

AN APPROACH TOWARD BEING, EXISTENCE, AND MANIFESTATION

From the Kindness of Being to the Face of the World and Beyond

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 1632
Orange CA 92856 USA
714-633-9508
~~palmer@exo.com~~

Copyright 1998 K.D. Palmer.
All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.
Version 0.01; 08/05/98; fe00v01.doc

Keywords:

Summary:

A tutorial on the path from Being to existence via the kinds of Being.

Introduction

We who live in the Western Dominant Culture need to find existence within ourselves. For us that is a difficult problem because we are so entrenched in Being. In this tutorial we will take the path from Being to Existence in as direct a manner as possible. This is equivalent to climbing a set of stairs to no-where no-when. Here we begin the climb.

In the midst of "beings"

We begin in the midst of "beings" where we find ourselves as a "being". We discover ourselves as a thing amongst things, and entity amongst entities, an emplacement among places, and our experience is a set of events among events. But we are a strange thing, an unruly entity, an unearthly emplacement, an untimely event. We are a thing that projects thingness, an entity that produces other entities, an emplacement that gives other places their disposition, and an event that makes time or wastes time. So when we ask ourselves about the nature of our "being" we do now know what to answer.

If we accept all the characterizations of Being that have ever been given within the Indo-European tradition then we would come to the conclusion that Being is the most paradoxical matter than as ever been thought. Every kind of characterization has been made of it that you can imagine, and many that will be difficult for you to imagine. The end result is that we do not know what the Being of beings 'is'. It is an open question that stands before us unanswered but always nagging at us because if we do not know that then we do not have any idea who we are ourselves. Since everything has been ascribed to Being at some time in our history it appears at once to be the most full concept, yet because it appears to have no internal differentiation it is also the most empty. It is the highest concept because it covers everything but it is the lowest concept because it is the foundation of everything. It is utterly nihilistic because many extreme opposites can be ascribed to it. And this confusion is not just within the western wing of the Indo-European tradition. Also in India there are the Upanishads that give many different interpretations of Being and the ultimate being, i.e. Brahman. Also in the West there are many interpretations of God as the ultimate being. If we do not know what Being is then how are we to know who God

is whose very basis is traditionally attributed to Being by Indo-Europeans. Thus we find ourselves in utter confusion before we even begin just by listening to the many voices from our tradition that ascribe so many things to Being.

Thus we need to make a new beginning in our search for understanding of Being. This is possible when we realize that it is the Indo-European tradition that primarily finds Being to be foundational. If we look at other Language groups, like the Semites and the Chinese we do not find Being at all in their languages except from interpolation through translation due to cultural contact. These other cultures have what we have come to call Existence instead. They are just as confused about the nature of Existence as we are about the nature of Being. But at least this fundamental distinction is somewhere to begin our search to understand Being. In Being we must look out on existence in order to discover the nature of our worldview at its most basic level. When we undertake the job of looking out on existence then we will be forced to come to terms with the Kindness of Being as a basic phenomena within our world. Ultimately we will see the face of our world and the reflection of that face in existence. So let us begin our journey out of Being into existence.

The Journey Begins

We start then with the utter paradoxical nature of Being that we inherit from our tradition. Our first job is to recognize what Hiedegger calls Ontological Difference. Ontological Difference (c.f. Vail) is the difference between *beings* and *Being*. This is talked about as the relation between the ontic and the Ontological. We can say that beings, things, entities, events, places are all ontic to the extent that they differ. But they are all Ontological to the extent that they are the same. The Ontological is something that applies to all things everywhere. The main

thing that we can see that applies to all things is the fact that they are encompassed by our world, i.e. the Western Dominant Worldview. It used to be that somethings were in one world and other things were in another world each seen by their peoples. But now because of global dominance the Western Worldview has taken the dominant position through the exertion of its power around the globe. All other worlds have been made subservient to the worldview of the Indo-europeans. One way to think about this is that Being is a plague that has swept through the entire earth suffocating everything by encompassing it. A different way to think about it is that Might makes right and that it is our Will to Power that has caused this dominance to occur and that this was the Western Indo-european's Manifest Destiny. Either way what we see is that other worldviews are like species that are going extinct and our earth is being impoverished to the extent that all the variety of worldviews that previously existed are being reduced drastically.

Is Ontological Difference something that is actually effective or something that is epiphenomenal? The question itself borrows itself from Being. Part of what Being does is determine what is real and what is not, what is true and what is not, what can become present and what cannot, what is identical and what is not. These are called the aspects of Being: truth, reality, identity, presence. Is it possible to establish the efficacy of Ontological Difference on the basis of something other than Being itself? This is the crucial question for us.

Ontological Difference is a distinction in terms of the relation of beings to Being. If we cannot make such a distinction then Being probably does not mean anything. If we do make such a difference we must borrow from Being to designate it as real, true, identical or present. Thus Ontological Difference itself in the very act of marking it presents us with a veritable paradox. We could see it in terms

of G. Spencer-Brown's marks which mark themselves and thus produce the primal separation from the blank ground of something, of some entity, of some event, of some place. But then we have adopted the ideal of Ontological Monism within Ontological Difference itself. When we say *Being is, Mark marks, Form forms* then we are ascribing a self-grounding unity to the thing and its operations on itself. We are incorporating from the beginning the concept of Autopoietic Unity, i.e. self-production which has long haunted our tradition in the quandary about the relation between the One and the Many.

Is there any way to approach introducing our first distinction that does not bring all this baggage into our thoughts hidden from ourselves? When we talk about Ontological Difference are we not merely positing the dual of Ontological Monism. Ontological Monism states that Being is One. It says that manyness is in the things, entities, events, places. Ontological Monism as it appears in Heidegger is dynamic instead of static. It says that there is a monolith of Being that has two modalities: dynamic and static following the views of the Presocratics Heraclitus and Parmenides. Being itself is One, a monolith, but we who are embedded in Being, see it via one or the other of its modes. We are embedded in Being the same way Einstein finds us embedded in Spacetime. Heidegger's formulation in Being and Time can be seen as the Analog for SpaceTime. He finds the world DynamicStatic. DynamicStatic is the monolith in the same way SpaceTime is a monolith with the difference that SpaceTime is only part of DynamicStatic. In fact within DynamicStatic there is both SpaceTime and TimeSpace (Minkowski's causal model that reverses Einstein's static spatial model). We call the reversibility between SpaceTime and TimeSpace the Matrix. The Matrix contains the two chiasmic views of SpaceTime and TimeSpace. The Matrix itself is a part of the Monolith of Being, because that larger

monolith must comprise everything that appears in spacetime/timespace as well. We call these mixtures of times and places eventities, i.e. states of affairs. The Matrix and the eventities are the basic aspects that appear in the DynamicStatic monolith. The eventities are entities to the extent that they have Being.

I personally like the category table of Ivar Johansson Which takes SpaceTime and states of affairs as basic. But at this point we will not explore any further the differentiation of categories beyond what we have distinguished above.

The problem arises when we note as Heidegger did that some of these eventities give rise to the world in which all the others are discovered. Thus entities are fundamentally divided into those that project the world and those that are discovered in the projected world. We will call those entities that are found within the projection things. Thing primordially was a social gathering. Thus things are entities that are socially constructed by mutual projection. It turns out that even the projectors are themselves projected so that entities that project are also things. We will follow Heidegger in calling the projectors "dasein, being there". Everything that does not project Being are non-dasein. The social projection comes before individual projection so mit-sein and non-mitsein come before dasein and non-dasein. The mitsein projects as a social group the things. Dasein can be seen as things. Thus we see in Buber the distinction between I-it and I-Thou. I-it relations are when dasein is seen as a thing rather than a part of the mutual projection. I-thou is when dasein is seen as part of the mutual projection of mit-sein.

All this terminology borrowed from Heidegger and Buber allow us to zero in on the source of the problem with Ontological Monism and Ontological Difference. Ontological Monism projects One-Many on

the relation between Being and beings. Ontological Difference projects Abstract-Concrete (Universal/Particular) representations on the relation between Being and beings. The question that we must ask ourselves is whether as Bateson says this is *a difference that makes a difference* or not. Any way you look at it we end up using some distinctions against other distinctions to define what we are trying to say. What we notice is that we are begin in the thick of things. There is no one beginning distinction that we can take as first. There are instead myriad distinctions some of which we consider meta distinctions in that they are differences that are relevant. In fact, as we look into it further we realize that the net of distinctions is what Deleuze and Guattari call the Rhizome, it has no beginning or end but only a middle and we find ourselves in that middle when ever we start to make distinctions that matter to us.

When we look at this meta-distinction between Ontological Monism and Ontological Difference we eventually realize that they together are an image of the Monolith itself. One side of the monolith looks at the One-Many problem while the other side looks at the Abstract-concrete problem more closely. Together these two furnish models of the present-at-hand and ready-to-hand as we value difference or sameness differently over time. So not only do we start in the midst of things but what ever our representations of the fundamental are they end up looking a lot like the structure of the monolith itself.

Beginning again . . .

Husserl had the problem of always having to begin again to define his discipline from first principles. We are now seeing how this occurs for us as well. We want to start out with beings and define the generalization of that. But we have difficulty getting past the point of making that distinction of difference

between Abstract and Concrete clear and distinct. We begin to recognize that the opposite formulation is the One-Many problem that gives us the Ontological Monism. And we recognize that these two formulations are an image of the Ontological Monolith with its bi-modality. So we are led back to trying to begin again in a seeming vicious cycle where our efforts are foiled by ourselves.

Another way of approaching this is not by establishing firsts at all, i.e. neither the first distinction not the whole from which everything else flows. Another way of approaching this is to do what Nicholas Rescher suggests in Cognitive Systematization. In that book he suggests that our axioms form a network and that we need to continually revisit the nodes of the network. This reminds us of the hermeneutic spiral. A continual process of regrounding rather than establishing Firsts.

Another way to approach the problem is to recognize that Being is paradoxical and use the best means we have to deal with paradox which is Higher Logical Ramified Type Theory developed by Russell and Copi among others. That theory would ask us to create a set of Higher Logical Types and whenever we find a class wanting to be a member of itself we appeal to the higher logical type. It turns out that we also need types at each meta-level to make this defense as sound as possible.

What we will do is combine these two methods suggested by Rescher and Russell into a single approach. We will first recognize four higher logical types. We will call them meta-levels and number them in the opposite direction but the idea is basically the same. Then we will recognize four aspects which will stand for our Ramified Types at each meta-level.

The Meta-levels of Being are as follows

beings	being-in-the-world	Ontic
Pure	Present-at-hand	Point
Process	Ready-to-hand	Grasp
Hyper	In-hand	Bear
Wild	Out-of-hand	Encompass

The aspects are as follows:

- ◆ Truth
- ◆ Reality
- ◆ Presence
- ◆ Identity

Each aspect appears at all the meta-levels and the Cartesian cross of the aspects with the meta-levels gives us the facets. There are sixteen facets:

	<u>Pure</u>	<u>Process</u>	<u>Hyper</u>	<u>Wild</u>
<u>Truth</u>	Pure Truth	Process Truth	Hyper Truth	Wild Truth
<u>Identity</u>	Pure Identity	Process Identity	Hyper Identity	Wild Identity
<u>Reality</u>	Pure Reality	Process Reality	Hyper Reality	Wild Reality
<u>Presence</u>	Pure Presence	Process Presence	Hyper Presence	Wild Presence

To these facets we will apply Rescher's idea of moving from axiom to axiom in a continuous cycle like the hermeneutic spiral in a process of continually regrounding. In that process we will recognize that there will be breaks and discontinuities. In those breaks

and discontinuities we further recognize that fractal and chaotic patterns may occur as if we were exploring something like the mandelbrot set with all of its variously colored escape velocities under the application of recursion to individual points. Similarly there are some of the intersections and interferences between facets that will make us consider the whole project of the production of Being is crazy. However, we will not allow these discrepancies to distract us from the general process of revisiting the facets in various orders as they interfere and intersect each other in Paradoxical Being. The network of facets is a Rhizome. We are always in the midst of it and it has no beginning or end. Being itself is like what Castoralis calls Magma in that it is what is there beyond our projection of reason on Being.

We will call Reason what uses the four aspects of Being against each other and toward each other to produce the semblance of order, discipline, rigor, and other imponderables. Reason means having a ground and proceeding from that ground. Any of the aspects or any combination of the aspects can furnish that ground. The problem is that we only leave the ground in order to reenter it again and again as we continue on our way though the hermeneutic cycle or the grounding cycle of Cognitive Systematization.

So we no longer expect to discover a first. We project all at once a complex situation in which we distinguish a minimal system of meta-levels and a minimal system of aspects and then we look at the interrelations that we find between these in a fractal and chaotic ever changing landscape. We choose four based on the dictum by B. Fuller that a minimal system must have four components to be a system. Thus we see a system of minimal components both in the levels of ramification and in the aspects. What this tells us is that we must project the whole ramified higher logical type network at one

time as an unfolding of a minimal system.

Minimal Systems

Penrose talks about spinnors as the minimal structure needed for something to stand still in spacetime. To stand still in spacetime as a whole you must move, in fact you must spin round twice giving 720 degrees of angular momentum. Now if we look at geometry we find four different figures that contain 720 degrees of angular change: Knot, Mobius Strip, Tetrahedron, and Torus. We have talked here in terms of the picture of the minimal system as Tetrahedron. But we could instead talk about it in terms of the Knot, the Mobius Strip or the Torus. In other words these are all representations of the eventuality that stands still in four dimensional spacetime. The knot talks about interference and only occurs in the third dimension. The mobius strip is also three dimensional in spite of being a two dimensional surface. It is the embodiment of non-duality. It is locally dual but globally non-dual as globally both of its apparent sides are the same surface. The torus is the three dimensional analog of the hyper-sphere in four dimensions. It represents inter-embedding.

We can see these figures from geometry as ways that the mind deals with paradox. It deals with it by splitting it up into parts like the parts of the tetrahedron and then ordering them into a whole. It deals with it by seeing something paradoxical as interfering with itself as does a knot. It deals with it by seeing something as being capable of non-duality globally despite local duality. It deals with it by seeing the paradox embedded in itself as the hyper-sphere is an embedding of spheres that has the volume of the torus.

The mind can handle a certain amount of ambiguity and that degree is imprinted in these images of the minimal system. When we see the aspects and the meta-levels as projections of a minimal system we need to

keep in mind that all the relations we find in these representations of the minimal system can be ascribed to our basic partition of Being and our projection of reason onto its intrinsic paradoxicality.

Rhizome and Magma

Thus the stairs of the kinds of Being come into existence all at once. They are self grounding. We can thus see that they can be seen as an image of an autopoietic, or self organizing system. They represent the self organization of the worldview. But this self-organizing is not of a single self but of multiple selves acting in concert. Thus this autopoietic system is reflexive, in other words the various selves that are projected in the building and as the builders are only mirror images of each other. The interrelations of the kinds and aspects as facets need to be continually explored. The exploration is part of the ecstasy of the unfolding of the World itself. The world is projected to be discovered. We discover it who project it. Depending on how immersed we are in the Paradoxicality of Being the more or less rational we will appear to each other. In terms of Deleuze and Guattari schizophrenia is the dual of capitalism. Capitalism appears to be rational activity. But how rational can it be if it is destroying the planet on which it depends. It is like a virus that kills its host. Schizophrenia is when we are utterly immersed in the paradoxicality so we cannot disentangle ourselves from it. Capitalism is when we attempt to control everything, all the flows, and they are all dislocated from the earth, so that we are utterly reasonable, what we do not notice is that all of our reasons are absurd.

In Deleuze and Guattari they posit the existence of desiring machines and the socius as basic and call the individual embodied person an epiphenomena of these two higher and lower levels. Desiring machines in a

rhizomatic network of the socius in which embodied individuals are illusory. This is their picture of who we are. The desiring machines appear from the body-without-organs of the unconscious as orthogonal to each other. There is no reason but only connections that work between the desiring machines.

We want to add to this picture several ideas. One is that there are not just desiring machines but also disseminating machines. The desiring machines form chains that use what ever is disseminated. Thus there is not just taking but also giving. Also we would like to use Castoralis' idea of the magma, i.e. the indiscriminated flows prior to their becoming the rhizome. In other words the rhizomatic network is itself still late in the process of projecting on the upsurge of paradoxical Being. Another concept that we take from *The Production of Desire* is that there are actually two unconsciousnesses. The unconscious of Freud that is personal and the unconscious of Marx which is by self-alienation which is social. Thus the unconscious is dual. Jung's Collective unconscious is some how the origin of both of these. Thus the body-without-organs is not without internal structure. It is not just the body-without-organs but the inverse the places-without-world and their origin. The body-without-organs is the body we experience directly, we do not experience our organs but only the surfaces of things. The savage writes on that surface, the barbaric takes control of the flows of that surface, and capitalism disengages the flows from their natural reference. Similarly the places-without-world is what occurs outside ourselves. We do not see the world itself directly but only a multitude of places. This multitudes of places holds the key to self-alienation in which the disseminating machines become orthogonal. That orthogonality leads to self-alienation. Places-without-world have no coherence. The origin of both places-without-world and body-without-organs is the collective unconscious

of Jung. That is the opposite of the collective consciousness. Collective consciousness is when we intentionally project together as when we create corporations. Collective unconsciousness is when we unintentionally project together demons and monsters that we make together. Between these two extremes is awareness. Collective awareness is the basis of Social Phenomenology. It is neither intentional nor unintentional but merely what appears to the social group. But the social group is not a bunch of individuals but networks of desiring and disseminating machines that project their world together including the surfaces of each other. They project bodies with organs and a world with places. But all we know is the bodies without organs in the places without a world because there is no transcendental apperception.

In the process of social projection the magma is turned into the rhizome and then further reified. This solidification process is described by Sartre in Critique of Dialectical Reason as the Fused Group is reified into various institutions. Canetti talks about the Pack instead of the Fused Group. Both are aspects of the primal social group from which individuals eventually emerge. Before that emergence there is magma and then the rhizome and then reason tries to sort out the rhizome. This process is described in the Economy of Cities by Jane Jacobs. She describes how new kinds of work come into existence. She says they are added on to old kinds of work and supplant them. Companies will do what ever works first and then try to rationalize it later. The magma is the market conditions before they are recognized. The rhizome are the different interpenetrating kinds of work that are mixed together in the viable system. The hierarchical structuring by reason comes later when there is enough surplus to afford it. Reason works off of what Bataille calls the Accursed Share. The production of the surpluses creates the points of excess for dissemination to occur from. The desiring machines and disseminating machines form what Bataille calls a

Generalized Economy.

Stairs to Nowhere

So this description of our being in the midst of the projection process of Being allows us to begin to think about approaching the stairs to nowhere. We think we know what beings are so we decide that this must be the lowest rung on the ladder. But beings are splinters shattered from the paradox of Being itself. So beings are just as mysterious as Being if not more so. If we take a being and take it to the first meta-level that means that we look at the being of a being, i.e. what the *being is*. We know about what the meta-level of language is, i.e. language about language, that's grammar. But when we ask what being a being is then we are suddenly stuck. Ontological monism merely treats this quandary in terms of grammar by assuming that one part is a noun and the other part is a verb so that a being beings as a process of becoming itself. But at the first level we merely have a static description of the confluence of a being with itself as a being which we call following Heidegger and others Being. We thus explain Ontological difference as the process of moving to the meta-level or the higher logical type as the case may be of the entity itself given as present or identical or true or real. This is the first rung of the ladder, Pure Being, a static snapshot of a being colliding with itself.

The next Meta-level above Pure Being is Process Being. At that level the verb enters the picture because when we take the static snapshot of the first meta-level to its next meta-level there has to be a displacement in time. In other words the shard of being, that splinter that we found frozen at the first meta-level then becomes itself though time rather than merely *being* itself. Why time? Because when we go to the next meta-level we must set back in another dimension and since all space has been taken up in the first meta-level then only time is left. When we set

back the being in time then we acquire the spacetime/timespace block of the Matrix. When we consider all the eventities within that Matrix we have a picture of the DynamicStatic Monolith which is both flux and stasis at the same time without interfering with each other. Our splinters of paradox acquire a specious present that Wm James described. As G.H. Mead said it takes time for things to become themselves and reaffirm who they are. Time exists in the quanta it takes for things to become what they are. At the second meta-level the process by which we move from being image¹ to being image² is suddenly visible. These two images collide with each other in at the first meta-level were we discover that a being is itself. How do we know? We have to compare two instances of itself and these can be seen as separated by time. It is at this level that what Heidegger calls the belonging together of Sameness appears over the stasis of pure identity. So what were merely splinters of paradox now fold back on themselves and then we see the process of their folding, unfolding and infolding.

From here we go to the third Meta-level. At this meta-level we focus on the discontinuities rather than continuities. At this meta-level we see not just that there is a process of a being becoming itself but that as it does so it may transform along the way. These discontinuities in process, the breaks that produce transformations in entities so that one entity becomes another is what Derrida calls Difference, which means differing and deferring. As the process goes on it differs from itself and it defers to other processes. Derrida got this from Heidegger where he talks about ~~Being~~ crossed out. Levinas talks about this as "Beyond Being", i.e. the monolith where ethics and metaphysics collapse together. Merleau-Ponty talks about this as the hyper-dialectic between Process Being of Heidegger and Nothingness of Sartre, its antinomy. It is a hyper dialectic because the dialectic is a process and this is a dialectical dialectic

similar to the one that Sartre describes in *The Critique of Dialectical Reason*. When we apply the dialectic to the dialectic then strange things happen. Derrida calls this the level of traces. He talks about it in terms of a Hinge. It is a moment of undecidability. At this level the being is undecidability itself in the stream of transforming processes, pure unmotivated discontinuities that shatter the continuity of Being.

Finally we take the discontinuous beings that were merely becoming themselves of just being themselves and have allowed them to become Other than what they are. This is why Being is written under erasure or crossed out. It no longer Is what it Is. Isness is discontinuous with itself. At that level we see what Michael Henry calls the breakup of the assumption of Ontological Monism and the arising of the unconscious of manifestation itself, what is beyond the unconscious of the beings in manifestation. Henry calls this the Essence of Manifestation and uses the work of Meister Eckhart to talk about it. Meister Eckhart the heretic who wanted his followers to *be* Christ and thus transform from human to avatar across the transcendental divide.

Finally we ask what is the meta-level above discontinuity. It can be nothing other than chaos. By chaos we mean the mathematical Chaos described by Gleick in his popularization of this mathematical theory that finds order even in chaos. Chaos is the mixture of order and disorder, not pure disorder. This mixture of continuous and discontinuous, order and disorder, or what ever fundamental opposites you want to name chaotically is Wild Being. Here we find that the entities themselves form a social field, like the socius of Deleuze and Guattari. They arise out of this field and fall back into it. Even the rhizome is a reification of this magma which solidifies breaking apart and then melts and fuses again. Castoriadis explicitly says that Being is Chaotic. This is the one step before utter paradox which is

where paradox is even paradoxical, i.e. the absurd. The absurd is the meta-system. Utter absurdity is achieved by the fusion of all the kinds of Being together. It is the magma beneath even the discrimination of the minimal system of aspects and the minimal system of meta-levels. Merleau-Ponty calls this Wild Being. John S. Hans calls this The Play of the World. Deleuze and Guattari call it the rhizome which has no beginning or end, root or branch, but only the middle. They use the borrow of Kafka as their example. Castoriadis calls it Magma.

When we try to go up to the next meta-level we face a problem. None appears. We search for it in vain. It seems there is none. But this is what renders our ontology empirical. If anyone finds another level then they will have expanded our world. At least we can say that no one among the continental philosophers have discovered it as yet, or at least we have not encountered it if they have. My own interpretation is that there is no fifth Meta-level. I follow Bateson in this who talks about the meta-levels of learning and motion in Steps to the Ecology of the Mind. He says that there are only four meta-levels of motion in the physus and only four meta-levels of learning in the logos. I have developed this into a model of work processes in my Advanced Process Architecture tutorial. There I talk about meta-levels of learning and change. These meta-levels are directly analogous to the meta-levels of Being, they are merely representations in the physus and logos.

If we follow Bateson and only posit four meta-levels then we must figure out what it means for the meta-levels to come to and end at four and for the fifth one to be missing. What the fifth meta-level represents is unthinkability and non-experienceability. This is because when we try to think it or experience it our heads hurt and we become disoriented. I interpret this unthinkability and unexperienceability to be what the Buddhists call Sunyata, or Emptiness or what the

Taoists call the Void. This is an interpretation and there may be others, but I prefer to go back into the Indo-European tradition and search for precedents rather than assume that just because we do not recognize what is beyond Being in the West that it cannot be conceptualized. Of course it can only be conceptualized by a non-concept and a non-experience, i.e. by a direct pointing or reference or indication.

I further suggest that what is beyond Being is existence. When the Arabs took over the Greek philosophy they did not have a word for Being. They only had Existence (wujud). They used the word that they had for Manifestation (kun) to stand for existence. When the Arab works were translated back into Latin the word wujud was translated by a made up word 'existence'. Thus each language made up a technical term for what they did not have in their own language. Thus we inherit existence from a non-Indo-European language and culture who inherited and passed along Greek philosophy to us. If it had not been for the Arabs these works would have been lost for the most part. Thus when we get to the limits of Being and look out over the edge as we do at the fifth meta-level then what we see is existence, i.e. that which is not caught up in the presentational system of Being. Existence is that which is outside the warp of Being. We define it as that which is neither true nor false, identical nor different, real nor illusory, present nor absent. It is the rock at the side of the road that no one cares about. It is left as it is because it is not worth anything to anyone. Underneath the layers of Being every being is an existent. That is what the being is after we peel away all the layers of paradoxicality projected by us on everything by our worldview.

Kierkegaard

As far as I know Kierkegaard is the first modern para-philosopher to understand this

whole spectrum of the kinds of Being. It is interesting that he is known as the first existentialists. He formulated the various levels at which one could live ones life. This formulation captures the human face of the spectrum of meta-levels of Being.

absurd	System
Transcendental Religion	Pure Being
paradox	dissapative system
Immanent Religion	Process Being
humor	autopoietic system
Ethical	Hyper Being
irony	reflexive system
Aesthetic	Wild Being
daemonic	Meta-system

Here we give the relation between Kierkegaard's levels of life and the kinds of Being. The aesthetic is the person who lives on the surface of life as a Hedonist. This surface has many facets that are understood as Nietzsche did in terms of styles. What is beyond the surface are the daemons like Apollo and Dionysus who embody the forces of order and reason verses disorder and unreason. This variegated surface of life is the very picture of Wild Being.

The ethical person has depth. That depth has to do with the fact that principles are used to decide whether something should be done or allowed. The principles are produced by reason or unreason but then are applied to order the surface of life. The person who applies principles to govern their actions has character. This is related to Hyper Being because applying ethics involves choices and

Hyper Being is the undecidable, i.e. the limit of choices.

The person who accepts immanent religion takes the principles from the received laws of God. This is to say that the laws come from beyond reason but are then applied to reason. This is like Process Being because there is a process by which the received law is applied. This process must reconcile the supra-rational nature of the laws to the individual cases. In Islam this is called Ijdihad and in Christianity it is called casuistry.

Transcendental Religion is the revelation itself. It is beyond reason and often takes the prophet beyond the laws that are given as in the case of Abraham who was told by God to kill his own son, or so it is believed by Christians. Transcendental religion is seen as paradoxical and when it takes us beyond the law it becomes absurd. Kierkegaard's whole point was to show that Religion contra Hegel was not a manifestation of Reason working itself out in the world. But something else that reason could not comprehend.

What is so intriguing about Kierkegaard's formulation is that he gives us the interstices between the levels as well as the levels. What is beyond the aesthetic is the demonic, i.e. that is when something else from beyond the surface of things reaches out and takes us over. Rollo May says that the Daemonic is when a part takes over the whole. The many gods are seen as parts of the psyche and when one takes us over then we are overpowered by something incomprehensible beyond ourselves. The Daemonic is represented by the Seducer in Either/Or.

Between the Aesthetic and the Ethical is seen the ironic. Kierkegaard does his dissertation on Irony of Socrates. Irony is the ultimate in the description of the social field. It is dissemblance of myriad images to the point that one does not know what the reference really is. This appears between the Aesthetic and the Ethical because between the surface

of life and its depths there is a myriad of images generated by which the surface comprehends the depth and vice versa. I know that you know that I know that you know that . . . What is really meant is splintered by what appears and vice versa.

Between the Ethical and the Religious is Humor. We can think here of the smile of the Buddha. Humor says that there is an ultimate vantage point on the myriad of ironic images and that vantage point is false. In other words I posit an ultimate interpretation which is wrong and that is what is humorous. It is the opposite of the ultimate vantage point that is right which is given us by religion. Religion is serious and what ever is not that is humorous.

Between the Immanent Religion and the Transcendental Religion is paradox because god gives us the laws and then tells us to break them. Thus laws are in themselves created things that can be abrogated by their creator. This locates all the paradoxicality in one place, the law giver that also breaks the laws. When we are told by god to break the laws then we step outside the paradox into the absurd. Laws that we can be told to break are paradoxical. Laws that we are told to break by the source of the Laws are absurd.

Each of these interstices is related to one of the special systems which are anomalous. They exist as quantal steps on the way from the system to the meta-system. Look what we learn when we see that the system is the absurd. We find out that the entity that appears to us as a gestalt is full of paradox, in fact paradox driven to absurdity. As we move away from the full embodiment by the entity as systemic gestalt toward the meta-system we encounter the special systems. The special systems are broken systems and partial meta-systems. Meta-systems are another name for the environment, milieu, context, situation, etc. Special systems are ultra-efficient. They are anomalous. They

appear on the human level as the interstices that Kierkegaard sees. So the dissipative system is like paradox. In other words the dissipative system is like the perpetual motion machine that we know is impossible. But instead it is a perpetual information machine based on a strange attractor that appears rarely as neg-entropic in far from Equilibria environments. Pirgogine describes such dissipative structures, i.e. where order is dissipating, in his book Order Out of Chaos. It seems paradoxical in a world governed by entropy that neg-entropy is possible but such things do exist as shown by the chemical dissipative structures described by Pirgogine.

The autopoietic system is composed of a conjunction of two dissipative systems. It is a system that holds its boundary static and its organization is homeostatically maintained. It is like humor. I think the best way to see this is via the study of Laughing and Crying by Palmer. That study shows how laughing and crying are opposites and how they alternate on man as the extremes of emotion. Humor is something that can cause crying as well as laughter. Humor can be a knife that kills psychologically. Humor can be political mischief. Humor can be a pun. Humor can be "dirty". Humor has many faces. Humor is how we maintain our sanity in the face of life's setbacks as well. If we see laughing and crying as extreme opposites of emotion then we can see humor as the thing that controls the balance between these extremes bringing us one extreme or the other. Humor stands for the balance point in our lives. What we are humorous about we can bear. What we cannot be humorous about is unbearable.

Irony is like the reflexive special system. This special system is made up of two conjoined autopoietic systems. It is by definition social. It is heterodynamic instead of homeostatic. It is the production of ecstasy by the social body. That ecstasy gives rise to the world which we find ourselves embedded in before we know who we are. Irony is the

perfect representation of reflexivity because in irony you never know what is true and what is false, what is identical and what is different, what is present and what is absent, what is real and what is unreal. Plato is the ultimate ironist. You can never believe what he is saying. Those that think they know when he is being serious are deluding themselves. In irony everything is a lie. But the lie has the cutting edge of reality. It is a dissemblance in the social group to protect yourself, but by that dissemblance you try to indirectly point at the truth, reality, identity, presence. Irony is the way the individual protects himself from the sanction of the group and still expresses the truth as he sees it. The meta-system is made up of all the ironies of all the individuals. The daemonic is the interference pattern of all the ironies.

How Kierkegaard saw this spectrum is beyond me because to my knowledge only Plato and Aristophanes saw it before him and you must look at both of their works to see it. Aristophanes embodies in his works about absurdity and paradox while Plato embodies about the daemonic and ironic. What they share is humor. Plato takes seriously the absurdities of Aristophanes and Aristophanes makes fun of Socrates who Plato seeks to take serious. Plato and Aristophanes are opposites and thought their opposition they embody the whole spectrum of the kinds of Being in their works.

Empty Existence

Once we have walked up the ladder of the kinds of Being and found the missing stairs at the top then we are ready to look out on existence which we discover to be empty. It is empty because what ever self we posit we cannot find it. What ever substance we posit we cannot locate it. This is a kind of emptiness that is absolute in that it is empty itself. It turns out that emptiness itself has various meanings that correspond to the levels of the special systems.

System	Hole
Dissipative System	No-thing
Autopoietic System	Interpenetration
Reflexive System	Emptiness is empty
Meta-system	Jeweled net

If we look deeply we find that emptiness has many meanings and that they are in fact embodiments of the special systems at the various levels of the interstices between the kinds of Being. Thus emptiness in its various forms is what separates the kinds of Being from each other. The Mahayana Buddhists found that the interpretation of emptiness as the dependent arising of everything was interpenetration of all things. If we apply the special systems to the Buddhist ideals then we would say that the Arhat is the image of the dissipative system, that Buddha is the image of the autopoietic system and the BodhiSattva is the image of the Reflexive system. I have covered these analogies in detail in my book The Maitreya Sutra.

The Face of the World

The different kinds of Being synergize together to form the face of the world. When ever you see all four kinds of Being operate together in some phenomena or theory then you are looking at the gathered face of the world. This is a rare and beautiful phenomena. An example of that is Chaos theory. Another Example is the idea of Virtual Particles that make up spacetime. Another example is the Laws of Form by G. Spencer-Brown when extended by the Surreal Numbers of Conway. Another example is the concept of Firsts, Seconds, and Thirds when extended by the concept of Fourths as Fuller's Synergies. There are many theoretical examples that are scattered

throughout my various working papers. Finding these synergies of the Kinds of Being and the Aspects of Being has been a major pastime of mine for many years. Each one is different from the last and each one gives us deeper understanding of the relations between the meta-levels and aspects. Each one is like a precious jewel that we find out in the Wilds of Being as in the story of Eldorado by Onar Aam.

It is not necessary to climb the staircase. Instead we can realize that the four kinds of Being and the aspects are like a mobile where the various facets intersect and interfere. When all the kinds of Being intersect and we look at the point of intersection then we see the face of the world. When we see that face we are looking at ourselves because of the wisdom that the world and the self are equal and mirror each other. When you are looking at the face of the world you see the structure of yourself. When you look at the face of the self you see the structure of the world. No more and no less. Both are utterly empty. Utter emptiness is when all the interpretations of emptiness intersect. This occurs when you see the face of the world. It is the world looking back at you.

The Quintessence

We have said Existence can be captured as neither this aspect nor its opposite. The dual of existence is the quintessence. It is both true and false, both real and unreal, both identical and different, both present and absent. The quintessence is the philosopher's stone, lapis that Jung talks about in his alchemical writings and the Alchemists themselves searched for in vain. The Quintessence is the non-dual heart of Being while Existence is what is beyond Being. The non-dual Vedantic Philosophy of Sankara called Avedia deals with the quintessence and calls it Brahma. It is what is usually called cosmic consciousness. It is the ideal state that the Hindu sages aim for and which the

Buddha reached before realizing its dual in Empty Existence. The quintessence is Full as opposed to empty. It is the ultimate overflowing fullness of Being. What ever is touched by non-dual Being is transformed. In the West this is called Glory and is what the heroes like Achilles attempted to achieve.

Manifestation

If we ask what there is when empty existence cancels with the full quintessence then the answer is Manifestation. Manifestation is the origin beyond the Quintessence and Existence. Existence is what is found inwardly or outwardly. Quintessence is the non-dual core of Being which is the absurd beyond the paradoxicality. Where Quintessence is absurd the Existence is supra-rational. Absurdity and Supra-rationality are opposites that entail each other. Steve Rosen in his idea of the Quantal jumps from one non-dual topological surface to the next shows us how to understand the relation of paradoxicality to supra-rationality a distinction Kierkegaard did not understand. We can understand it by studying Zen Koans and other supra-rational, rather than paradoxical, forms in Buddhism. As we move from lemniscate to mobius strip to kleinian bottle to hyper-kleinian bottle that defines the sphere of ambiguity we can see how supra-rationality transforms step by step into paradoxicality. Manifestation is the middle point in this set of quantum jumps, i.e. the discontinuity between the mobius strip and the kleinian bottle. Manifestation is the absolute midpoint between all opposites. When we contrast Buddhism with Taoism we find that Buddhism is still slightly out of balance because it is dialectically opposed to Being and finds its definition in nihilistic oppositions. Taoism does not have this problem because its Void was never related to Being. It has the problem instead of vagueness. Manifestation is that true void which is the mid-point between the paradoxical and the supra-rational.

Manifestation is named Kun in Arabic.

Plato's Divided Line

Plato explains it all to us in his metaphor of the divided line. The four kinds of Being relate to the different divisions. But the difference between the two subordinate divisions represent inward and outward existence. The difference between the two supra-ordinate divisions represent manifestation. So that in the divided line, between the Sun and the Cave metaphors we find the whole story laid out for us concerning the difference between Being, Existence and Manifestation.

Appearance (anti-aspects)

-----Outward Existence VOID

Reality Identity Presence Truth

=====Manifestation

Imaged Intelligibles = Beauty

-----Inward Existence EMPTINESS

Non imageable Intelligibles = Good

The sun of the Good as the unimaginable intelligible is to reality, truth, identity, presence as the Imagined intelligibles are to appearances. What is never questioned are the distinctions between the divisions of the line. In these distinctions Plato has placed great wisdom.

The Good as the source of all variety is just one of the great non-duals. There is also Right, Order and Fate. These are nestled in the dualities that define the Western Worldview. The fourfold that Heidegger mentions that is Socrates' definition of the World as Heaven:Earth::Immortal:Mortal applies to the Mythopoietic World. The Metaphysical World has the definition Apeiron:Peiron::Phyus:Logos. The nonduals

appear between the extremes of the duals as chiasms thus:

Physus/Logos (order, nomos)

Peiron/Aperion (right, rta, arte)

Have/HaveNot (good)

Exist/NotExist (fate)

Manifest/NonManifest (openspaces)

All of these are non-imageable intelligibles. Plato deals with nomos in the Laws by describing an Autopoietic City that is the dual of the Republic. The Republic deals with justice as the distribution of rights in the city and thus describes Rta the Indo-European ideal of Cosmic Harmony. Within the Republic at the mid-point Plato points at the Sun of the Good, the source of variety. And in the myth of Er Plato points at fate as the Rainbow in the interspace between life and death. That interspace itself is manifestation.

These same non-duals appear to the Prophets of the Semites as the Covenants between the Jews and their God. Adam is related to the Goodness of creation. The covenant of Noah is the Rainbow that says that God will no longer destroy whole peoples for their iniquity. The covenant with Abraham is the circumcision that places a limit on the body as a sign of what is unlimited. The covenant of Moses is the Laws or the order of God. Both the Indo-Europeans and the Semites have access to these non-duals.

The combination of the non-duals represent suchness of Buddhism in inward existence and the great ultimate of Taoism in outward existence. The interspace of the self between inward and outward existence becomes more and more constricted and when they overlap then that is manifestation.

Conclusion

When we get to the edge of Being and look out we see existence. Existence is empty. It appears where the fifth meta-level should be but is not. This renders our ontology empirical, i.e. refutable. If we see the fifth meta-level then our world expands into another dimension. Being due to its split into aspects and meta-levels by the ramified higher logical type theory is fragmented. At the heart of Being is existence. At the heart of every entity is an existent. The existent is what is exclusive of the aspects of Being and beyond the fourth meta-level of Being. The quintessence balances existence and annihilates it to reveal manifestation. Manifestation is the ultimate balance of all the opposites and the deepest non-duality.