. At that point Achilles reenters a normal relation toward his comrades and his enemies and becomes normal in some sense again. Achilles leaves the swerving behind. If you begin to swerve off the road in a car, you might tend to overcompensate and cause the accident you are trying to avoid. Exactly this over compensation in the opposite direction is what is acted out in the Epic, and that becomes the basis for the stories development. But this tells us something that is quite interesting about the anagogic/anamorphic. There is the anti-anagogic and the anti-anamorphic that needs to be taken into account as well as the anagogic and anamorphic. We use the term anagogic for the taking of a view that is awry, or anti-awry neither of which is the normal view. We use the term anamorphic for the object which embodies the multiple views within itself. In the anti-anagogic state Achilles views the enemy as nature would, and is remorseless in his killing, as if he were just a natural phenomena. Achilles is looking at the situation only in terms of revenge and this is causing his crazed and overly intense activity of killing which replaced his malaise by which he first reacts to the nihilism. Achilles has internalized the nihilism in himself, rather than it merely being something external to him. When he returns to a human perspective he is changed by the internalization of nihilism, it appears as the acceptance of his death flowing from his decision of having a short but glorious life, rather than a long and inglorious one. By the return from the double swerve one realizes that a full cycle has been enacted, and by means of that Achilles is prepared to complete his own monomyth. But this means that there can be not just absurdities but also anti-absurdities and that these can act as I and j of the paradoxes and be composed on each other's background, and the duality of the absurdities

allows us to have swerve and anti-swerve modes to the cycle that leads to completion. As soon as you allow absurdities and anti-absurdities then there are six possibilities:

- I yet J but J yet I
- K yet L but L yet K
- I yet J but K yet L
- K yet L but I yet J
- J yet I but L yet K
- L yet K but J yet I

There are 6 "buts" and every one is a relation between the two sets of dual paradoxes that make up the two absurdities. But that means we are dealing with a tetrahedron, and on the other side of the paradoxical points beyond their absurd relations, are the four faces of that tetrahedron. Those four faces are configurations of the absurd relations which are structurally stable. We want to call these the Zoas after Blake. They are the four meta-subjects. In Blake's time it was realized that there were multiple "monotheistic gods" in the bible, and Blake in the Four Zoas attempts to tell the story of these four eternal and their mythic relations to each other. The secret of the anagogic cycle is that there are meta-subjects defined by the dual absurdities and their relations to each other. The swerve and anti-swerve cycles of compensation and over-compensation that exist for any subject exists within this over all higher order structure which give rise to the zoas, i.e. the gods of the subject. The unity of god is the basis for the unity of the subject. But when the subject enters into the anagogic/anamorphic cycle ruled by paradox and absurdity then there comes into existence the supra-subjective foci of that condition experience of the subject. Blake called these the Zoas. Blake named the Zoas: Urizen, Tharmion, Urthona, and Luvah. They existed and acted out their struggle prior to any world in which subjects could act out their dramas existed. Each Zoa had a female emanation, a specter, and a shadow. In other words the other triangles of the tetrahedron appeared to each Zoa in the form of projections of themselves, and that is why each one thought of himself as the only god. But

they all were the sons of a sleeping father Albion who is like Varuna in Hindu mythology, or Hun Tun in Chinese mythology.

Any given Zoa as a side of the tetrahedron is opposite one of the paradoxes, of the two sets of dual paradoxes that come together to define the pair of absurdities. The ij or ji are directed lines between the paradoxes within the minimal system or tetrahedron of paradoxes. A subject can view the line as a possible anamorphic flip. The subject is at the center of the tetrahedron looking out beyond the tetrahedron. At what ever line the subject looks it is capable of an anamorphic flip. That means there are six anamorphic flips in the tetrahedron. In a tetrahedron two lines that are on opposite sides of the tetrahedron are orthogonal to each other. That orthogonality is the difference between the flip and the anti-flip. That means there are three flip/anti-flip pairs that the subject can see all orthogonal to each other. Each flip is a boundary between Zoas. What is beyond the tetrahedron can be seen either as the unconscious realm or the external realm. Both are foreign to the subject. Each flip is a break in the subject, an incorporation. Achilles flips first from engaged to inactive when he apprehends the nihilism of the sameness between Achaeans and Trojans. Achilles flips again when Petrol's is killed and he goes berserk. But then Achilles flips again when he gives in to giving back Hector's body to Hector's father. The orthogonal flip in each case takes us into the other absurdity. Return to normal again, but with a difference, is a reorientation by orienting to a different flip/anti-flip structure within the tetrahedron. Normal is preparation for another orthogonal flip/anti-flip sequence, so there are exactly three possible orthogonal flip/anti-flip sequences before you return to the starting point. At the center of each line in the tetrahedron of paradoxes within the dual absurdities there is a point of rest around which the flip occurs. These points of rest can be seen as oriented in the direction of the directed line which is a boundary of the tetrahedron. Each of these points are a place that the subject can rest within, they are meta-stable places within the flip structure. We can

think of these as the six places in the meta-map of Rawlands.

Your subject is looking at the external world/unconscious through the slats of the tetrahedron sides. In that external world/unconscious there are exactly six meta-stable places where flips can occur which are the central points in the sides of the tetrahedron of the paradoxes of the orthogonal absurdities. Pick any place in space and you have picked a place in the landscape of your unconscious, because the unconscious is isomorphic to the landscape given the anamorphic flip between external (Kunze) and internal (Abrahams & Torok) anamorphism. The subject looking at the Noumena (think-in-itself) as "Thing" in Unconscious and creating an image is always place number 1, Peirce's First. If we take up a place in relation to the external world (noumena) and unconscious (thing) then we will pick the meta-stable points at which the flip can occur. This is the place where we state our problem and orient ourselves to our problem with the clean start. This is the first place that Peirce likens to isolate, sensations arising in separation from each other.

When we then take up the second place that is already a flip, because we can look back at the first place and see it from a different point of view. So any other place is in fact a flip of perspectives if nothing else. But that second place inaugurates a relation between places, but it also orients us between two paradoxes ij and ji . By the act of the subject moving from place to place the meta-system has changed, and the subject has split. There is the subject oriented toward the paradox ij and the subject oriented toward the paradox ji . The second subject is what Kunze calls a fictive subject and Abrahams calls a phantom subject. In relation to the minimal system of paradoxes the subject has only flipped its orientation while in terms of spacetime the subject has moved and created a domain breaking meta-systems apart. This is the second place. Peirce likens it to relationships. Rawlands tells us that this is where language arose, and where we name the image from the first place. Name as

icon and sound of the name also split. Verb and noun also differentiate as language was created. Some part of the paradox we make dynamic while other parts we reify. The anamorphic object, i.e. the object that embodies both sides of the paradox must be situated in the meta-stable place. That means that the places we select in our landscape in relation to the problem we have chosen are themselves anamorphic. They are the meta-stable places where the flip can occur, but also that means the places are inhabited by the flip, and thus when we embody the places we embody the flip itself as a Janus faced possibility of meta-stability.

When we produce the phantom or the fictive subject as a deviation from the original subject by means of the flip, then we posit that externally to the tetrahedron as minimal system there is some "thing" as split off part of the unconscious, or some "small other" inside frame which is the opposite of the subject as it looks through the meta-stable place at the external world mapped to the unconscious. That is the place of the sameness which is different from the place of the duality of the projected object. By differentiating these places the subject at the center of the minimal system itself becomes unstable. It can only move by moving in the fourth dimension. And that is how the swerve is created. It is created by the production of a de-centering of the subject in the fourth dimension that compensates for the difference between the first outward scene and the second one which are so different but are really the same place seen differently, in one case as the realm of dualistic conflict, and in the second place all the same and thus losing its meaning. Rawlands tells us that this is where metaphor comes into existence along with the other rhetorical tropes such as metonymy and simile. The IS of Indo-European language as an illusory substance is created and on the basis of this substance things are identified that could only be likened previously. But that identity serves as a lever to force the move in the fourth dimension. This is the third place which Peirce likens to the production of Continuity.

Once the subject is displaced into the α and κ of the fourth dimension, that new space is opened up as the landscape of the fourth place. Rawlands says that we can construct a metaphor map and work out the relations of our metaphors to each other, and that we can see that map as a whole, and that whole map of metaphors is like a solar system where all of our metaphors are arrayed. B. Fuller talks about this extension of Peirce's philosophical categories in terms of Synergetics. But in terms of our tetrahedron, with the introduction of the fourth dimension our subject is pushed off into the fourth dimension and instead of being at the center of the tetrahedron the subject is now another point in the next higher minimal solid which appears in the fourth dimension. That minimal solid has five points, ten lines, ten sides, and five tetrahedrons. The sides of that pentahedron form two intertwined Möbius strips. The fourth place is anamorphic itself, but such that it actually opens up the fourth dimension, and it is the place of crossing of the two awry views that pushed the subject off into the fourth dimension. Once we have understood the $ij=ji$ of the anamorphic object and seen how the fourth place embodies the anamorphism of the place, which is why it is seen as embodying a wobble, then it is possible to differentiate this anamorphic object from the anamorphic object of the orthogonal absurdity. It is recognized that the $kl-lk$ anamorphic line that is orthogonal is at a distance from the one we have just mapped across the other side of the tetrahedron. But now the tetrahedron is really a pentahedron for the subject who has split internally based on the leverage given by the external world or the unconscious which are isomorphically mapped. The unconscious is what Michael Polanyi calls the tacit dimension understanding of our environment. The subject can follow the Möbius strips around to get to the other orthogonal absurdity. And the transfer to that next space is the transfer across to the orthogonal absurdity. In that place we see the second split of the subject as anti-fictive or anti-phantom, and the second unconscious "thing" or the anti-petit-other or anti-inside-frame. This fifth place is like entering hell, or

the underworld. It is the anti-place in relation to the places we are used to in normal anamorphism. It is anti-anamorphic, and thus anti-anagoric. This is the place where Achilles goes berserk. This is the place where he becomes one with natural phenomena in their terrible manifestations as flood, and destruction without care for humanity. The equation of life and death of Petroclus is weighed against the life and death of Hector in that place. This fifth place can be understood as integral. In it what is inside comes outside. When you rotate four dimensional objects in the fourth dimension they turn inside out.

But eventually Achilles moves to the sixth place which reframes his actions, and he returns to humanity moving out of the berserker mode. In that sixth place we discover by traveling the mobius strips that make up the surfaces of the pentahedron that there is another position different from either of the crossed paradox pairs of the dual absurdities. And this other possible orientation seems to be a relief from the crossed paradox pairs of the dual absurdities. This is a sixth place. By it we discover that all the other three crossed paradox pairs are basically the same as that we have just been through. When we enter the sixth place we discover the entire tetrahedron, in which the subject is de-centered into a pentahedron. By discovering the whole tetrahedron we can then go on to discover the whole pentahedron within it as the center is displaced in four dimensional space. If we again de-center from within the center of the pentahedron into fifth dimensional space then we discover the sextahedron with six points, fifteen sides, twenty surfaces, fifteen tetrahedral solids, and six pentahedrons. The second displacement of the subject internally is orthogonal to the first internal displacement, and is equivalent to the splitting of the subject orthogonally. But this brings us back to the perfect number six and anchors the six meta-stable points of the lines of the minimal system in a figure in the fifth dimension, with points and pentahedrons that anchor those meta-stable points within the differentiation of the subjectivity at the center of the tetrahedron in terms of its displacements in higher

dimensional space. There is an isomorphism between the six meta-stable points between subject and its environment, either external or internal as the unconscious, and the six points of the sextahedron which is the internal orthogonality that corresponds to the external orthogonality of the two absurdities made up of the pair of twin paradoxes.

There is in this geometric way of looking at the anagoric swerve and anti-swerve as a confirmation that there are six meta-stable points in the meta-map as Rawlands and Grove have suggested.

Let us go through the genesis of the meta-stable points again. The first is the points of which the tetrahedron is constructed, four points, each of which is a Percian First, an isolate. Second is the lines which connect these points which are relations between the points, which is a Percian Second which is a relata. Third is the surfaces of the triangles which make up the tetrahedron connecting three lines in segments of planes. This is a Percian Third which is a continua. Fourth is the tetrahedron itself which is a solid, the first platonic solid. This is a Trans-Perician Fullerian Fourth, which is a synergy. Fifth is the idea that the points are actually paradoxes, ij, ji, kl, lk fusions with precedence order, i.e. "i yet j" or "k yet l." These paradoxical fusions are combined into absurdities of the form "i yet j but j yet i." There are six possible absurdities of this type which relate to the lines of the tetrahedron. Rather than those lines being relations they become conflicts or contradictions. The tetrahedron is then seen not as a whole solid in this light but rather as a relation between orthogonal absurdities. The connecting conflicts or contradictions are of the form "i yet j but k yet l," or any of the four possible permutations which connect the two absurdities. In this sense the tetrahedron becomes like a tensegrity structure, where the absurdity connecting lines are braces, and the orthogonal absurdity self-connecting lines become like wires. In other words there is an internal dynamism to the structure itself, and internal tension between the two absurdities. The struts hold the absurdities apart, but the

wires hold the opposite faces of the same absurdity together. It is those opposite faces of the same absurdity that give us the exemplar anamorphic configuration. Fifth is this tension within the whole structure of the minimal system of paradox that amounts to the static configuration of orthogonal absurdities. This is the trans-Percian Fifth Principle, it is integral and related to Mathematical Category Theory, which has the possibility of meta-mappings. The meta-mappings that overdetermine the structure of the minimal system determines the tensions within the structure of the minimal system as tensegridity. Sixth is the fact that there are meta-stable points on each line connecting two paradoxes such that when the anamorphic shift occurs which is like the change of direction of the directed graph line between the two paradoxes, i.e. the precedence order of the “but,” there is no movement. In other words you can have ij but ji or ji but ij , just as you can have precedence order for the “yet” at the level of paradox. This is the anamorphic shift when the directed line between the two paradoxes shifts to the other direction. These meta-stable points, meta-stable meaning they are stable regardless of how the anamorphic shift occurs, and thus they are in effect the points where the anamorphic form is embodied that resolves the paradoxical relations. Thus we get six meta-stable places within the entire structure of the minimal system of the interaction of orthogonal absurdities. And these six places are at the level of the trans-Percian sixth principle. That principle of the sixth is holoïdal, i.e. related to interpenetration. When we consider the differences within the minimal system there are nodes where these differences or tensions cancel out, and these are the meta-stable points. It is these meta-stable points that allow us to escape the configuration of contrary, contradiction, paradox, and absurdity. In other words these are what Eliot called the still point in the turning world. These still points, these meta-stable points are stable despite the tension in the whole tensegridity structure and its internal dynamism related to the directed graph. It is of interest that the only platonic structure in which the directed graphs do not conflict with each other is that of the

octahedron. So in other words the traffic pattern of the directed graph within the overall tetrahedron is conflict creating within the whole system. An octahedron comes from fused dual tetrahedrons, which is opposite the cube which is made up of interpenetrated dual tetrahedrons. This is to say that before we get optimal flow we have to fuse two tetrahedrons of orthogonal absurdities. That means that a network with optimal flow twelve meta-stable points. The octahedron and cube have the same Eulerian lattice and are duals of each other. But they both have twelve lines between the six or eight points in the two platonic solids. Such optimal flow is a seventh trans-Percian principle. It only comes into being when we combine two minimal systems of orthogonal absurdities into a single network. In a sense the meta-stability flows throughout the entire higher order network, so that instead of having mere points of meta-stability the entire network becomes meta-stable. It has as its opposite the cube which is a non-meta-stable network because in it the two tetrahedrons remain separate and interpenetrated instead of fused. So in a single minimal system of orthogonal absurdities it is possible to have only six meta-stable places. But if we combine two minimal systems of orthogonal absurdities, then we find there is a way to get optimal flow in the network and there are in that case twelve meta-stable places within a meta-stable network of the octahedron as a threshold of complexity exactly double that of the dynamic minimal system.

Now once we understand the structure of the dynamic minimal system, we can go on to apply that to our insight which we repeat from above, which is how the subject, seen as the center of the minimal system, relates though the meta-stabilities to the outside of that system. We posit an isomorphism between the outside of the minimal system and the unconscious on the one hand and the external unknown environment on the other. In this way we can talk of both the Kunze and the Abraham and Torok systems simultaneously and realize their anamorphic relations to each other as we internalize the anamorphism of Kunze in the theory of Abraham and Torok. To

repeat what was said above perhaps more concisely as a summary, we find that the first place is the subject who views the thing-in-itself from the exterior or the thing as part of the unconscious and produces an image. In the second place, the subject looks awry at the presented image, and in language uses a name and sound for the object. This second place is the fictive subject of Kunze or the Phantom of Abraham and Torok. From this vantage point the subject sees the thing in itself, or the thing of the unconscious as different from what it is through the auspices of the metaphor. The metaphor is a symbol or symptom arising from the unconscious, expressed as something uncanny from the outside world. Thus there is a isomorphic mapping assumed between the external landscape and the unconscious. This is embedded in the tacit dimension of our understanding of our world from which our metaphoric resources are drawn. This isomorphism is expressed as the psychoidal in Jung. The psychoidal is the anamorphism between the psychic and the material world. In the fourth place by seeing awry, the thing out of kilter through metaphor one gets insight into the anamorphism of the meta-stable place that acts as lens or mirror. The fourth place corresponds to the whole of the tetrahedron. We must realize that whole structure before we enter the fourth dimension beyond it. That fourth place is a synergy of all the contraries, contradictions, paradoxes, and absurdities. We can see this through Hegelian eyes as the relations of thesis and anti-thesis into synthesis. The absurdity and anti-absurdity can be seen as thesis and anti-thesis that by an *afhebung* produces the synthesis of the whole minimal system that holds the absurdities together yet apart, and has a different quality from each of the absurdities it contains separately. Another way to view this whole process is as a movement into self-consciousness as Hegel does rather than merely statically as a binding by the strictures of self-created knots that bind us. This anamorphic place is the fourth place, as the resolution of paradox, its anamorphism embodies that resolution, and allows the anagogic viewing awry to occur. For that anagogic viewing to occur the subject must

move. But as it is trapped in the framework of the minimal system of paradox there is no where for it to move. Thus to move it must move in the fourth direction, toward the alpha or kappa directions, that are analogous to up/down, right/left, forward/backward, in four dimensional space. We get leverage tracing out that movement by going out to the third place and tracing back through the fourth place to realize where the fifth place must be in four dimensional space. The move in four dimensional space give us sudden entry into the pentahedron which extends the tetrahedron by one point into four dimensional space. Once we are in four dimensional space then the pentahedron can turn inside out by rotating in four dimensional space. Thus what is hidden in the crypt of the minimal system can be brought to the surface and the underside of the subject can be seen. As Nietzsche says the subject is the object turned inside out. This slight move beyond the mirror, like Alice in Wonderland, down the rabbit hole, is precisely the move into the fourth dimension. The fourth dimension is a double sided mirror that exists in every place in three dimensional space, in either the alpha or kappa directions. Once we fall through that mirror into the fourth dimension, then knots unravel of their own accord in that space. Thus the contraries that form contradictions, paradoxes, or absurdities unravel in four dimensional space if they are seen as knots. But also knots are self-organizations, and the inverse of the unraveling of the knots are the forming of knots as self-organizing processes. Thus if it is possible to get into the fourth dimension then what ever knots we have created that bind us can be loosened and we are free to self-organize ourselves in a different configuration that is less binding. This means that when we enter the fourth dimension at first it appears as Hades of the fifth dimension, it appears as if we are crashing and burning in that place. But actually the fourth dimension is made up of four three dimensional spaces, and thus when we enter it for the first time it appears as Hades, because it is a realm in which all the rules are different from that of the mundane world. But once we have seen the negative mirroring of Hades, then we are free to orient

ourselves toward the duals and the nondual which make up the other three dimensional spaces of the fourth dimension. This is what Odysseus experiences in his journey from his meeting with Hermes on Circe's island until he reaches Calypso's isle. The Iliad sets up the problem of nihilism and the Odyssey contains the resolution of nihilism though the realization of the nondual as the non-nihilistic distinction. This fifth place is the place in which we enter hades. It corresponds to the tension in the entire minimal system of the orthogonal absurdities being manifest as we enter the realm of the fourth dimension where those contradictions, paradoxes and absurdities begin to unfurl. Once we have entered the fourth dimension, by our awry look at the thing out of joint, which we trace back to displace the subject which is trapped into the fourth dimension, then transformational possibilities are unleashed that otherwise would not exist within the minimal system of orthogonal absurdities, no matter how self-conscious we are when we view it as a synthesis in tension between thesis and anti-thesis. The fourth dimension opens up other synergetic possibilities of interrelation that appear in the pentahedron. The pentahedron is composed of five points, ten sides, ten triangles, and five tetrahedrons. It is related though the group A5 to the octahedron and the dodecahedron. It is composed of intertwined mobius strips. Thus what was orthogonal absurdities within the tetrahedron become pairs of boundary logic relations in the tetrahedron. What was looking awry and anti-awry in the tetrahedron that flipped to the other anti-absurdity, can be seen as merely a flip to an opposite boundary logic. So the move into the fourth dimension in the fifth place opens up spaces in which the restrictions experiences in the third dimension can be resolved. That new space is structured by the pentahedron. Suddenly there are ten meta-stable points. Suddenly there is a viewpoint for the subject outside the center, de-centered from the minimal system. Suddenly there is the possibility to involute the minimal system. And it is possible to explore this entire uncanny realm, which is invisible, but which contains four three dimensional spaces that are all isomorphic to the three

dimensional world in which we live. Thus the isomorphism between unconscious and the landscape, because four isomorphisms. Once we have identified Hades, as the anti-metaphor, the realm of nonsense and anasemis beyond the mirror that Deleuze talks about in the Logic of Sense drawing on Lewis Carroll, then it is possible to explore the other mappings that are produced by the regions of the worldview, i.e. the two duals: shiva/dionysus/Nietzsche and brahma/apollo/Jung and to go beyond those duals into the nonduality of the Primal Archetypal Wholeness which is the realm of Vishnu/Albion/HunTun. When we switch from the anamorphousness of the first absurdity to the anamorphousness of the second absurdity we see that there are two entries into the fourth dimension, that of the awry and the anti-awry moment, that of the unconscious thing and unconscious anti-thing. These two entry points both take us to the fifth place but differently. The relation between those two pentahedrons can only be resolved in the sextahedron of five dimensional space. The sextahedron is composed of six points, one for each meta-stable point in the minimal system, fifteen lines and thus fifteen meta-stable points, of which we only need twelve to have laminar flow in the network, twenty triangles, fifteen tetrahedrons, and six pentahedrons. We have found access to two of the six pentahedrons from the awry and anti-awry anagogic views related to the two orthogonal absurdities. This opens us up to an even higher space. One dimensional knots that bind in three dimensional space unfurl in four dimensional space. Two dimensional knots that bind in four dimensional space unfurl in five dimensional space. Three dimensional knots that bind in five dimensional space unfurl in six dimensional space. In six dimensional space there is the septahedron, with seven points, twenty one lines, thirty five triangles, thirty five tetrahedrons, twenty one pentahedrons, and seven sextahedrons. There are seven knots of seven crossings which are the last fully rational knots. There are twenty one knots of eight crossings which are a mixture of rational and irrational knots. What we are suggesting is that this series of minimal solids is infinite. But

at the level of the sixth dimension where we have the seven fold minimal solid there is the possibility of unfurling any three dimensional knots that can exist in three dimensional space. As we move up the line of minimal solids adding one orthogonal point to each in the new dimension at each level, the center of the solid is slightly displaced. This slight displacement of that center is the awry look that occurs as the anagogic look at the meta-stable anamorph. In six dimensional space there is the seven fold minimal solid and that minimal solid has as its points the seven knots with seven crossings. But when we move to its lines between those knots we see the twenty one knots of eight crossings at the meta-stable points of which there are twenty one, i.e. the same number as there are knots with eight crossings. These knots form a field which is rational and irrational divided 12 and 9, and that field is also divided into fibered rational and unfibered irrational by 17 and 4. These two partitions of the field of knots relate to the mythical and the metaphysical worldview configurations respectively. Notice that in the mythopoeitic worldview era there are twelve meta-stable points that are rational knottings, but these are opposed to the nine irrational ones. Twelve is the number needed for laminar flow in the octahedron, where the whole network becomes meta-stable. But that means that there are nine points in the unconscious. These points appear as the parts of the world soul in Plato. But the world soul also has opposite the nine a set of four points. These are the fibered rational knots at the level of eight crossings. If these are selected then there are seventeen points in the unconscious that are not rational or fibered. The structure of the fibered rational knots determine the structure of the Western worldview in the metaphysical era. There are four meta-stable knots. These are the four that relate to the meta-stabilities that hold the two absurdities apart in the minimal system. They themselves form a minimal system of meta-stabilities, which is a stable minimal system within the tension of the absurdities with each other. But that means that seventeen knots related to meta-stabilities at the threshold of eight crossings are banished to the unconscious. This number seventeen is the

number between sixteen and eighteen the transparent numbers whose outsides and insides are equal, is the prime associated with the movement of Osiris to the underworld in time, i.e. his dismemberment happened on the seventeenth of the month. Seventeen is the only opaque prime between the only two transparent numbers. Knots are archetypes of self-organization. The first irrational knots appear with eight crossings. So it is very interesting that the seven point minimal solid in the sixth dimension would have points corresponding to the seven knots with seven crossings, i.e. the last fully rational knots, and that the lines between these points would be twenty one exactly the number of knots with eight crossings. Thus we speculate that the septahedron is related to the knotting structure, and that the field of knots has various symmetry breakings. We posit that the symmetry breaking between nine and twelve represents the breaking of the worldview in the mythopoeitic era, and the breaking of the fibered rational knots represents a further breaking for the metaphysical era. This means that the symmetry breakings of the knots related to the septahedron supplies the relations between meta-stable points. The first symmetry breaking of the mythopoeitic era produces the set of meta-stable points with optimal flow needed for the octahedral network, and it places in the unconscious the nine points related to the NTR, the gods of Egypt called the ennead. The twelve points of optimal flow appear in the journey to the underworld of the God Af by which the should reaches the Duat, i.e. the other world. The nine points define the gods that are irrational, and the twelve points that are rational define the places on the journey between this world and the other world through the orthogonal underground stream between the two worlds with twelve gates and twelve cities. In Greece this division becomes between the 12 Olympian Gods which are Semitic and the 9 that governs the structure of the Indo-European worldview as seen in the repetitions of the hung species in the worldtree which is part of the primal scene of the Indo-Europeans. In other words the Greek synthesis between Semitic and indo-European worldviews

follows the logic of the relation between twelve and nine based on the Egyptian model. On the other hand in the metaphysical era there is further symmetry breaking of this basic self-organization knotting field structure within Greece in which there is a division between four and seventeen. Greece adopts the four elements, and thus relates the unconscious to the seventeen, the singularity between the gates of transparency. The four is seen in the four elements gathered together and systematized by Empedocles. This four becomes our minimal system of meta-stable points that connect the two absurdities. The seventeen becomes the fulcrum for transforming things alchemically in later Arabic Egyptian alchemy. Our point is that it is when we reach the sixth dimension that is when there are six independent orthogonal dimensions then we reach a structure that can unfurl even three dimensional knots in a given three dimensional space. So what ever is knotted in our mundane space can be unknotted in six dimensional space. There are exactly six orthogonal coordinates in this space, which means that the meta-stable relations between absurdities can all open out to be orthogonal to each other in this space. And we have transitioned the subject from the tetrahedron to the pentahedron to the sextahedron to the septahedron. That is three awry displacements which is exactly the number that Achilles goes through to return to normal in the Iliad. The first displacement is when he sees awry the battle between the Achaeans and the Trojans through the lens of the robbery of his war prize by Agamemnon and realizes the nihilism of the situation and the ultimate sameness of the two sides in the battle. This is a transition from the tetrahedron to the pentahedron which is a slight displacement of the center point of the minimal solid into the fourth dimension. But then Achilles transitioned again with the death of Patroclus, and this was the anti-awry anagogic view which caused Achilles to enter the berserker state. This displacement was a transition from the pentahedron in 4d to the sextahedron in 5d. By this transition we get two orthogonal free coordinates separate from the three needed to define three dimensional space. We also get

the ability to relate to pentahedrons which are displacements from each of the orthogonal absurdities bound together in the minimal system. We also get a point for every meta-stable point in the minimal system of orthogonal absurdities. But Achilles transitions again back to normal when he gives up Hector's body to the father. Achilles will never see his father again because he has chosen short life with glory over long life without glory. Thus his own father will not receive his body, and this realization of Achilles' relation to his own father which is an inversion of the relation of Hector to his father, causes Achilles to relent and give up the body of Hector he has so abused, and has sworn he will allow to rot out of the ground which is the ultimate indignity. Achilles sees awry his relation with Hector's father through the lens of his relation with his own father, and thus he transitions again into an even higher dimension. This transition is from the sextahedron in 5d to the septahedron in 6d. With this transition Achilles seems to have returned to normal. But in fact we know that this series of transitions have taken his up three dimensions optional to the three dimensional space in which we live. In that space all knots, one, two and three dimensional can be unbound. In that space the minimal solid, the septahedron, has an affinity with the knotting field, as we have explained and its transition from rational to irrational. Thus at this boundary there is an analogy between the conscious and unconscious, between the part of nature that can be controlled and that which is out of control. In other worlds at this level we reach a relation between two independent three dimensional spaces, one virtual and the other real. This virtual three dimensional space exists as awry anagogic passages within the subject itself which produces an imaginary world within, the world of the crypt where other subjectivities can dwell that are hidden in our mundane world. In other words this is the imaginary world of incorporation which has been created by the three steps out of normal to awry, out of awry to anti-awry, and out of the Hades of anti-awry back to what is apparently normal. Who would have thought that the Iliad would have such a possible interpretation in Kunze

and Abrahams and Torok's anamorphic and anagogic world.

The movement to higher spaces, is a movement to higher schemas. If we look at the sphere and the various hyperspheres of these higher spaces then we find that hyperspheres get bigger in volume and surface area as we go up to higher dimensions but then they go down. It turns out that the volume and surface area peak out in different dimensions. One peaks out at the fifth dimension and the other at the seventh dimension. Thus by going up to the sixth dimension we have gone to the place just between these two peaks. This is the place of optimum openness of the world. The sixth dimension is shared by the Domain and Meta-system. The peaks are at the level of the Meta-system and System and the Domain and World respectively. So this optima of the sixth dimension shares a schema from each of the other peaks.

This means that when we do the metaphor work of clean space, each of the six places we chose has an independent coordinate from the sixth dimension, which we can chose to be a dimension of space or time. In the sixth dimension we can construct a three dimensional temporality to correspond to the three dimensional spatiality of the six places of clean space. The six places correspond to the six meta-stable points between the orthogonal absurdities. The six places correspond to the points in the sextahedron. But the six places also correspond to the six independent coordinate axes of six dimensional space in which the archetypal field of knots correspond to the seven points related to the seven rational knots with seven crossings, and the twenty one meta-stable points which are related to the lines of the septahedron. All the knots we can construct that are one dimensional can be mapped on to that field and its symmetry breakings. Its symmetry breakings determine the structure of the Western worldview in the mythopoietic and metaphysical age. The fact that the six places of the meta-map can relate to the structure of the worldview is itself very surprising. But we also see that there is a seventh place which has a special meaning

related to the meta-stable network, or efficient network. And this seventh place has its image in the seven rational knots with seven crossings, which remind us of the chakras, but also in the points in the septahedron. As in schemas theory the seventh place is transitional back to the beginning. But what we see here is that the seventh place has its own special meaning at the level of the principle of seven which is different from its meaning as negative one, i.e. as the singularity.

Metaphor Work

The Metaphor work of David Grove based on the theories of Willam Rawlands as explained elsewhere⁵, claim that it is possible to explore these anamorphic and anagogic structures and to actualize the anamorphic and anagogic flips within our own narrative and lifestories in order to erase the traces of trauma and clarify the absurdities and paradoxes of our own lives. We do that by realizing the anamorphic relations between maps and narrative, between places in space and events in time within our live history. This anagogic/anamorphic relation between maps and narratives of our lives as seen through the meta-map relations of Rawlands, allows us to produce an anagogic flip that reveals emergent knowledge within our lifeschemas.

⁵ See "The Places in Our Language" by Author.