The Metaphysics of Emergence and General Schemas Theory

The Advance of the Systems Engineering Discipline through an extension of Systems Theory

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

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

Introduction

This chapter will serve as a trial balloon for the concept of the addition of Ultra Being as a fifth meta-level beyond the other four meta-levels of Being. This possibility was mentioned in the previous chapter and really needs its own development outside the scope of the working papers. However, this chapter will try out the idea within the context of our hunt for the foundations of General Schemas Theory. If Ultra Being exists then that changes everything, including the nature of the General Schemas themselves so it is important to sort out this problem in any exercise that claims to lay the foundations of anything within the Western Philosophical and Scientific tradition especially for something as fundamental as the Schemas.

Kinds of Being

In my previous dissertation the key point was the analysis of the Kinds of Being discovered by Continental Philosophy using the Theory of Logical Types developed by Russell in Principia Mathematica and especially in terms of the summary of The Theory of Logical Types presented by I. Copi. Basically this is a scheme to avoid paradox by taking any paradoxical statement at one level of language to another higher level of language for resolution. However, it was found that one must not just introduce the logical levels but also at each level introduce logical types and these two partitions together will resolve almost any paradox. Now Being is the most paradoxical of all concepts within the Western Tradition because there are so many different versions of just what it might be. Notice just to state the problem we introduce the *monolith* of Being where we say *Being Is* by asking the question that President Clinton made so famous when he declared that "*It depends on what the meaning of the word "is" is*[1]." If Being is a noun or a verb then it has a different sense. In fact this difference could be seen as the difference between Pure Being and Process Being. In fact the other two kinds of Being could be seen as considering Being as an adjective or an adverb. Going from the monolith to the full multilith of Being is as follows: $Being^1$ Is^2; $Being^1$ $Being^3$ Is^2; $Being^1$ $Being^3$ Is^2 Is^4. Each of these kinds of Being has a different sense. This is similar to the fact that in Anglo Saxon there repeated negations had different meanings up to four negations used in a famous sentence by Chaucer. Similarly repetitions of the word Being have different senses. In language we can ask what *Is is* and we can talk about the *Being of Being*. No one actually puts all four together but the multilith is just a combination of these two normal expressions where we ask what "Being Being Is Is." The sense of this is as follows. We are asking about the *Being of*

---

[1] "It depends on what the meaning of the word "is" is. If the--if he--if "is" means is and never has been, that is not--that is one thing. If it means there is none, that was a completely true statement." –Bill Clinton, President of the USA, Grand jury testimony, August 17, 1998

Being. But *what Is the Being of Being*? And Is the Is what Being has of Being? All this is to sow that we can ground our distinction between the different senses of Being on grammatical relations of different forms of Being with itself. Although this is tenuous and confusing it merely shows that even with respect to the grammar of English as it stands the Theory of Types can be given meaning as we explicate the Monolith or the dual monolith called the multilith. It is however much easier to recognize that these different kinds of Being represent different meta-levels of the idea of Being rather than all existing on the same level as the grammar suggests. Thus we can use superscripts to distinguish the various meta-levels of Being and we do not have to continue thinking of them as grammatical categories. Rather they are different modalities of being-in-the-world as defined by Heidegger in <u>Being and Time</u>. As such they are related to the different modes of being where Pure Being is present-at-hand and Process Being is ready-to-hand. We have to look to other Continental Philosophers to help us define the modalities of the other two higher meta-levels of Being. Heidegger also discovered Hyper Being which he called ~~Being~~ crossed out. Derrida picked this up and developed it into his concept of Differ*a*nce. Merleau-Ponty in <u>The Visible and the Invisible</u> called it the Hyper Dialectic between Heidegger's Process Being and Startre's Nothingness. Merleau-Ponty goes on to define Wild Being in contradistinction to Hyper Being. We can talk about Hyper Being as having the in-hand modality and Wild Being as having the Out-of-hand modality. Deleuze and Guattari go on to create a philosophy at the level of Wild Being in <u>Anti-Oedipus</u> and <u>A Thousand Plateaus</u>. John S. Hans also creates a philosophy of Wild Being in <u>The Play of the World</u>. In this way the various kinds of Being as meta-levels have been pretty well explored by Western Continental Philosophers. In the Phenomenology of Perception Merleau-Ponty tries to give cognitive modes to the modalities of being-in-the-world. He defines Pure Being in terms of Pointing and Process Being in terms of Grasping. Levinas goes on to define Hyper

Being as bearing, talking about mothers bearing infants and infants bearing the ministrations of their mothers. Thus Hyper Being has a cognitive modality of bearing. I have volunteered that I believe that Wild Being has the cognitive modality of encompassing. There are levels of the ego associated with these different meta-levels of Being also. Subject and Object only exist in Pure Being. Process Being causes the Ego to dissolve into pure human being which is called by Heidegger da-sein. Da-sein is something that is a back ground coping practice that is prior to the arising of subject and object as a duality. Dasein is an ecstasy of the projection of Being out of the ontic onto the ontic as the ontological which we experience pre-ontologically. We are already within this projection from ourselves onto ourselves and onto all other non-dasein things. If we go to the next meta-level of Hyper Being the Ego is itself sheared back even further into what I call the Query. The query is the one who asks the question of the Being of Being. Dasein is the fold of Being though itself. The Query asks what the source of this fold is. Finally this results in an enigma that appears at the Wild Being level. For that source is not pinpointable by a being such as ourselves even if we ask the question of ourselves. So ultimately the four kinds of Being lead to an understanding of what Nietzsche and Heidegger called the groundlessness of grounding. The point is as we go up the stair case of the meta-levels of Being then it gets harder and harder to ask our questions and to formulate an answer. It becomes more and more difficult to think at these higher levels. Parmenides said Being and Thinking was the same thing. Heidegger carries this tradition on by asking about the meaning of Being and considering Being to be the intelligibility of the world. What "Is Is" is some sort of projection. The nature of the "Being of Being" is intelligibility. So the multilith itself is the background coping that we discover ourselves already in with the nature of familiarity which projects intelligibility of all the beings in the world and which makes us a human being-in-the-world. This background coping and familiarity that flows from dasein's

viability is not straight forward but complicated by the interaction of various kinds of Being. There is Pure Being which we think about as the Eternal Now which is frozen and presentable present-at-hand. This is the normal way we approach everything within our tradition as frozen always available presentable items in which Being is separated from Time. But when we start mixing Being and Time then we have to start thinking about Dasein and the ready-to-hand which gives access to a standing reserve. In other words we can put something into a standing reserve but it takes action to put it there, to maintain it, and then to bring it out and present it when needed. Think about disaster recovery units. They are maintained in readiness for the disaster to occur. It is work to set them up, to maintain them and then call them into action when needed so that they can be presented. So the ready-to-hand is everything that takes place behind the scenes by the action of the stage hands to move the various scenery when the curtains are both open or closed in the theater. All the scenery are prepared and standing in a waiting position. But it takes work to make them stand there and then to present them at the appropriate time. This work is what give us Process Being which is the next meta-level up from Pure Being. This work occurs in relation to instruments and equipment and so this is what Hiedegger concentrates on in Being and Time. However, there is the concept that within the totality of equipment and instrumentality there is the bearing of the equipment on each other. So we see that the third meta-level of being arises when we consider how the equipment relates to itself. For Dasein there is a totality of equipment which can either work or break down. When it breaks down and Dasein starts pointing to it instead of grasping it in the midst of use then that equipment takes on an unnatural present-at-hand modality being wrenched out of the ready-to-hand. But as long as Dasein is grasping it to use it, even if it is broken, then it remains ready-to-hand. Dasein is the one who projects the totality of the ready-to-hand nature of equipment with which it is familiar. When the equipment is wrenched out of that it becomes

present-at-hand where it appears as abstract unities or concrete pluralities. But what is not explored by Heidegger is what happens when the equipment bears on itself within its totalization. Merleau-Ponty talks about this toward the end of Phenomenology of Perception. There he first brings up the concept of Hyper Being as the expansion of being-in-the-world, i.e. where we learn to use a new tool, or create a new tool, or use an old tool in a completely new way. In all these cases we are causing a change in the bearing of the equipment on each other. The blindman with his stick or the musician playing a guitar are given as examples where their being-in-the-world expands to encompass the instrument and thus changes the totality. Here is where creativity enters the picture, where technological change arises. Levinas takes this idea and talks about the mother and child bearing on each other as well and discovers that at this meta-level ethics collapses into metaphysics. Derrida on the other hand takes the same tact as the later Heidegger who wondered what the Being[3] of the difference between Process Being and Pure Being was. Heidegger called this ~~Being~~ crossed out. Derrida took these few hints and expanded them greatly to define Differance as the differing and deferring of Being with respect to itself. If Pure Being is the level of Form, then Process Being is the transformational level of Signs, Structures, Fluxes, and Values. So Hyper Being is the level of traces. The traces are left by something bearing on something else. For instance when we write on a pad of paper we press through several layers of the pad. If we take up the sheet we wrote on and shade in across the surface of the second sheet in the pad then we see the trace of our writing. The trace is not made up of the graphite of the pencil. The trace is an indentation upon the substance of the paper itself. Derrida studies these Traces in his Grammatology. He recognizes these traces as hinges between different possibilities prior to actualization. This is why they lead to undecidability, that is the hovering between two unrealized possibilities without choosing one for realization. Indecision makes us realize the different channels we might go down and keeps

the competing possibilities in view as long as possible. When you concentrate on the traces you see something prior to the unfolding of the structures that underlie the forms. With respect to our own being this is the query. For Heidegger dasein is the one who takes a stand on its own Being. But there are many possible stands, the Query is which stand should I take on the meaning of my own Being? We can hover with so many possibilities open to us. We go for some attempting to realize them and with respect to others we are determined when events overcome us. But many times we want to linger in the question as to which stand we should take on our Being. We ask, "Who shall we Be?" before we plunge into the "Being Is" of the *monolith*, i.e. become something both as a noun and a verb. When we move up to the level of Wild Being then we are encountering a contraction of being-in-the-world that balances the expansion of Hyper Being. Merleau-Ponty defines this meta-level fairly well and calls it Flesh, which is a chiasm of reversibility of touch touching. In pointing there is no touch. But in grasping we touch something outside ourselves. In Hyper Being we touch ourselves and experience the fact that we cannot tickle ourselves directly. In other words there is an exclusion in touch touching in some cases where we can hover just prior to the being touched or the touching as possibilities prior to actualization. However, when we dive into the touch touching in Wild Being then we discover in most cases not an exclusion but a reversibility like the reversibility in a spacetime interval. We can almost touch ourselves touching but not quite. Every time we try it slips a way from us. Continually slip sliding away. Merleau-Ponty calls this the Chiasm between touch touching, i.e. between the two phases of the interval which are like differences between various inertial frames of reference in relation to the spacetime interval. Wild Being is the realm of propensities that underlie the traces. Traces are indentations in the substance of the substrate of our writing. Propensities are created when the pencil hits the various fibers in the paper some of which resist at different intensities so that the pencil line is moved

slightly in different degrees away from the intended line. The different positions in the substrate have different propensities to resist the tracing. Deleuze and Guttari talk about these intensities in the body-without-organs and their lines of flight. When these propensities take over things get out-of-hand. For instance, at the fourth meta-level of motion there is jitter and that can tear the craft apart if it reaches a sufficient intensity. At this level the self becomes an enigma. It disintegrates into the partial objects that Deleuze and Guattari call desiring machines. The desiring machines enter the field of the socius and the individual as an unified totality dissolves. At the level of Wild Being it is almost impossible to think. There is no room to build conceptual systems. The best model for this is the Mandelbrot Set which is constructed out of the propensities for lines of flight of each point in the complex plain under recursion. Different colors depict various accelerations of the lines of flight of particular points which globally gives a pattern of the Mandelbrot set which is infinitely complex as we zoom in to its various scales. Thus Wild Being expresses itself as tendencies, Hyper Being as Possibilities and thus can be described by Fuzzy sets and logic, Process Being as Probabilities, and finally Pure Being as determinate and continuous functions produced using the calculus. These different types of mathematics characterize the different meta-levels of Being. The characterization is an analogy because all mathematics is rooted in the present-at-hand.

Emergence

The crux of my earlier dissertation was to identify the four kinds of Being in the Continental Philosophical tradition with the meta-levels using the Theory of Logical Types and then to apply that knowledge to an understanding of the meaning of Emergence. Emergence was defined by G.H. Mead in his only self-published book <u>The Philosophy of the Future</u>. In his work Mead was wrestling with the implications of Darwin and Special Relativity. Mead discovered that he could import the essentials of these two scientific

theories into the Social Sciences by defining the term Emergence. Emergence is a change which is significant enough to rewrite history and change the future. Emergence can occur on many levels and different theorists have defined it on these different levels. For instance Kuhn defines it at the level of the paradigm which are the assumptions underlying the theory. Foucault defines it at the level of the episteme which are related to the fundamental categories defined by the tradition. Heidegger has talked about changes in the interpretation of Being throughout the Western Philosophical and Scientific Tradition's unfolding and thus specified emergence at the ontological level. We can define emergence even at the level of existence when we talk about the difference between Ultra Being, Void and Emptiness. We can even define emergence at the level of the absolute as various perspectives on the nature of the absolute are developed throughout history. The key thing about emergence is that once an emergent event occurs then there is no going back to experience history the way it was previously organized, just as there is no going forward to see what things will be like before the next emergent event occurs. Each cell between emergent events at what ever level of the tradition we are talking about, is sealed and cannot be transcended. We are locked in to these time intervals in our tradition and their organization is imposed on us. And we do not have any idea when the next emergent change will come nor what its new organization will be. All we know is that when it comes it will reorganize everything from that point in the hierarchy downward and nothing will be the same after that reorganization with respect to that level and below. Now what I discovered in my previous research was that there is an intimate relation between the kinds of Being and Emergent Events. My proposition is that for a genuine emergent event there must be a passage through all four meta-levels of Being. In other words there are various kinds of change and some of those changes do not extend though all the meta-levels of Being. These changes are not genuinely emergent, they may just appear to be emergent, but instead

they are nihilistic in some sense. Emergent events establish non-nihilistic distinctions within the tradition. They don't come from us but are imposed on us. Thus even though the world is our projection, the actual lava flow of this projection will have its own striations that are self-produced regardless of us and our projections. Our projections are contained in and modified by the striations in the overall projection mechanism that is social. All the individuals that are projecting within the mitsein, being-with, are subjugated to the striations in the overall cultural projection mechanism which is tempered by the emergent events that occur involuntarily. Once in a while a genuine emergent event occurs and one of the striations is produced as a non-nihilistic distinction within the tradition. When that occurs then all four of the four kinds of Being of the multilith have come into play and it is the actual acting together of all four kinds of Being that makes that a genuine emergent event and changes the order of the world at that level of abstraction. When all four kinds of Being come together that is called a face of the world. Like snow flakes which are all unique but all have a six fold symmetry, genuine emergent events all participate in all four kinds of Being but each of these conjunctions is a unique patterning that gives a peculiar organization. Once you have realized this relation between emergent events and the kinds of Being one can begin analyzing actual cultural material looking for the pattern of the faces of the world. Applying this to the history of the worldview results in a study called ontomythology, where we read the epics and myths of antiquity from an ontological perspective. I have written extensively about this in my book The Fragmentation of Being and the Path beyond the Void. I have applied this analysis of the computer metaphor and software engineering in my book Wild Software Meta-systems. Later I discovered the Special Systems as the differences between the kinds of Being and I have analyzed the reciprocal relations between the kinds of Being and the Special Systems in my book Autopoietic Reflexive Systems Theory. This theory has stood the test of time within my own research

agenda. I am continually finding confirmations of it sometimes in very unexpected places. It is mirrored in many different mathematical anomalous structures distributed throughout the various mathematical categories. It is mirrored in anomalous phenomena that are discovered by science which sometimes take a long time to explain like superconductivity, soliton waves, or Bose-Einstein condensates. This research agenda has been very fruitful and I am very happy to have serendipitously stumbled onto this path of research which has taken me so far on this wonderful intellectual adventure. However, I decided that I could go even deeper if I could be more disciplined and thus I sought to do another Ph.D. on this subject and thus push as hard as I could to understand as much as possible about the kinds of Being and the Special Systems that model Existence as Interpenetration. That route to a deeper understanding led to an attempt to ground General Schemas Theory which includes all the schemas not just the Special Systems. And in this series of working papers I feel as if I have made some progress in deepening my understanding of the fundamental issues surrounding the nature of general schemas theory and its grounds. As I was studying General Schemas Theory I realized that it was the inverse of my original Dissertation in as much as everything that emerges emerges into one or another schema before it is identified as a kind, before it individuates, before significance is assigned to it and ultimate meaning determined. So while emergence is a segmentation of time general schemas theory is about the segmentation of envelopes of space. We live in a world that is striated in spacetime or timespace. This is to say that both space and time are involuntarily broken up discontinuously, not by our will but by something that encompasses our projections and will. We could talk about this in the way Deleuze says Nietzsche does by thinking about meta-levels of willing. Normally we are just willing ourselves to do things. But at some point we realize that we need to will ourselves to will something. Heidegger interprets *will to power* as *willing to will*. But Deleuze interprets

will to power and *eternal return* at the level of willing to will to will or the third meta-level of Being, i.e. Hyper Being or Differance. By bringing will to power and eternal return together Deleuze wants Nietzsche to reach up to Wild Being. Will of course is interpreted by Schopenhauer as our access to the thing-in-itself (noumena) as that thing ourselves. So in a sense starting from this premise of Schopenhauer Will is not our own but something foisted on us from within from an unknown source. Thus the meta-levels of Will are also foisted upon us rather than something that we control. In other words we are free to project locally but globally the fact that we must ecstatically project is determined as part of our noumena. As we go from subject, to dasein, to query, to enigma we are climbing down into that part of ourselves that is a noumena, i.e. the unconscious from which the wellsprings of desire arise. Will from that point of view is merely the articulation of inchoate desires. It is the same with reason. Reason just means giving justifications. But once can give any sort of argument as a justification for what one wants. So at some level the basis of what one wants to reason about is given primordially, Heidegger would say preontologically. But then we reason about things in the world and sometimes we reason about reasoning itself. Rarely we give a reason for reasoning about reason. And almost never do we attempt to find the reason that we reason concerning reasoning about reason. But if we could find such a reason it would surely be at the level of Wild Being and would be driven by meta-level four kinds of willing. At this level things get out of hand whether they are called reason or will and there is an involuntary striation with discontinuities that we must live within and under both in space and time. In space they are called schemas and in time they are called emergences. What is interesting is that in the temporal envelopes between emergent events there is a unique ordering and no external structure only discontinuities. With respect to schemas there is an external structuring of dimensions that is very important but how the articulation occurs within the

spatial envelope is left to the kind and the individuation of the particular thing. Emergence directly effects the inner organization of the discontinuous time periods. Schemas effects the outer organization of the dimensional spatial envelopes and leaves the inner constitution to kinds and individual differences. Emergence and Schemas are directly complementary. So when we look at one we are considering in some sense the inverse of the other. This is very satisfying to me personally, because it means that this new subject still contains some of the excitement motivated my research in my earlier dissertation. I must admit I find the concept of Emergence more exciting that the concept of the Schemas. But what I find in this new research project is that you cannot really understand temporal emergence deeply unless you understand it's complementary opposite in the schemas as well. My earlier work was too one-sided stressing only temporal discontinuous changes and not considering the discontinuities that underlie our comprehension of space as well. And this is important because space and time are one interval of spacetime or timespace forming a matrix. There is no real separation between schemas and emergence, they are really two faces of the same thing. So we get a broader perspective from the vistas opened up by this new research agenda.

Is Ultra Being an actuality?

So having defined what I have advocated since the late 1970s in terms of the metaphysics of emergence we now turn to what I have persistently attempted to deny. That is that there is a fifth meta-level of emergence called Ultra Being. I assumed that Heidegger and Parmenides dictum that thinking and being and the same was true and worked from there. I assumed that there was no unthinkable Being. That is a big assumption but it seemed to work nicely in order to give a sharp contrast between Being and Existence. Being had four meta-levels and all the meta-levels above those were described by the term Existence. And this term could be interpreted in many ways but two of the most profound was in terms of Buddhist Emptiness or Taoist Void. I denied an interpretation in terms of Being. But I always said that this was an empiricist ontology and if someone could think the fifth or higher meta-level then they would transform our world, because an emergent event would then need to go through five meta-levels instead of four. What I did not think about was the fact that Being may be unthinkable at the fifth meta-level. In other words Being itself has a mode that undergoes a profound transformation just at the point where Existence appears. This is a much messier situation, if true. If Being exists at the fifth meta-level but unthinkable, then no one will be able to think the fifth meta-level, but still another interpretation besides emptiness and void of Existence would be Ultra Being. Over the years anomalies have piled up indicating that there is something like Ultra Being. But how to pose the question as to what Ultra Being "is" has not been very forthcoming. It is something deeper than an enigma, lets call it a perplexity. Churchill in his exasperation at Russia's incomprehensibility called it a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. If we take his series then a riddle is at the level of Dasein, which is something that is asked to which there is an answer. A mystery at the query level is something more open ended but within whose horizon you can ask questions and explore. An enigma is something which just stumps you and there is no way to get around it without inspiration from some unknown and unexpected direction. Not only is there no answer there is no real way to question an enigma. There is no horizon for further exploration that is clear. That is because an enigma is utterly encompassing. Yet even if you cannot wrap your mind around the enigma you can apply your mind to it. With a perplexity you cannot even apply your mind to it in any reasonable manner. Your not just stumped but at a total loss. You don't know how to approach it. Hither to I have just considered this a sign of Emptiness or Void. I did not consider that Being could have this quality of inconceivability. So the question now arises what if Being could be like that as well. What if Being is another interpretation of the fifth meta-level of Being and beyond, or at least to just the

fifth meta-level. It is another question whether it can be applied to the sixth, seventh, eight, etc meta-levels on up to infinity. In terms of possibility there can be infinite meta-levels of Being. But can they be actualized? Up to this point I have thought that they cannot be actualized beyond four meta-levels. Gregory Bateson in his famous[2] essay about the meta-levels of learning agreed with me on that score. But now I am starting to think that the situation may be more complex than I had thought earlier. This is because of the various anomalies that have arisen due to my position, which in general seems to be correct. In other words you will never think these higher levels of Being, but you could interpret the unthinkablity as Being rather than either emptiness or void. What this is saying is that where in relation to Being and its duals either emptiness or void are non-duals, when you get to the fifth meta-level this flips over and Being as unthinkable becomes the non-dual to the dual kinds of non-duality. This is actually a pretty scary thought. But it explains a lot of things that are left unexplained otherwise. If Being itself has an unthinkable, non-intelligible form of existence, then although it renders Being unclear and opaque, it renders many other things much clearer.

For instance there is the question of the transition from the mythopoietic to the metaphysical. If each of these are a face of the world at the existence level, i.e. the whole world collapses down to the bedrock of existence and is rebuilt from the ground up when these transitions occur, then what is the form of Being that transitions across this transition. In other words when the new worldview springs out of existence where does it come from. One answer would be from the bija, seed, of ultra being sown in the bedrock of existence. Another answer is that nothing is carried across. I have been giving this other answer for a long time. Now I am starting to doubt it because the first answer is more clearly in line with Buddhist metaphysics about karma as we see it in the

---

[2] to me at least

Awakening of Faith which talks about the Tathagata Gharba, womb of thusness coming. Here we won't go deeply into Buddhist metaphysics. Suffice it to say that the status of karma is problematic in Buddhism. But this problem comes from its adhering to the middle way. In other words we don't get rid of impurities completely. Some level of impurity is necessary to keep your immune system working properly. So it is wrong to stamp out thought completely or to do anything to an extreme. The middle way means living with imperfection but not letting it get out of control, and not letting perfection get out of control either. Buddhism, Taoism and Islam claim to adhere to the middle way. And the middle way is subtle. Part of that subtlety is that we do not stamp out Being completely, even though it is what produces the illusions of the world that make us miserable. It also brings us joy. So there is a more subtle argument that would say that there are many interpretations of Existence. Existence takes over at the fifth meta-level. But that a strange kind of inversion happens where below that level there are two duals with a non-dual hidden behind them whose nature is emptiness or void. When we get to the level where Existence takes over from Being there are at least three interpretations of the fifth meta-level: void//ultra-being//emptiness. All of these are unthinkable. Void and Emptiness are non-dual. Ultra Being is the seed of the dual but embedded in existence and as unthinkable and non-intelligible. This interpretation will make the Hindus who follow Sankara very happy. It would be the kind of Being associated with Vishnu that founds the duality between Shiva and Brahma but prior to the appearance of Brahma*n*, i.e. the godhead. It explains how the non-duals can in fact be dual as emptiness and emergence. It explains how the duals can in fact be non-dual as they partake in the non-duality of a yin-in-yang or yang-in-yin type of interchange behind the scenes. This interchange would move through Ultra Being which would be the secret connection that allows a communication at a distance between nihilistic opposites. It would be the nature of the bijas, seeds, that would still exist when you tear down

the worldview to the bedrock of existence, i.e. ultimate groundlessness. But it would mean that Existence as emptiness or void is contaminated by a tiny bit of Being of a very obscure type which is something that purists like myself are loath to hear.

Similarly it explains how our worldview can really be a meta-worldview, or Kosmos containing four distinct worldviews within it, which are the Semitic, Egyptian, Sumerian, and Indo-European. Each has its own primal scene but the primal scenes are intimately connected with each other, and that connection is through Ultra Being. This explains why the Western worldview is so robust and can absorb or destroy other worldviews but is immune from being destroyed or enveloped itself. That is because it already is a conglomerate of different worldviews and that is made possible because Being has an obscure mode where it can be turned into the unthinkability of other projections. So this ultra Being can be thought of as the *me* of the Sumerians, or the two kinds of existence of the Egyptians, or the wajud of the Semites. In other words Ultra Being can masquerade as kinds of existence and other approaches to things developed by other cultures and wordviews. It has a mode in which it is unintelligible. If we can be unintelligible to ourselves then we can understand the unintelligibility of the other in some deep sense. That gives an advantage in the clash of worldviews. It is kind of like a virus that can use other worldviews against themselves to its own ends by mimicking some essential part of them through a meta-level of being which is unintelligible to itself despite its being its own projection.

What convinced me that there might be something like Ultra Being was the complementarity of the relations between the four worldviews that make up the Western Kosmos and their primal scenes as explored in Primal Archetypal Wholeness and the relations between the eras of the Western Worldview like the Mythopoietic and Metaphysical. Actually there are previous eras that are accounted for in

the myth of Uranus, Kronos and Zeus so that there are several that go back into the mists of time whose traces are recorded in myth. If the four kinds of Being are the face of the world within an era of the worldview then what is it that stands outside and between the emergent events that change us from one era to the next? Similarly what is it that allows the four worldviews in the meta-worldview (Kosmos) to be sewn together? I think now that the answer to this question is Ultra Being, an unthinkable form of Being. Of course this knocks down an assumption that has held since Parmenides that no one that I know of ever questioned. Perhaps Being is ultimately unthinkable. That would explain a lot of things in mythology, like the wisdom of Krishna leading the Pandava Brothers to go against their Dharma that lands them in hell and their enemies in heaven. There are a lot of things in myth that are extremely counter intuitive and incomprehensible beyond what ontomythology normally reveals which is an understanding of the structure of the worldview in terms of the kinds of Being. For instance the primal scene of the archer who kills the sire of the Pandvas in the midst of making love as animals at the beginning of the Mahabharata. The archer is associated with Shiva. The sire is associated with the lines of the Brahmans. Here sex and death are merged as in the story of Achilles and the Amazon or the poetry of Dylan Thomas. There is a curse that occurs because of this act which sets up the action of the whole of the Mahabharata. But there is an incomprehensibility to this scene that is beyond all the structural explanations. The whole history of philosophy is in a way a denial of this primal incomprensibility and our perplexity in the face of it.

But there is another anomaly that should be mentioned that leads us to the conclusion that Ultra Being might be an actuality. This time it is Arkady Plotnitsky and his book Complementarity where he claims that there are not just dual or quadrupal complementarities but three way, five way, and other n-way complementarities. In my essay "Thinking the Unthinkable" I try to answer this in the

negative. I thought he was wrong about that and when I wrote him he had no examples of odd-way complementarities. However, later I found out that there is an important property of octahedrons called triality. Later this caused me to posit the existence of quadrality, and relate that to Tits magic square as the basis for the Emergent Meta-system. However, the existence of triality as a mathematical property shows that I was wrong and there is at least 3-way complementarity although it is rare. Not all three way things are complementarities. So this existence proof said to me that there might be something like Ultra Being. Another related point is that I discovered that the permutations of the multilith included a three way multiple as we multiply the 1*2*3*4 to get the combinations of four kinds of Being. This gives 24 permutations which is the number of configurations of objects in the four hands of Vishnu. The three way split is very important within the field of the permutations of the multilith. It reminds us of the possible algebras identified by Grassmann, xy=0, yx=xy, yx=-xy. There are quite a few of these deep threeway properties in mathematics and it slowly becomes harder and harder to explain them away by two or four fold complementarities. The reason this leads to the idea of Ultra Being is as follows. The worldview is set up with artificially extreme nihilistic duals in the fore ground that are in conflict. Behind that and before it there is a holoidal non-dual at every level of the worldview that contrasts with the excrescence generated by the conflict of the duals. In other words the holoidal non-duals and the excrescences are crossed with the duals at war. So there is a secret connection between the duals via the non-dual despite their claiming that they are each independent and can dominate the other. Now we get to the non-dual by reversal and substitution. In other words we start off thinking that the two opposites cancel (xy=0). But then we learn that they can actually be reversed (yx=xy) and finally we learn that we can substitute the negative for the positive (yx=-xy). It is this reversal and substitution that reveals the non-dual at each level of the hierarchy of duals. So algebraically we can

relax certain conditions and get to the non-duals. The relation of the non-dual to the duals gives us a three way symmetry that shows up in the multilith as the 3 in the multiplied Tetrakys. Now the question is where is this third piece to the puzzle. And the answer surprisingly is that it is embedded in existence beyond the fourth meta-level. It is there as the inverted difference between emptiness (even zero) and void (odd zero). We see it in Pascal's triangle as the Pascal Point of 1. As such it stands between the even and odd Zeros. This is rather surprising that one would have the nature of ultra being, i.e. incomprehensibility, but in some ways it might have been expected because the difference between one and plurality has always been a fundamental problem. Both unity and totality are ways of tying the one to the plurality. This one we are talking about is a primordial oneness such as that talked about by Laotzu and Wang Bi. In Indo-European myth it is the Giant that the universe was made of before it was cut up. In Chinese Myth this is Hun Tun. Hun Tun when he is cut up by this dual friends North and South turns into the sleeping Vishnu[3]. North and South are guises for Dionysus/Shiva and Apollo/Brahma. So when we enter the non-dual world of Vishnu/Albion then we see that he wakes up. This awakening is the same as the Humpty Dumpty of Hun Tun being put back together again. But that means that Vishnu/Albion/Hun Tun is really a dual character dead/asleep//live/awake. What separates these two states? If these are the difference between emptiness and void then what separates them is Ultra Being, the incomprehensible kind of Being. Non-duality is really dual. But then that means when we turn around that duality is really non-dual, and the nihilistic duals really participate in a naturalistic yin-in-yang and yang-in-yin relation via this incomprehensible kind of Being which is embedded in existence. So both the duality of the non-dual and the non-duality of the dual is mediated by this Ultra Being which is really a taint in existence because it is neither emptiness or void, i.e. truly

---

[3] Zeus

transparently non-dual. Rather it is a kind of residue of dualism that separates the two non-duals, but since it is embedded in Existence it can act as if it were non-dual in relation to the duals within comprehensible Being. This is just too odd to comprehend but there are all these anomalies that point toward the actuality of this possibility. We know it is possible because the logical types go on to infinite meta-levels. But when we reached the end of what we could comprehend we thought we had reached the end of Being, as did everyone in this tradition that had anything to do with philosophy, except perhaps Kierkegaard. Well what we discover is that we did not reach the end of Being when we reached the end of Comprehensibility. Parmenides and Heidegger were wrong along with almost everyone else. There is something in Being that is incomprehensible and that becomes the pivot around which everything else turns. It is the missing piece, the capstone of the pyramid, the rejected piece of stone, the omphalus, the prime matter. Really it is alchemy that describes it best, as Jung was so brilliant to recognize. Hillman is following Derrida and Jung and exploring this territory as well. There is the Sol Niger, the Black Sun that captures the thought explicitly. This incomprehensibility is not really studied by philosophers. This opacity at the heart of things is mostly ignored by the tradition. But we need to turn our attention there, because it transforms the whole of the worldview if it is true that Ultra Being is an actuality. It is Ultra Being that allows the Non-dual to be dual. We know from previous studies that we can see the two non-duals in the Divided Line of Plato and that Manifestation is the center line of the divided line. But we have discussed the antipode to manifestation which is the extrema beyond supra-rationality and madness. It is this anti-pode that draws its life from Ultra being. The extrema is the conglomeration of supra-rationality and madness we know as dunya, dukha and maya. All that is based on the the actuality of Ultra Being. It is the basis of magic and shamanism. Magic is the use of things in the world to gain power. Shamanism is the use of things from other worlds and realities to gain

power. It is opposite the genuine spirituality taught by Buddhism, Taoism and Sufism that seeks powerlessness instead. Buddhism is associated with the non-dual of emptiness. Taoism is associated with the non-dual of void. Sufism is associated with the deeper non-dual of manifestation. But they are all opposite Magic and Shamanism which seek power either by manipulating things in this world or bringing things in from other realities and worlds to change what is here in this world. As Carlos Castaneda said there is a difference between Tonal and Nagual. The Shaman goes into the Nagual in order to manipulate what is on the mesa of the Tonal. Even if most of what Carlos Castenada wrote was made up this is something he got right. Nagual can stand for the other worlds and realities of the Pluriverse. The shaman travels between realms and gains power from that. The magician stays within the world but manipulates the things in it to gain power. The way of power is always opposed by the way of powerlessness. As Sidi Ali al-Jamal says in The Meaning of Man the terrestrial overcomes the celestial in every case. Going low always triumphs in the end. Powerlessness is going low. Power is going high. What goes high by choice is forced down. What goes low by choice is forced up. This is the rolling over of the natural opposites. Their rolling over even trumps the nihilistic duals that is why the yin-in-yang and yang-in-yin connection between the duals renders them ultimately non-dual in spite of their extreme artificial nihilistic duality.

Now I am going to offer a first attempt at figuring out what the modalities of Ultra Being might be comparing it to the modalities of the other kinds of Being. For one thing we are going to make a fundamental shift and say that Ultra Being has the nature of being-out-of-the-world[4]. So now it is clear that a fundamental phase shift has occurred that takes us out of Being into Existence. However, one of the

---

[4] I owe this expression to George Berzins (GeorgeBerzins12@aol.com) who expressed similar opinions on the beingandtime-dialognet@yahoogroups.com elist.

things that can exist in the world is an incomprehensible fragment of Being. For us we experience that as being-out-of-the-world. And example is when there is an undecipherable dead language, but we have all kinds of artifacts, like with the Maya or Sumeria or Minos or Egypt or Ugrit before the code of their language was broken, or like the civilization in India at Harappa or Mohenjo-daro which still today is not deciphered. When we cannot read the writings of a people we cannot enter their world. It is something we apprehend from the outside. And to others our we are beings-out-of-the-world who do not understand our culture and tradition and cannot read our writings and speak our language. So the brute fact of an untranslated alien culture's writing is an example of being-out-of-the-world as opposed to being-in-the-world. It is a cause of perplexity because the pieces do not fit together at all even if the archeological remains point in a certain direction we cannot obtain understanding. The brute existence of the remains of daily life tell us little about the thoughts of the people who inhabited those worlds. With respect to modality we need a word that goes beyond encompassing. Something that suggests exteriority rather than the interiority of the world. It tentatively suggest "*integument*" to describe the modality of being-out-of-the-world which would in terms of handedness be lost-to-hand rather than merely out of hand of Wild Being. Why has it not occurred to me to posit these extensions to the level of Ultra Being? They seem so natural. But it was unclear that they were justified. And it is unclear that this projection of the nature of Ultra Being is correct because these names themselves are intelligible. This is the paradox or absurdity that we get into is that if we can understand it at all it is not it. Just as the point that Deleuze and Guattari make about the unconscious is that if the elements are connected at all then consciousness is involved, only truly orthogonal elements are representative of the unconscious. Similarly with Ultra Being if there is any intelligibility in these names for various modes of it then that is definitively not it. But it may serve as a pointer

in the general direction of unintelligibility. But can anything be truly unintelligible in our world? Heidegger thinks not. But perhaps he is wrong on that score. Maybe there are things in the world that do not figure in our philosophies. But now we have to hunt for them. It has been called the blackness within the milk. The milk is white but when you are encompassed by it then to you it is black. Ultra Being is the dot of incomprehensibility and unintelligibility in the midst of an intelligible world, just as the many worlds are a see of unintelligibility to each other of which our own world is a place of safety were we can find many things intelligible and familiar. Sometimes the familiarity strikes something that is utterly unfamiliar and alien. That is a piece of Ultra Being. For instance when the Highland New Guinea natives first saw the white men, their expressions caught on camera were utter shock and bewilderment. They saw their dead relatives returning from the dead, because the dead were known to be white. In those photographs perhaps we get a glimpse of one of the few times the bubble of familiarity that establishes the world is completely burst. It happened many places as colonialization proceeded to terraform the planet but destroying world after world like we destroy species of plants and animals today. But those earlier examples of first contact did not make it onto film. We get a little glimpse of what must have been a worldwide phenomena as the Western colonialization proceeded apace.

So here we are again on the verge of a new adventure, attempting to find traces of Ultra Being, the black diamonds of unintelligibility in the sea of familiarity of our world. Alchemy, Mythology, the Epics give us some good candidates. But what we really want to find is some key examples that show that Ultra Being functions in relation to the Four lower meta-levels of Being. One way we can think about this is to wonder what the discontinuities of the multilith are made out of. Once Owen Ware introduced the concept of the multilith, that various combinations of the kinds of Being had different qualities, which I called the exotics, then it should have occurred to me that there

must be something different from the other four kinds of being holding apart the four kinds in any particular combination. This is just so obvious once you have accepted the necessity of Ultra Being, but was far from clear before. In fact this is how you build from one kind of Being to the next is to ask what the difference is between the last two. But with the phase transition to Existence from Being the fact that there is a residue of Being at the fifth meta-level gets lost or swamped out by the wonder of emptiness and void. It is the small residue of evil that appears at the end of <u>Time Bandits</u> where the parents touch the remnants of the Devil. Everything gets swept up but one little piece, and so the whole thing starts over again. We can think of Ultra Being as what joins and separates the Black Hole and the Miracle and the dual singularities from each other that appear in the Meta-system. In other words what generates the differences between these complementary aspects of the meta-system. What is their mutual generator. The represent non-duality, but why is that non-duality expressed as dual singularities and both positive and negative *positive feedback*. Negative feedback is the manifest sailing over rough seas. But the antipode of both the positive feedback and the folds that generate pairs of singularities must be something like Ultra Being. There is a good chance that Bataille's work on non-knowledge was an attempt to breach this conundrum. But I have not read it. What might be in the books I have not read are a closed book to me. These closed books are in a way a lack of intelligibility. But I understand what an unread book is or an unknown author. They harbor a sealed world, the world of another mind, which if I took the time and were not so lazy I could open up as a world that is adjacent to my own. So in a way the part of our culture we do not know functions as Ultra Being to us in its entirety. There is always a greater amount that is unknown than what we can know. Then there is what is lost in the mists of time that no one knows because the book lies in a monastery or Vatican library unread. For instance the world of Archimedes was opened up to us recently by

finding a manuscript hidden in a palimpsest. This is an excellent example. The book is in terrible shape. The pages have been overwritten and painted. The bare traces of the original work lies beneath the scrapings and writings of the medieval scribner. But the few things we can see using modern equipment open up the world of Archimedes to us because in them he explains his method of discovery. The world was set back a thousand years in mathematics by the loss of that one work. Everything had to be rediscovered. For instance Archimedes dealt with infinity a subject that everyone though was anathema to the ancient world. What else have we lost, in the Arabic tradition or other preceding traditions. What we have from the Greeks is only about 4% of their corpus. So much was lost with the burning of the library of Alexandria. So in this way the losses of history are an expression of Ultra Being because ultimately they are inscrutable and they seal us out of a potential world. We have to reinvent, recreate and we do so realizing other potential worldliness of development. Ultra Being is something we are going to have to pursue vigorously if we are ever going to come to terms with it, not to say understand it because that is impossible. It slips in through a back door, because it is not intelligible as we would have expected the next meta-level of Being to be. The closure of Existence is maintained. But the hint is that non-duality is actually dual. And what separates these duals, it is some inscrutable fragment of Being left inadvertently which we do not understand at all. It is Being as if we found it beside the road outside all projections we get caught up within. It is what the outside of a world looks like. We should know it because we have looked at so many worlds from the outside. The problem is that we have never seen our own from the outside. Ultra Being is the outside of our own worldview. That is why it is the most hidden of all things. It is the utter alienness of our familiarity and the familiarity of our alienness.

General Schemas Theory

Of course, in this space it is impossible to fully explore the implications of the existence of

Ultra Being. But what we can do which is crucial for this research project is to explore the implications of Ultra Being's existence for General Schema Theory. This is crucial because of the relation between Schemas and Emergence. What we see is that our theory of Emergence does not change much because Ultra Being is not intelligible, or thinkable. This is to say Ultra Being is really what our worldview looks like from the outside, as if it were merely another existent, or non projected thing rather than a projection. It is still necessary for an emergent event to pass though the four lower meta-levels of Being to be genuine. The existence of Ultra-Being does not add to or change those levels of intelligibility. Rather it adds a perspective of what the outside of the worldview would appear if projection stopped. To us inside the worldview there is no difference. This is assuming that the assumption that Ultra Being is non-intelligibility holds. But on the other hand since Ultra Being is an outside view, and existentialist view of Being sans projection it does effect the relation to general schemas theory in the following sense. Schemas are the projection of externality within the world. So in a sense the very nature of schemas are that of Ultra Being. Ultra Being is what the entire projection system would look like from the outside if it were merely an unintelligible existent thing. Schemas are the way that externalization appears within the worldview. The emergent thing always takes the form first of a schema then kind, then individual, then significance. So externality is projected within the world first. It is kindness that we focus on when we look at things in the world. We do not notice that there are only about ten kinds of schema into which everything fits. We do not feel claustrophobic in a world with only ten schemas. This is because the projection of schemas is invisible to us for the most part. That is why there is so little literature on the what Umberto Eco[5] calls the mathematical or geometrical schemas, which is what we mean by the term schema in this work. So when we

consider the connection between projected externality as dimensionality in the schemas and Ultra Being as the externality, Integument, of the worldview itself we find that there is a very interesting relation here that should not be ignored. It is as if when we project externality within the world we are coming to terms with the externality of the worldview itself within the kosmos. And that is why, Ultra Being is associated with the gluing together of worldviews into the Western Meta-worldview or Kosmos, and with the production of the eras of Being within the Western Worldview. For us the Kosmos is Physical, it is the sores on which our projections wash up when it interacts with the physical universe. But the earlier kosmi were the place where different worlds came together and interacted, the market place of worldviews if we see it as a general economy. For us those key interacting worldviews were the Sumerian, Indo-European, Egyptian and Semitic. Out of this interaction comes the Western meta-worldview, the destroyer of other worldviews across the planet via colonialization. The robustness of the Western worldview comes from its combination of various different worldviews into a meta-worldview kosmos. But it is this which also allows it to support extreme emergent at various levels within the worldview because Ultra Being itself can become just an existent among existents, and there by become a seed for the production of a new worldview out of existence. This possibility of its being embedded in existence means that the four kinds of Being can utterly collapse and then spring up again like the hydra from the sewn dragons teeth. This makes the western worldview extremely robust. But when it springs up again it does not necessarily have the same internal organization and this allows for emergent reforming of the worldview in various eras in response to world shattering events. What those events may have been we do not know. But we know the last one was inaugurated by Anxamander who took us out of the mythopoietic into the metaphysical eras. We postulate that when the four kinds of Being collapsed and then reformed into another

---

[5] In <u>Kant and the Platipus</u>.

organization that was metaphysical that there was a residue of Ultra Being produced which appeared as an existent thing. This is a hypothesis. But stretching back we know that in each previous period there is a particular recorded emergent event that marked each previous era. Between Uranus and Kronos there is the arising of Aphrodite, between Kronos and Zeus there was the arising of the Omphalous at Delphi, between Zeus and Necessity[6] there was the production of human law. This final transition to the reign of *necessity* is marked by the Anaximander fragment. Necessity is the root of the non-duals that appear in the Metaphysical era.

"From out of that which things arise, there also does their destruction [or dissolution] occur, according to necessity; for they render justice and recompense to one another for their injustice, according to the orderly arrangement of time." [7]

Anaximander says that necessity and justice are the root of the worldview. He contrasts the finitude of things with the unlimited. He mentions the non-dual of order with respect to time. And it is order with respect to time that brings us directly to Kant's interpretation of the Schemas as the temporalization of the categories of things. Schemas are dimensional differentiation of spatiality. But Kant recognizes that there is an inner relation between this spatialization and temporality. This is because in a spatial realm things can happen simultaneously. What is the complement of schematic spatialization is simultaneous temporality of the things that are schematized in space. This simultaneous temporal spatiality leads directly to Einstein's idea of relativity. Richard M. Pico in

---

[6] ANANKE See
http://www.theoi.com/Khaos/Ananke.html

[7] http://www.quodlibet.net/moore-logos.shtml ex ôn de ê genesis esti tois ousi kai tên phthoran eis tauta ginesthai kata to khreôn. didonai gar auta dikên kai tisin allêlois tês adikias kata tên tou khronou taxin. Anaximander, fragment B 1 (Diels), my translation. The fragment is preserved in Simplicius' Commentary on the Physics 24.13-25.

Consciousness in Four Dimensions generalizes this from merely being related to physical stuff to the emergent levels of life and consciousness. In dreams it is the brain region that produces simultaneous spatiality that is activated according to Richard Bosnak. Thus in dreams what appears to us is already schematized. Dreams show that simultaneous temporal spatialization of the schemas in time is a projection and produces a virtual world in which we can have experience divorced from the physical world of mundane experience. It shows that schematization is the basis of experience as such regardless of physical support for those schemas and it shows that schemas are projections because we project dream worlds that are schematized and that schematization is the basis of our familiarity with the world in which we related to our experience. This changes our view of spatiality from merely an unfolding of space in which movement is possible to a structure that allows simultaneity of different relativistic temporalities at the level of the physical, of the living cell, and of consciousness as well as a level that Pico does not explore which is the social. These are of course the of levels of phenomena related to the Special Systems. If we think of simultaneous relativistic temporalities as a more basic type of temporality, a primal temporality, prior to either linear or circular temporality then we can begin to see dimensionality as the complementary structure to this simultaneous temporality. The categories start out as what you can say about anything in Aristotle, and by the time of Kant they become the dialectics that encompass the highest concepts on which Newtonian science might be based. But this means that they are still about things that are present-at-hand. Kant adds time through the schemas and of course that is why Heidegger is interested in the demoted Transcendental Imagination and the Schemas because that gives us a hint that the ready-to-hand is implicitly in the picture as well as the mixture of Being and Time. But what is missing in Kant is an appreciation of the fact that there is this primordial type of temporality which is

simultaneously spatial. And that kind of temporality is important for the support of the possibility of supra-rationality, which allows opposites to be simultaneously true without interfering which is the opposite of paradox and absurdity. This connection of necessity and primal temporality appears in the Primal Scene of the Indo-Europeans already explored in The Fragmentation of Being and the Path Beyond the Void by the author. That Primal Scene is the Well and the Tree of the Indo-Europeans. The Norns that represent Necessity sand between the Well and the Tree transferring the water of life from the Well to the Tree. The circulation of the waters represent a circular time that relates to the Orlog and the growth of the worldtree. But the fact that there are three fates and three wells around the one tree represents the simultaneous temporality that is more primordial than cyclical time.

The fact that the simultaneous temporality is the complementary opposite of schematic spatiality is crucial. It allows us to see that the moment in which we spatialize dimensionally with the schemas as a projection that comes before categorization of kindness is a moment in the midst of simultaneous temporality. This simultaneous temporality is like having a sack of viewgraphs which we are looking though all at once rather than one at a time. All the pictures that are on all the viewgraphs are happening simultaneously within our embodied states as we project the schemas which is a very narrow precategorization prior to the discovery of kindness related to thatness. The thatness of the things that emerge come from our ability to relate to those things by pointing, grasping, bearing and encompassing. The thatness of the things within the world has a hidden connection to the thatness of the world itself as seen as an existent from the outside. We might say that we are looking at the outside of the worldview from within when we see the thatness of things. This would mean that the thatness of the exterior of the worldview is striated into ten schemas that allow spatiality within the worldview but that means when we look on the worldview from the outside then there is a structure that is the

inverse that effects the temporality of the worldview and that is itself divided into ten element, and those elements are the tetrakys which we then multiply to get the 24 states of the multilith. So if we see the segmentation of the schemas that allow simultaneity within the worldview as inverted if we look at the worldview from the outside then what we see from a temporal point of view is a tenfold structure that appears at the multilith which contains the permutations of the four meta-levels of being beneath Ultra Being. Ultra Being is what separates the four meta-levels of Being from each other in the Multilith of Being. This inversion that relates the schemas of space to the multilith of time is very significant for our understanding of General Schemas theory. General Schemas theory is in fact how the multilith looks when turned inside out. The ten elements of the tetrakys that is multiplied to give the twenty-four permutations of the multilith appear to us within the worldview as the ten schemas. The connection to time is by the fact that it is the dimensionality of the schemas that allows a space for the simultaneity of time. That simultaneity of time when inverted gives us the ten types of time that are represented by the elements of the tetrakys which then when permutated give us the exotics or esotics, i.e. the permutation of the kinds or aspects of Being. The Tetrakys is a generalization of the generator of the Pascal simplicies. In other words the Tetrakys is the keystone of the Pascal triangle, which is the place where the special systems take form. The differences between the cells of the multilith have the standing of Ultra Being. In this way we see that the tenfold structure of the schemas is related through a strange inversion to the ten fold structure of the tetrakys which is a generator for the Pascal triangle and the permutations of the multilith of Being. As Pascal triangle it is a fusion of the different aspects of the special systems which are the separators between the kinds of Being. As the multilith it is the fundamental pattern for the world which expresses itself as exotics and esotics which ultimately are reconciled though the 24 cell polytope which has the lattice 1-24-

96-96-24-1. In other words the exotics of the kinds of Being and the esotics of the aspects of Being are mutually supportive and produces a non-interfering structure that supports the projection process of Being. The projection process of Being is Ultra Efficacious.

Now we understand why Ultra Being was haunting our efforts to understand the foundations of General Schemas Theory. Ultra Being is the ground for the Schemas because it is the ground of the externalization of the worldview as a whole which appears to us within the worldview as the externalization of the things in the world. Our temporalizaton of things as simultaneous is ecstatic. All other temporal orders are reifications of that primary simultaneous temporalization that is relativized and that takes on different frameworks with respect to physical things, to life, to consciousness and the social. The key point is that physical things by being dimensionally spatialized can move in different ways independently and thus have different inertial frames. Within cells there are different internal clocks set of chemical reaction cycles within the envelope of cells. Within consciousness there are different thought processes and temporalities to do with thought and intelligibility. Within the social there are different time fields that relate humans in different cultures and societies. So ultimately the simultaneity of time has a relativistic relation of the time lines within the various fields to each other. This series of emergent relativities form the basis for understanding the special systems as the foundation for these emergent separations of relativistic fields. But the insight of Pico is that each of these fields are four dimensional and that is the basis for our understanding of each of the general schemas as fourfold. There are four systems in a meta-system, four meta-systems in a domain, four domains in a world, and so on up and down the series of schemas. Each schema is four dimensional, and each schema has a relation to the next lower as a general economy to a restricted economy. So really the difference between the system and meta-system is repeated at each level of the hierarchy of the schemas, and that means that an image of the special systems appears between each layer of the general schemas hierarchy. So the schemas as a whole sport the basic four dimensionality that we see in all the relativistic fields associated with the special systems, with the normal system and the meta-system. It is relativity of the simultaneous temporal dimension which interfaces with the spatiality of the schemas that determines the four dimensionality of the schemas themselves. But this four dimensionality of the schemas is keyed into the dimensional unfolding that is based on the Pascal Triangle. So although each schema is four dimensional at its own level it is tied to an embodiment of to specific dimensions in the unfolding of the dimensions so that the rule that there are two dimensions per schema and two schemas per dimension is upheld. When we say four dimensional we are talking about how the schema is related to the relativistic temporal simultaneity of physical phenomena, life, consciousness and the social. In other worlds this four dimensionality is temporal in essence while the spatiality is related to other dimensions. It is only at the level of the system and the meta-system that the spatial dimensionality crosses with the temporal dimensionality and this is why these become the prototypes for the articulation of all the other schemas, for in a sense they are balanced between their spatial and temporal articulations. But the rest of the schemas are not balanced because they are four dimensional from a temporal simultaneity point of view but they have other dimensional underpinnings from a spatial dimensionality point of view. That articulation that changes with regards to space, is then inverted when we go to the underside of the schemas and look at the worldview as ultra being from the outside. There we then see the dimensional articulation of spatiality in terms of the differentiation of time into the tetrakys that forms the permutations of the multilith and it is this differentiation of time that drives the emergent events that the western worldview experiences as eras and other finer levels of emergent unfolding. The emergence comes from

the striation in time that is the inverse of the schemas striation in space. Each combination of the four kinds of Being within a phase of the multilith as a permutation is a unique face of Being. Ultra Being is the inverse of this face of Being which looks like the face of existence, it separates this face from the other faces of the multilith. It is Vishnu that holds the four objects[8] that represent what is permutated to produce the twenty four possible combinations of exotics (exodic, outward) or esotics (esodic, inward). Also it is relevant that Vishnu has ten incarnations[9]. Hindu philosophy in though Sankara and the associated mythology is clear in its support of a non-dual mode of Being and it is not yet clear that this is the same as Ultra Being because in this case non-dual is hard to distinguish from a monolithic state of Being related to Brahman, the god head, but it is worth further research to determine if the indications of Mythology are supported by the philosophy of Advaita Vedanta. Sankara is suppose to be influenced by Nagarjuna through one of his teachers and is suppose to have introduced concepts related to emptiness back

---

[8] Vishnu is also known as Mahavishnu, represents Sattvaguna and is the centripetal force as it were responsible for sustenance, protection and maintenance of the created Universe. Another name of Vishnu is Narayana. Vishnu is always described as Nialamegahasyana, of a dark blue hue like than of the rain-bearing cloud.The icon of Vishnu has one face and four arms each one holding Sankha (conch), Chakra (discus), Gada (mace), Padma (lotus) and wears a necklace with the famous gem Kaustubha dangling on the lock of hair Srivatsa, on the left chest. He also wears a garland (of gems or fragrant flowers) Vaijayanti by name. The Sankha represents the five elements like the earth, water etc; chakra stands for the cosmic mind, Gada indicates the cosmic intellect and the Padma points to the evolving world. The curl of hair, Srivatsa, represents all objects of enjoyment, the products of nature. The gem Kaustubha, resting on it, stands for the enjoyer. The garland Vaijayanti is symbolical of the subtle elements.
http://www.webindia123.com/religion/hinduism/gods/trinity.htm
[9]

http://www.webindia123.com/religion/hinduism/gods/incar.htm

into Hinduism as a basis for the re-absorption of Buddhism as a non-dual heresy back into Hinduism. However, it appears from the actual texts of Sankara that his vision of non-duality was actually a monism. If in fact Sankara was saying that Being was really Emptiness following Nagarjuna, and if we went further and said that Being was void too, and that the combination of emptiness and void in the same thing was Ultra Being then we would have an argument that would make Hinduism the first philosophy to discover the possibility of Ultra Being as the mediation between emptiness and void. However, this is only a hypothesis at this time.

What we find then in the relation of Metaphysics of Emergence and General Schemas Theory is an intimate relation between Ultra Being and the Schemas via this turning inside out of the worldview and the complementarity with simultaneous temporality. This means our fundamental ground of the Schemas is in Ultra Being as the ultimate exteriorization or integument of being-out-of-the-world. Dasein is out of the other non-dasein things which are schematized in his or her world. This out of the things of dasein is the complementary notion to the out-of-the-world as the outside of the ecstatic projection system produced by the other meta-levels of Being working together. We see in this the integument that is outside the encompassing of wild being, the bearing of hyper being, the grasping of process being and the pointing of pure being. Ultra Being is the outside view of the ecstasy of the projection of Being as if it were any other found thing in existence. But this pure exteriority of Ultra Being is the mediation between emptiness (even zero) and void (odd zero). It turns out that what is between odd and even zero in the Pascal Stalactite and Stalagmite structure is the Pascal Point "1". So if we see ultra Being as "1" in an exterior view then we see the unfolding of the Pascal line and the Pascal triangle and the other simplicies as the interior view of that "1." In that sense then it may be that this is what Sankara has in mind with respect to thinking

about Empty or Void Being as a Monolith. One is a perplexity because it gives rise to all the differentiation of the Pascal simplicies internally. Where -1 is the singularity that acts as a source, 1 acts as an origin. It has a certain opacity which is the opposite of the interpenetration of the hyper complex algebras. How can so much differentiation come from one. How does the many give rise to the one and yet each of the many remain only one, so that the image of oneness becomes infinitely ramified. That is why we need the non-dual that appears as emptiness or void and is modeled as interpenetration by the hyper-complex algebras in order to offset this perplexity of the one-many relation that is caught between repetition and representation. However, we do not have to solve this perplexity of the opaque exteriorized oneness that is the Pascal point in order to understand the relation between Ultra Being and the Schemas. The schemas are Ultra Being turned inside out. When we look at our world we schematize things first that is give them exterior spatiality. But this is the inverse of the exteriority of the worldview itself seen in Ultra Being. Exteriorizing dimensional spatiality allows for the realization of simultaneous temporality. That undifferentiated temporality when the inversion occurs turns into the differentiation of Being itself into the ten elements of the tetrakys which then permuted give us the exotics or esotics of the multilith. The inward striation of spatiality gives us externally the striation of temporality and from that point of view the space of Being becomes a plenum. But ultimately both space and time are joined into the spacetime and timespace of the relativistic matrix so that this complementarity between inside and outside is a fundamental characteristic of the matrix itself. The schemas or the permutations of the multilth and its differentiation in time are ultimately different ways of looking at the articulation of the matrix of spacetime or timespace and that is why Pico's argument about the relativity of biology and consciousness is important which connects this back to the Special Systems. All of the relativity of the matrix has an inverse of definite discontinuous striations of space as the

schemas and time as emergent events. Both are necessary and involuntary differentiations imposed on us within the Western worldview and perhaps other worldviews as well. It is this necessity that forms the ultimate ground for General Schemas Theory based on the Metaphysics of Emergence that recognizes the actuality of Ultra Being and the complementarity between emergence and schematization.