

ADVANCED PLURIVERSE THEORY FOR PLURIVERSE ENGINEERS

Chapter 10 of the Anti-thesis

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

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

Copyright 2002 K.D. Palmer.
All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.
Version 0.3; 02/12/07; sd09v03.doc

Keywords:

Pluriverse, Schema, Meta-system, System,
Process, Engineering

Summary:

None yet.

Exploring the Experience Bracketing Schema

In the last chapter we talked about the Facet schema and how we loop the loop to return to the Pluriverse schema through the interface in the ninth dimension which takes place in the context of the tenth dimension. But we also talked about how

we do not need Quantum Mechanics to generate the idea of the Pluriverse, but in fact Parmenides poem if taken seriously produces something similar to the Pluriverse, which is the principle that anything that can be conceived has Being whereas what ever cannot be conceived is Non-Being which Parmenides wants to deny the possibility of existing. On the other hand there is the middle path which Parmenides also warns us of which is the mixture of Being and Non-Being which is change that gives rise to appearance, opinion, and error. Thus, Parmenides denies change and thus actuality in general which would be equivalent to the observation that breaks the wave function in Quantum Mechanics. Heraclitus on the other hand denies the transcendental realm and says that all is change, strife, fire. In our tradition most philosophers like Epicurus tried to find a middle way between these two extremes. But a few like Hegel tried to follow Heraclitus in giving change primary importance. But the number of philosophers that followed the way of change and difference, like Deleuze for instance, are very few. So the pluriverse without observation and thus actuality leads to something very similar to the idea of the existence of many universes which is an interpretation given by for instance David Deutsch in Quantum Mechanics. We do not need the confirmation of Quantum Mechanics to foster a belief that there may be many other universes than our own forming a pluriverse which we do not see but which we get intimations of as possibly standing behind the Kosmos that we posit beyond the Universe. However, Quantum Mechanics drives us to consider this possibility more carefully. Like the Facet the Pluriverse is twice removed from our

experience standing as it does on the other side of the Kosmos. The Kosmos is like the Monad and the Pluriverse is like the Facet. We are talking here about the two schemas of the Large and the two schemas of the small that bound or bracket our experience. Deleuze calls them the Large and the Small in Difference and Repetition following Plato who explicitly says that something is either large or small it is not a spectrum. Opposites are absolute. Which is a highly non-intuitive thing to say until you consider the differences between the schemas of the large and the schemas of the small and you see that in terms of the schemas there is no connection between them other than complementarity. In fact what we are dealing with here is a complementarity of complementarities which is a sign that we are dealing with a meta-system beyond experience, the so called ultimate "Operating System" for our experience. We see it as a complementarity of complementarities that bracket our experience. We call the whole shebang Being. All of the things of our experience which are schematized fit into this all encompassing bag of tricks. We posit the Kosmos, Pluriverse, Monads and Facets beyond experience as a means of coming to terms with the meta-system that must encompass the application of our experience running in the operating system of all that IS. So when we say that Parmenides would wish us to project all possible things that might have Being, those things we do not experience directly go into the 'Operating System' of the meta-system *beyond* experience. Either they are too small to comprehend and we consider them to be at the monad level, or they are part of the fusion and interpenetration of all things at the facet level, or they are somewhere

out in the cosmos beyond our world that we have not visited, and probably can't visit due to speed of light constraints, or they exist in other universes than our own that inhabit the realm of possible but non-actualized things in other universes. There are plenty of carpets to sweep things under that do not appear in direct or indirect experience. These bracketing or limiting schemas of the ultimately Large and Small are excellent hiding places that we might appeal to when we want to posit something that does not appear to have immediate presence or indirect hearsay or even registered presence.

What we need to come to terms with when we discuss the pluriverse schema is the idea that it is infinite in extent because possibilities are infinite in extent. This is what puts people who would like to simplify Quantum Theory off besides the fact that these other universes are invisible. The idea that Quantum Interference is the manifestation of these other universe in our universe is brilliant, but not ultimately convincing. Of course, if Quantum Computers can compute incomputable things then that will be some kind of evidence that such other universes exist. However, it is not necessary to wait for that experiment to be done to speculate as to the relation between the various universes. We can consider them to be not just endlessly proliferating, but instead as locked into an Emergent Meta-system cycle. In other words we can think of universes as being created and destroyed following an EMS cycle so that they do not proliferate infinitely. Up until a given point in time when some observation is made and a collapse traps something in our universe it is shared by the other universes in a superpositional state. We see that trapping as the way that universes proliferate and there does not seem to be any way for them to vanish again. However, consider this: In the EMS cycle we have seeds which in our case are monads. Seeds produce the kosmos by a creation process though their observations of the possibilities turning them into actualities. Those various kosmi are actualized and they interact mutually producing a viewpoint on them which Leibniz called good, but we could consider many viewpoints instead of one infinite viewpoints as the ancients did positing many immortals. These immortals then schematize the actualized

universes and produce the candidates, the actual near infinity of possible universes. These candidates then cancel to produce the seed monads of the next cycle. Notice that in order to have this schema it is necessary to posit as Leibniz did something like the mind of God which is immortal and inhuman to counter the human beings view via the monads. This is probably why in the last era of our worldview the opposites of mortal and immortal were set off against heaven and earth. Earth is actualized kosmi and Heaven are the potential kosmi. In other words the EMS cycle goes mortal then Earth then immortal then Heaven then back to mortal. Heaven are all the possible but non-actualized possibilities. Heaven is where the interpenetration takes place and so it is related to the fusion and interpenetration of facets. Earth is the realm of actuality where the Komos comes into being from the monad seeds. This means that the pluriverse is associated with the viewpoints in the EMS cycle. Who sees the pluriverse? The immortals, i.e. the Gods of Greece, or the Ntr of Egypt. Since the transformation into the Metaphysical Era we have lost our bearings with regard to why the gods existed in the Mythopoeitic Era. Now we can see that it might be because for the EMS to work there has to be someone who views the pluriverse as we view the kosmos. The EMS goes from monad to kosmos to pluriverse to facet and back again. This positive fourfold of Heaven Earth Mortal and Immortal associated with the masculine (which Heidegger talks about taking it from Socrates) was balanced by the negative fourfold of Abyss, Covering, Night, Chaos associated with the feminine. We can trace this negative fourfold back to the Ogdad of Egypt. It

appears in the Birds by Aristophanes as an alternative theogony. It can be found in many myths as I have shown in my book The Fragmentation of Being and the Path Beyond the Void. There was a *mysterium conjunctus*, royal marriage, between these two fourfolds to produce the fourfold of the metaphysical era called Logos/Physis//Finite//Infinite. Our fourfold is the golden child of this marriage of the fourfolds of the previous era. If we understand the positive fourfold as being an Emergent Meta-system cycle which produces the four bracketing schemas then we must attempt to understand the negative fourfold as well. This is because behind our worldview, i.e. in the bracketing schemas, there are not just those things we can schematize but what lies beyond schematization. That is understood in terms of Abyss, Chaos, Covering and Night. The opposites of these are attributed to the Positive Fourfold. So the Positive fourfold becomes the ruling ground, order, uncovering (aletheia) and light. These attributes appear out of the interaction of the schemas and what cannot be schematized. It is these emergent attributes that are opposite the negative fourfold that gives rise to the current fourfold structure of the world as physis/logos//finite/infinite. The physis and logos unfold and that is a progressive uncovering. Between the physis and logos there is the non-dual order that manifests in both realms. The metaphysical principle, as infinite or absolute serves as the ground for finite beings. Light is what appears outwardly as sensory light and inwardly as reason to produce the clearing of being within the realm held apart by these dualities. Both reason and sensory light of the clearing manifest rta (right) as cosmic harmony

between finite beings within the infinite limit. Nonduals and Dualites play together to produce the clearing in being that Heidegger talks about in Being and Time. But we use the terminology of Hilary Lawson introduced in his book Closure. The clearing in being is made up of the openness that can never be completely closed. But we introduce continually certain closures on that openness that produces material and texture, i.e. further emergent openness at the next level but certain reification as material as well with its own emergent properties. This is what is happening within the world framed by the dualities named above in the metaphysical era. What we have shown is how the positive and negative fourfolds of the mythopoietic era come together to produce emergent characteristics which are opposite the negative fourfold and that these then produce the basis for the framing of the dualities in the metaphysical era. But behind this is the idea that in the mythopoietic era there was some understanding of the meta-system that produced the bracketing schemas that we have lost in our era. What could not be schematized was represented as the dual of the EMS of schematization. There was an interaction between these which produced the characteristics of the Clearing in Being which still operate in our metaphysical era and which in fact have become reified in the current framing dualities of our worldview in this era. If we understand the framing schemas as an Emergent Meta-system then that simplifies the problem of the production of infinite worlds. We see rather that infinite worlds are not produced but there is a constant production and destruction of worlds in the form of the EMS cycle. This is a non-

dual alternative between infinite universes and the Copenhagen solution that merely isolates quantum phenomena in the microcosm. Rather this view allows us to consider the meso and macro scales quantum mechanical in essence as well while protecting us from infinite proliferation of universes. The universes that are created are viewed by the immortals who schematize them as we schematize within our kosmos and they produce the candidates or possibilities which then cancel to produce the seeds of the next cycle. What is nice about this way of looking at things is that it directly connects the monad 'seeds' with the komos 'monads' through a creation operator. That operator is the equivalent of an observation in quantum mechanics. When an experiencing monad or observer does an observation that is what produces an actual kosmos. Different observers making different observations may make different kosmi. These actualities then interact with each other and that interaction leads to quantum interference. The various kosmi are then seen by those who can see the various worlds, i.e. the immortals, our duals. They schematize these worlds and invent potentials as candidate worlds. Those candidate worlds annihilate each other leaving some as a side effect that produce the monads that may make the next set of observations to produce new kosmi. In the mythopoeitic era positing the gods or *ntr* as our counterparts that can see into and though all the worlds which we cannot see into or through was no problem. The gods were as real to those mythonaughts prior to the split in the bicameral brain as they were to themselves. For us that is a problem because we have a difficult time believing in invisible people that can see multiple

worlds that we cannot see, the other branches of the tree of the world called Yaddrasil. However, recently we have become to doubt our own unity, as egos and have had to admit that we may be a plurality ourselves. That is the plurality inside us whether we think of it as complexes, instincts, drives, trieb, passions or whatever else it might be: the fragmented I which Nietzsche talks about that makes up to the totality of the Self according to Jung. Slowly we are realizing that we may ourselves be a swarm of monads, observers, preceptors, rememberers, cogitators, agents, etc. And so then we can think of these monads as making observations and that creates outside of us the kosmos. Each observation may produce many kosmi and these actualizations interact and interfere with each other. We may then posit transcendentals, like the transcendental ego to take the place of the gods and form the views of the interacting kosmi, which then are schematized by a projection by the transcendental egos and through that many other possible kosmi are imagined in an act of transcendental imagination (exactly the part Kant took out of his Critique of Pure reason according to Heidegger). These imaginations are productions of pure reason through the antinomies cancel or contradict each other which leads to the production the monads as side effects that can be seeds of the next realm of the Emergent Meta-system. You see in the Metaphysical era transcendental philosophy becomes the vehicle for the projection of the immortal views. They are seen as part of us that are immortal beyond our own empirical kenning. The transcendental ego is what produces the a priori synthesis of experience. It projects space and time

and by that it projects with space and time the schemas that we are discussing which are a further refinement of the Kantian Schemas. This transcendental philosophy gives us our comprehension of understanding as the mixture of reason and experience. This is further articulated by Husserl who uses this framework in a further refinement to define phenomenology. In that process Husserl discovers the difference between essences and ideas, which then leads Heidegger to posit two kinds of Being as the basis of this difference between essence perception and ideation. This leads in turn to the discovery of the other kinds of Being until we have a picture of the multilith that is the intersection of the four kinds of Being and the four aspects of Being. But the Emergent Meta-system that we are talking about can be seen as an interplay between empirical and transcendental egos. We assume that they are us in some sense even though we do not know how. The gods have merely become part of us as Jung has said. But the structure by which the bracketing schemas are produced and destroyed is still applicable. The EMS cycle is merely the dynamic of the meta-system. By positing that dynamic as an interplay between mortals and immortals or between empirical and transcendental egos we are merely saying that that meta-system that brackets experience is dynamic in the way that all meta-systems are dynamic, i.e. via the EMS cycle. The point is that we project this transcendental framework. Husserl in his phenomenology assumed it as well. This is because experience makes sense to us and something has to be making it make sense beyond ourselves as we experience ourselves. Now we call that source of sense making the unconscious. We are

still trying to understand how that works. We are trying to figure out ways of constructing philosophies without projecting those transcendental frameworks. But that is difficult because we know that we do not produce the sense that the experience makes ourselves but receive it as a product that we then manipulate. We know that these a priori syntheses come to us already made and it is not a far cry to posit makers of those syntheses that we call transcendental egos and our forefathers called gods. We assume they are unities because we are unities. We think they may be egos like our ego that we construct artificially a posteriori on the basis of the prior synthesis of experience we are given. From the point of view of Jung the totality of experience is made up of our ego and the self, which is the transcendental ego. Between these are several thresholds of organizations called the shadow and the archetypes. The archetypes also appear as gods, or complexes to the ego. The shadow is the inassimilable material that belongs to the totality like the negative fourfold.

This is a picture of the pluriverse as a moment in an emergent meta-system made up of the four bracketing schemas as they represent the interplay between transcendental aspects beyond and within us that we project because we experience a prior synthesis of sense in our experience which is given us by the unconscious. Saying unconscious rather than transcendentals is really the same as saying gods in the last era. What ever is beyond experience, even indirect experience, is bracketed by phenomenology and can have many interpretations. Dogmatic Philosophies interpret these invisibles in diverse ways. Critical Philosophies concentrate on what

is experienced. Phenomenologies bracket rigorously everything that is not experienced in order to concentrate on understanding precisely as possible what is experienced. All of them admit that there are invisibles. The key question is that is the relation of those invisibles to *sense*, in both the perceptual and meaning related cognate senses of that term. We project some kind of meta-system beyond the system of our experience. These schemas are one manifestation of that projection. They have no empirical basis at all, not even indirect. So we could ignore them and rely on some other explanation. But normally we attempt to figure out what they might be, and the pluriverse because it aligns with Quantum Mechanics nicely is a good way of thinking about the ultimate frame of Experience in the Large which is the counterpart of the Facet in the Small. But as we have said we do not need quantum mechanics to drive us to this extreme, the principle of Parmenides is enough to produce similar mysterious concepts as a way of looking at the nature of Being without change. That means that all change is posited to occur in the Monad and Kosmos level. The Pluriverse as all possible things and the facet which indicates interpenetration and fusion are change resistant concepts. Monad and Kosmos schemas must embody that excluded change. As you can see the schemas are all made up of various extremes that balance each other. But the key point we are making is that this balancing act is dynamic because it ultimately takes the form of the Emergent Meta-system as the way we think of the meta-system of experience impinging on us. Of course, schematization is entirely an unconscious process and all the schemas are

projections of this kind, it is just that the other six schemas have some entanglement with actual content of experience where as these bracketing schemas do not.

Necessity and Possibility

We are using David Lewis' theory of many worlds as an example of the pluriverse. He speaks of Necessity and Possibility. However, we believe that these are just other names of two different kinds of Being, i.e. Pure Being and Hyper Being. It seems that there is really a range of modes corresponding to the different kinds of Being.

Pure Being	Necessity
Process Being	Actuality
Hyper Being	Possibility
Wild Being	Potentiality

Much of the confusion in this theory of necessity and possibility comes from not realizing that the modes are a different way of talking about the kinds of Being. David Lewis talks about worlds, but of course we now know that the Worlds schema and the Kosmos schema share a dimension. We would like to reserve the World for what Heidegger talks about when he discusses being-in-the-world or what Husserl talks about when he mentions the Lifeworld. The Kosmos is a better term to consider as what David Lewis calls the world and the pluriverse is the set of all possible kosmi. However, since world and kosmi share a dimension we can really use the terms interchangeably as long as it is clear that a plurality of worlds really means the plurality of kosmi in the pluriverse. In other words from David Lewis' point of view we are talking about some sort of ultimate container

which posits spacetime. The Kosmi posit spacetime as a container, and the pluriverse is a myriad of spacetime containers all separable yet with a metric that allows us to compare them in terms of closeness of similitude. We will allow all the attributes of the worlds that David Lewis posits to be posited of the kosmi, and we will even allow them to be called worlds as long as we know that we are just talking logically in terms of necessity, actuality, possibility, and potentiality. David Lewis says that this world, i.e. his world is the actual world. Of course others may argue which unique world is marked as actual. We believe that different worlds may be actual for different monads. In fact, what is to keep different monads from participating in several actual worlds in relation to their different facets. Limiting actuality is I think a problem for the theory of David Lewis. However, using spatio-temporal connection as the basis for assigning worldmates seems right. And the separation between worlds should be complete, as is the separation between monads. But whereas the facets represent fusion and interpenetration, the pluriverse seems to represent the opposite of fusion, but some kind of void. In fact, we might say that whereas the facets are emptiness and thus interpenetration, the pluriverse is perhaps composed of a void. In other words the separation of worlds is the key to the character of the pluriverse. The work of David Lewis is based on that of Kripke, who posited that names span worlds and refer to the same thing in all worlds. This rather strange idea leads to the consideration of what must be true across all worlds, which is called necessity. What is necessary must also be determinate. This is why we say that necessity is another word for Pure Being. When David Lewis says that anything which might possibly, could or might Be IS, then we have no problem with that because we know it has Hyper Being, which is a kind of being. Necessities also are, and we call that Pure Being. But then so are actualities, which we call Process Being. And we would

like to include also potentiality as being different from possibility. We talk about mere possibility, which is different from a potential. A potential is something, which might unfold into actuality, like a confluence of propensities headed in a direction toward actuality. Other possibilities might be there but with no potentization. Understanding potentization as different from possibility is one way to understand how it might be possible to have a limited number of kosmi within the pluriverse being created and destroyed in an Emergent Meta-system cycle. Not all possibilities are created equal. Some are more equal than others given the circumstances. It is strange that Necessity and Possibility are considered duals but that actuality and potentiality are not really considered as important. There is one actuality and no potentiality in the standard theory of modality. We would rather have it that there is an equal amount of actuality and potentiality to balance the necessity and the possibility. Potentiality is something almost actualized just as necessity is a the culmination of possibility. Necessity is a constraint on possibilities bringing them down to one. Actuality is a realization of potentialities out of the vast field of mere possibilities. Potentialities are what is more likely to come and Necessities are what has to come. Mere possibilities can have any chance of coming into actuality, most of them have very low chances. We think that fuzzy numbers should be used to denote the different weightings of possibilities across many kosmi. This is the meaning of the fuzzy number. Probability is the chance that something will become actual, i.e. to be true of this world, the marked kosmi we are in. Fuzzy Math demark the intensity of the possibility across the separated kosmi as either the max or min of their summation. Propensities on the other hand denote the tendency for something fuzzy to become a probability, i.e. the potential. You really need both probability and fuzziness. Propensity denotes vagueness. Vagueness is more or less the inverse of propensity which could be

thought of as definiteness. This is to say there might be some fuzzy distribution of possibilities across worlds but this is orthogonal to its probability. Fuzzy possibility does not necessarily denote a probability that something will become actualized. Probabilities are computed based on occurrences, i.e. actualizations. But possibilities are not tied to occurrences. You may have many possibilities that you never actualize. When you walk out your door in the morning you have the possibility of going anywhere in the world. But if we check what you actually do you normally go to work, or to the local store or elsewhere in your normal routine. You don't go halfway across the world. But then sometimes you do. If you are thinking about going somewhere for the first time, there is nothing in the actualities to tell that. There could be a fuzzy mapping of possibilities of places you might go if you had the time and money. That fuzzy mapping might have its max in Europe and its min in Iraq. The overall fuzziness is no real indicator of what you might do in any one case. Something else is needed which we call the propensity. In a specific situation you have a propensity or what Coutu called a tendency-in-a-situation (tinsit) to go in a particular direction and a particular distance. This propensity based on the context combines with the overall fuzzy weighting of the possibilities to determine what you will do in any case. Once you do it then it becomes an actuality which is the subject of future probabilities. In the past so called subjective probabilities were used to determine what is more properly determined by possibility and propensity together. Possibility tells you everything you might do, while propensity is what you want to do in a given situation. What you might do plus what you want to do tends to determine what you actually do. It is as if the propensity is the connection between the possible situations and what you might do, while possibility is what you might do not knowing the situation, i.e. everything you might do at any given point in time. Probability has to do

with what you did in the past. So possibility has to do with the future in general. Probability has to do with the past. Propensity has to do with the current horizon of the situation and how that effect you, propels you toward something. You see that in probability and possibility theory there is nothing that propels you as a desiring machine, or an avoiding machine, or a disseminating machine, or a absorbing machine. Possibilities are merely what you might do in any case. Different cases have different weights across worlds. We can sum them to find out the fuzzy min and max. Probabilities is what you have done in the past. Propensities is what you are propelled to do in a particular situation, regardless of what you have done in the past or what your possibilities are. For instance, people try impossible things because they are propelled to do them, or things with very low possibility weights because they are propelled by something, say treib (drives, passions) to do them. Things they have never done before. Probabilities cannot explain that nor can possibilities. Only propensities have a chance of explaining the attempt do the impossible which you have never done before. People actually do die trying things that are impossible, like climbing a mountain given a certain climbing technology that is perhaps too primitive to make it possible.

Given this analysis of how you actually need all four kinds of Being to describe multiple kosmi within the pluriverse we might have to revise some of David Lewis' ways of looking at multiple 'worlds'. There is no doubt that what might be IS in some kosmi, because all the possible 'worlds' have hyper being. They relate to actuality, i.e. the probable through the multilith of Being, i.e. what Deleuze calls the univocality of Being. The multilith is the Meta-Being that contains all the kinds of Being. Meta-being is fragmented by discontinuities of existence. Those fragments are delineated by the special systems. But meta-being contains also the determinate Pure Being of necessity, or impossibility. It

also contains potentialities of tendencies or propensities related to Wild Being. One important point is that each of the aspects (true, real, present, identical) is modified based on the meta-level of Being that addresses it. This brings to grief much of the analysis of the Analytical Philosophers like David Lewis. They tend to think everything is related to Pure Being. So what we are saying here is that the multilith is a kind of kernel that relates the pluriverse to its kosmi. The kosmi that we are in, our spacetime container, is actuality from our perspective. But other kosmi might be the actuality for other agents. Actuality is determined by actualizations of occurrences in their world, i.e. collapses of wave functions. Actualities are created by the process of observation itself and thus the kosmi is dynamic based on the observations that are occurring within it. The pluriverse itself contains all the possible worlds that are generated by these observations, as each observation may have multiple outcomes which observers in the different kosmi see differently. The Pluriverse contains different possibilities as ideal 'worlds' before observation, and after observations these 'worlds' of different outcomes become actualized. All the probabilities have to do with what the different observers see in the various worlds. Outcomes though random in any one world, become situations in the worlds in which they are realized that produce potentialities which drive observers to do and observe particular things. What quantum theory does not explain is what drives the observers to observe or do the experiments they do. That is the propensities and that produces a feed back loop. Situations create potentials that the observer then may try to realize by doing some experiment or action and observing the results. What happens is governed by possibilities in the form of the wave function which collapses to become probabilities, which then are transformed into actualities or occurrences that create new situations that lead to other propensities. Without all the parts of the multilith contributing this cycle

remains unrealized and the result is confusion such as we see in the analytic philosophers who deal with this problem. The Multilith is the kernel of the issue in terms of differentiating between kosmi and the pluriverse. The pluriverse contains prior to observation many possible worlds. After observation it may contain many actualized worlds for different observers. Actualized worlds lead to potentialities within the worlds. Those potentialities may cause the landscape of possibilities to be accessed or assessed in a different way. Then the agents might follow up on one particular set of possibilities that they are driven toward, or they may even pursue impossibilities either knowingly or unknowingly. As observations occur emergent effects causes the landscape of possibilities to alter. History is rewritten and the Future re-envisaged at each emergent event. So that means that certain possibilities are vanishing while others are appearing. Emergent effects means that certain ways of looking at history are changed and ways of looking at possible futures change too. Potentials are continually shifting as situations change given what has happened and what was observed. Actualized worlds are converted into new possibility landscapes which then lead to different potentialities that lead to new actions and new observations. Necessities only exist for a given world in a given era. Once an emergent event occurs that may change what is necessary or impossible. These things are not fixed forever. Rather we rotate through the multilith, and it is the structure of the kinds of Being by the way that gives us the structure of the emergent event. Only emergent events are faces of the world, i.e. involve all four kinds of Being. If we have less involvement of the meta-levels then we have degenerate situations productive of less radical change. What we should really be looking at is how emergent effects occur. The unfolding of the physis and logos are discontinuous, like the punctuated equilibrium of evolution. These bursts are emergent events. They structure the levels of

the ontic hierarchy that include strings, quarks, particles, atoms, molecules, cells, organisms, and societies. They also structure the emergent occurrences in the Social Hierarchy as facts, theories, paradigms, epistemes, ontologies, etc change discontinuously in the scientific and philosophical tradition. These discontinuous changes occur because of the interaction of the panoply of Meta-Being. What we see when we look at it is the actualized worlds being produced out of the pluriverse as the highest schema. But this same thing is actually happening at each level of the hierarchy of schemas. Possible schema projections are interacting with what is there that is not schematized, i.e. the magma, and somehow producing a particular realization of the magma into a schematized form. This is governed by Necessity, Probability, Possibility and Potentiality at all the levels. But we tend to concentrate on this aspect of the dynamics when looking at the very top level, i.e. the Large as Deleuze calls it. At the level of the Large it is this interaction of the kinds of Being that is most clear. But exactly the same thing is happening all the way down, that is why David Lewis claims the same thing for part of the world as for the word itself. Those parts are the schemas embodied in the magma of the noumena. The magma according to Cornelius Castoriadis is what is there before we classify things. It may be classified in many ways. But when we classify or schematize prior to classification then we reify or rigidify the magma which is like the magma from the volcano cooling. This is the hidden awkward dimension of opacity that David Lewis does not deal with. Possibilities seem to be very discrete things that fan out infinitely. Potentials take account of the discrete opacity and tendency of the things themselves, their tribe (drives, passions). Potentials are lines of force, lines of escape as Deleuze calls them in *Anti-Oedipus*. The potentialities rebel against the conceptual projection of the regular possibilities. It means that the actualities may be irregular in

their occurrence. This irregularity causes the situation dynamics to be very chaotic at times producing new potentials that are quite unexpected leading to radical reassessments of possibilities based on new probability data. So what we should really be looking at is the Multilith of Meta-Being, i.e. the univocality of Being, and how the different voices of Being, i.e. the different kinds of Being, speak together. The idea of the univocality of Being is that the different kinds of Being all still speak of Being all be it in different ways. But we can think of these different kinds of Being also as different voices that weave together like a chorus all singing the same song, as if with one voice. We can also hear the call and response of the voices of the chorus that suggest intertwining strands of many voices within the over all synthesis of the chorus.

Once we understand that it is the multilith of Being which is divided into aspects and kinds and that the kinds are seen as modes, i.e. necessity/impossibility, actuality, possibility and potentiality, which is what connects the kinds of Being to the various associated types of mathematics, i.e. determinate (calculus), probability (stochastic), possibility (fuzzy), and propensity (chaotic), then we can see that the sixteen facets of Being form a mobile within the multilith of Being. When we speak the word '*IS*' we may mean any of these kinds of Being, this is the Univocality of Being. Normally we only mean either the Verbal or reified Nounal meaning: '*Is IS*' this is the monolith of Being. The difference between the noun and the verb is ~~Being~~ (crossed) out or Hyper Being. Wild Being as Merleau-Ponty says is what is left over from the cancellation of Process Being of Heidegger and Nothingness of Sartre, i.e. the antinomies of Verbal Being. Wild being is the chiasm of reversibility that is prior to the appearance of ~~Being~~ (crossed out). The Multilith is made up of different kinds like the Pluriverse is made up of different kosmi. Deleuze talks about the univocality of Being i.e. that it is one voice that says the different kinds of Being, but he does not speak of what separates the different kinds. We posit that this is the void or emptiness, i.e. existence. But this also appears as the roots of Being as well as the special systems and the gods. In other words there are different ways of looking at the gaps between the kinds of Being. We noted that the gods are the transcendental egos that can see the kosmi from the pluriverse as we mortals can see the pluriverse from the actual kosmos. Gods are implicated by the emergent meta-system that encompasses heaven, earth, mortals and immortals. The special systems are implicated in terms of a model of the interpenetration of the void or emptiness, although we think that the void is more similar to the interstices between the kosmi in the pluriverse than emptiness. But also the roots of Being are implicated. They are the roots of Being in the Indo-European

languages, particularly Old English. When we talk about the kinds and aspects of Being that form a mobile within the multilith we are talking about abstract representations of Being, but the abstract representations are founded on the roots in proto-Indo-European. Actually the roots come first, and are melded into the Idea of Being, i.e. its illusory continuity, which is indicated using various roots for different tenses. Being is the most fragmented of words with respect to its roots in all the Indo-European languages. So the roots arise first, and then amazingly the kinds of Being appear as the differences between the roots. The roots have a particular structure that is ES/ER//BHEU//WES/WER. ES further differentiates into SEIN and SEYN which Heidegger talks about in Contributions to Philosophy (from Ereignis). Heidegger says that the fundamental turning is from Sein to Seyn which takes us to the other Beginning of Meta-physics. That is a turning from the philosophy of presence to the uncovering of truth. But all of what Heidegger is talking about is merely the very top of the series of roots. We can go all the way down to the *Werothern* which is the incipience of Being in Old English, an extremely rare usage for Being. By traversing from the nihilistic duality of Sein and Seyn into the depths of Being we find and traverse the different kinds of Being one by one and thus come to know the Multilith. The roots of Being are our guide into these depths, the stepping stones, the opacities of language that among all the roots come to stand for the various ways of Being referred to by language in the homeland of the language more than 8000 years ago. So the multilith is not something shallow or superficial, its layers of Being are held apart by these opaque roots of great antiquity. The Pluriverse takes part in this depth. In formulations like that of David Lewis the Pluriverse the kinds of Being are referred to in terms of Necessity Impossibility, Probability, Possibility, and Potentiality, i.e. the modalities of Being. But within the Pluriverse the Kosmi come into being as

emergent events and these emergent events have the signature of the kinds of Being on them. As we said the Kosmi 'monads' are created from the monad seeds. Then the kosmi interact mutually and are seen by the immortals/transcendental egos which schematize them to produce the candidates which then annihilate to form monadic seeds again. At each stage the operations that take us through the stages of the Emergent Meta-system basically pass through the various kinds of Being. Pluriverse and Kosmos with Monad and Facet are the complementarities of complementarities that form the meta-system within which the system of experience or consciousness exists. This Emergent Meta-system is the dynamic of this meta-systemic environment. That dynamic is based on the appearance of the kinds of Being and the interstices of the special systems which refer back to the the roots of Being and the gods. . . . How are these related?

When we think about possible kosmi within the pluriverse say as a thought experiment, such as that of David Chalmers's Zombies, then we are monads that create a world from nothing just by stating its conditions. Chalmers marvels on how we can create whole worlds in our minds so easily and compare them. So if our cognition creates a few different worlds based on different conditions and then cognizes their differences then we generate a view like that of the transcendental ego before our reasoning faculty that views the relations between different kosmi within the pluriverse. This view is like that of the gods that see various different worlds from the outside rather than from the inside like we do. Based on that vision of the differences and similarities between these worlds we can then schematize the relations between the worlds and on that basis produce the structural relations to allow us to generate the whole field of worlds, for instance we can posit the whole field of universes from different physical constant settings. From that we learn that only a small range gives rise to universes that

are interesting and an even smaller range give rise to universes with life leading to the anthropomorphic principle. Now we see our set of created and viewed worlds in the context of the whole field that comes from producing all possible permutations of the basic characteristics of the core set. Then when we see the entire field it is possible to cancel (math), or annihilate (physus), or contradict (logos) the oppositions to produce the limits of necessity and impossibility and so from that cancellation process a few candidates remain that become the monadic seeds of the next round in the life cycle of the Emergent Meta-system. Monads are produced out of this annihilation process. Annihilation comes in terms of reason by the production of the antinomies. Antinomies are arguments that start from opposite premises and prove the opposite result. For instance, one of the antinomies in Kant is whether the universe is limited or unlimited. We now believe it is limited in time but not in space, because we can understand that there are surfaces that have no edge and thus are non-orientable like a Kleinian bottle. This is a great advance in cosmology to take the antinomies of pure reason and to have come up with a probable answer to the question, strangely the answer is both infinite and finite, but finitely infinite and infinitely finite. In other words the universe seems finite in time with respect to the beginning but we are unsure of the end whether it is open or closed. This is finite in one direction and possibly infinite in the other direction of time. On the other hand in space we see no end, it appears infinite but we know space curves and know that curvature like that can be non-orientable so that it is finite though it appears infinite. So what is most likely is some mixture between finite and infinite which is different for both time and space. Now Reason by itself only thinks of the two extreme alternatives and there is deadlock between them until as Kant says some experience comes in to tip the balance, and in this case it tips the balance differently with respect to time and space and the mixtures of

infinite and finite. The deadlock of indecision would have been contradiction if we just said both finite and infinite. But we have specified it even more and shown how there is a different balance with respect to space as in respect to time. But this tuning of deadlock into cancellation results in the empirically driven seed of a solution that sees a different mixtures in respect to time and space which is a side effect of going beyond contradiction to a specific mixture that is different in the two cases. This differential mixture creates a basis for a different viewpoint on space and time, we see it now as spacetime (Reimann) or timespace (Minkowoski). This basis is the monad which then gives rise to the next observation of a world which is embedded in spacetime rather than space and time which are in fact dualistic reifications. Now spacetime regions are interacting and we get a view of them from nowhere, i.e. as the regions where the lightcones do not overlap, or from the different inertial frames. We then schematize projecting various models that combine quantum mechanics, relativity theory and chaos theory. Which leads to a completely different sort of field of possibilities perhaps string theory or M-brane theory which has different side-effects that can be the basis for a different observation which creates even other kosmi for us to consider. Going round this cycle we get the view from the possibility side rather than from the actuality side and we become like the gods or the transcendental ego rather than being like the empirical ego or the mortals. It is amazing that the speculative mind can project multiple worlds just by saying their conditions and then compare them in terms of similarity and measure the differences between them in order to see the necessities and impossibilities on the one hand and the field of possibilities and the potentialities on the other hand. We have this capacity to project kosmi and to compare them and to see them as the basis of creating structural fields which we can navigate in order to produce the vantage points for further explorations. This is an incredibly

important capacity. And what I want to suggest is that it occurs at all the levels of the schemas, not just in an Emergent Meta-system of the bracketed schemas beyond experience. We can see the same thing at work at a lower level between pattern and form as well as world and domain. It also happens between meta-system and system and reflexive and dissipative special systems. In other words there is an interplay between the kinds of Being that forms Emergent Meta-systems that are nested at all these levels surrounding the center of the vortex which is the autopoietic special system. This is because there is really a series of meta-systemic levels, tiers of them that surround the autopoietic system which is the pivot around which these complementarities of complementarities circulate. At all these stages the we see that possibilities are made actual and potentialities are determined as necessary or impossible. Schematization in general is a projection onto the magma of experience that is the noumena. The schema is a possible configuration of elements and relations. When in a situation we observe potential phenomena we mix the possible field with it and that is actualized and then reified into a probability which happens though the additional projection of a classification scheme on the actual occurrences to determine the frequency of each class. Schemas can be thought of as the relation between the potentials and the possibilities that manifest as actualities that are probabilitized which then yield correlations somewhere in the range between necessity and impossibility. Any given schema has many ways of fitting onto particular magma. But they normally fit in such a way to maximize the recognition of potentialities that are latent in the situation. We project one schema rather than another in order to maximize the recognition of these potentialities. But that is an art based on intuition there is no method for it. It is like prospecting. One gets a scent for the veins of ore beneath the surface that is projected. We watch the lines of escape and the distribution

and flow of the Chi characterized by Li beyond the meta-essence in order to picture what is going on at the level of Wild Being where the potentialities thrive. Any schema is thus a combination of the determinate as necessity and impossibility fixing the ultimate limits, the possibilities which the essence can be deformed through, the probabilities that appear from actual observations using the schemas and the potentialities that the schemas align to or not as the case may be. When the schemas align with the resonances and potentialities in the magma then they give us deep insight into the nature of things in our world. When they do not align with the potentialities then they are merely wall paper covering over things rather than displaying them in a refreshing way that makes them stand out to our sense, giving a sense of what we are seeing or are otherwise engaged with. So suddenly here near the end of our series of essays we discover a way of talking about schema projection that is more sophisticated, at once aligned with the kinds of Being but seen in terms of modalities. The EMS cycle we see beyond experience also operates in different ways within experience too. Patterns give rise to domains which then interact to produce the World which is then schematized to produce candidate Forms that cancel to give us seed patterns. Similarly, dissipative special systems give rise to systems that interact to produce meta-systems which then schematize to create reflexive candidates which cancel to give us dissipative special system seeds. These unexpected cycles each have meanings. Notice that patterns and worlds *and* forms and domains are in the contradictory positions rather than the contrary positions. Similarly the dissipative special system is in the contradictory position to the meta-system and the reflexive special system is in the contradictory position to the system. Each complementary of complementaries acts as the meta-system for the system of the lower schemas. There are four levels with the autopoietic system as the ultimate system with three levels of meta-system surrounding

it. One is beyond experience. One relates the most direct experience pattern and form to the most indirect experience of domain and world. One relates to the center of experience where between the System and meta-system there appears the special systems, and ultimately the point of perfect balance, the autopoietic special system, i.e. the organism itself, normally forgotten existential center around which the drama of speciation takes place according to biologists following Darwin. Evolutionary theory is about essences, it treats how essences change over time revealing the meta-essence. What is lost in this panoramic scene is the view from the organism of its existential viability. The organism appears as the balance point around which the Emergent Meta-system composed of dissipative special system, system, meta-system and reflexive meta-system revolve. But this then is an empty center around which the Emergent Meta-system composed of the pattern, domain, world and form revolve. Finally this is an empty center around which the bracketing schemas of monad, kosmos, pluriverse and facet revolve. All these are examples of the positive fourfold, i.e. mortal, Earth, immortal, and Heaven. In each case there is a negative fourfold, i.e. Abyss, Covering, Night and Chaos, the magma upon which the projection of the schemas is occurring as the nested Emergent Meta-systems revolve. This opacity of the noumena has a hidden dimension of Grounding, Uncovering, Light and Order. These are the characteristics of the Clearing in Being that unfold into the projected dualities that make up the worldview like physus/logos and finite/infinite. The positive and negative fourfold interact in what Jung following the Alchemists call the *Mysterium Coniunctus* which gives rise to the clearing of Being and the new dualities of the metaphysical era. This *mysterium coniectus* (royal marriage) is not a one time affair, but is continually happening as we produce closure within the openness of the clearing in Being. That closure has both a material component and a

texture. The material component has various emergent properties but the texture has certain new possibilities, and its own history which is rewritten to open up a new past as well. Potentials arise in the situation that cause one kind of closure to be realized rather than another. Material and Texture can be unmade when the magma is reheated and then cools again into another configuration. There are myriad possibilities for closure but the propensities and tendencies in the situation drive the selection which is teleonomic of the particular possibilities that are realized. After the closure happens we look at the actualities and construct probability distributions which do not take into account unactualized possibilities, or unrealized potentials. This is a fairly dynamic model of schematization in general. It recognizes that schematization only takes place in the context with creation and destruction on the one hand and with the balancing influence of mutual action on the other. Behavior determines what the perceptions can project. New possibilities, new potentialities are created and destroyed with probability and the limits of necessity and impossibility. This means we are continually living in a world on the brink of transformation by emergent events. A meta-stable world with different resolutions of emergent events randomly appearing as to produce punctuated equilibriums. Neither Parmenides or Heraclitus are all right as Empidocles suspected. But we had to wait for the pragmatists like G.H. Mead to point out that it takes time for something to Be what it IS. That minimal time for it to unfold sets the granularity of emergent events because that is the minimal time for something to become something different. The quanta of similarity and difference are the same, because you don't recognize that the same has become different or vice versa until this quantum of qualitative time has passed. When something becomes what it is that is Process Being. The end result is the product or Pure Being. The difference between the two is something else called

differ^{ance}, or Hyper Being. In the difference lies a realm of possibility and indecision as to which possibilities to realize. It is only when we get to Wild Being that there is some propensity, tendency or potentiality that indicates which possibilities are more likely in the given situation. Differ^{ance} separates the same from the different. It creates the difference that makes a difference at the third meta-level as well as the identical that makes the identical. But Wild Being as chiasm, reversibility and intaglio bring them back together beyond their separation. When we look at Chi, Shakti, we see a field of propensities, lines of flight, like the Mandelbrot set. The lines of flight have flow to them as a pattern. Patterns give rise to domains by the production of classifications of the patterns. There are different classificatory schemes which interact with each other and vie to rule the closure. By the posing of the various classifications then it is possible to get a critical view and schematize all the possible classifications that lead to closure. The antinomies of the various pluses and minuses for choosing a scheme from the field of candidate schemes cancel and some scheme is chosen which then becomes the seed for the next pattern. We see the classified pattern in terms of a form that encapsulates it from the point of view of a domain or classificatory scheme. In other words the pattern circulates though domain and world in order to find its form. Similarly dissipative special system circulates though system and meta-system to find its place in a reflexive special system. This circulation provides a strange dynamic in the schemas as they work together as Emergent Meta-system cycles revolving around the perfect balance of the autopoietic special system.

