Holophany, the Loop of Creation - Chapter 1

Throughout history, both philosophy and science focused on the defined object (the nature of this or that object or idea), which I call significance, ignoring the fact that any explicit act of definition implies the indefinite beyond. The act of definition is the fundamental paradox of existence. Can a notion, such as "absolute wholeness" exist? What would have happened if instead of "I think, therefore I exist", Descartes would have said, "I experience, therefore I exist"?

CHAPTER ONE - HOLOPHANY

1. I EXPERIENCE, THEREFORE I EXIST

The ascent of science to its current position as the premiere means by which humans define the world around them could be said to have started with the French philosopher and mathematician, Rene Descartes (1596-1650). He wanted to discover what is indubitably true, which according to him, meant knowing something with absolute certainty. He was actually questioning the nature of knowledge, and he began by questioning what can be known in the extreme sense of the word, for he recognized that he could not build a method of knowledge without defining this parameter. Such a method of knowledge could then serve as the basis of philosophy, science and other fields of human endeavor. But how could one know anything with absolute certainty? How could one identify an indubitable truth? He recognized, for example, that he could not point to some of his beliefs as true and others as false, because if he held those beliefs, then they were true for him. So the primary question then became: How can one suspend all beliefs? Descartes' answer was simple: By doubting the truth of those beliefs. Perhaps, he reasoned, our sense perceptions are only the figments of our imagination or a dream. Perhaps, the entire physical universe is a dream. If our sense perceptions can be overshadowed by doubt, if we can doubt their existence and true nature, then perhaps our very existence slides into the abyss of uncertainty. How do I know that I exist? he asked. Because I can see my reflection? Because others can see me? And so Descartes went on doubting everything. But there was one thing he could not doubt; he could not doubt that he was doubting, so he could not doubt his own existence. From this reasoning emerged his famous assertion: Cogito ergo sum (I think, therefore I exist).

Why did this sentence, or more specifically, this type of reasoning, lead to modern science? What did the conclusion, "I think, therefore I exist," change in the human conception of the world to the extent that history took a major turn? Since Descartes could only establish that he existed as a thinking being (a thinking essence - from the Latin esse, which is "being") with indubitable certainty, this was no proof or indication of his body's existence. The doubtless fact that he existed as a thinking entity said nothing about his body's nature or existence. While he knew his thinking substance with certainty, he knew nothing of his corporeal substance. From this he concluded that his mind and body were two distinct, nonidentical substances.[1] This dualism, separating the mind from the body, launched a new epoch of pragmatical science.

In spite of the fact that every philosopher with a decent level of self-esteem since Descartes has delighted in tearing his reasoning to pieces (and many of them successfully), and in spite of the fact that no lesser light than Newton invested lots of time in refuting Descartes' physics, it was Descartes' investigations of knowledge that set the framework for modern science and technology. The dualism separating body and mind, attributing mechanical and solely causal characteristics to body and matter, engendered empirical questions - such as, how does a body fall? what are the parameters of force? gravity? etc.? - instead of more philosophical questions querying the purpose and meaning of existence. The empirical line of questioning certainly led to well-formulated theories and experiments proving or refuting these theories, but why couldn't these questions be posed while spirit (as good a word as any for the non-material aspects of human being) and matter constituted an integrated whole? Now that's an interesting question. Why, indeed? Imagine that Descartes would have reached the conclusion that I experience, therefore I exist, instead of I think, therefore I exist. What's the difference between these two assertions?[2] This correlation will become clearer later in the text.

A thought is a kind of definition, a kind of ordering and classifying of experience into known idioms, whereas an experience itself is something very private that can never be forwarded or shared. Only what one "thinks" of the experience can be shared, or in other words, the interpretation of the experience. Thoughts can be shared, but experience can only be shared through the combined mediums of thought and language, via a second-hand expression (more about this in Chapter 6.) So, thoughts can be expressed and shared through language (either spoken language or mathematics or other formal expressions). However, one's experience remains in the realm of the unknown, in the realm of the spirit. The experience of bliss an individual achieves by looking at a beautiful flower is not caused by the flower, for if it were caused by the flower, then everyone seeing that flower would experience the same effect. The flower might be the trigger for a given individual's experience of bliss, yet we cannot speak of causality in its truest sense here, because this cause does not always achieve the same effect. What brought about the experience of bliss is something much more complex. Therefore, we can conclude that experience is transparent to causal laws, and yet modern science has managed its many achievements precisely by positing causal laws. This objectification of lawfulness does not permit personal experience (the spiritual aspect) to interfere with scientific results. Consequently, experiments substitute for experience, and thus, experiments - to be pronounced scientific - need to be repeatable by different people in different places and effect identical results. However, by merely performing the same ritual you do not have the same experience each time because the nature of experience, as shall be shown later on, is essentially different from the deterministic makeup of experiment.

During the last 350 years, science has allowed for the development of very advanced technologies. In the 20th century, with the advent of relativity and quantum theory we seem to have reached the twilight zone where we need to re-question the precise conceptual fundaments that brought us this far. Cosmology wrestles with questions of Creation, the latest ideas suggesting that the basic objects of existence arise as a necessity from the laws of physics, but science has no answer for how the laws of physics could emerge from nothing. So cosmology, at its present level of development, cannot describe the creation of something from nothing.

To this day, quantum theory wrestles with interpretations of its formulas. The formulas work, for they are the fundament of modern computer technology and much more. Yet in spite of some claims that these formulas mean this or that truth, somehow, when boiled down to their essentials, a shroud of indefinite mystery envelops the whole subject. For instance, non-locality is a very embarrassing phenomenon for physicists because they can't claim to understand it to any depth. Einstein referred to non-locality as a "spooky action at distance." An example of non-locality is when two particles exhibit correlated behavior when they cannot communicate with each other to match positions. How does one particle know what the other is going to do? How does it adjust itself simultaneously with the other's behavior? Another conundrum connected to non-locality that has physicists stumped, and which has given rise to many contending interpretations, is how a particle, which is actually a wave spread all over the universe (with different degrees of probabilities to be found in different places), suddenly collapses into existence in one place when measured? These puzzles gave rise to philosophical ruminations that tend to re-instate the unseen spiritual realms, which is also referred to as consciousness - although what consciousness is seems to evade in-depth definition, no matter how many dictionaries or tomes of philosophy you examine.

Because of such riddles that our present state of scientific understanding can't explain adequately, some scientists believe that we have reached the limits of the kind of science we have today. Although no scientist would suggest that the technological potential has been exhausted from our current level of understanding, we do not know how the world was created any better than the ancient Greeks or Phoenicians. We still don't know how to create something from nothing. Knowing about the Big Bang (if there was one) does not mean we can create one. Although it is true that if you know how to make pea soup then you can make pea soup, but of course, you need a pea for that purpose. If we speak of Creation using this metaphor, our pea soup is the universe, and if we know how the universe was created, then we can create a pea, or the basic stuff from which the universe is made. That's what it means that you know how the world was created. However, the embarrassing questions arising from non-locality and the previously mentioned measurement problems point in the direction of the probability of unknown and unseen lawfulness (something is missing from our recipe). Since science arrived at this twilight zone, where the unseen could gain meaning by influencing the seen, and since the unseen has been derived from the seen, perhaps it is time to re-instate and braid the unseen into the seen in order to yield the seen so we can derive the unseen from the seen, or in other words, to reinstate consciousness into the cosmic recipe. Does this seem like a loop? It is. The Loop of Creation might bring about another turn in the history of evolution by restoring consciousness into the web of reality. This hypothesis then assumes an imaginary Descartes, who

would have said, I experience, therefore I am.

What then is the theory of the Loop of Creation? I mentioned that it includes the unseen, non-physical dimensions of consciousness. How can there be a worldview that can both underlie scientific thought and also braid consciousness and the unseen into a theory that can give rise to something from nothing? How can a theory that describes the universal lawfulness be created without embedding it in causality? As I mentioned earlier, causality demands an external objective dictum - external to the observer or perceiver - which by definition denies the possibility of individual experience or unrepeatable instances. So how can there be a consistent theory of lawfulness that both demands repeatability (by definition, a law is a statement of a relation or sequence of phenomena invariable under the same conditions) and also subjective changeability? Isn't that a paradox? It is. Nevertheless, the requirement of initial conditions that incorporate consciousness and the physical dimensions dictate that such a non-causal theory, to represent lawfulness, should be rooted in a different way of thinking. A different kind of logic is required to give rise to a rational and consistent framework within which Creation of something from nothing can be palatable. Indeed, that logic is Holophany, the Loop of Creation.

1.1 Nemesis

I would like to tell you now what the Loop of Creation is, but first, you should know that it took over twelve years to conceive and integrate this material and that I have been writing and re-writing this book for the past seven years. I think the best way to explain what the Loop of Creation is could be by honestly showing you the history of its emergence. No, I do not mean its chronological history, but the psychological evolution of this new logic. It consists of arguments between my various inner viewpoints, something like dialogues between differently defined logical personalities. Since all of them are me, I will call them Clara from the left, Clara from the right, and rarely, Clara from above, etc.

Clara from the left: "Not very imaginative."

Clara from the right: "Who asked your opinion?"

Since childhood I had these commentators expressing opinions on my deeds, thoughts and emotions. It was a kind of looking on my perception, as if another me assessed my perceptions or emotional reactions to events. It made me miserable because I thought I was counterfeit. For instance, when I was eight, my aunt died, and as I shed a few tears during the funeral ceremony, I became aware of me looking at me.

Clara from the left: "If you would tilt your head a little more to the side, then your sorrow would be more conspicuous."

I grew angry.

Clara from the right: "I don't think she should be all that conspicuous in her grief. She obviously feels sorry for her dead aunt."

Clara from the left: "You are a fake. The fact that you are aware of the degree of your sorrow proves that you play at it and are not truly experiencing it. You don't feel it all the way. You cannot feel all the way."

I felt helpless while Clara from the right tried to defend me: "It's not true!"

And I really started weeping the tears of frustration.

Clara from the left: "You see? Getting frustrated proves my point. You are a fake."

Clara from the right: "No, I am not."

Clara from the left: "Yes, you are."

Clara from the right: "No, I am not."

Finally, I grew weary of their bickering and said, "Hey, both of you! Aren't you overdoing it? I am trying to concentrate on Aunt Piri's eulogy."

You see what I mean? Fortunately, I recognized this multi-viewpoint crowd to be an ability to simultaneously take different viewpoints, each with its own inner logical structure. Arguments between these different structural organizations helped in augmenting the logical structure, which became the Loop of Creation.

1.2 To think or not to think?

That Descartes' conclusion lead to the pragmatic development of science is due to the fact that his cogito ergo sum elucidates Western thought. The objective of pragmatic science has been to investigate Nature in order to establish existing relations and sequences of phenomena as laws. These then become tools to predict future phenomena and also serve to change or create phenomena. For example, if the phase change of water to vapor means that vapor has a wider volume than water, then this phenomenon can be utilized to make a steam engine. The steam engine will work with water and heat, and without incantations or prayer or voodoo. We don't need spiritual or unseen, and hence, unpredictable forces such as the favor granted by gods by virtue of sacrifices in order for the steam engine to work. It is enough to know some laws of mechanics.

This aspiration to discover how objective Nature works, this single note to represent a very complex composition, has been present in Western history since ancient Greece, and hence Descartes' cogito ergo sum resonates. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to mention that rational thinking has gone hand-in-hand with superstition and mystical tendencies throughout history. Pythagoras' law is as valid today as it ever was, but his mystical lifestyle or philosophy are hardly known. And even after Descartes, Isaac Newton (1642-1727), considered the father of classical physics, reverted to alchemy after all his achievements in mechanics, calculus and optics. Rational? Hardly. This mystical, irrational element in the equation reverberates with the experience of unseen lawfulness, which became apparent in our age when Werner Heisenberg (1901-1976) discovered that our approach cannot establish how Nature is by measuring it, but rather, we must concede that the measurement itself interferes with what is being measured, with how Nature is. If the subatomic levels of Nature do not exist in any specifically defined way, if our interaction with them might influence them, then we have to revise our view of the objective status of Nature. That means, Nature or reality is not objectively external to our perception if our perception of it can change it.

Clara from the left: "Do you mean to say that if you look at a flower, then you change the flower? That reminds me of the guy who would use his glasses only for special occasions because he was afraid if he used them a lot they would get worn down."

Clara from the right: "Not exactly. She spoke of the subatomic realm where the classical laws of causality do not apply, where the measurement made from the macro universe influences and, yes, forms the nature of the micro, subatomic world."

Clara from the left: "But the macro consists of the micro! So if the elements of something responds to a certain lawfulness, then it is only logical that the something that consists of these elements would respond to the same lawfulness. No?"

Clara from the right: "Well, yes and no. Actually, NO. The classical laws of the macro world definitely do not describe the subatomic realm, whereas the subatomic laws cancel out and you get an average when you deal with big amounts of atoms that describe the macro world. So actually this average is the set of classical laws."

Clara from the left: "Smartass! What you are really stating is, that you influence the observed by observing it, but you cannot really see it because you live in the macro world and there it does not work. That sounds like an eloquently worded bunch of mystical bric-a-brac with scientific credentials."

Clara from the right: "Thank you, I suppose that's a compliment. Anyway, on the quantum level, measurements have been done that vindicate the theory, which means, the measurement influences the outcome, and on that level, Nature does not have a definite form, but is formed by the actual interference of the measurement. On that level, these phenomena can be seen, and consequently, this is a phenomenological fact. Before quantum theory, phenomenology dealt with bigger chunks of the seen governed by classical laws. The exciting element here is precisely the occurrence of the lawfulness from the unseen realm within the phenomenologically measurable."

We could say that the quantum world is the phenomenological link between the unseen and the seen, between the qualitative and quantitative dimensions where both worlds gain expression. The phenomenological laws can be deduced by observation and experiments, but the qualitative laws, the laws prevailing in the unseen realms, cannot be deduced from the seen. You cannot know what generates what, which processes and lawfulness lead up to the formation of matter when these processes are unseen. You can see the bottomline, that there is something, that there are particles, but from these you cannot deduce the complex processes taking place in the unseen realms of quality that created the particles when you cannot even see traces of those complex processes. Because these processes take place in the unseen non-phenomenological world, you cannot have a clue of what's going on in the unseen using the tenets and practices of present-day science. All you can observe is the observable, and all you can know from observation is that there is something beyond what you can see - the unseen world - although you don't know how and what that is. However, we will attempt to unfold some of what this unseen world could be.

Clara from the left: "So far the claim that there is an unseen world with its laws and processes is an empty claim. You proved that much by saying that you don't know what's in the unseen world because you don't see it. So how do you know that there is an unseen world? Just because some phenomena point in the direction of some unknown lawfulness? That does not necessarily mean that these laws crop up in some hypothetical unseen realm. It does mean, however, that you deduce that there is an unseen world out of your own beliefs: if I don't see and don't know, it means there is something. As if not seeing and not knowing would lead to the logical conclusion that there is something of which you are ignorant. Two negative propositions do not lead to a positive one. Moreover, you don't even say it cannot be known. If you did, of course, you would be talking theology. No, you only think you are being rational when you say you can know the lawfulness within this supposedly unseen realm. I can't wait to tear apart whatever you're going to propose."

Clara from the right: "Aren't you getting a little too personal? We are talking here about the essence of existence, not trying to get at each other's throats."

Clara from the left: "Speak for yourself. All the fun is jumping down your throat and showing what a pompous asshole you are. Who do you think you are? Smarter people than you failed in their attempts to outguess God; so do you think you are going to succeed?"

Clara from above: "The assumption that there is only what one can see, touch or otherwise assess with phenomenological tools (measurement of some kind) is not some brand of universal truth, but only a presumption. Phenomenological tools proved functional as far as they helped build theories that could be applied to further deeper understanding of the physical world, and thereby, attain technological advances. That there is an unseen world with different laws than the observable physical realm is also an assumption, just like the previous one. The question, whether one assumption or the other is the real God-given truth, is irrelevant. If the existence of such an unseen world with its laws can be proven to be tools to further even deeper understanding, which can in turn provide further tools and technologies, then this unseen world is legitimate, justified by its results."

Clara from the left (murmuring to herself): "Great, now we have one more voice of God." Then aloud: "And pray, how was

the pragmatical assumption that worked well in the past, and which brought and continues to bring about all this wonderful technology, acquired? If it is only an assumption, as you say, then how come it works? Perhaps it is the truth and that's why it works."

Clara from above: "That one theory works does not exclude the possibility that other theories could work as well. That something works is no indication of either the truth or a lie. Sometimes lies work too. Although recent worldviews are based more on assumptions ('let's say that so and so are initial conditions', etc.), earlier in human history assumptions were indeed equivalent with self-evident truths, which could not and should not be proven, because, again, they were self-evident. In a word, these assumptions carried the weight of axioms, and axioms carry authority - whatever the authoritative truth might be and whether it worked or not."

How can authoritative truth rule science? How can authoritative truth gainsay facts? If I am an authority and claim that it is raining and that it's night on a sunny day, then I lose my authority. Nevertheless, the earth was flat for a long time because of authoritative claims. Perhaps the best way to illustrate how this could have happened is through a true story.

An Israeli flight inspector was asked to replace an African friend while the latter went on a two-week vacation. The airport he was supposed to take care of was a tiny runway with one daily incoming flight, and except when the plane was landing, the landing area was utilized as a playground for children. The Israeli was told that when the airplane was supposed to land, he had to ring a bell and the kids would go home. Also, one of the kids had a pet lion, tame as a pussycat. Everyone could caress him, ride him or play with him. The Israeli was a bit wary with the lion, but soon he learned that the lion was as amiable as a dog.

Everything went well until the last day of his duties. The plane was arriving, he rang the bell, and the children cleared the runway - but they forgot the lion. The lion was lying in the middle of the runway, peacefully enjoying his siesta in the African heat. The Israeli whistled to the lion, but it only responded with a lick on its paw. The Israeli began to grow agitated:

"The bloody kid promised to take his lion home when the runway has to be cleared. Why does this happen to me, and on my last day?"

The plane was approaching. He could already see it. He ran onto the runway and started nudging the lion. The lion merely turned onto his other side, otherwise ignoring the Israeli. In the end, when he could hear the landing craft, he lifted the lion's rump, and sweating, he ushered it into the bushes with occasional blows on its buttocks. The plane landed without mishap.

Later that afternoon, the Israeli approached the lion's owner: "You promised you would keep him away from the runway. Why did you leave him there today?"

"I didn't," replied the kid.

"What do you mean?" asked the Israeli flight inspector with horror.

"Honestly, the lion was tied up with me all day and we were home when the plane landed."

"My God," realized the Israeli with goosebumps, "I smacked the rump of a wild lion."

You see? That's authority. He knew the lion was tame and harmless, so he wasn't even brave, merely operating under the assumption of the axiom: the lion is tame. Furthermore, he had such authority that the lion accepted his instructions, and although it could have been lethal for the flight inspector, the lion acted as if it were tame and harmless.

Clara from the left: "So you say, the earth remained flat and science consisted of alchemy throughout the middle ages because of this kind of authority, because of such faith in one's sense of the truth that everyone was bound to accept it?"

Clara from the right: "People often become blind; they cannot see things that are not in line with what they accept as the authoritative view. Such people don't want to be confused with facts, preferring to stick to their beliefs. In the country where I was born, the party members were so authoritative, so powerful that they could command not only the heavenly bodies but also the dead. I saw it happen when I was seven years of age, when my daddy took me to a public concert in the park."

Clara from the left: "Yes, I remember. They played Beethoven's Fifth."

Clara from the right: "After the concert, an omnipotent party member gave a speech, thanking the orchestra and ‘Comrade Beethoven' for the good music, suggesting that next time ‘Comrade Beethoven' should use more folklore in his compositions."

Clara from the left: "And the audience never questioned that the party member could indeed get Beethoven to do precisely that. Well, now I would like to tell a story:

"A guy was locked up in the loony bin because he believed he was a worm. The shrinks worked on him for three years, until he was ready to join the ranks of the sane. He no longer believed he was a worm. ‘Are you a worm?' asked the shrink. ‘No, I am not,' answered the man. ‘Are you sure?' asked the shrink. ‘Positive. I have been cured. I know I am not a worm.' answered the man. ‘Good bye then,' said the shrink and the staff.

"He said good bye nicely to everyone and left the loony bin, but he returned two minutes later pale as death. ‘What happened?' asked a surprised nurse. ‘There is a chi... chi... chicken out there!' stuttered the man. ‘So what? You know that you are not a worm,' said the nurse. ‘Yes, I know. But does the chicken know?'

"You see, authority or not, the other has to accept a supposition as authoritative, or authority does not work."

Clara from above: "That's what happened when the earth stopped being flat."

2. CAN GOD KNOW ITSELF?

I am the greatest

Mohammed Ali

Now that we have touched upon authoritative truth, let's return to axioms, the self-evident truths. Axioms were the solutions to linear questions that would have been infinite, and consequently, would have remained unanswered and useless. For instance: How did Creation start? What was there "before" time? How did the universe start? If God created the world, then who created God? And who created the one who created God? If the world started with the Big Bang, then what went Bang? What set off the first quantum fluctuation? If the world came about as a necessity dictated by the laws of physics, then what created the laws of physics? What was there before that? There must always be something before something, but if something did indeed come out of nothing, then what triggered that event? How was that trigger created? And so on and on ad infinitum. Seeing God as being his own cause was one solution, which is an axiom that doesn't have to be demonstrable because of its beyond questionable truth-value, and that strategy proved to be a workable tool for a long time.

So, instead of asking endless questions that would have led nowhere, the pragmatic approach was to say, "Fine. Instead of starting from the beginning, let's start from an insight, which is absolute truth." Think of the axiom that only one line can be drawn parallel to a given line through a point not on the given line. Who could question the truth value of such an assertion? It is obvious - its opposite unthinkable.[3] Theorems and laws were based on axioms. Axioms were indubitable truths - Nature unveiled. Later in history, axioms were utilized more like propositions, which could either be true or false. If true, they served the same role as axioms did earlier. From a pragmatic perspective, axioms and propositions generated mathematical tools and laws of physics when combined with observation (fact or truth, or whatever people believed they observed). Since axioms are assessments of truth, it is obvious that they cannot be absolute truth.

Clara from the left: "Now you lost me. Are you saying that if something is true then it is not true? Are you saying that axioms, self-evident truths, are paradoxes? Aren't you overstepping your own limits?"

Clara from the right: "Precisely."

Although an axiom claims to be a first principle, a basic building block, we can ask where the axiom came from? The answer could be an observation, a belief, a supposition or something similar. By definition, an axiom is not a result of deduction. Put simply, an axiom is neither a result nor the end of a process, but its beginning. So an axiom is an intuitive subjective description of something supposedly objective. It is a start of something from a pragmatic point of view, but not from the viewpoint of an absolute beginning because there can be no absolute beginning, for it could be asked about any possible beginning, "What was there before that?"

Although not an absolute beginning, could an axiom be an absolute truth? Could there be such a creature as an absolute truth? Could anyone state an absolute truth?

Clara from the left: "Yes, of course, why not? Many did."

Clara from above: "It was a rhetorical question."

Perhaps such an absolute assertion can be stated as a slogan, but it cannot be demonstrated logically. One instance is enough to disprove a theory that has a thousand proofs. One possibility that our absolute truth might prove shaky is enough to refute its absolute status, whereas an infinite number of "proofs" cannot determine that the absolute truth in question could not have additional angles that might neutralize it. For example, it can never be proven with absolute certainty that a theory is true in spite of the fact that it might work. When it works, it works within the scope of its parameters. That is, as far as its parameters permit it to work. To be universally true in an absolute sense, a theory would have to take into consideration all past, present, future, possible, impossible, thinkable and unthinkable parameters, or in few words, all the parameters in the universe. Who could do that? Who or what could state an absolute truth?

Clara from the left: "God?"

Clara from the right: "Besides the problematic logical assumptions of people claiming to know what God thinks or says, hypothetically, could God state an absolute truth?"

Clara from the left: "Of course he could. He can do anything he wants. If there would be something he couldn't do, then he would not be God. So if God is God, then he can state an absolute truth."

But here is the problem with such statements: the reasoning that led up to this conclusion is correct. To be universally true in an absolute sense, the absolute truth must come from the totality of being, absolute wholeness, something that could take into consideration all the parameters of the universe (actual and potential). That's why God comes to mind as the eligible candidate. The problem is that such an entity first needs to establish that it is wholeness, and in order for wholeness to be wholeness, it needs to be defined as such - which means that there is nothing beyond it and indeed that there cannot be anything beyond it. The latter part of the assertion, that there cannot be anything beyond it, is the real problem. Hypothetically, God could say that there is nothing beyond him, but he could not demonstrate that there couldn't be anything beyond him.

Clara from the left: "You are full of it. Do you think you can prove what even God cannot prove?"

Clara from above: "Bravo! Now you understood it."

God, the totality, total wholeness cannot demonstrate that there cannot be anything extraneous to him. Only if he could do so, and then only from this absolute state of wholeness, could he state with certainty an absolute truth.

Clara from the left: "I still don't get it. Why can't totality, in this instance, God, state from the position of being the totality that it is indeed totality and that all existence, even all potential existence, is within it rather than outside it? Why couldn't God say that all there was, is, will be or could be is within him?"

Clara from the right: "Because if wholeness defines itself as such, then by the act of definition it limits its existence to occupy the space within the borders of the definition. A definition is a limiting process - de-finire in Latin means to limit, to make finite. The word ‘whole' means something to us. If we look it up in the dictionary, it has a definition, but the concept ‘wholeness' is itself a paradox because, on the one hand, it states that it is all there is, and on the other hand, being defined indicates that there is something beyond it, not included in its definition."

Clara from the left: "And what's that? What's beyond wholeness?"

Clara from the right: "The definition of any term or concept is meaningful only if it bounds the defined term by excluding all other concepts that the defined term is not. In other words, the act of defining is explicitly inclusive and implicitly exclusive. If wholeness is wholeness, then it is not a dragon or a broom. Which means, to define wholeness, the concept needs to be limited to being solely itself as distinct from everything else. Yet wholeness means precisely that it is everything else too. So the act of defining wholeness excludes what the meaning of the definition includes - that's the paradox. Defining wholeness would be something like saying, ‘I include what's beyond me.'"

Clara from the left: "Well, you certainly don't include what's beyond you in defining yourself, but if wholeness defines itself as including what is beyond it, then there is no problem. Wholeness has successfully defined itself, and then it can state an absolute truth."

Clara from the right: "Nope. Such a definition is meaningless. Wholeness can only have meaning if there is something beyond it, which gives it meaning as a contrast and which is not wholeness. Could light have meaning without darkness? Could the concept ‘mother' have meaning without a child? Could a definition have meaning without all that it is not?"

Clara from the left: "I see, you are finding subterfuge in theology leading up to a dualistic view claiming that, if there is God, then necessarily there must be a Satan or something to give it meaning."

Clara from the right: "Nothing is further from my intentions, and you are getting on my nerves. Could you please shut up so I can finish a line of thought?"

Any definition is only meaningful if, even surreptitiously, it implies what it is not. A border would be meaningless without an implication of what there is or could be beyond the enclosure so defined. Whereas darkness enhances light by contrast, and thereby giving light meaning, the definition of mother includes the hint of her relation to a child.

Clara from the left: "If light gets its meaning from what it is not, then saying that light gains meaning from a chair would also be true. Total balderdash."

Clara from the right: "You are right. The concept of light gains meaning from the concept of a chair too, in a very far-out and detached sense. However, a chair is much more amorphous in the gestalt background that gives meaning to light than, for instance, darkness. If you regard the space excluded by the definition as the gestalt background of the concept of light consisting of layers upon layers upon layers of more and more indefinite elements, then the concept of a chair is a long way down the road, quite non-definite in this gestalt background."

Clara from the left: "I'll tear that conjecture apart later on. In the meantime, what does that have to do with absolute truth?"

Since only total wholeness, only the totality of being could assess all the infinite parameters that could establish an absolute truth with certainty, to be that total wholeness, it needs to define itself as such, excluding anything beyond it. Yet the act of definition includes the hint of the term's own contrast. By saying there cannot be anything beyond it, wholeness defines what there could not be, and by that act gives meaning to the possibility of something extraneous to itself. This act means that the term is no longer that total wholeness that could assess the entire infinity of parameters necessary to state an absolute truth with certainty. So, if wholeness is really wholeness, defined as such, then it is not wholeness.

Clara from the left: "This whole argumentation seems weak to me. Why should wholeness endeavor to define itself in the first place?"

Clara from the right: "I didn't say wholeness must endeavor to define itself. I only said that, if there was such a creature as absolute truth, then it could only be stated by something that can take into consideration all possible parameters, a something that must be wholeness. If wholeness - or anything else for that matter - is not defined, then it is indefinite. And to preempt another of your stupid questions, which is I assume, ‘Why couldn't the indefinite state an absolute truth?' The answer is, ‘indefinite' does not qualify as wholeness - it could be anything."

Clara from the left: "Let's say wholeness does not define itself, but rather, I define the concept of wholeness as such. Then from my point of view, it is wholeness, all there is or could be, and then that wholeness could state an absolute truth from my point of view. Look, I am nice and I am going along with you. I understand that wholeness has to be defined to state an absolute truth, but you still did not demonstrate why it has to define itself, why I cannot define it."

Clara from the right: "To define wholeness you would need to take into consideration all the possible parameters, which you cannot do from your point of view. You would need to be wholeness to do so, and even wholeness cannot do the job. And you, you cannot even define yourself, let alone wholeness."

Clara from the left: "Now that's new. You better explain that claim."

Clara from the right: "A definition describes what something is. It is the structure of what it describes. If I define an object, then I create that object in my perception by stating its structure. This structure then is what the object is for me. If I define something, then I am the subject and what I define is the object. That's quite obvious that I would be the subject if I engaged upon defining a chair, for instance, which then would be the object. Here subject and object are obviously different; the definition of the chair within my perception is the chair's entire structure, whereas that same definition is only part of me, part of my structure. I can also perceive my thoughts, the dog chewing up my Persian carpet and a whole lot more complex interactions. All these characterize my entire structure. In that sense, I am wider than the chair."

In a self-referential system, however, subject and object are supposed to be one and the same. By uttering the pronoun "I," I define myself. I refer to something identical with me, which is self-reference by definition. In that sense, "I" is the claim of identity with the totality of my being (my perception of the totality of my being). The problem is that, although self-reference means that subject and object must be identical, they cannot be identical when I define myself. Why? If I define myself, then the definition of what I define is its entire structure, whereas it is only part of the defining entity's structure. So subject and object are not equal, and the defined self will always seem less than the defining self seen from the point of view of the subject.

Clara from the left: "What about the point of view of the defined self? Will it see itself less than the defining self?"

Clara from the right: "No. From the point of view of the defined self, it is all that the defining self is and then something more. Being the outcome of self-reference, on the one hand, it is identical with the subject that defined it, which means, it has the ability to define an infinity of perceptions, and in addition, it also contains its newly defined structure. So it is wider than the defining self."

Clara from the left: "How can two items both be bigger than the other?"

Clara from the right: "That's the paradox."

Wholeness can only be a self-referential system, for if there was something extraneous to wholeness, then it would not be wholeness. On the other hand, if wholeness was the only existence, then it could relate solely to itself. Yet to be a self-referential system, wholeness needs to define itself as such, where the defined self reflects all of existence without the possibility of anything external to it. The moment All-That-Is, the totality of existence, would say "I" it would define a projection, which would be less than it is from its point of view. Trying to achieve identity (a true definition of itself wherein the defining and defined selves are identical), it would endlessly attempt to redefine itself, and by that it would create infinitely more and more reflections of itself. We could say then that whatever defines, creates. Wholeness defining itself is an infinite activity because it cannot define itself, so it "tries" to do so infinitely.

Clara from the left: "Gosh, all this rambling just to make a point that absolute truth can only be stated from the point of view of absolute wholeness, which has to define itself as such to state an absolute truth, but it cannot do so? You are really confusing me. As you mentioned, if wholeness can only be wholeness if it is not wholeness, then this is a paradox. Then what's the use of all this scholarly discussion?"

2.1 Thinking the unthinkable

Clara from within: "Are you sure you want to get into the topic of paradoxes? These logical enigmas could drive even a computer raving mad. You should dread paradoxes and avoid them like stepping on a banana peal. If you step on them, you might slip."

Clara from the left: "Give her some credit, but don't worry, I'll make sure she slips - and I'll have fun proving it."

Now that we have absolute truth out of the way, we face the rough highway to paradoxes. However, no matter which way we look, if we probe deeply enough into the intricate web of Creation, we are bound to meet these enticing creatures. In general, it must suffice to define a paradox as a dynamic that sends your head spinning between two points. If so and so, then not so and so; and if not so and so, then so and so. As we have seen, for example: if wholeness is wholeness, then it is not wholeness, and yet if it is not wholeness, then it is wholeness.

Clara from the left: "Why do you say a paradox consists of a dynamic? Everybody knows that by definition a paradox is stuckness."

Clara from the right: "The dynamic of a paradox is the running one does between the ‘if' and ‘then' points. Neither the ‘if' nor the ‘then' are final conclusions, but both urge you on to the next ‘if-then' and so on, to infinity. You could continue with this motion indefinitely, so paradoxes could be characterized by their dynamics."

Clara from the left: "Only, this dynamics, as you call it, is rather static because you are running indefinitely between the same two points, at least a set of only two points seems pretty static to me."

Here is the crux of the matter. Indeed, we can speak of two kinds of paradoxes: those that create a framework for motion between two fixed points and those that are really dynamic, each point generating a new destination in turn. An in-depth review of paradoxes can be found in Chapter 7, so here I will only relate to the latter version, paradoxes that can initiate creative processes. Let's return to wholeness, which is no longer wholeness when defined as wholeness.

We said that, when wholeness defines itself as such, the act of definition creates something beyond itself, which makes it no longer wholeness. But since it created something beyond itself, this beyond belongs to it, so now it can define itself as wholeness with nothing beyond it. But alas, as soon as it defines itself thus, the definition creates something beyond this new "self" and etc. The process of continuously redefining itself with each instance defines a different but similar entity - similar because it repeats its act of self-definition and different because each wholeness includes more parameters of the beyond than the previous definition of wholeness. With each new definition, wholeness creates more and more parameters by which it can define itself. Further, these parameters also have to be defined, and their definitions have to be defined - another infinite recursion. Each additional parameter of the beyond comes from a previous definition that defined wholeness, albeit stating "there is no beyond" (the meaning of wholeness being, ‘all-inclusive'), but the act of definition infers the necessity of the beyond (which the meaning of the definition denies). Due to these extra parameters, the wholeness that first defined itself as such and the wholeness that defined itself as such afterwards are similar but not identical.

Clara from the left: "I have no problem with that. If self-reference is not a time-related concept, then in an a-temporal framework there could be an infinite chain of defining processes, which at the limit approaching infinity would really define infinite wholeness, and consequently, this infinite process of defining would be included in the definition of wholeness.[4] Got you!"

Indeed, when we discuss the self-reference of wholeness, we should relate to it in an a-temporal framework. And then, if there was such an infinite process of definitions, when these definitions reached the limit at infinity, then that would indeed be wholeness because there would be no definition whatsoever. In the case of wholeness defining itself, we would only find the indefinite at the limit approaching infinity, so nothing would have been accomplished.

Clara from the left: "You say that if wholeness defines itself as such then it no longer is wholeness. Fine. Then it is no longer wholeness, period. So what? I don't see the dynamic here. Not being wholeness does not necessitate a re-definition of wholeness, so there is no motion between the two points, which are wholeness and not wholeness. Wholeness successfully established that it is ‘not wholeness.' That's a paradox but it is not dynamic."

Wholeness and not-wholeness certainly seem to be the two opposing sides of a paradox, but a deeper look reveals something utterly fascinating. We have established that when wholeness defines itself then it is not wholeness. Before it set out to define itself, it was indefinite, whereas when it defined itself, it could not succeed to define itself as wholeness, so in fact it stayed indefinite and nothing happened except the fact that it created a process of definition, which nevertheless, left the defining entity indefinite. From our point of view, the process of definition is something discrete. In fact, when we analyze this process, we discover a repetitive pattern characterized by discrete re-definitions constituting this one process wherein the indefinite attempts to define itself. However, from the point of view of wholeness, it continues to stay indefinite in a continuous fashion in spite of attempting to be defined. From that point of view, the act of definition is one continuous act creating infinitely while wholeness stays indefinite. And that's the dynamic: the infinite repetitive process of definition, which is one continuous action.

We have reached a very important point here. All our attempts at defining Nature, seeing how things really are, investigating the truth about objective reality, are measurements. Whenever we attempt to establish any fact or behavior, we are doing a measurement. Any measurement is discrete, whereas what we measure is continuous. In other words, our tools to think with (be it mathematics or spoken language), define in discrete terms, whereas what we measure, whether subatomic particles (waves) or the complexity of a human's behavior, is continuous, so it can never be precisely defined. Not because our tools are too primitive, but because the more precise the measurement will be, the closer it will approximate the indefinite continuous substratum of existence.

Clara from the left: "Hold your horses! Indefinite substratum of existence? Discrete measurement of the continuous reality? Big words. What are you really trying to say? That the tools that arise from the indefinite continuous oneness are discrete? If nothing can be defined with precision, if the creative indefinite substratum can never be totally and precisely defined since this creative substratum is continuous, then how come your tools are discrete? Where do they come from?"

If I could explain that in one simple sentence, then I wouldn't need to write a whole book. Anyway, how there can be something definite in spite of the unsuccessful trials of the indefinite to define itself is dealt with in Chapters 3 and 4, and in general, that is the topic of this whole book. Right now I would rather talk about how we try to assess Nature.

We want to know how the world is, how Nature is, the true nature of Nature. Yet in light of the above discussion, obviously Nature is continuous and remains indefinite in spite of my endeavors to define it. The only tools at my disposal are discrete, and these cannot truthfully reflect the indefinite character of the world external to my perception.

Clara from the left: "You are not stating anything new here. Quantum theory has it that the measurement interacts with and hence influences what is measured."

Clara from the right: "Why do you always have to put something new into the framework of something already known? You hear the first two words of a sentence, which apparently triggers an association for you, and you jump up to interrupt what someone is trying to say. You do not listen to what anyone else is saying, only to what you think. If you already know it all, then you cannot learn. Or do you just want to show off how smart you are? Try to listen for once, to really listen."

Clara from the left: "Oops, look who is getting personal!"

Briefly, we are trying to understand the world and ourselves by measuring, by trying to define things. We measure by defining physical relations (ratio). We reason by defining abstract relations (ratio). Both rationality and defined proportions arise from the same process. This process is discrete. However, what we try to measure are complex structures (such as subatomic particles, the birth of the universe, human nature, etc.) consisting of the very processes that define the definitions with which we try to measure. This view is a loop that a priori denies the possibility of true differentiation between the measurer and the measured - or the observer and the observed, which is a much deeper absurdity than the measurer interfering with the measured. Here the measurer and the measured, the observer and the observed, are inseparably inter-creating each other. And that's not all.

This implies that the nature of the measured depends on the measurer, whereas the measurer's perception or measuring ability depends on the measured. It implies that there is no possibility for the measured to have an independent existence apart from or extraneous to the measurer's perception.

Clara from the left: "I have shut up for a long time, but now you've really overdone it. You are daring to claim that if there is no one to look, then a tree falling not only does not make a sound, but there is no tree? Preposterous. If you don't see the table in the middle of the room, then you cannot knock your knees?"

Of course there exist independent objects extraneous to your body, but not to your perception. My claim is not that we can or cannot know somehow how things really are. What I am claiming is that there is no such thing as how things really are! These are but our beliefs. Things are as we form them to be, as we perceive them, which can change. For instance, we become convinced about something, but then we can change our minds, and yet the new view is still as we see it in our minds - the new truth. Nobody can state anything beyond his own point of view. The only point of view we can have is the point of view from which we perceive/conceive the world. Even if we imagine what someone else would do or say, we still perceive that from our point of view. We cannot know the real nature of Nature - not because we are too underdeveloped, and not because we interact with it when we want to learn about it, but because it has no real nature. It is in no specific way because it is indefinite. When I interact with this indefinite flux, I discretize it, shape and form and define it into what I perceive it to be. That says nothing about what it really is, only something about how I perceive it.

Clara from the left: "If there is nothing external to you, at least nothing definite, then everything, the whole universe, all of existence is you (yea, that figures - all the self-proclaimed Napoleons, Einsteins, Messiahs and gods are children compared to you). Anyway, your sublime divinity, in your infinite realm of wisdom, how do you differentiate between you and someone else more mortal? That is, if everything is in your inner world, then how do you know the difference between you and the other in this inner world of yours?"

Interesting question. If everything is within my perception and nothing can define anything objectively, then how can there be different entities within my perception? If my neighbor is an indefinite process, and my cat is an indefinite process, and they both only gain definition to be a neighbor and a cat from my point of view because I give them that definition within my world of perception, then how do I do that? I can only do so because the neighbor and the cat each gained their definitions through different processes. Each one of us is a kind of system sustaining its structural integrity (selfhood) by continuously changing, interacting with ourselves through perception, which includes our interaction with others. That means that our perception of others is also self-interaction because the other gains meaning as such within my perception, from my point of view. Likewise, the neighbor established his structural integrity (selfhood) through his interactions, and so did my cat. Only how and with what they interact is different. Their interactions with others and themselves within themselves define their structure (identity) at any given moment. When I perceive them, I perceive that they defined a selfhood for themselves - a dynamic structure - which I can differentiate from my structure (my interactions and relations), so they become the other in me. That is, I can perceive that they interact differently than I do, for they consist of different relations than I do, so then I can see that they are the other in me.

Clara from the left: "And what about a chair? Does a chair define itself through its perception?"

Clara from the right: "Not through perception, but it does gain structural integrity (what I define from my perception as a chair) through its interaction with the rest of existence. In that sense, it also is the other in me, or rather within my perception."

Through being able to relate to ourselves and to the environment, through perceiving, we give meaning to both ourselves and everything else. And we interact through that meaning.

3. THE MAPPING

Ontology relates to how things are as independent existences in themselves. Usually, statements referring to what and how the universe is, what Creation is, what and how consciousness really is, are meant as ontological statements. Also physical laws, such as Newton's first law of motion, which states that if a body is at rest or moving at a constant speed in a straight line it will remain at rest or keep moving in a straight line at constant speed unless it is acted upon by a force, relate to the ontological nature of reality. However, the fact that Nature seems a given way from all viewpoints, or in other words, that there is agreement between the perceptions of different beings, does not lead to the logical inference that Nature is really this or that way, only that we perceive it that way and that there is agreement between our perceptions. Nevertheless, I would argue that statements about the real nature of things can only be stated as workable tools, not as ontological statements with a truth-value. When I use such statements, for example when I speak of the seven dimensions of Creation hereafter, I propose these statements as a mapping of reality, as tools to think with rather than as truths. My propositions, which I intend to develop further in the following chapters, are subject to logical reasoning overall; but logic says nothing about phenomenology, about the real world or Nature, only about the consistency of propositions made about Nature or the real world.

Clara from the left: "Then what can you know about the real world if you insist on applying logic alone and it says nothing about the real world?"

I don't know and won't know the real nature of the world. Because of that and because of my logical reasoning, I assume that the world external to me has no defined nature. Nevertheless, I interact with the variety of existence, and I know about that interaction through my perception (not only sense perception but also cognitive perception and the totality of what I experience). So the real world goes as far for me as my awareness permits. My perception teaches me that I cannot decide what I perceive. That is, I cannot decide to perceive my cat to be my driver and then experience that she drives my car. I cannot turn my fickle whims into my perceptions, and if I did, these would be delusions. Even if I did have delusions, however, I could not perceive these to be the commonly agreed upon reality - that others perceived what I perceived while busying themselves with locking me up in the loony bin. Perhaps this is the premise for the belief that there is an objective reality, because others agree that they have perceived the same.

Clara from the left: "If what you perceive is your doing, if what you perceive is decisive of how the world external to you is being formed, yet it is not you who decides how this is going to occur, then there must be some lawfulness that determines how you form external reality to be as you perceive it. And then, this lawfulness is external to you, a lawfulness common to all perceivers, but you neither create nor perceive this lawfulness. It must be definite and definable or it would not be an instance of lawfulness. This argument ruins your whole theory that there is no defined existence extraneous to your perception! Ha!"

Yes, it follows from the previous reasoning that there must be such lawfulness. However, this lawfulness is not external to my perception, but rather, enables my perception to be compatible with someone else's perception. This lawfulness gives meaning to my perceptions in the sense that they can be compared and proportioned to yield a meaningful picture of my experience. Without experience and perception in the widest sense, which is perception that has meaning, this organizing principle or lawfulness would be utterly meaningless. On the other hand, without such an organizing principle my perceptions would also be meaningless. So in that sense, this is not a lawfulness "out there," external to me, but the organizing principle that attributes sense to my perceptions. Actually, this lawfulness is the potential of my perceptions, the capacity for my perceptions to be organized, sensible and meaningful. Additionally, this lawfulness gains not only meaning but also existence from the realization of this potential. That means this organizing principle gains existence in retrospect, by extrapolation, from having perceived something.

We cannot separate the lawfulness that enables perception to be meaningful from the act of perceiving because neither of them could exist without the other. This is the nature of the loop - they co-create each other. It seems to me that Einstein was led by a similar kind of reasoning when he formulated the relative nature of space and time:

"The object of all science, whether natural science or psychology, is to co-ordinate our experiences and to bring them into a logical system. How are our customary ideas of space and time related to the character of our experiences?...

"By the aid of language different individuals can, to a certain extent, compare their experiences. Then it turns out that certain sense perceptions of different individuals correspond to each other, while for other sense perceptions no such correspondence can be established. We are accustomed to regard as real those sense perceptions which are common to different individuals, and which therefore are, in a measure, impersonal. The natural sciences, and in particular, the most fundamental of them, physics, deal with such sense perceptions. The conception of physical bodies, in particular of rigid bodies, is a relatively constant complex of such sense perceptions....

"The only justification for our concepts and system of concepts is that they serve to represent the complex of our experiences; beyond this they have no legitimacy. I am convinced that the philosophers have had a harmful effect upon the progress of scientific thinking in removing certain fundamental concepts from the domain of empiricism, where they are under our control, to the intangible heights of the a priori. For even if it should appear that the universe of ideas cannot be deduced from experience by logical means, but is, in a sense, a creation of the human mind, without which no science is possible, nevertheless this universe of ideas is just as little independent of the nature of our experiences as clothes are of the form of the human body."[5]

I propose that we make a mapping woven of logical propositions to enhance our understanding of how we experience the physical world and our interaction with it. Knowledge of the lawfulness, which is the fabric of this tapestry, enables us to control which relations and interactions we create to experience; or in other words, it enables us to understand and interact with the physical world in a more controlled fashion than hitherto. This mapping is the loop of Creation. What does it tell us about the physical world? It tells us that the infinite wholeness creates the finite world and itself by defining itself. Wholeness is nothing if it does not create, for what does not relate and is not related to is, by definition, non-existence. Only by being given meaning, does wholeness, as is true of anything else, gain existence. Thus wholeness defining itself gains meaning - it can say "I" for instance. But to be able to say "I," it first needs to create (by defining itself as wholeness, which then is no longer wholeness, etc.). The potential of something is created in retrospect from whatever emerged from this potential. In that sense, wholeness can say "I" by virtue of already being partially defined. This would be saying, "I create God to create the world in which I am from where I can create God, etc." It matters not where we start the process in the Loop of Creation. We can still have all of it no matter where we begin.

Precisely because the act of definition is the creative factor, existence consists of different levels of processes defining the indefinite. These processes interact and create new processes by mirroring, by reflection. On the one hand, it is the same process (the whole defining itself, the whole defining itself, etc. - ad infinitum), and on the other, each new definition newly mirrors the earlier processes. The latter is multiplicity. Each such process is only part of the whole, which gains meaning and real existence by the other parts of the whole (similar to it) relating to it. Wholeness or Oneness creates multiplicity by attempting to define what Oneness is. Oneness has no meaning in itself, but rather, it only has meaning if there is multiplicity - it only has meaning from multiplicity. So Creation could be said to be the mirrorings of wholeness attempting to define itself, which would mean that anything so created is a process that can interact with other processes.

The universe is not a conglomeration of particles. Life is not a spontaneous (whatever that's supposed to mean) self-organization out of nothingness. Creation is not just accidental parts somehow miraculously co-existing. Both the act of Creation and all that is created (the projections of the act of Creation) are this organism, the whole infinitely creating by attempting self-definition. Space and time are also creations, and the process of the self-defining wholeness does not occur in space-time but creates it. The "space" of the process of the self-defining wholeness could be considered a qualitative dimensionality that can be defined in mathematical terms (more about this in Chapter 4). This process of creation is the isomorphous[6] lawfulness present in all creations, including the process of creating space-time and whatever can exist therein. This process of creation is the fabric of our perception and experience and anything that has meaning to us. It is both the process of creation and also its projections on all levels. This isomorphous lawfulness is consciousness (not awareness) omnipresent in anything and everything, repeated in every self-referential system (more about this in Chapter 5).

Clara from the left: "That's a lot to chew in a single mouthful. Could you elucidate what you mean?"

Yes, that's what the rest of this book is about - and much more, of course.

Clara from the left: "There is one thing you have omitted. Where did you get this theory? It couldn't possibly be you who thought it up."

True. This philosophy was retreived from SHET, the universal lawfulness itself, as has been recounted in the Prologue. SHET named his philosophy, Holophany, which means, the process of manifesting wholeness. More about that in the following chapter.

Think-tank material

What is a definition?

If paradoxes reside in the core of Creation, then how can they be utilized as tools of creation?

Could a theory of everything be based on axioms, on subjective beliefs regarding how things are, or should it rather unfold from a logical structure?

If there can be no ontology, if there can be no theory of existence describing how things really are, only a subjective description of how one perceives, then what is the space of the logical structure?

[1] The story of how Descartes finally reached the conclusion that he also had a body can be found in Descartes' Meditations.

[2] Some might claim that thinking and experiencing are one and the same. That is of course true in the case of those whose experience of sex is thinking about it.

[3] In 1823 the Hungarian mathematician, János Bolyai (1802-1860) developed a non-Euclidean geometry that did not include this axiom.

[4] The limit at infinity (the limit approaching infinity) is a mathematical term describing how, for instance, a polygon can be turned into a circle. You add more and more sides to a polygon within a circle (from square to hexagon, octagon, etc.), and when it reaches 'n' sides (at the limit where 'n' approaches infinity), then for all practical purposes the polygon is a circle.

[5] Albert Einstein, The Meaning of Relativity, MJF Books New York, pp.1-2

[6] Isomorphous means having the same logical structure in different representations.