

Metaphysics of Emergence

The Multilith of Being

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

Orange CA 92856 USA

714-633-9508

kent@palmer.name

<http://kdp.me>

Copyright 2003, 2014 K.D. Palmer.

All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.

Started 12/15/03; Version 0.06; 12/23/03; me01a06.doc

Edited 2014.02.18

Keywords: Emergence, Metaphysics,
Ontology, Newness, Western Worldview

Introduction

What is different about this treatment of the various kinds of Being discovered by Continental Philosophy as modes of being-in-the-world is that we are looking at them after they have already emerged in the metaphysics of the last century and within the framework of the Theory of Higher Logical Types. The framework makes these differences sharp and definite but does not constrain their characteristics. The characteristics were discovered by Continental philosophers in their search for these various strange kinds of Being. In the process of discovery they did not know how many kinds of Being they would find nor where to look to characterize them. All that was intellectual adventure and primary exploration of the first order. We on the other hand are in a position to look back on the whole development and characterize the kinds of Being all in a single vision that comes from hindsight. If we do that then it becomes clear that there is not just

one way to see the relations between the different kinds of Being but as Owen Ware suggested to me we must consider the various combinations of Being. We call all the different kinds of Being a multilith just as we called Pure and Process Being alone a monolith. We take this term monolith from Michael Henry whose Essence of Manifestation accuses Heidegger of having a fundamental assumption of Ontological Monism. This is to say that Heidegger thought by combining the Verbal and Nounal forms of Being together he had covered all the bases and produced a monolithic basis for understanding Ontology. Michael Henry hinting at the problem of the fragmentation of Being instead says that there must be a plurality of kinds of Being and thus opens up the possibility of the Multilith, the multifarious kinds of Being. To get from the Monolith to the Multilith we add two other kinds of Being called Hyper Being (difference) and Wild Being. Thus there are two pairs of complementary kinds of Being: Pure:Process::Hyper:Wild within the Multilith of Being. What Owen Ware pointed out in personal communications is that these may be combined in up to twenty four different ways with the permutations described by $4*3*2*1$, i.e. the tetrakys of Being. The key point here is that there is a three in this multiplication which gives us the three exotics (exotics), i.e. three primary ways in which the multilith can be combined. The same thing is true of the four aspects of Being which we call the esotics (esotics). There is a fundamental three fold structure behind the fourfold structure of the aspects or kinds of Being. We understand that the two sets of 24 permutations might yield a structure like the 24 cell polytope that has a lattice that is 1-24-96-96-24-1. The 24 cell polytope has a special property of non-self interference so that the kinds and aspects

in their permutations could communicate with each other without running into self interference. The 24 cells are octahedral. So we begin to get a picture of the tetrakys of the multilith that is more complex when we take into account the relation between kinds and aspects of Being. Kinds and Aspects are both necessary because The theory of Higher Logical Types need both ramification of meta-levels and types at each meta-level in order to unravel all types of paradox. Each aspect of Being, i.e. truth, reality, identity, and presence is transformed as it appears at the successively higher meta-levels. For instance, truth at the level of Pure Being is verification while truth at the level of Process Being is showing and hiding. Truth at the level of Hyper Being is a fundamental uncovering as we see in Oedipus' attempts to find out who the bringer of plague is and who the murder of his father is. It turns out to be himself. His search is a query about who he is himself, thus we call the self at this level of Being a Query. But also in the myth there is the enigma of the sphinx. Oedipus is asked a question to which he must respond and which he must answer correctly or die by the sphinx. Thus Oedipus is not answering a question but is being queried himself, but again he answers "man" to the question of the sphinx which Oedipus is himself thus pointing to the enigma of his own finitude. So we call this level of the self which is questioned and for which the only answer is his own finitude the enigma. We see this as Oedipus' orientation to the Wild Being of the monstrous female. When he answers this riddle the sphinx dies. There is verification in the play because the shepherd is the same as the messenger who enters to confirm his role in taking Oedipus away to another kingdom. There is showing and hiding in as much as we see the action of the Oracle of Delphi and

Terresius who show us the fated end before it has come upon Oedipus and become undeniable. All the different kinds of Being appear in this play with respect to the various kinds of truth that are displayed. Similar differences appear with respect to Reality, Identity, and Presence in other contexts as the multilith allows the interaction between the four kinds and four aspects of Being, something like a mobile of Calder except in this cases the various pieces of the mobile move through each other and interfere with each other rather than merely being balanced away from each other so that they do not interact with each other. Perhaps a better model is the kaleidoscope. It is hard to explain how the 24 cell polytope allows for non-interference yet is so synergistically dependent and self-dual. It is a unique figure among the Platonic solids with very special properties. Ultimately we see that the theory of higher logical types dictates that there must be both kinds and types of Being. There are four thinkable kinds of Being and four thinkable types, that is a minimal system of both. But permutations are possible between these four kinds or between these four types and this generates the tetrakys that gives us 24 permutational states of each. The 24 cell polytope then stands as the natural way that these permutational states can ultimately relate to each other. The 24 cell polytope is a unique Platonic Solid with strange properties of non-self-interference if the lines by which it is constructed are replaced by arrows. So we assume that the multilith in all its permutations of kinds and aspects also would feature such a ultra-efficacious characteristics. Since it is self dual we can think of it as having 24 points of combinations of aspects and 24 octahedral cells of combinations of kinds of Being or vice versa. The idea of basing our understanding of the multilith of Being

on the 24 cell Platonic polytope in four dimensions is that it allows us to understand that the multilith itself is not an arbitrary structure but is a central and unique structure geometrically with a definite structural form. This makes the multilith of Being very stable and enduring which we would expect from something that stands for perdurance. It gives the aspects and the kinds of Being specific relations to each other. In fact, we can think about this opening out of the multilith in terms of the kinds of Being themselves. The model of the Higher Logical Types are determinate and thus appears as a manifestation of Pure Being. The unfolding of the different essences at the various meta-levels however is a process and exemplifies process Being. It takes time for each meta-level of Being to unfold. There is a sort of condensation out of each one. Some sort of sublimation by which each kind of Being arises emergently from the last at a higher meta-level of Being. So this process of condensation or sublimation mixes time with being discontinuously producing the gaps between the emergent levels of the kinds of Being. Once the various kinds of Being have arisen and the aspects as types at each meta-level have separated then there is the possibility of permutation of both kinds as exotics (esotics) and aspects as esotics (esotics). It turns out that because there are four kinds of being and four aspects, i.e. two minimal systems of four each, then just mathematically that is a tetrakys and the permutations of each are 24 ($4*3*2*1$). Strikingly this is the same number of permutations as the objects in the four hands of Vishnu. These permutations give us all the possibilities of the combinations of the four kinds and the four aspects which are 24 each. Permutations are possibilities and possibility is described by Hyper Being.

When we recognize that these two sets of twenty-four possibilities corresponds to the Platonic four dimensional 24-cell polytope then we see that there is a particular unique geometrical or lattice like structure that we can relate these possibilities to each other. That structure has tremendous synergy in as much as only 24 points by the connection of 96 lines gives us 96 triangles out of which we can build 24 octahedra. We should only be able to build four octahedral out of 24 points, or eight octahedral out of 96 lines. So there is a tremendous over-determination in the use of points and lines that betokens synergy in the 24-cell polytope. This polytope is regular in four dimensional space. That means we can only see part of it at a time in three dimensional space without distortion. Because it is made of octahedral there is the special property of non-self interference of flows along the arrows that make up the sides of the 24 cell polytope and thus there is unimpeded flow within the polytope itself. That flow can be seen as a process which is ultra-efficacious like superconductivity. Since the 24 cell polytope is self dual we can think of the aspect side as being the points and the kinds side as being the solids or vice versa. Or we can think of it as a lattice of interchange between aspects and kinds. But because the fourth dimension is brought into the picture there are features of the fourth dimension which are like Wild Being. One of those is the fact that the fourth dimension has quaternion rotations, and from that we could calculate quaternion Mandelbrot sets, which are examples of things that have properties like Wild Being. Also the fourth dimension has the infinite fake topologies rather than a finite classification of differential topologies which also reminds us of Wild Being. So we then relate Wild Being to the characteristics of the four dimensional

embedding space in which the 24 cell polytope is embedded. Wild Being has propensities, tendencies, and dispositions. Because we are talking about possible configurations in the permutations there must be something that actualizes a particular configuration of kinds and aspects and actualizes it. We would think that this must be the propensities of the four dimensional space under the action of the superconducting flow of the 24cell. In other words there is at any one moment a selection of some particular configuration of kinds and aspects which is actualized. That actualization occurs because there is a determinate flow within the lattice represented by the ultra-efficacious flow of info-energy within the multilith that interacts with the possibilities in relation to the propensities of the four dimensional space itself which has fake topologies and quaternion Mandelbrot properties to cause probabilistic changes with respect to which possibilities are actualized and become probabilities of realized actualities. When we look at the same thing from the point of view of aspects we see that there is the identity of the aspects and kinds as points but that this identity is realized within the field of differences presented by the 24 cell polytope. There is some actualized presence of a configuration of kinds or aspects which is differentiated by the absence of the other non-actualized possibilities. There is within the multilith a realization of reality and truth as well. Truth means to be true or straight rather than crooked. When the ultraefficacious flow is not perturbed by the dispositions in four dimensional space then that is truth, a straight flowing. Reality is in fact the opposite of truth, it is realized by opposition of some kind to some action. To the extent that the flow is perturbed or blocked then there is injected some measure of reality. Because the aspects of

Being are transformed at the various levels of the kinds of Being the determination of the aspects becomes more and more difficult as we climb the ladder of the kinds of Being. This causes the 24-cell to become interfolded within itself, and it is also warped by the fact we cannot see the whole thing within the third dimension. So what seems to be a simple model suddenly becomes very complex when we begin to consider how the multilith folds though itself as the aspects of Being are transformed at the various meta-levels. The aspects end up having a quaternionic relation toward each other. What is important to us here is that we can describe this structure as an articulation of the kinds and aspects of Being whose combinations and configurations give us states of Being. What is ultra-efficacious in the states of Being is the flow between the possibilities of the 24 cell lattice. This is what makes perdurance possible. So Heidegger is right there is an important way that the mixture of time and being (Process Being) coincide to give us the ecstasy of projection. The 24 cell itself, or the tetrakys on which it is based, is determinate and thus belongs to Pure Being rather than Process Being. Because there are different possible routes of actualization we can hover just before those branchings in an undecidability that Derrida calls *differance* which is differing and deferring. Differing and Deferring is the inverse of Efficiency and Effectivity. Thus Differance and Efficacy are opposites. When differance and Efficacy interact we get Wild Being, i.e. the nature of the four dimensional space itself with its fake topologies and its quaternion Mandelbrot map of intensities. When the ultra-efficacious flow moves across the infinitely fine propensities of the Mandelbrot set or flows though the infinite fake topologies of the differential topologies then it is difficult to say what

will happen. The result is chaos but a chaos which is driven by an unending ultra-efficacious stream. It is a paradox similar to the idea of the Unmoved Mover in Aristotle. It is an ever non-interfering stream flowing across an infinitely detailed map whose topology is continuously changing. It is also a space in which all knots that exist in three dimensionality fall apart and become unknotted. So the streams do not knot. All these are intrinsic characteristics of four dimensionality itself which was invoked to account for the fact that there were two sets of twenty four states of kinds and states of aspects which combine to give the possible states of Being some of which are actualized in this superconducting unknotted flow across an infinitely detailed and constantly changing landscape. This is a vision of the multilith of Being.

Now what did not occur to me until recently was that there must be something that keeps these different kinds of Being or aspects of Being apart. In other words just like hyper Being is the difference between the noun and verb of the monolith of Being so there must be a difference between these configurations of aspects and kinds of Being, and this difference can be described as either void, emptiness or Ultra Being. We can quickly posit that if the kinds of Being are the points then the differences between them are emptiness. If the aspects of Being are the points then the differences between them are void. But that leaves the question of what happens when these self-dual assignments of aspects and kinds mirror each other. The opacity of that mirroring is Ultra Being, i.e. Being seen from the outside as a found thing rather than a projection like an existent. If there is a double face mirror at the center of the 24 cell polytope then the opacity of the tain of that mirror is Ultra Being. So we can see the points of

permutations of aspects and the points of permutations of kinds as being like the fish and the birds primal scene. The fish see their reflection in the mirror of the water but see the shadows of the birds beyond that surface. The birds see their reflection in the mirror of the water but see the shadows of the fish below the surface. There are flying fish and diving birds but for the most part they live in their own realm. We can imagine a progression from this primal scene to that of the Egyptians where the first land appears and on to the Primal Scene of the Indo-Europeans which is the Well and the Tree. The primal scene of the Egyptians brings out attention to the Special Systems which separate the kinds of Being from each other. The primal scene of the Indo-Europeans show us the world tree of the multilith, the flowing of the info-energy (chi) between the well and the tree helped by the Norns. The three wells represent the three fold division of the worldview represented by the esotics or exotics that represent the realms of duality and the realm of non-duality. The image of the Well and the Tree tells us that the Tree Yaddrasil which embodies all possibilities within the multilith is nurtured by the flow of the ultra-efficacious mixture of Being and Time, i.e. both Parmenides and Heraclitus are each half right. Everything flows but what flows perdures. And this flow occurs between the three realms of the esotics or exotics within the worldview as non-duality stands before and between the two duals. It is the fates that stand outside the three realms and are able to pull from each of them in order to water the whole tree and that is what keeps the cycles going. The multilith gathers all the primal scenes from the Egyptian, Sumerian, Indo-European and Semitic worldviews into a single multifaceted image that has its mathematical analogue in the 24cell polytope. Ultra Being is the

inner glue, the tain of the double mirror that allows the 24 cell to be structured as self dual. Emptiness gives a clearing inwardly and Void gives a clearing outwardly. But the difference between Emptiness and void must be something different and that has the nature of Ultra Being. It is Ultra Being and its effect on the metaphysics of emergence that is the focus of these chapters.

Ultra Being and the Multilith

From the moment that Owen Ware mentioned to me the idea of the multilith of Being, which is an idea that I had some intimations of but which he crystallized for me when he formulated it explicitly, I should have known that it meant that something like Ultra Being must exist. In other words once you say that there are different combinations of the kinds or aspects of Being then the question arises how these combinations are different and that means there arises the possibility of another meta-level of Being on which that difference manifests. Just like the fact that Heidegger got to the idea of ~~Being~~ crossed out by asking about the difference between Pure Being and Process Being within the monolith of Being. So here the difference between the individual 24 configurations or permutations of the kinds or aspects of Being implies that there is some difference in Being that separates them. However, because of special systems theory I thought that the separation was merely in terms of emptiness or void. That is to say I did not think the multilith per se raised the specter of Ultra Being. Rather I came to the conclusion that there might be something like Ultra Being from the thought about the complementarity between the Eras of our worldview and the various worlds that fitted together to make up the meta-worldview. This complementarity also begs the question, what is the glue that holds together the worldviews of the meta-

worldview, and what is there that moves from one era to the next when the worldview undergoes a transformation right down to the level of existence as when the mythopoietic era transformed emergently into the metaphysical era. But when you put this complementarity together with the model of the multilith then it becomes pretty clear that something like Ultra Being must exist, however I could really only accept its existence when I realized that it did not have to be thinkable or intelligible as the tradition had assumed. Once you accept that there is some form of Being that looks like existence, i.e. is unthinkable and unintelligible, i.e. Being as seen as a found thing from the outside then lots of other things start to make sense. The best example of something that may be like Ultra Being is Evil. Another example is when an undeciphered language¹ like Linear A locks us out of a ancient world for whom the archeological remains do not tell us enough to reenter their world. Similarly Evil as a concept locks us out of our own world, it is something opaque and incomprehensible within our own world. We know that Evil functions this way because in India the concept of Evil developed into an idea of Karma, i.e a causality from one life to another as an alternative to the idea of a heaven or hell. An example of Ultra Being from a movie is the black stuff which is what is left of the "Evil One" found in the toaster at the end of the movie that destroys the parents when they touch it before the boy who was kidnapped by the Time Bandits could react. I am pretty sure that lots of examples of unintelligible externalized Being can be found if we look hard enough for it in our worldview. For instance, Alchemical Prime Matter might be an example of Ultra Being. In karma it is what is left of the

¹ <http://www.omniglot.com/writing/undeciphered.htm>

action which then determines the future fate of the person in another incarnation. The idea becomes intensified when in Buddhism one accepts the idea of Emptiness because there is no medium for the causal effect to travel through. This shows up again in the idea of the Tathagata Gharba (Womb of Thusness Coming) where bija, or karmic seeds are laid down in the suchness as a basis of karmic causality. As a philosophy of the middle way Buddhism cannot completely deny causality nor uphold it. The concept of storehouse consciousness is a way of producing a model that satisfies this middle way. These seeds can be seen as warpages in the emptiness. In that sense they are like Being and thus perhaps might be thought of a contaminating residue from Being that infiltrates the emptiness. Unfortunately this means that the category of Being and the category of Emptiness or Void is not pure and completely clear cut which is really unfortunate from my point of view as a theorist. There is some fractal intermixing along the boundary between Being and Existence. There is the possibility for Being to become embedded in existence. This embedding is called Ultra Being, where Being acts like existence in a dormant state. We have already run into this in our study of the roots of Being where the root *Wer appears on the other side of Ultra Being. This was the strongest hint that Ultra Being must exist because there is some root of Being beyond it, i.e. beyond the threshold of Existence as a contaminant. So this contamination or poison of the purity of emptiness or void by a condensed form of Being is a real problem in the world. It gives rise to what I have called the extrema which can be described as *dunya*, *dukha*, or *maya* which is the antipode to manifestation. Exactly what that connection is I am not sure. But it is

fairly clear that there is a connection between the extrema and Ultra Being. I would prefer that this is not the case but it is getting harder and harder to deny.

In my own thought explorations via speculation I take a stand on certain issues in order to see what happens when I do that. Sometimes these stands I take lead to unwelcome results, others hold, even for a long time. The idea that there are only four kinds of Being has held for a long time. But finally the build up of anomalies caused by this stand became too great to deny even if I did not like the results I had to consider the possibility. I would prefer a less messy world. But I guess we have to accept the world as it is. I resisted the idea of the extrema for a long time. Now I have resisted the idea of Ultra Being also for a long time. But once we have both of these ideas then a lot of things make sense that would not make sense otherwise. But it means the world is more subtle and nuanced than I had expected. And of course it opens Pandora's box again when we ask when does the series of kinds of Being end. Is there is sixth kind of Being? When ever we construe another kind of Being our world expands, as it did this time into the idea of Meta-worldview (kosmos) or in time to the idea of Eras of Existence like the metaphysical and mythopoietic. In other words these emergent events have a deeper founding than previously expected. We are moving though the multilith and its permutations and we experience actualizations of many states of being (kinds plus aspects). Those actualizations have some small contribution from Ultra Being as the foundation for their existence. It means that the Western worldview is not that different from other worldviews with existence in them like the Semitic and Egyptian. In fact, it is the Egyptian worldview with its idea of the scarab as the

representative for Being between the two kinds of existence that might be the source of this structure. This needs to be researched carefully. But the point is that if Being as Ultra Being is not too different from Existence then that makes it possible for the Indo-European worldview to amalgamate with other Existence based worldviews. It means that Being can pretend it is a kind of Existence and dissimulate in a context where existence is a better way of looking at things, and in order to bridge to other worldviews without Being. It means that there is not that great a difference between the Western worldview and other existential worldviews. So it means that it is perhaps harder to vilify the Western worldview and blame our troubles on Being. It has all sorts of consequences that are not palatable to someone who has developed a fairly robust understanding of the structure of the Western worldview which may be in the process of tumbling down. It reminds me of the moment when my son, pointed to a line in Sidi Ali al-Jamal's Meaning of Man which said that only fools believe that things are empty. For some time my view of the world teetered on the brink of annihilation. I gave my son no end of trouble for destroying in one off hand comment a whole lifetime of theoretical construct building. Eventually I saw that there was a way of salvaging my work, such as it is, by saying that this was the way it looked from the point of view of existence, while from the inside of Being emptiness was the key. In other words that was the first blush of the concept that Existence needs Being and Being needs Existence as the other by which to define itself. They are complementary duals. But the strange thing is that while Being within the world is threefold, with the duals and the non-dual, what is in existence is also three fold in as much as ultra being in the

guise of the One separates odd and even zero, i.e. void and emptiness. I have always eschewed the One. But there it is in the Pascal Triangle between odd and even zero. So a lot of things need to be rethought as we step into this new era of actualization. Since Ultra Being is seen as an interpretation of Existence along with Void and Emptiness then the actual change must be taking place at the next level down which is the level of actualization in my model of the social and individual hierarchies. It all seems very strange to me at the moment. But hopefully it will eventually make sense how the anomalies fit together. At this point it is unclear. What we are really after is the sense it makes in itself not the sense I project on it. I could keep my tidy world vision. But then I would not be growing in my understanding any more. Better to have the whole thing crash down than to stop learning and exploring. I've only got about thirty years invested in the old way of looking at things that keeps the difference between Being and Existence crisp and allows no contamination by Being of Existence. No telling how long it will take to work out the relation of the anomalies presented by Ultra Being. So the adventure continues.

If Ultra Being exists that expands our world and deepens it. Of course, from the world's point of view it has always existed. I am just now recognizing the error of my ways denying it. But still that expands the world for me, my world, and that is interesting. It means that there is something beyond the expansion and contraction of being-in-the-world, and beyond the mixture and separation of time and Being. Right now I am calling that being-out-of-the-world following a usage somewhat similar to that of George

Berzins². In other words, where as the other four kinds of Being are seen from inside the world Ultra Being is only seen from outside the world. It is how the world looks when you are locked out of it and it is unintelligible and opaque to you. So there is still a phase transition between Being and Existence. It is just that there is one interpretation of existence that sees it as unintelligible Being rather than emptiness or void. This brings up a different way of interpreting the work of Sankara in Avida Vedanta which makes it a progressive move by the realization that there is a monism of Ultra Being that is beyond and between emptiness and void. It is unclear that is what was meant but that is a new possibility that comes to the fore with this interpretation of Existence as Ultra Being. So this is another horizon of study that should be followed up to see if Sankara really did mean a simple monism as it appears. If it is a simple monism then it is really not non-dual, because non-dual means not one, not two, but something else. Monism is just not two, and thus is not by the definition of Loy in Nonduality, not an example of non-duality. There are as many dualisms as there are monisms in the world of philosophy and religion. Non-dual views are normally a heresy from the dialectic of dualisms and monisms. Non-duality seeks another direction which is not a dualism nor a monism but something else that can only be indicated but not named. The best examples of these heresies are Buddhism a heresy of the Hindu Tradition, Taoism a heresy of the Confucianist Tradition, and Islam a heresy of the Western Tradition. In ancient Greek philosophy this heresy was represented by the skepticism of Sextus Empiricus. That is why in the Western tradition almost every

² GeorgeBerzins12@aol.com actually he says “not-being-in-the-world” See being-and-time-dialognet@yahoogroups.com elist.

philosopher begins by beating the straw dog of skepticism. But skepticism is actually a very subtle and sophisticated philosophy that sees the dialectic between Dogmatists and Academic Philosophies as never ending, and which tries to keep inquiry going for its own sake finding rest in the fact that it is never ending. But the skeptics to keep the search for truth going will take any side necessary. This is just like skillful means in Buddhism. It is not like Aristotle depicts the tetralemma as all being said at once. Instead, one makes the statements of the tetralemma over time at the appropriate moments so that your interlocutor realizes that the discourse and everything else is ultimately empty. Skeptics who are Buddhists would not just take what ever side needed to be bolstered but would use skillful means and continually point to emptiness or void. But here is the disturbing thing, they could point toward Ultra Being as the difference between void and emptiness instead and they would still be describing Existence. This is what makes it similar to the concept of the scarab as perhaps similar to Ultra Being in Egypt which is between the two forms of Existence³. Once you allow there

³ In the minds of the Egyptians the efficacy of the amulet was based on the habits of the actual beetle. The Greek writer, Plutarch (ca. AD 40-120), described their asexual perception of the beetle:

One accepts (with the ancient Egyptians), that these varieties are only male beetles, that they put down their seed substance (semen) which forms a ball and the beetle rolls it forward with its widely spaced hind legs so that the beetle imitates the path of the sun as it went down in the west and rose in the east in the mornings.

to be a form of Being that is existence then that is the beginning of a very fundamental contamination of the world. But suddenly the structure of the Egyptian language for Existence makes a lot of sense and looks far more foundational than it would otherwise. There are two terms for existence and one for Ultra Being associated with the scarab. Suddenly we get a deep insight into the nature of the Egyptian worldview. And perhaps a similar insight into Sankara's Avida

However, in reality the male and female often work together and it is the female which, after dropping her eggs in the ground, covers them in excrement on which the larvae feed. As the soft dung ball is rolled across the ground, dust and sand attached to it so that it became hardened and was sometimes equal in size to the beetle. Without a doubt in the mind of the unknowing Egyptian this was a thought provoking and impressive achievement that imitated the daily appearance of the sun. This observation prompted the Egyptians to associate the beetle with one of the many aspects of the great sun-god, that of the rising sun, Khepri.

The magical sense of the scarab as an amulet was reinforced through a play on the name it was given. The Egyptian name for the dung-beetle was hpr, "rising from, come into being itself," close to the word hpr, with the meaning "to become, to change." The word hpr later became hpri, the divine name Khepri, given to the Creation god, who represented the young rising sun.

The name Khepri was often included as one of the five great names in the titulary of the king. Khepri was identified with the sacred beetle, Kheper, in life style and in being self-created. Khepri is often shown as a man with a beetle head or surmounted by a beetle or as a beetle. Kheper, the sacred beetle, was believed the reincarnation of Khepri, the sun-god, being reborn each morning as the young sun, newly emerged out of the earth. Khepri, with the great sun-disk before him, would be energized in the other world each morning and roll the sun disk onto the horizon at sunrise and across the sky, just as the beetle rolled its dung ball over the horizon on the earth and buried it in the sands. As the earthly symbol of an aspect of the great life-giving sun, Kheper was identified with spontaneous creation, regeneration, so closely associated with eternal existence. See <http://mcclungmuseum.utk.edu/permx/egypt/egs-text.htm>.

Vedanta. And insight is what it is all about. Not hanging on to conceptualizations just because it is convenient or non-threatening. However, I do not have to like the implications of the existence of Ultra Being. It makes the world a much more complicated place, and it was already pretty complicated with four kinds of Being. If we have to contemplate a sixth kind of Being then we are in trouble. But if there are five meta-levels of Being then the chances that there are meta-levels six and seven and n goes up quite a bit. Basically I don't see how it is possible to hold back the dam. We are going to have to keep climbing this infinitely high mountain it looks like. If there are three interpretations of existence at level five then what happens at level six? That is a big open question. But I can only handle considering the possibility of one kind of Being at a time. So that will have to be a separate effort to attempt to understand. Lets make sure that Ultra Being really does exist first, which is a big job in itself, because it turns the fundamental assumption of the intelligibility of Being upside down. However, we know that there are things like Evil in the world that are not intelligible. So that means that all those parts of the world become highlighted and we must ask if they are founded in Ultra Being.

For instance, we can think about the levels of Will. Heidegger thinks will to power is will to will. Deleuze thinks will to power is will to will to will, and that eternal return which combined with it takes us into Wild Being. But it could be that Nietzsche was really talking about Ultra Being. Every time the word Being is used we can now consider whether Ultra Being is meant rather than one of the other kinds of Being. And what happens to the aspects of Being from the point of view of Ultra Being. I would say they fuse into one thing seen

from the outside. We know that Haqq is truth and reality and that Sharia is identity and presence. But what is the fusion of Sharia and Haqqiqat? Is that the Dhat? While the Sifat are only seen when these are kept separate. You see things that were fairly straight forward when Existence and Being were clearly separable become open to reinterpretation and questioning which can lead us to some pretty profound changes in interpretation, and I am not sure where these are going to lead. So I am a little worried about the whole thing and where it is going to lead. There is something incompressible about Ultra Being. Now we have to determine whether any given incomprehensible phenomena is really emptiness and void or perhaps it is really a guise of Ultra Being. In a sense in the realm of Existence Ultra Being is deeper because it is the non-dual between the duals of non-duality, i.e. emptiness and void. On the other hand below the fifth meta-level it was always the non-dual that was deeper than the duals. This duality across the phase transition between Being and Existence makes a lot of sense. It makes the Egyptian ontology that mixes being and existence relevant as the underpinning of our own ontology. It probably also makes sense of the Shavite tattvas or *me* of the Sumerians. But it is extremely worrying because we do not know how these ideas actually fit together and whether their incomprehensibility makes sense in some ultimate way, or whether we have merely entered a region marked “monsters here”. The incomprehensibility of Ultra Being needs to be thought about very deeply. But ultimately we cannot think about it. Ultimately we have to come to terms with the poison that Shiva swallowed that turned his neck blue.

Egyptian Substrate as a Transition to a Perfect World.

There are two words for existence in Egyptian *un* and *au*⁴. But there is also the word *hpr* which is related to the dug beetle which is a cognate *hrr* and this pun eventually turned into the concept of Khepri the creation god related to the rising of the sun. The dung beetle rolls its young in a ball of dung and this was seen as the concept of the travel of the sun though the underworld. Plutarch (ca. AD 40-120) said “One accepts (with the ancient Egyptians), that these varieties are only male beetles, that they put down their seed substance (semen) which forms a ball and the beetle rolls it forward with its widely spaced hind legs so that the beetle imitates the path of the sun as it went down in the west and rose in the east in the mornings.” Note how close this is to the idea of the *bijas* in the Tathagata Gharba. The seed of the only male beetle is placed in the rolled ball which represents the sun moving though the underground, but which results in the off spring arising. This is like the karmic movement though emptiness. The denial here of the female contribution is similar to the denial of the feminine among the Greeks, for instance Apollo’s denial at the trial of Oresties. It is interesting that existence should have three forms one of which is taken as the major form that has a similar story of the embedding of the seed into the ball of existence from which it breaks out. This is related to the story of the iron ball from which the seed of the enemies of the Pandava are born. This is similar to the story of the dragons teeth from which the men of earth spring in the story of the founding of Thebes. All these disparate stories are pointing to a similar idea that there is a kind of Being, Ultra, that mediates the two forms of existence in the Egyptian Language. For the Egyptians this

⁴ Bunge, *Egyptian Language* p. 149

was symbolized by the scarab which was made into an amulet which was suppose to ward off death. In other words the fact that karmic traces were laid down in the bedrock of existence meant that there would be another arising to life after death. This black sun rolled by the lowly dung beetle was the antipode to the bright sun that moved through the heavens. It symbolized the movement of the sun through its nadir below the earth which we see on the pyramid walls and in funeral texts. It is this concept of the underworld that the Egyptians have contributed to our culture that remains submerged as the concept of the unconscious. All of life was seen by them as a preparation for the journey made after death. That life in this world is ransomed for life in the next world is a theme we see in later Christian concepts of life. The fact that most of life is unconscious and that what we are conscious of is only a small part of life is a theme that we see with the rise of psychoanalysis in the work of Freud and Jung. The fascination with Egypt is very deep in Western culture because with the deciphering of Egyptian by means of the Rosetta stone we are no longer locked out of this foundational worldview that is crucial to understanding our own worldview, just like the deciphering of the cuneiform makes us possible to reclaim our Sumerian legacy as well. Prior to these two decipherings we were locked out of these worldviews and although we could look upon their artifacts we had no idea what those artifacts meant. When the deciphering occurred we were allowed back into those worlds that underlie our own. What we discovered was alien to us but also foundational to our own worldview because these societies were so long lived and were both precursors to our own worldview. They challenged the bible in many ways which was our only legacy

from the deep past previously. The bible comes out of the Semitic interspace between Egypt and Sumeria. The Jews were said to have been slaves in both Egypt and Sumeria. The Bible is full of references to both of these cultures so the interface was defined from one side. By understanding what the worlds were like that the Bible was referring to from the inside gave us a more complete picture of the Bible within its context as it was forged between the Egyptians and Sumerians (and their followers). Suddenly the deeper roots of the Western worldview come into view and our culture becomes more robust because we know of those long lived influences on our culture. For instance we also uncovered the Hittite Civilization which may be the oldest Indo-European branch. So we start out with only the Bible/Torah as our link into the deep history of the Western worldview, but in the last two centuries much information has been added about the Indo-European roots, the Sumerian roots and the Egyptian roots of our worldview all of which the Bible speaks of, and we have enriched our understanding of the context of the Bible through these archeological finds.

But what is interesting to us here is the fact that the Egyptian worldview and its basic standing with respect to existence seems to have a model of the relation between emptiness and void to Ultra Being built into its language at a fundamental level through the difference between *un* and *au* with respect to the Khepri and the symbol of the scarab. This symbolism seems to summarize their view of the afterlife and the possibility of life after death. And this symbolism seems to give us a picture of the relation of Ultra Being to existence as both emptiness and void. There was some sense that Ultra Being made possible the life after death. And if we interpret

Egyptian culture from the point of view of it being a model of Ultra Being then that radically changes our interpretation of it and our understanding of its relation to our own culture. The submersion of Egyptian culture into oblivion can be seen as similar to the denial of Ultra Being as something to be reckoned with by the Western worldview. Ultra Being is lost to the western worldview just as it had lost the connection to the Special Systems that we seen in the organization of the *ntr* or gods of Egypt. The loss of Ultra Being as Khepri from view has had profound effects on our culture just as the loss of the Egyptian legacy did for the historical development of the Western worldview. Thus we are engaged in a kind of ontomythological archeology of Being where we are finding our connection to the possibility of Ultra Being is a very unexpected place which means we must really re-evaluate the relation between Egyptian culture and the Greek Legacy. We now slowly are seeing that the Greek Legacy is based on an earlier legacy from Sumeria and Egypt. But the Greeks privileged the Egyptian connection because of its unity and its long history. However, it is clear that in some ways the Sumeiran, Akadian, Babalonian heritage was more important than the Egyptian. But Egypt was privileged in their own accounts because of its unity and its relatively uninterrupted history. Because of this proto-legacy of the Greeks we must consider this our own legacy, just as we consider the other Indo-European nations from history part of our own legacy. It is just that recognition of this proto-legacy is slowly dawning because many of the finds are fairly recent and slow to disseminate outside their disciplines. However, here we wish to take advantage of this proto-legacy in order to understand the fifth meta-level of Being and the possibility of the

existence of Ultra Being. Since the Khepri is so central to the Egyptian way of looking at things, once we interpret it as ultra Being and as the interspace between the two kinds of existence: *un* and *au*, then we have a basis for reading the whole of Egyptian culture as telling us about the nature of Ultra Being. The Semitic culture is based purely on Existence in the form of *wajud*. The Indo-European culture is based purely on Being. But the Egyptian culture is based on this strange combination of existence and Being which is so problematic for us to understand. Perhaps some of the alien qualities of Egyptian culture flows from their immersion in Ultra Being and their dependency on it to take them across the abyss of death, i.e. through the lands of emptiness and void. Notice that when the Pharaoh moves through the underworld it is down a river, like the Nile from the Sunset to the Sunrise. That river through the underworld separates void from emptiness. In other words from this perspective the Egyptian worldview in relation to the world of death, the underworld, is very germane to our understanding of our own worldview because it is a model in some sense of the fifth meta-level of Being and the three interpretation of existence that inhabit that meta-level. Why it would be that way is hard to understand. It seems that culturally we start at a high meta-level and move toward lower and lower meta-levels during historical development only to rediscover these higher meta-levels later through the process of ontomythology. It causes us to carefully consider the relation of the Egyptian Khepri to the Me of Sumeria and to the difference between the *Wajud* and the Indo-European Being. Me is a copula but it is also represents the *tattvas* of the cultural arts which Inanna steals from Enki. The Me are all different from each other as the basis of culture. The copula is

the weakest of the representations of a standing. This fragmentation of culture into the *tattvas* of the *me* parallels the fragmentation of Mesopotamian cultural history in relation to the unity and continuity of Egypt. This difference between unity and diversity runs deep as a difference between the two proto-legacies. Existence, *wajud*, comes from the desert that is the interspace between unity and diversity, while Being comes from the outside as the nomad. The differences between these various standings are extremely interesting. The fact that Egypt does not just present us with Existence, *per se*, but the differentiation of it into its interpretations is of great interest. We can almost move east and see first the differentiation of existence at the fifth meta-level, then the decomplexification of existence into something unitary among the Semites, then the simplification into the copula but that unleashes the diversity of the *tattvas* which then become the entities that are the basis for the building up of the meta-levels of Being among the Indo-Europeans as the differences between the caste structure. Being flowers as it moves down from the fifth meta-level but through the mediation of existence and the copula which is attached to the *tattvas*. It is as if when you simplify the standing to a copula then the complexity is pushed out into the things themselves as mechanisms of civilization to *tattvas*. So now we are forced to consider the differences between these worldviews at the level of their standings. The Indo-Europeans explore the implications of the four lower meta-levels of Being as the difference between their castes, between the roots of Being, between the special systems. The Semites consider existence as something pure and singular, but the Egyptians have a more refined view that brings out the three interpretations of Existence at the fifth

meta-level that includes Ultra Being. The Sumerians shift all the complexity out of the standing of the *me* but then turn right around and use it as the basis for recognizing the *tattvas* of culture. It is almost as if the Sumerians were saying that there is something different from either existence or Being that is their standing toward the world. The same word *me* is used for both copula and *tattva*. Difference and connection in the same word. Nothing about perdurance like the Indo-European Being. Nothing about the subtle relations between different kinds of existence that we get from the Egyptians. If we think of the Egyptians as describing the fifth meta-level of Being where there is a phase shift to Existence, then it is truly between the simple structure of existence seen by the Semites and the differentiation of the caste structure by the Indo-Europeans through the lower meta-levels of Being. The Egyptians recognized the Special systems in the organization of their gods, so in that way they had a subtle way of differentiating those levels based on the organization of the *ntr*. We can see how the Egyptian view had full coverage of the fifth and the other meta-levels. Indo-Europeans developed the other meta-levels and the Semites developed a unitary model of existence. The Sumerians developed a different model where there was diversity of the *tattvas* but the word for the *tattva*, i.e. *me*, was a word for connecting things across the boundaries of diversity. So we can contrast the unitary model of existence of the Semites with the diversity of the model of existence of the Sumerians. But this is a non-hierarchical way of approaching diversity where all *tattvas* are created equal, as arts of human civilization. Slowly we begin to see how these standings all fit together in a strange way. It is that fitting together of the various standings that creates the meta-worldview

of which we are a part. Since the Egyptian worldview captures the fifth meta-level we are almost forced to admit that the meta-worldview must go up to the level of the sixth meta-level in order to encompass these differences. We are trying not to consider this level but if we were to consider it then we might call it Perfect as a standing because it is associated with a perfect number. Such a number is a whole equal to the sum of its parts. Its parts are 1, 2, and 3 which sum to 6. Notice that it is the Egyptian worldview that has three standings at its heart at the fifth meta-level. The Semitic worldview fuses existence as wajud into one standing. It is the Sumerian and the Indo-European worldviews that accept diversity in their standing, one hierarchical and the other in an egalitarian manner through the copula and the tattvas. The diversity can be seen in the dualism of twoness. The standing of the sixth meta-level must be something different from either Being or Existence. We will tentatively call it manifestation. It is the perfect standing in which the whole is exactly equal to the sum of its parts. If we posit a perfect standing of manifestation then a lot of other things make sense. In other words we understand that duality of existence which is complementarity has two ways of expressing itself, as tattvas and were the logos is reduced to a copula or at the other extreme Being which imposes a hierarchy on the things through the meta-levels. Being and Existence are mixed at the fifth meta-level. But at lower meta-levels they are differentiated as the Semitic plenum of existence or as the differences between the tattvas, or as the hierarchy of the meta-levels. There are almost these three non-mixture alternatives that are rivals to the Egyptian mixture at the fifth meta-level. The mixture and the three non-mixture alternatives form a complete set. Things are kept apart by a

hierarchy of meta-levels of Being. They are kept apart by a pure plenum of existence. Or they are organized into tattvas which are segregated by differences all at the same level, which is the human level. All these four possibilities fit together perfectly in the standing of manifestation. That is what makes the meta-worldview complete and stable in itself. There are multiple complementarities between the four sub-worldviews with different standings but the four together actually fit together perfectly into the sixth meta-level standing. This sixth meta-level standing is something that perfects even the imperfection of the poison of Ultra Being. Thus it is perfection of both perfection and imperfection.

If we accept the idea of there being a standing of manifestation beyond existence at the sixth meta-level then what we are saying is that there is a total change in standing at each meta-level. This brings up the question of whether there is a change a standing at every meta-level from this point forward? And whether there are an infinite number of changes of standing? But if manifestation does appear at the sixth meta-level then it becomes clear that this is the first perfect number and that at this standing there is something occurring similar to the Special Systems in terms of how the various standings fit together into a minimal system of standings. Hither to fore we said that all standings five and above were existence and there was just one phase transition. We can understand this if we take the position that each standing is a refinement of the previous standing. So Being is refined into existence, existence into manifestation and manifestation into more refined forms of manifestation. That would mean that there are infinite refinements of manifestation

each with their own standing but the difference between them are nondecernable to us. I am not sure that this is a good way to think about the infinite series of manifestation beyond Being and Existence but this is what comes to mind at the moment. It is an open question whether manifestation is a good way to talk about the sixth meta-level or not. The key point is in the first four kinds of Being these seem to be in pairs, and so it makes sense that Ultra Being and Manifestation would also be a pair with some mutual significance. We have already seen this in the relation between manifestation and the extrema, now this opposition has been expanded with the recognition of Ultra Being as a possibility. Once Pandora's box has been opened it is hard not to speculate on the seventh meta-level and what that might be like as there is nothing to stop the series from going on infinitely. However, let us say that the pairing of the standings as we go up each two meta-levels is something like what we saw in General Schemas Theory, so it occurs to us that perhaps there is some kind of relation between this pairing of standings and the pairing of the dimensions by sharing schemas so that we got two dimensions per schemas and two schemas per dimension. This brings us back to a question that I have looked into earlier which is to ask if there is anything like meta-dimensionality. Could the meta-levels of standings be something like meta-dimensionality. If that were the case then the schemas might be something like the interspace between the dimensional infinitude and the meta-level infinitude. In other words, could it be that the schemas stand as intermediary between the infinitude of meta-levels and the infinitude of dimensions. We have noted previously that each schema has its meta-levels that correspond to the meta-levels of Being. Thus the meta-levels of the

schemas in in some sense orthogonal to the schemas themselves. Each of those meta-levels of the schemas is an articulation of the standings at each meta-level of Being. Also we have noted that the infinite dimensions as signified by the Pascal Simplicities, but which are templated by the Pascal Triangle, are related to the Schemas in our rule two schemas per dimension and two dimensions per schema. This is not an orthogonality but instead a lacing together of the dimensions by the schemas and vice versa. If there is meta-dimensionality and that is logical, i.e. the higher logical types, then we could see the schemas as the interface between the dimensional and the meta-dimensional with a different relation to each. The schemas lace together the mathematical dimensions but they are orthogonal to the meta-dimensions which are logical rather than mathematical. This would be a very welcome result for General Systems Theory because it would mean that the schemas would be defined on either side by dimensionality and meta-dimensionality. I don't think that this has been considered before within the mathematical or the logical communities, i.e. that mathematical dimension has logical meta-levels as their meta-dimension. But this is at least worth exploring as a possibility.

Another point is that the perfect standing of manifestation would encompass the standings of existence and Being and the various standings associated with the four worldviews that have been named. We have not thought before that these four worldviews standings might interlock perfectly. If this were the case then the four together would have a non-dual standing which would be right for manifestation as the deeper non-dual beyond emptiness and void. We have vaguely suggested how these four

worldviews standings might fit together to give us a perfect standing which is a standing that is exactly equal to its parts. It would mean that the western worldview at its core were non-dual which we have already hypothesized. But that non-duality is based on the perfect standing of manifestation as the dual of Ultra Being. It would be based on the fact that the four standings of the different worldviews that make it up would all have to perfectly compensate each other despite their several flaws. How could this have happened historically. Is it through long interaction between these worldviews that they took on a compensatory relation to each other? We are contemplating a phenomena that is very hard to explain and is quite unexpected. However once we posit that the Egyptian worldview encompasses both Ultra Being and the other unintelligibles such as Void and Emptiness, and that they knew about the Special Systems and organized their gods accordingly, then we see that the Indo-Europeans developed the kinds of Being as a response which filled in the difference between the Special Systems. We also see that the Semites developed a pure fused view of Existence and that the Sumerians developed the idea of the copula with the tattvas as a more nuanced theory of the standing of existence. Then slowly we begin to see how the various standings fit together and compensate each other. We might speculate that they were merely filling the logical space of possible extreme differences from each other which was tempered by their long term interaction that made them part of the same space of standings toward creation. One standing emphasized projection and the other finding, these are the Indo-European and the Semite standings. But we discover when we unearth their worlds that the Egyptian worldview is founded on the

relation between Ultra Being and the other two interpretations of Existence as Void or Empty and that this flows from the orientation of Life toward Death. But equally we see that the Sumerian standing unlike that of the Egyptians emphasized discontinuity, variation and openness rather than continuity, uniformity, and closedness. Thus the Sumerian standing emphasized the difference between tattvas and simplified Being to just the copula, the simplest possible form signifying merely connection. So there is a complementarity between the Egyptian and Sumerian standings and there is a complementarity between the more peripheral Indo-European and Semitic standings. The Semitic standing comes from being trapped between the other two standings and the Indo-European standing comes from outside as nomads after being settlers in Anatolia to the north of Sumeria in the land of Kur.

It is now comprehensible why Islam as a heresy to the Western Worldview, and a meta-worldview itself would seize upon manifestation as its basic standing toward the creation. Islam and the West share the standing of manifestation. The West has it implicitly as that which encompasses the other standings. Islam has it explicitly as the basis of its theology. In fact if we bring Islam into the picture and we see Manifestation as the sixth meta-level then we can immediately posit that the Dhat is the seventh standing. This is because manifestation as the standing of the Sifat, or attributes of God, has an opposite traditionally as the inner coherence of those attributes which is called the Dhat. The Dhat is unique and thus would stand outside the six meta-levels below it. However, this is just speculation at this point. Every time a new standing comes into view we must ask ourselves why

should we stop there at that standing. Perhaps the next standing exists.

Another question comes to mind is whether there is meta-meta-dimensionality, and if there is something between the meta-dimensions and the meta-meta-dimensions like the schemas. In other words are there meta-schemas? It is hard to stretch our brains in that direction. But if there was something like meta-schemas then that would be a very big find because it is probable that no one has thought of that possibility before. But it is possible to think that the meta-schemas are the standings and that the pure logical meta-levels are what anchors the meta-schemas. This might explain the structure of the standings in relation to the meta-levels. We notice that the schemas only go to ten while the dimensions are infinite. The standings perhaps only go to seven even though the meta-levels are infinite. In other words even though the dimensions and meta-dimensions are infinite, the interspaces of schemas and standings are finite. We note that for Being the orthogonal levels are the types of aspects. Thus we could posit that the types actually cut across all the standings. This would explain why we need the types at right angles to the kinds of Being and the other standings and why the aspects seem to apply to Being, Existence, Manifestation, and Thatness alike.

(infinite)

Foundationⁿ 0 (finite) (0 crossings)
Metaⁿ level (infinite)

Foundation² 1 (finite) (3 crossings)
meta⁷ level (infinite)

Foundation¹ 1 (finite) (4 crossings)
meta⁶ level (infinite)

Foundation⁰ 1 (finite) (5 crossings)
meta⁵ level (infinite)

Divisions 2 (finite) (6 crossings) [sharia, haqq]
meta⁴ level (infinite)

Regons 3 (finite) (7 crossings) [xy=0, yx=xy, yx=-xy]
meta³ level (infinite)

Aspects 4 as Types (8 crossings) (finite) [presence, identity, truth, reality]
meta² level (infinite)

Standings 7 (finite) (9 crossings) [Pure, Process, Hyper, Wild, Ultra, Manifestation, Thatness]
meta¹-level logical (infinite)

Schemas 10 (finite) (10 crossings) [facet, monad, pattern, form, system, meta-system, domain, world, kosmos, pluriverse]
meta⁰ level math. dimensions (infinite)

Quadratic Interval 16 (11 crossings) (finite)
Meta⁻¹ Non dimension (infinite)

Interface 25 (12 crossings) (finite)
Meta⁻² Non dimension (infinite)

Interface n (n crossings) (finite)
Meta⁻ⁿ Non dimension (infinite)

(infinite)

If we look up the sequence 1,2,3,4,7,10 there are very few candidates that are fundamental. There is one sequence that stands out from the rest A051449⁵. The

⁵ ID Number: A051449

URL:

<http://www.research.att.com/projects/OEIS?Anum=A051449>

Sequence: 1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 16, 25, 40, 62, 101, 159, 257, 410, 663, 1062, 1719, 2764, 4472, 7209, 11664, 18828, 30465, 49221, 79641, 128746, 208315, 336872, 545071, 881638, 1426520, 2307665, 3733880, 6040746, 9774133, 15813587, 25586921, 41398418

Name: Fibred rational knots with n crossings.

Formula: $x^2/2*((-x-x^2)/(x^4+2x^3+x^2-1))+(-x-x^2)/(x^4+x^2-1)$

sequence 1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 16, 25, 40, 62, 101, n could be generated as the sequence of rational fibred knots⁶. Rational knots are those that go over, under, over, under, etc. Fibred knots are those that when turned into a Seifert Surface display fibration. Fibration is when a surface has hairs hanging off of it. Once we know that the sequence we are dealing with is the set of Fibred Rational Knots then we can fill in quite a few details in our model of the Multilith that would not be possible otherwise as we can see above.

We should expect the interfacing at every level between the infinite meta-dimensions and the finite interfaces: foundations, divisions, regions, standings and schemas, quadratic intervals seem to tend to reduce as we go up the ladder of the meta-meta-dimensions. So if we assume that there is the sequence 1, 2, 3 added to 4, 7, 10. And then we look up the sequence to find 27 candidate sequences. The most interesting of these sequences is that associated with the Fibred Rational Knots, although why that should be is a mystery. The key point here is that if we consider the meta-levels of dimensionality as a different dimension then it might make it possible to understand how the schemas and the standings both serve as interspaces

Example: $a(7)=3$ because there are 3 fibred rational knots with 7 crossings: 7_1, 7_6 and 7_7 (in Alexander-Briggs notation)

See also: Sequence in context: A018132 A033320
A013982 this_sequence A018143 A082766 A082958
Adjacent sequences: A051446 A051447 A051448
this_sequence A051450 A051451 A051452

Keywords: easy,nonn,nice

Offset: 3

Author(s): Alexander Stoimenow
(stoimeno(AT)math.toronto.edu)

Extension: More terms from James A. Sellers
(sellersj(AT)math.psu.edu)

⁶ Stoimenow, A. Generating Functions, Fibonacci Numbers and Rational Knots, arXiv.math.GT.0210174v1 11Oct2002

between this ladder of meta-dimensions. By aligning the standings and the schemas in this way we can come to understand the nature of their relation better and will have an analogue to the schemas which will help us understand them better because we see then that the schemas interface with the dimensional ladder and the meta-dimensional meta-level ladder and that the standings interfaces with the meta-level ladder and then interfaces with the meta-meta-level ladder which gives us the types. In turn the types are seen to appear in the three regions of the worldview which in turn resolve into two divisions: Sharia and Haqq which is the fundamental division between things in the Islamic heresy of the Western tradition. We can thus see how that heresy is orthogonal to the four worldviews that make up the Western Worldview⁷.

A New Model of the Tetrakys of the Multilith made visible through the Meta-Tetrakys.

What you are seeing in the last few paragraphs is a revolution in the thinking about the multilith and the tetrakys. For years I have attempted to avoid the idea of Ultra Being. Once the possibility of Ultra Being is allowed then it becomes clear that manifestation (sifat) and thatness (dhat) are also standings and that once there is a phase transition from Being to Existence then after that there are other phase transitions, and those could be infinite. However, I only know of two other candidates beyond existence which is the sifat and dhat. So how can I posit that there are only seven and no more. It is impossible to say how many phase transitions there are between standings.

⁷ Further consideration of this orthogonality can be seen in the paper "The Lodestone" by the author.

But generally it is impossible to limit the number of schemas, standings, aspects, etc because the number of dimensions, meta-dimensions, meta-meta-dimensions etc are infinite. Therefore what is needed is some way to limit this opening out of Pandora's Box. But what we note is that the schemas must be finite even if the set we are proposing is the wrong ones because we are finite beings. The number of standings must be finite for a similar reason, as finite beings we can only take a finite number of standings toward the world. With respect to aspects as well there must be a finite number ultimately because we can only handle so much because of our own finitude. We are trapped in low dimensions, but we are also trapped in low meta-dimensions, low meta-meta-dimensions etc, and it is reasonable to suspect that we can make use of less and less of the higher meta-dimensions. Now if we set our sites on 10 schemas, 7 standings, four aspects, and we see the interfaces as being finite in each case that interfaces with an infinite dimensionality, meta-dimensionality, etc then it is reasonable to think that these continue to decrease with the addition of each meta-level to dimensionality. This gives us the series 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10 and there are not many interesting sequences with these numbers in them. The most interesting of these are the rational fibred knots. So if we follow our hunch and use the sequence A051449 as a basis for our modeling of the Tetrakys of the multilith as it extends into meta-dimensionality, an amazing thing happens, we find that the meta-dimensions can only finitely go up to the seventh meta-dimension. And the crossings plus the meta-level number always add to 10. So that is what lets us know that we are in an extension of the tetrakys of the multilith into the meta-dimensional space.

We have produced a model above of the

various levels of the meta-dimensions and their interfaces in each case. The interfaces are finite. They relate to the dimensions on a one for one basis but then there is an orthogonality by which they relate to the next higher meta-dimension. This orthogonality between meta-dimensions gets expressed in the schemas. The schemas are in some sense the place where the orthogonal twist occurs. Thus there is this amazing relation between the meta-dimensions through the interfaces in that the interfaces is the nexus of orthogonal expression AND also the place where infinitude is limited to a specific finitude and that finitude is related to a certain class of knots, that is fibered rational knots. It is interesting that the finitude of the tetrakys is expressed in terms of the differences between knots of various crossing numbers. Each knot is different. Knots only occur in the third dimension. There are no higher level knots. So that means that regardless of the meta-dimensions into which we are extending there is a tie to three dimensionality being expressed here because knots only really exist in three dimensionality. Knots are one dimensional circles that pass over and under themselves within a three dimensional space. Rational knots are those that pass over and under themselves in succession. Fibered knots have to do with the relation between 3D complement of the knot and the knot itself. In a fibered knot there is a set of fibers that connects the complement 3D space of the knot to the knot itself. Knots are self interfering structures. A Seifert surface is a topological surface created from a given knot. Fibered knots are a particular type of Seifert surface such that the complement space has a smooth connection via fibers to the knot thread. (???) The key point is that the meta-dimensional tetrakys is an expression of the relation between meta-dimensions and knot crossings at each

level such that the over all number ten is conserved. That is at the highest level we are at the seventh meta-dimensional level and there are three crossings of the trefoil knot. At the next level down we are at the sixth meta-dimensional level and there are four crossings in the only four crossing knot. At the next level down we are at the fifth meta-dimensional level and there are five crossings of the knot. There are generally two five crossing knots, but only one of these are fibered. So at this level a fundamental split occurs between fibered and non-fibered knots. This split expresses itself in the next level down which has three knots generally but only two of them are fibered. Then at the next meta-dimensional level down there are four fibered knots out of seven general knots. And so we go down the meta-dimensional levels with the interface differentiating out the fibered from the unfibered knots at each level. But it is interesting that the interfaces between meta-dimensions that transform infinitude into finitude should be expressed in terms of knots that is something which is self interfering, yet rational and which has a particular type of mapping between its complement space and the line of the knot itself. That is to say in these knots there is a mapping of fibers from the third dimension to the one dimensionality. In that mapping there are an infinite amount of fibers involved. There is a mapping from a higher level dimension to a lower level dimension. The fibers are organized by a fundamental group that control the Seifert surface so that there is an infinite cyclic covering generated by a finite group in the case of fibered knots. (???) So the interfaces between the meta-dimensions seem to have two main characteristics. They are finite while the meta-dimensions are infinite. They are the place where the orthogonality plays out between the meta-dimensions.

And they have specific emergent qualities and specific limitations in terms of finitude. These finite differences within the interface are based on the finite differences between knots. But not all knots. Only a specific subclass of knots that are rational and fibered. So there is always something different from the interfaces themselves at the lower levels to act as an otherness which is still similar because we are talking about a differentiation between types of knots which is seen in the fact that the Alexander Polynomial is has a leading coefficient of ± 1 . (???) So if we think of the field of all self-interfering one dimensional circles that appear in a three dimensional space. And we remember that knots are a unique feature of three dimensional space, that is they do not occur in any other space. So they are unique to the main space to which we relate. All knots are untied if we move to four dimensional space. In four dimensional space we would have to knot surfaces instead of lines which is different topologically from the knotting of lines. So we pick out from all the knots only those that have a fibered mapping from the three dimensional space to the one dimensional lines of the circles. This is to say those knots that are involved in a transformation from a higher to a lower dimension. This is to say those knots that are relating one dimension to another. That is what the interfaces in general do they relate one meta-dimension to another. They do so in a way that expresses a twist from one dimension to another, i.e. meta-dimensions are orthogonal to each other. This is much like the Pascal Simplicies which adds dimensions as we climb the ladder of the simplicies, with each added dimension orthogonal. We would expect meta-dimensions to be orthogonal because dimensions, the base class, are extended by adding orthogonally to each dimension.

Thus the meta-dimensions must express meta-orthogonality in each case. What the knots may be expressing is the bridging across the meta-orthogonal twist or rotation as we move down the levels of meta-dimensionality. But that bridging causes a particular finitude to be expressed which is that of the differences between the knots. But this is different from all the knots. In other words there are different kinds of self interfering. But the self-interfering that we are interested in is that that bridges dimensions. The self interfering that bridges dimensions are related to the interfaces and differentiate them finitely and by that differentiation we can discover the structure of the meta-tetrakys of the multilith of interfaces between meta-dimensions which was up to now unknown. What is interesting is that there are seven standings at the meta-dimensional level and there seven levels in the meta-tetrakys. Thus it appears that the meta-dimensional tower is really an articulation of the seven standings in some way. We note that the top three meta-interfaces have one fibered rational knot each. These three “ones” show up as the trinity in Indo-European mythology, such as that were the traveler meets Odin and finds the High, Highest and Most High. The trinity of Father, Son, Holy Ghost, or other Indo-European trinities might be understood in these terms. But for our own part we understand this as the phase transitions between existence, manifestation and thatness which are all unitary. However, we note that there are three different crossing numbers associated with these three meta-dimensions ranging from three to five as we climb down the ladder of meta-dimensions. Thus they are not all equal. Along with their meta-dimensional number and the crossings each level sums to ten. But what we are seeing is an increase a showing forth of the

self-interference as we descend the hierarchy. Less information about the tetrakys is stored in the hierarchy and more is stored in its self interference as we descend. The Meta-tetrakys itself appears at the meta-dimensional levels seven through two. Then when we reach levels two and one move out of the tetrakys proper into the the expansion of that tetrakys into standings and schemas. But we can even go further and see how the expansion takes us beyond dimensionality into non-dimensionality and its layers which has its own rational fibered knot differentiation. What is interesting is at the first non-dimensional level there are sixteen differentiations of the interface with eleven crossings. These sixteen we have already related to the Quadratic interval which is associated with what Jung calls the quadrate of quadrates in his book Aion. In other words when we go beyond dimensionality into non-dimensionality we encounter archetypal structures seen in the collective unconscious. Thus we see what was before schematization. These archetypal structures precede schematization as they organize the sensation in the unconscious prior to dimensionalization. Thus this structure suddenly gives us a way to organize our way of thinking of what comes before schematization as well as putting schematization within the context of all the other finite interfaces between meta-dimensions and thus showing that it is a general phenomena not something unique and unprecedented. We suddenly have structure to study the schematization in which all philosophy has lacked up to this point. It turns out that schematization is outside the meta-tetrakys. But then so are the standings. Rather they are the extension of the meta-tetrakys. The tetrakys of the schemas appears as an image of the meta-tetrakys. Thus the

aspects which form the bottom of the tetrakys and their esotics are shown to be more fundamental than the exotics. However, the regions that organize the exotics into three regions come from the meta-tetrakys at the meta-dimensional interface level that has three fibered rational knots.

The tetrakys of the kinds of Being and the Aspects of Being is based on a more general structure called the meta-tetrakys which is composed of the interfaces between meta-dimensions that are related through meta-orthogonality. At each level orthogonality takes on a new meaning as we go up the infinite steps of the meta-dimensional ladder. However, the interfaces between meta-dimensions are in fact finite and their finitude is expressed in terms of fibered rational knots which limits our consideration to the seventh level of meta-dimensions. Levels seven thru five are the three ones, which are seen in the trinity myths of the Indo-Europeans. Levels five thru two is the meta-tetrakys itself that is organized into Foundation, Divisions, Regions and Aspects. Then at level two there are the seven standings that map into the seven finite meta-dimensional levels of the meta-tetrakys. But of these seven three are unitary which is Thatness, Manifestation and Existence. This leaves the four standings of Being which appears in combinations in the tetrakys generating the twenty four exotic configurations that mirror the twenty four esotic configurations of the aspects and which are combined in the 24 cell polytope. Below the level of standings are the dimensions themselves and their interface is the schemas. But prior to the schemas there is non-dimensionality which is broken up into the quadratic interval, and there are infinite levels of non-dimensionality as negative meta-levels of dimension below dimensionality. It is only by the discovery

of the finitude of the schemas being represented by fibered rational knots that we can begin to think about the negative meta-levels of dimensionality and their infinite and differentiated depths. The top of the meta-tetrakys is the three ones. Then the meta-tetrakys itself. Below that the standings which is isomorphic to the meta-tetrakys and where the tetrakys of the multilith of Being appears. Below that the schemas and then below that the proto-schemas between the dimensional and the non-dimensional. This is a very different picture of the multilith than we began this paper with. Suddenly a new horizon has opened out that started with a search for sequences like those we have been working with in terms of the finite number of schemas, standings, aspects etc that we have found speculatively. By finding a sequence that connects those numbers into a mathematical structure we can now reinvent our ontology and show that there is a bridge between finitude and infinitude that the fibered rational knots allow that organizes our field of interfaces between the meta-dimensions and limits our consideration of them to small numbers of elements in each case which is what we can handle within our finitude. But the organizing theory helps us extend our theory to other areas that have not been clear up to this point and rethink the relations between the various elements of our overall theory fundamentally. Thus the discovery of the relation between the finite interfaces between the meta-dimensional hierarchy is a fundamental step forward in our research program of understanding the schemas because it produces a field of interrelated structures within which the schemas can be understood rather than as a unique phenomena unrelated to any other phenomena as it has been considered throughout the philosophical tradition. Suddenly the tetrakys of the multilith has a

very interesting structure that it lacked before because it has been extended into the meta-tetrakys of interfaces at the various meta-dimensional levels.