

The Way of Being

Anil Mitra © 2002 – 2022

Contents

Preface	4
Division 1 Encapsulation	7
Division 2 Roots—Into the way	12
Prologue	12
Origins	15
Into the way	17
Division 3 Metaphysics—the real	17
Human ground in the world	17
Mind, world, and action	21
Meaning and knowledge	23
Existence	25
Being and beings	25
What is being?	26
How to identify beings	30
A specimen collection	30
Kinds of being	31
Cause, effect, and power	32
Natural law	33
The void	33
Merging of opposites	34
The universe	37
Cause revisited, reasons	37
Possibility, logic, and science	38
Logic as the theory of the universe	39
Metaphysics	39

The fundamental principle of metaphysics	41
Identity of all beings and the ultimate	41
Enjoyment	42
Realization as an imperative	42
Abstraction and the foundation so far	43
The abstract metaphysics and tradition	44
The real metaphysics	45
Cosmology of space-time-being	46
Cosmology of limitless identity	47
On the meaning of life	48
Dimensions of being	49
The pure dimension	50
A system of pragmatic dimensions	50
Paradigms of explanation and prediction	51
Growth of persons and civilizations	53
Division 4 Realization—pathways to the ultimate	55
Pathways to ultimate being	55
Paths and templates	56
On meditation and yoga	57
Everyday template	58
Universal template	60
Quality of being	62
An ideal world	62
Doubt, judgment, and action	63
Resources	64
Division 5 Return and prospect—into the world	65

Preface

This edition of the way of being is a field MANUAL—a booklet that can be carried in one’s pocket (this small print edition) or backpack (alternative large print). It is not a system of step-by-step instructions.

In this work, the preface is about the publication or work, not the content. However, work and content are not entirely separable. Let us therefore begin with what is new in the way, followed by a brief overview of the main divisions.

What is new in the way

‘The way’ has the following character—it presents an ultimate picture of the universe as ultimate (a ‘[real metaphysics](#)’, p. 45), works out a worldview and a way to the ultimate within that framework and is therefore an evolving narrative within a fixed one. The elements and build of the picture draw from the history of ideas and my personal experience and reflection. Without the historical, this work would not exist. However, it seems to me that both elements and build have gone beyond history so far. However, I have read and forgotten much—often without taking notes. So, rather than claim originality, I prefer to leave that judgment to readers.

The five divisions of the manual

1. The introductory [encapsulation](#) (p. 7) is an informal overview of the way.
2. The informal preliminary chapters, collectively an informal [roots division](#) (p. 12), [prologue](#) (p. 12) through [into the way](#) (p. 17) are an orientation; they show something of the discovery and forging of the way—and of ways and principles of discovery and forging.
3. The first formal division is primarily the development of a [metaphysics](#) (p. 17). Its chapters, [human ground in the world](#) (p. 17) through [growth of persons and civilizations](#) (p. 53), are a more formal treatment of the system of ideas of

‘the way of being’. The account is in relative depth, for understanding and action are each complete only when they stand together.

4. The second formal division is [realization](#) (p. 55), chapters [pathways to ultimate being](#) (p. 55) through [doubt, judgment, and action](#) (p. 63) show how to realize what is revealed in understanding. Though less formal, the pathway templates do not provide a recipe, for realization requires understanding and experiment, more than following a prescription.

5. A final division, [return—into the world](#) (p. 65), notes that living the way is seeing past, present, and future—and the immediate and the ultimate—as one.

For further foundation and detail, the text refers to the [resources](#) (p. 64).

The manual and its use

In what way is this work a manual? As noted, it is not a step-by-step system of instruction. Rather, it recognizes that true understanding and realization require immersion in and negotiation of the processes—I see my relationship with readers as sharing rather than instructing or leading.

For FULL REALIZATION, readers will focus on the entire content.

ACADEMIC READERS will focus on the ideas—[human ground in the world](#) (p. 17) through [growth of persons and civilizations](#) (p. 53).

TRANSFORMATIONAL READERS will focus on [pathways to ultimate being](#) (p. 55) through [doubt, judgment, and action](#) (p. 63).

INFORMAL READERS—those interested in realization but not the detailed development and reasoning of the main text—may read the [encapsulation](#) (p. 7), chapters [pathways to ultimate being](#) (p. 55) through [universal template](#) (p. 60); they may then read the main text as desired.

All readers may find the [resources](#) (p. 64) to be useful.

Understanding the content

Issues of understanding include that (1) the picture of the **metaphysical system** (p. 45) is far more inclusive than received pictures, and may therefore present difficulty and meet inertia of received understanding (the present picture may seem paradoxical to an intuition accustomed to the received pictures) (2) the build of the picture incorporates traditional and as well as perhaps new issues of thought, which in themselves require exposure and experience to understand (3) the build itself appears to be new—and is forged from principles perhaps more inclusive than the received and which may seem paradoxical (4) most terms are not new but it has been necessary to introduce new uses or to single out specific uses from ranges of use from received and common use—which is done via definition (a fully axiomatic development may be undertaken in a future version) (5) language—standard English at any rate—is inadequate to the shades of meaning already present in the received and the ‘overloading’ of meaning introduced by the technique of **abstraction** (defined on p. 43) introduced and employed in the development (6) language and its use have other difficulties in capturing any understanding of the universe of which those pertinent to the present development included (a) paradoxes pertaining to the concept of ‘everything’, which are here defused by use of ‘possibility’ as a high level concept and (b) difficulty in capturing a limitless universe in a fixed system of language, which are defused by identifying directions in which such capture is incomplete and allowing those directions to remain in process for beings that are limited in their present form (which includes human beings).

For readers not interested in the difficulties, there are suggestions in the previous section on how not work through them and yet absorb the essence of transformation. All readers may note that the problems of understanding

are diffused by the development of a precise framework for the metaphysics, within which any metaphysical imprecision is rendered moot by the framework.

What is new in this edition

The evolving part has new ways of seeing the world, new ways of seeing the framework, new applications, and new insights on approaching the ultimate. Thus, this edition it is both new and old and it is important to inform readers that what is new in each internet edition or version is incremental.

However, there is only one earlier distributed print edition, published in 2013. Its distribution was a personal affair, and it has been read by few. So, for the vast majority, this edition is new. For those who have read the previous edition, the present version, while it has the same high-level framework, is a significant advance since 2013.

Notation

In the text, SMALL CAPITALS indicate significant terms and definitions. When small capitals are used, e.g., as in “EXPERIENCE is conscious awareness in all its forms”, ‘is’ stands for ‘is defined as’. ‘I’ is sometimes the author, sometimes universal, and sometimes a stand in for ‘us’ or ‘we’.

The way of being

Division 1 Encapsulation

My interests have included a search for what is meaningful or significant in life, and the meta-issues of the meaning of meaning and how the search may be understood and conducted.

Into the way

The search led, among other things, via the concern of what to do with my life, to the question *What is the greatest that we can do?* A response follows.

Among other things, via a concern with what to do with my life, the search led the questions—*What is the greatest thing that we can do? That can be done? That the universe may attain or achieve?* A response follows.

Ideas—metaphysics, identity, cosmology, death, doubt, and reason

Neither nothingness nor its absence has constraints, therefore *the universe is the realization of the possible*, in the greatest or most inclusive sense of possibility. The thus proven italicized assertion is named *the fundamental principle of metaphysics*.

Some significant consequences follow, but first let us lay out some principles.

The principles of reasoning for the general consequences that follow immediately are that (i) from the fundamental principle, if the most permissive possibility allows something, it must obtain in the universe (ii) the most permissive possibility is that which contradicts neither known fact nor logic in the deductive sense. Thus, (a) since an existing world is possible, our world is one possible world, and we do not expect to see all possibilities we can imagine, while remaining limited as inhabitants of a limited world (b) from the fundamental principle, all possibilities obtain beyond the world.

Here are some significant consequences, which follow via the principles above, and for which detailed argument is given in the main text—

The universe has identity. The universe and its identity are limitless in extension, duration, variety, and peak and dissolution of being; they phase between manifest and nonmanifest—‘something and nothing’. Our cosmos is

one of limitlessly many, of limitless variety, some in temporary but never eternal isolation from one another, all in communication with the void that is nothingness.

All beings realize this ultimate. Death is real but not absolute. In the ultimate, all beings are one. Ethics has a ground in the oneness.

These and other consequences exceed common interpretations of experience and are rarely recognized in received knowledge. Therefore, there will be doubt. There ought to be doubt, for DOUBT is a way to elimination of untruth and establishment of truth. However, a proof is given above, and while it is inconsistent with some interpretations of experience, it is consistent with experience itself, and with reason (see [merging of opposites](#), p. 34)—and, as will be seen, it contains a seed for reevaluation of experience and reason.

Consequently, knowing, action, and reason (knowing about knowing and acting) emerge together—ANALYSIS and META-ANALYSIS are one, which, though some finality of foundation (depth) will be attained, remain in process for limited beings for whom, paradoxically, the outcome is certain while the path has nonlinearity, uncertainty, and experimental RISK.

Thus, though the received is often thought definitive and comprehensive, it is neither. This may not eliminate doubt, but given the consistency with experience and reason, two alternative and positive attitudes to the fundamental principle arise—(i) as a fundamental metaphysical postulate and (ii) as an existential principle of thought and action.

While the implications of the principle for thought are immense, in this encapsulation we emphasize its implications for and continuity with action. In fact, action and thought are incompletely distinct and essentially bound—there is no action without thought and action is essential to the completion of

thought. Thus action, thought, and reflection on the same, which we may tend to see as distinct, are one, even as they have distinctions.

Realization—pathways to the ultimate

Partly because it is not often seen, ultimate realization in or directly from this world expected to be uncommon. The way to the ultimate is a process. It does not reject but is necessarily grounded in the present and immediate. Grounded in the immediate world, we expect to always be at the beginning of realization.

Pathways have *experiential* or intrinsic and *material* or instrumental aspects; the former include yoga, meditation, contemplation of the real, art, and existential attitude; the latter include science, technology, economics, politics, and an attitude of action and transformation.

These pathways of experiencing and becoming are entailed by the fundamental principle and may be developed from it, in mesh with reason, experiment, and received culture. Pleasure, pain, will, intention, and action are unavoidable ('greatest' does not mean 'best' but it includes that we may realistically seek true understanding and realization of the 'good' and the 'best'). From pain and seeming remoteness of the ultimate, the way is not easy, not 'all roses'. If the universe realizes all possibility, it realizes—individuals and societies realize—the 'worst' and the 'best'. Though not all fair skies, the way is the greatest adventure. The enjoyment of pleasure, pain, will, intention, and action, in balance with therapeutic alleviation is imperative and efficient.

This mesh has a perfect aspect (described above), which frames a pragmatic side (significantly derived from the tradition of human knowledge); the perfect shows an ideal and illuminates the pragmatic; the pragmatic illustrates and is instrumental toward the ideal. The pragmatic side includes

our artistic disciplines in imagining possibility and the rational disciplines in enhancing and criticizing imagined possibility. The pragmatic side permits detailed consequences within the framework of the earlier general consequences and adds to the principles behind those consequences (and examples will be given in the main text).

The mesh is an interacting whole, which shall be named the *real metaphysics*.

Is there an end to search? Is knowledge ever open—with foundation seemingly in sight but never achieved? The real metaphysics shows that for limited beings, there are ends and wholeness in some directions, but ever openness in others. Which is on the way to the limitless and the complete.

Into the world

Having sought, developed, visioned, and begun the way to the ultimate—in and from this world, we return to living in the world, to living in the immediate and the ultimate as one.

Appendix—themes

The metaphysics has a wide range of implications for knowledge and exploration. THEMES that are relevant to the way include (i) *received worldviews*—usefulness and limits (ii) *possibility* and its implications for reason and logic (iii) *being* and *experience*, especially being as on the surface of the real and experience as the place of knowledge and being (iv) *kinds of being*, especially the abstract and the concrete (and the possibility of perfect knowledge in some abstract cases), experiential and agentive, and whole and part—particularly, the *universe* and the *void* (v) some *kinds of knowledge*, particularly perfect and pragmatic (vi) *identity of the immediate and the ultimate* (iv) *co-emergence* of knowledge, exploration, and knowledge of knowledge and exploration (*meta-theory*) (v) *emergence of system*—i.e., that

the emergent world view of the way is more powerful than is apparent in the ingredient rings of thought and meta-thought (there is no circularity of reasoning, for the ideas stand in structural but not implicative relation) (vi) *for limited beings, knowledge and reason remain in process*—yet there is some finality in the depth or foundational direction (vii) *there are pathways to the ultimate* characterized by enjoyment of what is seen as positive and negative and by intelligent negotiation of the way. The [resource documents](#) (p. 64) have more information on themes and implications of the metaphysics.

Division 2 Roots—Into the way

Prologue

The prologue is a short story of the road to the way as it is continuous with being.

How the beauty of the world led to the way

I found the beauty of the world so powerful that it led to an EXPLORATION—a search—in ideas and the worlds of nature, society, culture, and beyond.

I found I did not know my true origins or my true destiny. What sense does it make, I asked, that, at least seemingly, my awareness came into being, that it will end, and that it has degrees of isolation from all awareness in the universe? Those thoughts further motivated my explorations. Will this narrative have answers to these questions? Let us allow what answers there may be to emerge from experience, constructive explanation, and criticism.

The search and how it led to a foundation in being

I explored ideas from world cultural traditions—framing them in terms of received paradigms such as materialism, naturalism, individualism (the notion that one’s awareness is an absolutely distinct awareness), idealism, process,

evolutionism, emergence, relation, and dynamism; and conceptually creative and critical philosophies, and their generalization, oppositions, and syntheses.

This led to a framework based in 'being', suggested by reading work by Heidegger and others, and the idea that knowledge is essentially connected to action—acting and knowing do not exist without each other. The merit of foundation in being is elimination of hypothetical foundation for a foundation in being is a foundation in the world itself and not in a hypothetical aspect of the world (the SUBSTANCE and other paradigms noted above). But 'foundation of the world in the world' seems trivial and circular. Can the real be founded in being? We will find a most powerful foundation grounded in the concepts of being and beings—and not just that but also in the variety of beings.

The foundation in being

What is the being—the essence—of beings, of our being? Is this famous question in the history of ideas answerable? Precisely? How may we frame the question? Is an answer worth the attempt? The projection of this work onto the space of these questions will provide constructive and emerging answers.

Three essential elements of the construction are (i) analysis of being and non-being, particularly the rational observation that the constraints of our world—of any given world—do not obtain for nonbeing (which is also presented as a metaphysical postulate that is consistent with experience and as an existential principle of thought and action) (ii) the observation that the universe-as-universe is empirically and perfectly known even though its inner detail is only incompletely and imperfectly known (iii) the existence of the void—of nonbeing—as a logical construct from the equivalence of its existence and nonexistence.

Essential consequences of the foundation

I discovered via demonstration that the universe is LIMITLESS, i.e., that all consistent possibility is realized (note the use of the term ‘limitless’ rather than ‘infinite’, for infinities may be limited). The universe is the greatest (possible) identity and, consequently, I am the universe, as are all individuals—but we are also limited individuals who do not fully see and experience our identity with Identity (that I am and am not the ultimate is a matter of perspective and phase of being and is, therefore, non-paradoxical—see [merging of opposites](#), p. 34). What of relationship? Community and relationship will be found to be embedded in Identity.

The way of being—process and finality

This work is a story of ongoing discovery and realization. A foundation will emerge that has finiteness in depth but is limitless in breadth and in interpretation.

On reflexivity and multiplicity of viewpoint

Along the way, I found it useful to explore and sustain multiple points of view—e.g., paradigms, worldviews—which may have been in fact or seemingly contradictory. It is empowering to do so, while finality of understanding and foundation have not been achieved, which remains true for limited beings as noted elsewhere (e.g., in [ideas—metaphysics, identity, cosmology, death, doubt, and reason](#), p. 8). I read and thought broadly, while I attempted to also think deeply, constructively (‘creatively’), and critically (sieving out empirical and rational inconsistency). The many threads of thought and experience interacted horizontally and vertically (‘meta-analysis’). I called this process reflexive, after but not in identity to its use in [epistemology and sociology](#).

I learned that while understanding and knowledge are in process, it often results in conflict—in inconsistency—when a system of language, logic, or thought are treated as final; which inconsistency is the result of an incomplete system applied beyond its limit.

Then, as noted, some finality was found. Therefore, the idea of reflexivity is extended to allowing finality and process to remain in reflex. While limited, this is where we are—this is what emerged.

Origins

Some questions of meaning

ORIGIN and MOTIVATION (REASONS) for the way of being include questioning—*What is the best I can do in my life? What is the greatest possibility for and in my society, humankind, the universe?* These interwoven questions have clear significance in the sense of ‘MEANING OF LIFE’—but relative to them, issues of LINGUISTIC MEANING (p. 23), taken up later, are also critical—*What is the meaning of best? What is my relation to the universe? Who or what, if anything, is the ‘I’ behind the ‘my’? What is ‘my life’—is it ‘this life’ and if so, what is beyond this life? And what are the meanings of ‘greatest’, of ‘possibility’, and of ‘universe’?*

A fundamental question of meaning

Regarding these questions as one, this FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION OF MEANING may be approached in the context of further questions—*What is the best that any being can do and what is the greatest possible universe? That is—What is (the) ideal? And—How is it related to the real?* The real and the greatest possible will be found to be identical and to contain the ‘best’—and the ‘worst’ (which, being the case, ought not to be encouraging of nihilism).

Sources for the way of being

A beginning of the way was with reflection on, exploration of, and action upon these issues of meaning and the real. Other sources and reasons for the way are the history of ideas, intentions, knowledge, and action, and individual understanding, reason with feeling, and action.

Emergence of the worldview of the way

The history of ideas is colored by PARADIGMS or WORLDVIEWS from which we learn received frameworks of perception, thought, knowledge (especially knowledge of knowledge), being, and action. In learning we are empowered but discover that the paradigms have limits, many of which, we discover, in employing and explicitly critiquing them, are not essential limits, but self-imposed due to the *assigned* value of those limits and our limited understanding at a given time. In *the way*, via reason (criticism and imagination) and action, we discovered an ultimate paradigm of the ultimate (via ways of discovery and meanings of ‘the ultimate’ that will emerge later)—which will be developed below, and which frames what is valid and valuable in the ‘traditional’ paradigms.

We will see that the worldview is emergent in that it is not apparent in the ingredient ideas.

The ultimate is immediate—not remote

Though the ultimate has been seen as too sacred, too dangerous to even name, a true ultimate would not be remote; it would include to embrace, nurture, and beckon us. And we find, within us, a motive to reach out, to search for it. The ultimate and the immediate will be found mutually enhancing—will be found to be one (but, for limited beings, realization of the ultimate is a process).

Though we may imagine the real as pure and remote being, there is effectively no being that is unknowable (later, the word ‘effectively’ will be found unnecessary). Therefore, there is no being that is never known.

Into the way

Here, ‘into’ is metaphorical for we never leave the world, and we are never completely removed from the immediate.

Knowledge and action never separate, for even ‘pure thought’ remains (potentially) connected to the world and, besides, knowledge is a form of action.

A temporary retreat, so as to return to better negotiate the world

However, it is effective to occasionally withdraw from immediacy of acting, to reflect, to understand, and to make action better (what the understanding consists in includes knowing the world and knowing what is desirable and their mutual inclusion).

Therefore, we delve into this understanding.

The aim of the way

The AIM of the way of being is shared discovery and realization of the ultimate in and from our world.

Division 3 Metaphysics—the real

Human ground in the world

The concept of experience and its significance

EXPERIENCE is conscious awareness in all its forms. We do not get beyond of experience (it is a pragmatically adaptive abstraction that we experience ourselves as getting out of it), and it is therefore fundamental to and the place of meaning (linguistic and of life), knowledge, and our very being in the world. Experience is packed into the concept of MENTAL CONTENT in what follows.

That experience is the place of our being shows its existential importance. To consider experience is also essential to careful thought—to reason. Since it is the place of knowing, its analysis is critical to knowledge. Thus, questions of ‘what can be thought’ and ‘what are the limits of thought’ thread through the history of philosophy. The concern threads through this work, informally above and now, more formally, beginning immediately.

Thinking about thinking—about knowing—is something that in today’s language would be called meta-analysis or meta-thought. We will find directions in which we arrive at perfection and directions that, for LIMITED beings, are ever open—note that the limited shall be understood to include the finite and much more, for it also includes all infinities except the absolute infinite, and it includes all *kinds of being* (p. 31) except the limitless but still possible. But we shall also find that if we regard thought and action as a process, there are no true limits; limits arise only in connection with fixed language and concepts of language and with fixed systems of thought—with illusions of fixed being—hood (we shall find, against received thought, the notion of beings, human and other, as having fixedness to be a convenient illusion).

While ‘meta’ applies to reflexivity in thought, the ‘para’ dimension is also critical—it is the direction that is ever open to limited beings, the direction that we later identify as variety or breadth.

The reality of experience

Is experience real? That is—is there this thing that we call experience? What this really means, as we will see in discussing *meaning and knowledge* (p. 23), is whether, in terms of the best understanding of the world, our conception of experience corresponds to something in the world—i.e. to an actual object, experience itself. We do not and need not ‘prove’ experience

itself to be real—it is a name we give to that part of ‘what there is’, of which our feeling of things and thoughts are elements. We are capable of knowing and naming it because we experience our experience—*our* experience is ‘REFLEXIVE’.

Is there a world whose existence and nature are independent of experience—i.e., is there a real world? The true meaning of this question is, with regard to meaning (as in the previous paragraph), is whether the contents of experience capture something beyond itself—‘the world’. If there is a real world, given that our grasp of it is (seems to be) always in knowledge and not in itself, can we know the real world? Thus, there is a world, if only of experience itself.

Finally, how well does the content of our experience, correspond to a world beyond itself?

We now turn to this question but before doing so note that it is not clear that we ought to be looking for correspondence. Thus, we might better replace ‘correspond to’ in the paragraphs above by ‘capture’ in some sense and also ask what that sense ought to be. We will find that the sense of capture will include a correspondence framework, which will frame a sense of capture that is pragmatic, one that enables, e.g., negotiation of the world (which, however, may be seen roughly as correspondence).

Is there a world? Interpretive responses to the question

Is there more? That is, is there an object of experience—an ‘external world’, beside experience itself? Common experience is as if it were of a world beyond experience. But this COMMON interpretation of experience is perhaps only an INTERPRETATION of experience—a picture of the real that is consistent with experience—for there are other interpretations that are consistent with the presenting content of experience. One is that there is

nothing but my experience, in which it is understood that 'I' am the kind of limited knower that 'we' think we are in the received thought that places us as individuals in a world; this interpretation has been named SOLIPSISM.

Another ('field') interpretation is the same as solipsism except that the 'I' is a universal and pan-knower, that the common I's are part of the universal I, and that the material and ideal worlds—the 'external' and the 'internal' worlds—are equally part of the experiential world. These three interpretations—common, solipsist, and universal FIELD of being and experience—harbor the range of the possible (with suitable detail, both field and the common interpretations cover metaphysical accounts from being, matter, mind, process, relation, arrays of worlds, transient worlds, phasings between manifestation and non-manifestation; solipsism is an example of worlds; matter includes inert worlds. Which, if any, is 'true'? This question is taken up in [abstraction and the foundation so far](#) (p. 43) and in the complete edition (the [resources](#)).

About the truth of solipsism

It is natural to think that solipsism is not true. But how might we show this? There does not appear to be a consensus on answering the question or even whether there is a problem. However, it does seem that the question has no purely logical answer and a response must make an appeal to something more than the bare fact of being experiential and the contents of experience. Various approaches have been [considered](#), e.g., to consider what the best explanation of the seeming world is. Here, the approach is (i) to consider a comprehensive range of equivalent interpretations (ii) to indeed appeal to logic though it will be to more than logic as a deductive apparatus—it will also be to logical equivalence of existence and nonexistence of the void (nothingness) and its logical consequences. The interpretations are taken up

immediately, the appeal to logic later, beginning with [the fundamental principle of metaphysics](#) (p. 41).

True, equivalent interpretations

We will see that the common and field interpretations are both true interpretations but provide different perspectives; that is—they are both true, but neither is true in the sense that it is absolutely *and* exclusively real. Thus, the first concept of experience above is embedded in a deeper concept of experience that extends to the root of being, is relational, and is effectively the essence of the world and universe. At the root, it is not experience-as-we-experience-it but, rather, the elementary stuff of our experience. Though our experience is not the world, it is effectively our world, and the world as we know it is a process of a wave front of experience moving outward. Experience in the deeper sense is the world, its varieties and forms the varieties and forms of the world, and the ideational and the material are its projections.

We will find that solipsism is not true of the universe but that there are solipsist ‘cosmoses’—as well as purely material cosmoses.

Mind, world, and action

The concept of the concept

A CONCEPT is mental content, which includes perception, signs, feeling, intention, free cognitive concepts, with or without significant feeling (mental content with associated simple or compound signs are SYMBOLS). Concepts, signs, and symbols may be simple or complex, e.g., as in the use of language.

Pure and referential concepts

Some concepts seem pure, some seem to refer. Perhaps there is no ‘referring’—perhaps concepts (awareness) are all that there is, but there is at least ‘as if referring’. Later, we will see that the seeming awareness is not an illusion and that there is referring (there is a world). So—I will proceed naïvely

and justify referring later. Since there is illusion, I distinguish between real referring and illusion. As a preliminary point, there is no doubt that concepts can refer to concepts—that some concepts refer to others (this is the essence of Descartes' cogito argument).

It has been argued that concept words cannot refer, because to have reference requires the reference to be referred. The objection is that reference would require infinite regress; it is thus a logical objection. But the objection has two counter objections (i) it is equivalent to saying that for there to be a real, there must also be a supra-real (the problem of the real would be that of knowledge of the real) (ii) a real reason non-iconic words by themselves cannot refer, because there is nothing to connect word to object and even convention must be grounded in some connection—however, the word-object notion of meaning is empty and this is a reason for the above introduction of the word-concept-object conception of meaning.

A REFERENTIAL CONCEPT is a concept that refers to the world or part of it, which include 'things as they are' and 'action' (unless said otherwise, in the rest of the text 'concept' shall mean 'referential concept').

Continuity of concepts, world, and action

Though there are distinctions among them, concepts (ideas), world, and action are essentially continuous. Action—intended change or stasis—or intended change is part of the world—a part that is in a direct causal relation with ideas, which could be written ideas → action → ideas → action without end. However, the connection is more intimate in that there are loops within loops, in that ideas phase into action and in that ideation that is not purely spontaneous is action. Knowing is a form of acting, change without knowing and intention is not action.

Meaning and knowledge

In this chapter, ‘meaning’ is concept and linguistic meaning.

Meaning

MEANING is a concept and its possible referents.

A note on meaning as use

Use anchors meaning but is not meaning itself—and the notion of a definite user would be mistaken. In beginning to encounter meaning, there is an essential vagueness, not entirely overcome by convention—e.g., dictionaries, grammars, or societies for standardization of the same. At the same time, a given text ought to be specific in its—system of—meanings, while also allowing interaction between its system and received meaning from the communities of meaning.

Knowledge

INTENTION is referring that is focused or pointed at the referent (i.e., it is more than mechanical or casual reference).

KNOWLEDGE is meaning realized—i.e., concepts and their actual (and intended) referents.

Are there concepts and objects?

Though generally interwoven, the referring and referent—concept and object—may be decoupled (i) perfectly, with sufficient abstraction (this will be found to empower perfection in metaphysics) (ii) often with pragmatic sufficiency.

Meaning, knowledge, and paradigm

The ‘meaning of meaning’ above is fundamental—it is necessary and sufficient to effective meaning, for without the concept, there can be no referent, and with the concept, signs—words and other linguistic concepts—have the capacity for reference (actual reference needs verification in specific

cases and classes of cases). It resolves further problems of meaning, e.g., the problems of negative existentials. And—because the metaphysics of the narrative will go beyond received knowledge, to the ultimate, new meaning will be associated with new and received terms, individually and jointly (as a system). As meaning is conceived here, it will be effective in the task of developing emergent meaning (it is important for understanding, that readers attend to meanings and system meaning as introduced in the text).

Contextual character of meaning and knowledge

See that in going beyond received paradigms, meanings of terms *must* change. There cannot be *identity* of meaning in paradigmatic advance. Since the narrative draws from the received in which we are grounded, *continuity* of meaning is necessary for grounding, significance, and accessibility of the work. But if the received has not achieved the ultimate, it cannot have achieved ultimate meanings—its meanings, no matter how established, must have transitionality. What is crucial is that the new meanings, individually and in system, should capture the real.

These thoughts, and the difficulty we have of thinking about the real and using language to express that thinking, suggest that language can be misleading. We consider this issue in the next section and will return to it again in *merging of opposites* (p. 34).

Transcendence of context

It will emerge that, for limited beings, there are directions in which ultimate meaning and knowledge can be achieved, and ways that are available only to ultimate being. For limited beings, these limits are found but not given. It will emerge that the limitedness of limited beings is contingent and will be transcended.

Existence

The concept of existence

Given a concept that has a hypothetical (possible) referent, the concept-referent is said to EXIST—has EXISTENCE or is an EXISTENT—if the reference is real(ized), i.e., is actual. An OBJECT is a concept-hypothetical referent, realized or not; a REAL OBJECT is one for which the reference is realized—i.e., a real object is one that exists, (the object is ‘real’). A NONEXISTENT OBJECT is one for which the concept is not realized. Under this distinction, Sherlock Holmes would be a nonexistent object, which, despite nonexistence has significance and at least as if reference.

Being, existence, and object

A BEING is a real object; BEING is the property of beings that marks them as beings—i.e., being is existence. A putative distinction is that whereas there are nonexistent objects, beings are regarded as causal and therefore necessarily exist. However, this distinction would be based on a classical conception of ‘cause’ and that in a full conception, nonexistent objects can be causal (the apparent violation of our sense of existence and cause will be defused). Therefore, we will find that we can also talk validly of nonexistent beings. It is not necessary to distinguish beings from objects.

In ‘objective’ terms—

Being and beings

The concepts of being and beings

A BEING is that which can be said to be—i.e., which exists; BEING is existence.

The issue of subjectivity

This might seem to mark the concepts of ‘being’ and ‘object’ as subjective in the mere sense, but reasons for objectivity have been given in the previous

chapter. However, there is nothing mere about the subjectivity, for we never get out of the knowledge loop of any knowledge being dependent of further knowledge (this may seem to imply that knowledge can have no final foundation, but we will find final foundation in depth but not, while we are limited beings, in breadth). Despite this we will find a way to see the universe objectively, beginning in a later chapter, [how to identify beings](#) (p. 30). What is found is that there is perfect knowledge, which is objective, and pragmatic knowledge for which subjectivity does not negate the value of the knowledge—and, further, the perfect and the pragmatic mesh in a system, [the real metaphysics](#) (p. 45), which will emerge as perfect in terms of its own emergent criteria (as will be seen, the emergence is not circular).

Metaphorically, at least, our realism is grounded in the realism of the universe knowing itself.

Being vs existence

If being is identical to existence, is not the term ‘being’ superfluous? Yes, ‘being’ is formally superfluous. However, from its historical use, we prefer ‘being’ as referring to a framework for the richness of that lies within existence.

What is being?

The aim of the section is to clarify ‘being’

Though I have identified being with existence, that has not been and is not the philosophical consensus. However, after millennia of philosophy, east and west, the question of being—what it is—is not universally regarded as adequately answered. Since ‘being’ has a connotation of something like ‘the essence of things’ that is perhaps as it ought to be now and in the future. I therefore devote this chapter to the question of being. The aim is to clarify being and its question and to address being as existence.

Considerations from the concept of meaning

In the first place, from the discussion of meaning, what we ordinarily think of as a named thing, is really a sign-icon-referent; the sign-icon is the concept, the referent is the object or 'thing'. Thus, generally, to discover what a thing is, is neither to merely find something in the world nor to merely clarify and define an unclear or indefinite concept, but to search in a dual space of concepts and objects.

Thus, being is not something definite in-the-world, which is to be discovered, and for which any 'mystery' is simply that it is deep not yet fully known. Rather, it (the concept) is simultaneously constructed and (the referent-object) discovered. Further, the assertion of '*simultaneous construction and discovery*' may be ambitious—in general, search in the dual space may iterate among word-icon-referent.

Supplementing meaning in terms of systems of meaning

But is that all it takes to discover the meaning of something—of being in particular? The world—the universe—has articulation—i.e., while we would not say that it is perfectly formed, there is some formedness, some articulation. We therefore expect understanding of the world to also have articulation. Good understanding will not be of the concepts of parts (things, relations, processes and so on) of the world, taken each in themselves. It will consist in a system of concepts in articulation. Further, the system ought not to be imposed, but it ought to emerge from interaction of an articulated system of concepts in reflective and experiential interaction with the world (and its formedness). It is critical to note that when this is done, the distribution of meaning among the different ideas is not guaranteed to be unique.

Therefore, it is essential to see that the meaning of being will not be captured by a defined concept-discovered object but will be part of a captured system of such concept-objects, designed to capture the world—and given justification as to the capture. Generally, such justification will lie in the range of definite and necessary to indefinite (‘vague’) and likely. The system to emerge here will have both of these aspects—there will be a definite and necessary system, a framework, within which, and meshed with it, a pragmatic system. The definite will be oriented more, but not only toward understanding; the pragmatic will be oriented more, but not only toward action.

About the richness of being

In philosophy, being has been used as more than just existence, and a being as more than just something that exists.

Here, however, to avoid vagueness and confusion, concept of being will be just the concept of existence. The richness the idea of being in the history of thought, will be an aspect of the emerging narrative, distributed among the variety of beings—see [a specimen collection](#) of beings (p. 31) and [kinds of being](#) (p. 31).

Degrees of being

There can be non-existent objects, e.g., Sherlock Holmes (who lived at 221B Baker Street, London). As we noted, the (our) theory of meaning resolved the problem of negative existentials, i.e., of non-existent objects.

Now, one use of being includes being an object, which includes being a non-existent object.

This suggests that being is more than just existence. However, let us ask what it is that makes a non-existent object have being. It is (i) that we can talk

about such ‘things’ and (ii) more importantly, that the ‘things’ have effects, i.e., are causal.

How are they causal? Since we have concepts of concepts, the concept is also an object (even under materialism, a concept is something in a brain, e.g., a configuration—and so we ought perhaps to say ‘especially under materialism’), an existent object and not a nonexistent one, it is the concept-as-object that is really being causal and not the non-existent object. But regardless of existence status, it is the concept-object that is causal.

This eliminates the distinction between existents and nonexistents and, therefore, a distinction that we might have considered introducing between being and existence.

Degrees of abstraction

What of ‘abstract objects’, e.g., numbers, which are said to have no causal interactions or spatiotemporality? Are they just objects, truly without causality and spatiotemporality, or are they also beings (with causality and spatiotemporality)?

One approach to abstract objects is to define them symbolically, e.g., numbers via the Peano Axioms. A problem with that approach, is that it does not guarantee something real, even if only an abstract real. Another approach is via abstraction from the world (ideally, the two approaches would mesh). In this approach, an abstract object is not acausal or non-spatiotemporal, but has degrees of such physicality abstracted out. Thus, if all causality and spatiotemporality are abstracted out, the causality and spatiotemporality are not null but zero.

What being is—summary

In summary, beings, objects, kinds such as non-existent and abstract, can be placed on a unitary footing with distinctions among the kinds rather than among the basic concepts.

Any mystery regarding being is interior to being and its kinds rather than of being and the kinds. The problem of the richness of being is a problem of breadth or variety, not of depth or foundation. This thought will be visited again in [the real metaphysics](#) (p. 45).

How to identify beings

A collection of specimens—examples of beings—if a concept is not logically contradictory, it has a possible object. This enables listing some possible kinds of being without further criteria; development of ‘metaphysics’ later ensures their reality—i.e., that they occur somewhere in the universe.

The next chapter is an ad hoc collection intended to illustrate ‘how to identify beings’ and the broad inclusivity of being.

A specimen collection

Here is a collection of possible beings and kinds of being based on the criterion above—as illustrative rather than systematic, as showing the inclusiveness and implied power of the concept of being, and as preliminary to systematic cataloging of kinds of being—

Causes or interactions, *relations*, *sentient* or experiential beings, *facts*, *states* of affairs or being, *events*, *objects*, *processes*, *laws* and patterns, *abstractions* from beings (by filtering the concept), beings conceived *perfectly* or *pragmatically* (as justified later), objects anywhere on a *concrete-abstract* continuum (including those with sufficient abstraction to be perfectly knowable, e.g., on correspondence criteria), *ideas*, concepts including linguistic concepts, signs, letters of alphabets, parts of speech, clauses,

sentences and other linguistic constructs, *universals* (e.g., redness), *particulars* (e.g., a red ball), *tropes* (e.g., the redness of a red ball), the universe, the void, transient emergents from the void, creators, particles, fields, and cosmoses.

Later, it will be seen that for the universe, the possible and the real are identical.

This chapter has presented an ad hoc to illustrate a rational principle for identification of beings. The next chapter emphasizes kinds, systematically.

Kinds of being

The problem

How may we enumerate kinds, systematically? That is, how may we work toward eliminating the ad hoc character of ‘a specimen collection’ (p. 30).

Approach

A being is an element of a knowledge relation, so we begin with modes of knowing—perception and free conception, or concrete vs abstract. Though all experiencing is feeling at root, there is a bifurcation that emphasizes intensity or emotion and inner or body experience including pain vs form and external experience. Experience lies on sentience and agency dimensions. The external forms include parthood, possible vs necessary existence, primitive vs ultimate, abstract vs concrete forms—e.g., logical vs physical law including cause. Let us formalize these as a system of continua—

The kinds

Abstract-concrete—related to essential-detailed, *inner* (body)-*external* (world), degree of *sentience* and degree of *agency* (agency is continuous with sentience), *logical-physical* (abstract cause and law vs concrete and physical cause and law), *parthood* (e.g., whole, proper part, and null part), degree of *existence* (negative, possible, definite, and necessary), *concept-object*, *primitive-high level* (degree of realization of the ultimate).

Cause, effect, and power

The concept of cause

Given a being, if its existence implies likelihood of existence of a second being, the first is the CAUSE of the second, which, if it does exist, is called the EFFECT (of the cause).

Inclusion of the ordinary conception

Defining cause in terms of existence may seem to exclude much of what is ordinarily thought of causes and effects, e.g., a force causing motion. However, the causes and the effects—in the example, the force and the motion—may be thought of as existents.

A trivial case—a being as its own cause

In a trivial case, the second being is the first—it is trivial in that every being is trivially its own necessary cause.

Classical causation

If there is a traceable ('contiguous') link between cause and effect, the cause is CLASSICAL, of which one kind is MATERIAL. Not all causation is known to be material or even classical.

Power

POWER is the capacity to give and receive cause; it is important because power has been seen, e.g., by Plato, as the measure of being.

Possible, necessary, and probable cause

If the likelihood is certain, the cause is NECESSARY (if the cause is not necessary, it may be because *either* there is a necessary cause, but the given cause is partial *or* there is no necessary cause; the terms POSSIBILITY and PROBABILITY are associated with causes that are not necessary).

Spontaneous and absolute cause; self-creation

If the cause is null, the effect is SPONTANEOUS. The cause of spontaneous and necessary being is ABSOLUTE. Spontaneous, necessary, and absolute cause are not ruled out by experience (but only by induction from experience). Nor is SELF-CREATION ruled out, though it seems to require simultaneous being and nonbeing.

Natural law

A being has a PATTERN if the INFORMATION to specify it is less than the raw information. A natural LAW is a (reading of a) pattern for a being such as a cosmos. Laws have being—they are beings, i.e., laws exist.

The void

The concept of the void

The VOID ('nothingness') is defined as the being that has no parts, i.e., sub-beings. Its existence and nonexistence are equivalent. The next statement is therefore valid. *The void exists and is eternal.* In atemporal terms—the *existence of the void is necessary.*

Are there laws in the void?

Because laws have being, *there are and can be no laws of or in the void.*

Doubt about existence of the void

Doubt has been relevant so far, but it is critical regarding existence of the void. As nothingness, existence of the void ought to be doubted from the meanings of 'existence'. The doubt is reasonably addressed by referring to the earlier discussion of [meaning](#) (p. 23) but this does not entirely remove the feeling of discomfort with the assertion of existence. It is therefore, that we asserted that existence and nonexistence of the void are equivalent. Given

that existence of the void does not entail existence of manifest being, this, too, is reasonable, but, again, there will be residual doubt.

While the two doubts just addressed remain, they do not point to inconsistency.

However, that the void simultaneously exists and does not exist, has the form of a contradiction and we generally think that the existence and nonexistence of something, x , is a contradiction. We have argued that when x is the void, there is no contradiction. But in standard sentence logic, a contradiction, i.e., assertion of something and its negation, implies ‘explosion’—the consequence that all assertions are true (and therefore that all assertions are false). Therefore, we ought to further address the issue of contradiction if we wish to remove doubt.

A simple approach is to note that standard sentence calculus does not refer to the entire universe but to the ‘universe’ of its application, from which we may choose to exclude the void. I will say more in discussing dialetheia in the next chapter, on [merging of opposites](#) in which inconsistency is formally removed.

However, despite removal of inconsistency, doubt may remain. It is effective to defer general address of doubt to the chapter, [doubt, judgment, and action](#) (p. 63).

Merging of opposites

It was seen earlier that the void may be taken to exist and to not exist. This is an example of MERGING OF OPPOSITES.

Motive

A motive to consider merging of opposites is that it will have powerful use in what follows this chapter.

Is identity of opposites always paradoxical?

That opposites can be identical is normally found paradoxical—in standard logic it leads to ‘explosion’—i.e., from the truth of an assertion and its negation, the truth of all propositions—and thus their negations too—follows. However, this is not invariably the case, and there are significant cases of the merging of opposites. Let us analyze the situation in terms of ‘dialetheia’.

Dialetheia

A sentence that is both true and false is called a **dialetheia**. DIALETHEISM is the view that there are true dialetheia—i.e., there are true contradictions.

Here, I mention of dialetheia out of interest—but only briefly; a more detailed treatment is in the [in process complete edition](#) in the [resources](#). In the detailed treatment, we will see that there are at least as-if dialetheia, but that perhaps they can be unpackaged in standard non-contradictory terms. But even if that is the case, dialetheia are of interest (i) for perhaps there are real, unpackageable dialetheia and (ii) perhaps dialethic reasoning, e.g., in terms of paraconsistent logic, is a convenient shorthand for situations where the unpackaging is too detailed or difficult to access.

There are dialetheia

We saw, above, that the void exists and does not. Thus, there is at least one dialetheia.

How dialetheia will be useful

An example of usefulness of dialetheia is encountered later, in that I am my limited self and the universe. A more complete dialethic analysis of the view is assigned to the [in process complete edition](#) in the [resources](#).

How dialetheia may be understood

However, one way of understanding dialetheia may be noted now. Standard sentence logic is not universal as it is usually understood to be but

concerns a definite ‘universe’ of discourse. Take that discourse and abstract it so that ‘opposites’ and other distinctions no longer obtain. For example, in the trivial modular arithmetic modulo 1, $5 = 3$. While such abstraction has a trivial character, we have seen and will continue to see that it has depth and significant consequences. Thus, the contradictions that obtain are contradictions in form, but not in fact. Analysis of tentative dialetheia—see [dialetheism](#)—suggests that most dialetheia, if not all, are at the edges of the standard universe in which standard logic obtains. That is, while there are dialetheia, they are perhaps trivial in their formal nature and paraconsistent logic is perhaps a trivial extension of standard logic.

This suggestion needs further reflection and analysis but, in any case, dialetheia are of interest, formally and for a means of representing logics of some ‘non-standard’ universes.

It is important that regardless whether dialetheia and paraconsistent logic are formally trivial, relative to our paradigmatic understanding, they constitute a profound advance—even, as seen already, to the ultimate (in some directions). How useful and necessary are formal developments of dialethic systems and paraconsistent logic? The question is open.

On sophistication

While dialetheia and its analysis and other analyses give us more precise insight into the real, it might seem that the pursuit of precision is without end. How might we regard this situation if our aim is not just knowledge, but also of realization? This concern could be addressed here, but it arises in many places, and to avoid repetition the address has been placed in [certainty as a non-exclusive value; this is the time for action](#) (p. 64).

The universe

The concept

The UNIVERSE is all being. From the concept, the universe exists and there is precisely one universe. Since there is no other manifest being, the manifest universe has no other creator. Creation alone does not explain the existence of the universe except just at the moment of creation. However, sustenance would explain ongoing existence, and an extended meaning of sustenance would explain creation and destruction as part of sustenance.

Sustenance of the universe

The SUSTENANCE of the universe is the cause, ongoing and everywhere and beginnings, its being, and its endings. The universe cannot have another being as its sustainer. But logically, its sustainer may be itself or one of its parts—even the void. In fact, as will be seen—especially the void. How then does classical causation arise? How is it that causation in our world has the appearance, not just of being less than universal as just described, but as being significantly classical? This is addressed in the [cosmology of limitless identity](#) (p. 47).

Cause revisited, reasons

Reasons and the case for reasons

Though it has been implicit so far, it appears that more than one kind of cause has been recognized. First, one being may cause another (which may be temporal or atemporal). Naïvely, on this account, the universe can have no cause. Arguing from this naïve account, Leibniz suggested that though the universe cannot have a cause, there may be a REASON—or reasons—for its being. If there are causes, they may be seen as reasons. Thus, Leibnizian reasons may be seen as including but more general than classical causes.

Reasons are causes—either classical or non-classical

But we have found that both the void and its absence (nonbeing) may be and are causal—they cause the beginnings – sustainings – endings in and of the manifest and total universe, and it follows that reasons are causes. Of course, this extends the meaning of causation beyond its classical senses.

Co-existence of classical and non-classical cause

How do the classical and extended senses of cause co-obtain? That is, given our received notions of causation as the effect of one being on another, how can extension to this ‘causeless cause’ be possible at all? The classical obtains, as we will see, in formed local spatiotemporal regions and perspectives, while the extended obtains beyond the formed and the local. The causeless causation is extended or non-classical causation.

Possibility, logic, and science

Possibility and some of its kinds

A being is POSSIBLE if its nature (conception) does not rule out its existence. It is LOGICALLY POSSIBLE if its conception alone does not rule it out. LOGIC is what makes for logical possibility of concepts. If, over and above logic, its existence is not ruled out by the context, which may be physical—e.g., particles to the physical universe—or social, or other, the being has REAL POSSIBILITY, alternately named UNIVERSAL POSSIBILITY. SCIENCE—fact and induction, which include experience of the world—is what makes for real possibility (our science pertains in our world). From their conceptions, logical possibility is the greatest (most permissive) possibility and the extension of the real must lie within that of the logical. Ultimate science is framed by logic.

Real possibility is bounded by the logical

For any context, the real is bounded by the real possibility or possibilities, which is bounded by logical possibility.

Possibility for the universe

For the universe, the real, the real possibility, and the logical possibility are identical.

Logic as the theory of the universe

Let us view GENERAL LOGIC as the amalgam of logic and science; then, in this general sense it might and will be found that *logic is the theory of the universe* (we will need to be careful about the extension of ‘the’).

Metaphysics

The concept of metaphysics

METAPHYSICS is knowledge of the real.

There is metaphysics—the abstract case

Because concepts are not their objects, this conception of metaphysics has been criticized and often rejected as impossible—especially with knowledge as precise correspondence. But we have seen that, via abstraction, not only is some metaphysics possible, there but some definite metaphysical knowledge in the sense of concepts corresponding precisely to knowledge.

Extensions, ultimate and pragmatic

Can this concept of metaphysics be extended? We will extend it in two ways—(i) in the next chapter we extend it to the ultimate, but in the abstract (ii) subsequently, we incorporate the pragmatic—but the question arises, if pragmatic knowledge is imprecise, how is it metaphysics?

That the pragmatic is metaphysics

On some conceptions of knowledge and its justification, there is no knowledge at all (the Pyrrhonic school of skepticism). But if there is no knowledge at all, surely, we would not be able to do anything at all—and if all is illusion, surely there is no such thing as illusion. Even without these

considerations, to critique the possibility of knowledge, one ought to critique its conception and criteria. Subsequently, terminating in [the real metaphysics](#) (p. 45), we will justify the use of pragmatic criteria for pragmatic knowledge as perfection.

The outcome of the developments will be an ultimate and perfect metaphysics.

It is important to note that (i) common critiques of metaphysics often employ an insufficiently criticized criterion of knowledge (ii) knowledge is part of the world and therefore to criticize metaphysics should entail criticism of the criteria of justification (iii) both metaphysics and knowledge are critiqued here in in what follows, with what is argued to have an adequate outcome with regard to the ultimate context and criteria noted above.

Metaphysics and epistemology

It is also shown that though the metaphysics justifies the epistemology and vice versa, the argument is not circular, for its justification is both in itself and its relation to the world.

Received conceptions of metaphysics

There is a range of lay to academic conceptions of 'metaphysics', and even though the academic conception is often seen as not well understood and speculative in nature, we will arrive at a precise and non-speculative conception (within the framework of which, just as we do in 'science', we may employ reasonable speculation in the sense of hypotheses to be pragmatically justified by experience and reason).

The present conception of metaphysics covers the academic

As conceived here, metaphysics includes science, as well as vast swathes of what is considered to be 'philosophical metaphysics'. This claim is justified in what follows.

The fundamental principle of metaphysics

The principle and its proof

If from the void, a possible being did not emerge, that would be a law of the void. Therefore, all possible beings emerge from the void; an equivalent form of this assertion is what shall be named the FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF METAPHYSICS—*The universe is the realization of the greatest possibility.*

Universality of causation in its most complete sense

Thus, the void which exists and does not exist is causal. This is an example of a nonexistent object being causal. Further, since the void may be seen as part of every object, all objects are causal. This realizes the earlier promise that in a full sense of cause and existence, nonexistent objects can be causal—even though this seems absurd on the classical notions of cause and existence. Reason requires acknowledgment of non-classical causation.

The void is equivalent to every being—to the universe itself.

Every being is equivalent to and the sustainer of every being—the void, the being itself, every other being, and the universe. For the universe at large, sustenance and cause are entirely nonclassical.

Identity of all beings and the ultimate

Every being is all being

In that they are mutually inter-transformable, every being is (equivalent to) all beings—and to being. ‘Every being’ includes the universe, the void, and sentient beings. It is a dialetheia that the universe is identical to the void, that zero is identical to one, which is not to say that in standard arithmetic, under standard logic and arithmetic that zero is equal to one.

All beings realize the ultimate

Thus, all beings realize the ultimate (that more than one being cannot be ultimate is not a contradiction for they may be sequentially ultimate at

different times and because for the absolute or transtemporal ultimate, beings merge in the realization). This realization may occur in *this life* but if not, is realized beyond—which may involve migration of identity (identity is defined later) from being to being, world to world, cosmos to cosmos, through the ultimate of the universe, to the void, and back—and transtemporally as the absolute being whose abstract stands still above the process of the world ‘below’. If the spaces between manifestations of a limited identity are essentially infinite, they are experienced as not even instants. This suggests that the world of limited experiential beings, *as limited*, is eternal and continuous.

Sense in which there is self-creation

I noted earlier that self-creation seems impossible. However, we can see the void as part of every being, therefore self-creation of all beings and the universe is possible—i.e., it is a valid though not necessary interpretation of the being of things. The cause of the being of the universe is self-creation. This requires abandonment of universality of classical causation.

Enjoyment

PLEASURE and PAIN are given. ENJOYMENT is the appreciation of the range of experience, which includes feeling—i.e., pleasure, pain, and more—and cognition, and intending, and action. Realization of the ultimate does not exclude pain, but is the best enjoyment, which, together with [realist therapy](#) (p. 56) is the best approach to the issues of pleasure and pain.

Realization as an imperative

Enjoyment is an ULTIMATE VALUE and therefore realization of the ultimate is an IMPERATIVE.

Abstraction and the foundation so far

Abstraction as foundation and its limits

Considerations from conception of concepts, through the fundamental principle, to the imperative, entail *perfect knowledge of the real in a correspondence sense of truth* (METAPHYSICS). The entailment is via ABSTRACTION from the essential concepts, which is removal of detail whose distortion cannot be filtered out. This shows the ultimate but not how to get there; it shows the imperative but not how to follow it. The ‘how’ is developed in what follows.

Truth of common and field interpretations of experience

Earlier, in [human ground in the world](#) (p. 17), we asked which of the common, solipsist, and field interpretations of experience is true? We can now see that the common and field interpretations are both sufficient explanations, and both have truth. The situation has analogy to the question of heliocentrism vs geocentrism—while explanation for the solar system favors heliocentrism as being supremely simple, we still use earth bound coordinates for many purposes—and either interpretation employed where it is not convenient would make for psychological disorientation and explanation that is unnecessarily complex. Choice of common vs field interpretations depends on whether we are concerned with a local or the universal perspective.

Non-robust worlds and their apparent frequency

The solipsist interpretation has purchase (i) if I see myself as the universal self (ii) for limited regions of the universe. The numerical likelihood of knowing solipsist cosmoses is taken up below in [paradigms of explanation and prediction](#) (p. 51).

The abstract metaphysics and tradition

Tradition as complement to the abstract metaphysics

To the ABSTRACT METAPHYSICS, append TRADITION—what is valid in the history of human culture, which includes knowledge-intention-action, to the very present time. Tradition may include perfect truth (in whatever sense you choose) as well as pragmatic truth—that is, tradition is imperfect by traditional criteria (I use ‘PRAGMATIC’ to refer to at least rough and usable truth—not specifically to the philosophical tradition of pragmatism). Even if perfectable, the perfection of tradition, though not an essentially unworthy ideal, is not worth waiting for before moving forward (we can move and wait simultaneously). It is (at least the beginning of) the journey through identity, and, in new manifestations, in new civilizations, new worlds, new cosmoses, and beyond, it will be part of what sustains the journey to the ultimate.

Perfection of the join of the abstract metaphysics and tradition

Thus, the join, even though it is imperfect by traditional and received criteria, is perfect relative to the ultimate. On the way, the abstract side guides and illuminates the pragmatic, and the pragmatic illustrates and is instrumental toward the ideal—the ultimate revealed by the abstract.

Science and philosophy are not invalidated

The join of the abstract metaphysics and tradition might, therefore, seem to make the furthering of science, mathematics, logic, and philosophy—of the synthetic and analytic disciplines—unnecessary. This is not true for (i) we still live in our cosmos (ii) improvement in tradition will make the transformative path to the ultimate more efficient. What is changed is that the final relative and absolute significance of tradition is lessened in scope, if not in magnitude, by our knowledge of the join.

The real metaphysics

The metaphysics

This join is named the REAL METAPHYSICS.

In the real metaphysics, the problem of foundation of the world and knowledge of the world is resolved. That is, the problem of depth is resolved. What remains ever open to limited beings is the variety of being to be known and to be realized. The problem of variety is the problem that is being searched when philosophers search the ‘depth of being’.

The finality of the foundation is implicit

The metaphysics is final in the direction of depth or foundation. Is it truly final? I.e., is deductive logic final? We are not asking whether our systems of logics are final—obviously, the system of the systems is not. But is deductive logic as defined earlier final? Implicitly—yes, but explicitly no! For even logic as logic, is in terms of modes of expression, and our discovery and formulation of the modes is most likely incomplete. Thus, the finality of which we speak is implicit. Not only are modes syntactically (grammatically) and semantically (meaning wise) incomplete, but their expression in discrete form, though convenient and generative of formal precision, may be incomplete, for perhaps what is needed for completeness is complement of the discrete mode of expression by the continuous (and perhaps more than just the formal continuum of the real number system).

The metaphysics is ever open with regard to variety

For limited beings, variety is ever open. That is, the metaphysics is explicitly open in BREADTH.

Though the metaphysics achieves (implicit) foundational depth, it reveals the richness and existential depth of being to be ever open. It is here that, for limited being, there is never ending adventure and journey.

Demonstration—proof—from the real metaphysics

According to the metaphysics, if it is possible, it exists—is real. Therefore, demonstration of generalities is trivial. However (i) many of the general conclusions are of great significance even though the proof is trivial—some are even ultimate (the non-triviality lies in the derivation of the metaphysics); we shall take up such conclusions immediately (ii) conclusions regarding concrete, detailed, and probable outcomes require non-trivial reasons based in the concrete side of the metaphysics (tradition etc), and is taken up beginning with the [dimensions of being](#) (p. 49); such conclusions are likely, perhaps even very likely, but not generally necessary (yet it is necessary that what is possible and likely in general does occur—for even the unlikely but not impossible localized states must occur infinitely often, where the infinity is infinitesimal in comparison to the limitless totality).

Cosmology of space-time-being

Let us look at a little cosmology. We first consider *being, extension, and duration*—i.e., SPACETIMEBEING. The most primitive experience is of SAMENESS and DIFFERENCE. Experience is experiencing, which entails change, whose measure is DURATION ('time'). IDENTITY, whether of other beings or selves, is a sense of enduring sameness through change. Incremental change in identity without duration marks and measures EXTENSION ('space'). Because the distinction of change with and without duration is not precise, an incompletely separable being—extension—duration constitutes the world. There is a dynamic—beings are in interaction, and the interactions are a source of change.

Thus, space-time is of and in being—the title of the chapter could have been 'Cosmology of being'. The present title makes immanence of spacetime in being clear.

Cosmology of limitless identity

About the universe

The universe—

- (i) Has ultimate identity.
- (ii) Is in a process of phasing in and out of manifest form, which achieves peaks of limitless quality and magnitude.
- (iii) Has arrays of cosmoses and sub- and super-cosmoses, all in transaction with nothingness, i.e., the void.

As far as we seem lesser than the ultimate, the limits of our being—

- (iv) Are real but not absolute.
- (v) Are only apparent from an ultimate perspective (for all beings realize the ultimate in merging in its peaks).
- (vi) Are no more than an apparent gulf between our world and the ultimate.

On God

The idea of God is possessed of the real—

- (vii) As immediate and pervasive rather than remote—as immanent rather than other.
- (viii) Not as static but as in process—a process of which we are part.
- (ix) As exemplified by our cosmos and its living and sentient-sapient forms rising from primeval origins.

The essential issue of God

“What ought we to consider God to be?” is perhaps the essential question regarding ‘God’. An effective answer renders moot the issue of the existence of God.

The many legend Gods of the religions have symbolic significance. However, the issue of their existence is a diversion from the real issue of the constitution of the ultimate.

Is a limited sense of the real illusory?

Finally,

- (x) The cosmology does not imply that a limited sense of the real is an illusion—rather, it is an illusion to see the limited as the *precise* and *entire* real.

On the meaning of life

Transcending individual difference

To talk of *the* meaning of life may seem presumptuous. However, (i) in its common use, the phrase allows and ought to allow multiplicity of meaning (ii) here we seek a level that transcends individual differences.

Some questions of meaning

Earlier, I asked “What sense did it make ... that my awareness came into being, that it will end, and that it has degrees of isolation from all awareness in the universe? Will the narrative have answers to these questions?”

Reflections on meaning

We can now reflect on these issues.

“What sense did it make...” was a question of meaning. We have seen that we have phases of ultimate and limited identity, and we are comfortable asserting that meaning in the ultimate phases is ultimate while meaning in the limited phases is informed and guided by conception of the ultimate.

But this does not quite address the meaning of the meaning of life. To transcend individual difference, we must abstract, and, to be universal, the abstraction must be in terms of the ultimate.

The question of the meaning of life

The meaning of the meaning of life expresses the meaning of life in abstract terms.

Our meaning of the question of meaning, is that we have experience of the positive and the negative and want to know whether there is completeness, closure, and final positivity. That is the question of meaning of meaning but in abstract terms.

Is there such meaning?

And the answer is that there is such meaning—as such in the ultimate and as an ideal in the immediate (which is not to rule out the *sense* of completing meaning in the immediate). That there is such meaning and that it is ultimate is given from the real metaphysics.

Dimensions of being

Why we do not imbue being with richness

In some accounts, being is more than foundational—it is also essence, especially human essence. That approach clouds foundation and essence or depth, variety, and function of being. Here, being is foundational but essence and richness are aspects of being rather than being itself. Here, being is not depth but reflects and contains it; this avoids the clouding. The narrative has been developing function and depth. This now continues and is complemented by breadth or variety.

How we introduce richness

The DIMENSIONS OF BEING shall be aspects of being chosen for their efficiency in realization. The dimensions arise from givens.

Kinds of dimension

The pure dimension is high level and may be developed into kinds or CATEGORIES, which would have application in realization (for example, the earlier chapter, *cosmology of space-time-being* (p. 46) suggests a local dynamic system of BEING-in-RELATION-and-CHANGE). The pragmatic enables

meaning and function in our world. The pure and the pragmatic mesh in the real metaphysics.

The pure dimension

The PURE DIMENSION of the world is of experiential being in form and formation. It has an experiential-intrinsic side and an instrumental-as-if-material side. The path of realization involves both. The yoga tradition addresses both sides ('mind' and 'body'). But yoga cannot be static—as if an ancient tradition with insight should have necessarily had an insight that should have no transcendence. A true yoga ought to learn from tradition but also be enhanced by imagination, experience, and reason. The pure dimension has pragmatic aspects.

A system of pragmatic dimensions

But the pragmatic aspect needs enhancement.

Choice of system

Our detailed knowledge of the world is imperfect in traditional senses of 'perfection'—limited beings (minds) can fill in the pragmatic only selectively. However, from the real metaphysics pragmatic knowledge need not be perfect in the received senses, for that is not a block to realization of the ultimate. The PRAGMATIC DIMENSIONS or categories of any world culture may be chosen—we choose western culture, to which we append the 'universal'.

Nature

NATURE—is physical (simple), living (complex), and experiential ('mind', intelligence). Nature is that which, among other things, we have *found* unchanging (the boundary between the changeable and the unchangeable is a function of knowledge—changeability vs unchangeability is perspectival).

Society

SOCIETY—is the niche in the world we create for ourselves, which provides for basic and higher ‘needs’. Culture is our store of knowledge, its modes of expression, communication, and evolution. Culture is a cumulative result of intelligence, communication, and experience. The ‘dimensions’ of society include economics, technology, politics, knowledge (discovery and transmission), and significant meaning as in art, literature, and spiritual endeavor (including religion—at least in symbolic interpretation—if not in the religions).

The universal

THE UNIVERSAL—is the (at least metaphorically) highest reach of the possible as outlined above; it is not very well recognized in the west or well understood in the east (however eastern metaphysics has been suggestive for the way); its means are the real metaphysics, experiment, and reason together with the dimensions of being.

Other systems

It is planned to study and experience other systems for efficiency and inclusion in the way.

Paradigms of explanation and prediction

Robust vs possible worlds

The real metaphysics implies the existence of every possible world. How may we distinguish ROBUST WORLDS—those with relatively stable existence from, say, solipsist and transient universes? It is possible and therefore true that there are cosmoses just like ours is this very moment, but that spontaneously came into existence five minutes ago. How may we argue that our cosmos is not such a cosmos?

Explaining robust worlds—the paradigms of a dualist science and philosophy

We may appeal to paradigms arising in the western materialist pragmatic dimensions. Even though imperfect, they are what we have (we could appeal to paradigms of other cultures). Major paradigms are (i) incremental EMERGENCE (of emergents not manifest in the sufficiently remote past), originating in but spilling beyond biology, via transient indeterminist change and determinate capture of stable emergents (determined, e.g., by near symmetry) (ii) the mechanism of physics—especially as in the relativistic theory of gravitation and in quantum field theory. The latter exhibits properties of determinism and indeterminism, which may be a residue of original formation (iii) statistical theories in physics (tentative because this may require some analytical specification of the greatest possible universe) (iv) ideas from condensed matter physics (also tentative), including emergence.

Emergence and origins

The paradigm of incremental emergence is capable of explaining origins of cosmoses as well as freedom of will (and can contribute to the nature and meaning of free will).

Why stable cosmoses effectively outnumber the transient unstable

The paradigm of emergent stability suggests that known cosmologies will be stable and effectively outnumber the unstable, for the latter are transient and most likely barely knowable from within. It suggests that while we do not know with certainty that our cosmos is not ‘weird’ (e.g., just came into existence and will shortly cease to exist), its weirdness is very unlikely (there

are arguments based in conditions presumed to obtain in our world, but though such conditions may be likely, they do not necessarily hold).

Growth of persons and civilizations

Dimensions of growth

In forward motion of the world, achievement of the ambient culture often presents as ultimate. However, the secular and transsecular aspects of culture are nearly always limited by experience, pragmatic considerations, and conflicts of interest. A truth of most cultural paradigms is that they cannot validly claim any essential completeness. The real metaphysics shows the essential incompleteness of the paradigms. There is a universal dimension beyond nature and culture. I do not imply that cultures have no sense of the universal. Rather, we can now see that most such prehensions are incomplete.

Completion of growth—a common view

It is common to think of the height of growth to be grounded in person, culture, and no more.

A complete view

The ‘normal’ growth of individuals and civilizations progresses through the dimensions of nature, society with culture, and the universal.

One perspective on nature is that it is the ground in which beings and their societies live and which, at first, is found to have a given or unchanging base—which may be experienced as unchangeable. Society and culture are communal niches, which are situated in but also a buffer against the ‘harshness’ of nature. In the process of understanding and employing nature, it is found to not be unchangeable. The apparently unchanging base is understood at deeper and deeper levels so that what was thought unchanging is later found changeable and malleable. At any given time, culture has a view of what is changeable and what is given.

When a person is primarily at the social phase of growth, their view of nature, of what is and what is not malleable, is more or less that of their culture. What is the source in the change in the cultural view? A significant source is the individual who investigates the ‘nature of nature’. Another source is technology and experimental technique that enables us to see with greater depth (of course individuals contribute to this too).

But even today our philosophers and scientists find givenness amid the change—there is a standard secular view (*SSV*), which is roughly that the universe is physical—the field theories of the fundamental forces, the big bang cosmology, that the universe, even if infinite, is a continuation of that picture with future modifications being in improvement and unification of the field theories.

Here, however, we find that we can go far beyond *SSV*—especially see [the fundamental principle](#) (p. 41), [the real metaphysics](#) (p. 45), and [the cosmology of limitless identity](#) (p. 47). The inner and outer worlds of beings, though they have ground in their culture, are not limited by the paradigmatic limits of their culture.

The limits of the individual are the conceptual limits of the greatest possibility. Of course, the attainment of that ‘limit’, intellectually, instrumentally, emotionally, and real-ly is a process.

The future of physics

Will the ultimate future of our physics—while we are limited beings—be mathematical as it is today? This is not easy to tell. However it will be framed by [logic as the theory of the universe](#) (p. 39) and it may well be qualitative (but mathematics already has a qualitative side). Is this the future of physics? It is a likely framework for it.

A common arrogance

Relativity and absoluteness of cultures are both ‘arrogant’ in seeing person, culture, and society as the end of growth.

Division 4 Realization—pathways to the ultimate

Pathways to ultimate being

A full title of this chapter would be Pathways to the ultimate in and from the immediate.

The ways

It follows from metaphysics (from REASON as how to establish facts and draw conclusions—different from an earlier use of the term as in reasons for something) that the ultimate is ‘given’—that all beings realize the ultimate. However, waiting for it to happen, and though some focus on the immediate and social worlds is essential to grounding, to focus only on those worlds is immensely inefficient and unrewarding relative to the ultimate. It also follows that—

- (i) there are efficient and intelligent PATHWAYS to the ultimate (INTELLIGENCE is not just ability to function in our world but also of negotiation for and beyond the world),
- (ii) if enjoyment is VALUE (desirable), there is an IMPERATIVE to be on an intelligent path (ENJOYMENT is appreciation of pleasure and pain, and of the use of abilities in and for the world),
- (iii) that there is an imperative is not to be seen as moral compulsion, but as knowledge that without being on a path, one’s life and being are incomplete even if enjoyed, and that one is not enhancing the process of the world, even though ‘they also serve who only stand and wait’ has truth,
- (iv) the imperative is to an ULTIMATE VALUE,

- (v) pleasure and pain are unavoidable, and their best address is being on a path (which is and includes therapy),
- (vi) to be on a path is not just to follow but also to share, to negotiate the way, and to develop pathways,
- (vii) that all possibilities are realized, does not imply they are attained in this world or our cosmos; it implies that there are limitlessly many cosmoses in transaction with the void and that while the ultimate may be realized beginning and remaining in 'this life', it is more likely realized beyond—in the movement of identity and perhaps of civilizations from cosmos to cosmos,
- (viii) received ways from tradition are useful, ought to be considered for integration of their useful elements into paths, but the received, even where they aim at the ultimate and finality, are almost invariably limited and in process.

Therapy

The templates address 'normal process', group and individual. The needs of two kinds of individual may remain unaddressed—(i) exceptional and (ii) disturbed. REALIST THERAPY is the best therapy a culture has to offer, within a framework of realization and feasibility. It shall address the issues as issues of being—i.e., as psycho-physiological issues.

Paths and templates

How are we to be on a path? Two generic and adaptable PATH TEMPLATES, *everyday* (below) and *universal* (p. 60). A dedication and affirmation are derived from experience, metaphysics, and dimensions of being. The templates are generalized from my use and include detail sufficient to a range of situations, phases of life, and kinds of day—e.g., a normal work-day, day at home, a day on an expedition, a day or retreat, or a day without explicit

goals—perhaps of abandon. Thus, the templates are not rigid, which is their intent. They can be adapted to need by altering emphasis and detail. For details and further information on how to adapt the templates, see [path templates](#) in the [resources](#).

On meditation and yoga

This section is preliminary to the everyday template.

What are meditation and yoga?

MEDITATION is person (mind and body) employed reflectively on their self and the world toward ends of its intelligent choosing. YOGA is the system of ways to the ultimate in and from the immediate. In this sense, meditation, reason, and yoga are identical. See the link, [received ways](#), in the [resources](#).

Incomplete separability of body from mind is implicit, therefore meditation entails yoga, reason, action, and transformation. The aim is dually about ends and process—calm attachment, toward which, practice in detachment and selective detachment are tools.

Intelligence

Intelligence is frequently understood as that which enhances effective action in the world. Here *action in the world* is enhanced to *action in and for the world*.

Yoga in tradition and in process

Traditional modes of meditation (e.g., Shamatha and Vipasana) and of yoga (e.g., eightfold, which derives from Buddhism) are included.

The traditions are often treated as completed. However, they are very much in process. Therefore yoga (with meditation) is regarded as any theory—an in-process conceptual structure in interaction with an empirical base.

Everyday template

The ground and the way

In the everyday template, activities are for *the way*—DEVELOPMENT AND EXECUTION, marked by a dagger†, and GROUND, unmarked.

The template

Rise early, before the sun, dedicate to the way and its aim, affirm the universal nature of being (for a dedication and affirmation, see below and [path templates](#) in the [resources](#)). Morning reflection in nature. Breakfast.

† *Meditative-contemplative review* of priorities and plans—the way, life, the day. Reflect on realization, priorities, and means; employ simple reflection, (Shamatha—calming meditation for re-orientation of purpose and energy—to experiential transformation toward oneness; Vipasana—analytical to visionary meditation—to see what is essential now and in other time frames; see the discussion of experimental meditation and yoga at [received ways](#) in the [resources](#)).

† *Realization*—WORK; CARE AND RELATIONSHIPS—networking; IDEAS AND ACTION; EXPERIMENTAL AND STRUCTURED YOGA-exercise-meditation-share in practice and in action; ENGAGEMENT IN THE WORLD—languages, art, and other activities.

Tasks—daily and long term; midday meal. ATTITUDE—in tasks and toward others and the world—an element of realization; light; yoga in action. Merge with Realization.

Physical activity—exercise and *exploration* of the worlds of nature and culture for experience and inspiration.

Evening tasks, supper, preparation-dedication for the next day and future.

Evening rest, renewal, review, † meditation and realization, network, and community. Sleep early.

A daily routine

A routine can be constructed from the template. For example, the following could be set in tabular form with details from above, rise → realize → review times → yoga, continue realization → ground, tasks → lunch → exercise → afternoon → evening → sleep.

Dedication

I dedicate my life to *the way of being*,

To living in the immediate and the limitless ultimate as one.

For they are one, their separateness only apparent, the oneness waiting for realization.

The means of realization—

To its shared discovery and realization,

Under the pure dimension of experiential being in form and formation as the world,

And the pragmatic dimensions of nature, society, and the universal.

In flow and adversity—

To shedding the bonds of limited self and culture, so that even in adversity, life approaches flow,

Practice and therapy merging in action.

To realizing the ultimate in this life—this world—and beyond,

So again, to return to beginnings.

Affirmation

“That pure unlimited consciousness—transcending all principles of form... that is supreme reality. *That* is the ground for the establishment of all things—and that is the essence of the universe. By *That* the universe lives and breathes, and *That* alone am I. Thus, I embody and am the universe in its

ordinary and most transcendent form.”— Abhinava Gupta (950 – 1016 CE, a philosopher-theologian of Kashmir).

In plain language—All beings are ultimate being, which is the greatest possible being, which from blind and material beginnings, is the ultimate self-aware designer and transformer of the universe as ultimate. Though we are not that ultimate in our present form there are aware, intelligent pathways to it, which traverse pleasure and pain. If we do not recognize it, that reality is already harbored deep in our being, and there are ways to bring into the light of awareness and shared transformation.

Universal template

Pure being, everyday

Being in the world—Dimensions: PURE BEING, yoga, meditation, ideas to action; COMMUNITY, education (general, paradigm, ways of life), retreat to the real, renewal, development-reemphasis of paradigm.

Ideas—Dimensions: RELATION, *knowing* as relation to the world, reason, art; ACTING—effective creation of the real. Means—reason, yoga-meditation, the real metaphysics, and the site plan for the way of being—for links to yoga-meditation and the site plan, visit the links [received ways](#) and [development](#), respectively, in the [resources](#)

Essence—yoga, meditation, ideas into action. Community, education (general, paradigm, ways of life), retreat, renewal, development-reemphasis of paradigm.

Becoming

Introduction

This introduction to activities in becoming lays out dimensions of becoming, and intrinsic-instrumental activities corresponding roughly to experiential-physical being. Note that the distinction between the intrinsic and

the instrumental parallels the distinction between [the pure dimension](#) (p. 50) and [the pragmatic dimensions](#) (p. 50).

From [a system of pragmatic dimensions](#) (p. 50), dimensions of becoming are (i) nature (ii) civilization, society, and culture (iii) artifact and technology (iv) pure being and the universal.

Instrumental activities emphasize the science—physical, biological, psychological, and social—and technology of western culture; they enable knowledge of the world, exploration, and physical transformation. And while these enhance and support transformation and appreciation of the ultimate, they are not in themselves transformation of our being as shown by the real metaphysics. Intrinsic transformation is catalyzed by yoga and meditation, noted earlier; by the processes of science, art, and the humanities; and the immersive activities below—beyul, cultural immersion. Full transformation should require synthesis of the instrumental and the intrinsic.

[Nature](#)

Nature as catalyst and essential to the real. With animal being and devolution—observation, situational empathy, defocus, reason—as preliminary to reconstruction of being.

Essence—being in nature as source—immersion over conquest, an example is beyul of Tibetan Buddhism (Generically, ‘beyul’ is journeying to remote natural environments that evoke true self; for a link, visit the link [beyul](#) the [resources](#). In the Nyingma school of Tibetan Buddhism, Beyul are hidden valleys which the Buddhist ‘master’ Padmasambhava blessed as refuges. They are places where physical and spiritual worlds overlap, and Tantric practice effectiveness increases with multiple perception dimensions.)

[Civilization, society, and culture](#)

Civilization as vehicle and path to the real. Transformation via psyche—by immersion in social groups as place of being and catalyst to the real.

Essence—immersion and travel in a range of cultures; the dimensions of society engaged in directive and immersive manner (economics, politics, ideas and culture, art, religious-spiritual sources). Immersion in and attention to the challenges and opportunities of the world.

Artifact and technology

Civilizing the universe (especially technology as enhancing being in the universe)—universe as peak consciousness via spread of sapient being.

Essence—technological enhancements of being (artificial being, sciences—abstract and concrete, technology of exploration and space travel).

Pure being and the universal

Realizing Peak Being in the present. Said to be rarely achieved in ‘this life’ which is a beginning that is continued beyond death. The means are in the previous items and the everyday template (see the [path templates](#) in the [resources](#))—and open.

Essence—metaphysics into action, meaning and awareness of self – human limits – birth – and death; their real but non absolute character.

Quality of being

In all these endeavors, quality of being, which includes satisfaction with our states of being and process, is an essential focus.

An ideal world

Individual and community are the focus

The individual and their quality of life is the focus of instrumental ends in our world, for in its identity with Identity, their identity contains community and relationship. This is the aim of cultural action—i.e., of social, economic, and political action. It the aim of cultural action in the narrower sense that

includes the language, knowledge, art, and experiential reality (including 'spirit')—their cultivation (e.g., 'research'), and transmission (communication and education). All this is important in the immediate world for it is there that their corruption occurs. And as nature is a ground for culture, its importance as a place of being, and a primal material and spiritual resource is essential.

Relevance of other institutions; pride

Cities, nations, economic and political and religious institutions are not unimportant. Their importance lies in their being of and for the people. PRIDE in institutions that we did not entirely make, is a sense of being part of and contributory toward them and their identity within us.

A primary ethical principle—realization of the ultimate

A primary ethical principle is the value of realization of the ultimate. Common principles fit under this—for example, concern for the other, for community, for social institutions and organization are given because identity is Identity and therefore one is not merely related to others, one is the others.

The immediate world

In the immediate world we do not (of course) expect the ideal. There are two approaches to the apparently non-ideal character of the immediate world—(i) it is on the way to the ultimate and so, while improvement is good, perfection is not only impossible but unnecessary and (ii) what we see as negative, even evil, in the immediate, may have transformative and cathartic value (as a way of seeing, not of seeking or justifying).

Doubt, judgment, and action

This chapter repeats some earlier observations on doubt.

Importance of doubt

The real metaphysics is consistent with experience and reason, which include science and logic. However, despite rational and empirical

consistency, the proof ought to be doubted. Doubt is further directly addressed in the [in process complete edition](#) also linked in the [resources](#).

Alternative attitudes to the real metaphysics

Given its consistency and the reasonableness of its proof, two alternate attitudes to the real metaphysics are (i) as a hypothesis or axiom as foundation for a metaphysics for the entire real and (ii) as an existential principle of action.

Certainty as a non-exclusive value; this is the time for action

There is value to careful philosophical analysis that is accepted by the global community of thinkers. However, must we be passive in the absence of absolute certainty? The time to act on the real metaphysics is now—it is not to be deferred to some future generation. We judge that it is now on the ground of the reasonableness of the demonstration, that in eternity, now is always the time—it is the eternal present, and in our finding that rejects some received notions of perfection as counterfeit.

It is conceivable that these remarks may be seen as an attempt to justify imprecise thought. Therefore, it is pertinent to recall the precision and perfection of and within the real metaphysics—and the conception of perfection therein.

Resources

The way of being on the Internet

The way of being home page, <http://www.horizons-2000.org> has resources. Near the top of the page is [development](#)—plans for realization and for development of the way and the site; and suggested [reading](#), which also has information on sources.

The main resources

The home page of the above site has resources, which may be explored. Of particular interest are—

Two editions of the way—(i) [in process complete edition](#) ('in process ed' at the home page)—has detailed development, rigor, and explanation ([editable version](#)) (ii) [this field edition](#) ('field ed') or 'pocket manual' and [editable](#) and printable MS Word version.

A pdf version of '[path templates](#)' with dedication and affirmation and MS Word [editable](#), adaptable, and printable version.

An in-process document on synthesis from '[received ways](#)' and [editable](#) version.

In the line labeled 'resources'—a link on [beyul](#), more [sources](#), and a [system of human knowledge](#) based in the real metaphysics.

Development of the way and the website

Follow the link, development, near the top of the home page.

Suggested reading

Follow the link, reading, near the top of the home page. This page also lists writers whose influence has been significant.

Division 5 Return and prospect—into the world

Though we may never find ourselves complete, we seek sublime satisfaction with our states of being and process. We seek a balance between satisfaction and achievement. With understanding that is perhaps new, we return to the world, to live in the ultimate, the immediate, past, present, and future as one.

'Return' is metaphorical and emphatic, for we never left the world—or the ultimate.