Holonomic Theory of Counsciousness

AN OUTLINE OF RESOURCES FROM FUNDAMENTAL ONTOLOGY

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

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

Keywords:

Being Conscious

Consciousness is another term for *Being* with an emphasis on the aspect of presence. Consciousness has arisen in the midst of our material culture as the walled off arena of subjectivity. It must be contrast implicitly with the realm of the unconscious and the material world. However, phenomenology discovers this realm to be the *sine quo non* of Being itself as everything which "is" comes to us through consciousness, even the unconscious through gaps and failures, as well as the material world through our interpretation of phenomena objectively and intersubjectively. So from a phenomenological point of view as given to us by Husserl, Consciousness as such is synonymous with Being in general. So it then behooves us to consider the results of fundamental ontology for our understanding of consciousness and vice versa.

In this paper, we will begin translating the results of fundamental ontological studies into the context of the study of consciousness. The last century has seen great progress in the understanding of Ontology in the Continental School of Philosophy. In that school the fragmentation of Being. This little known revolution in our way of viewing our world has little realized profound implications for the study of consciousness in general. The whole thrust of this development is rooted in the work of Husserl who was the first to pay close attention to the contents and structure of consciousness as a basis of philosophizing. All prior philosophers might be thought of as dogmatic in the sense that they pursued ideas using consciousness as the forgotten medium of their thoughts and experience. Husserl explicitly recognized this unexplored horizon and sought to render it as visible as possible to the philosophical gaze. In this process he discovered that there is a fundamental difference between ideas and essences, i.e. that essences are not simple ideas as had been previously assumed. Rather essences are constraints on attributes of things and ideas are abstract glosses. This difference that makes a difference that Husserl discovered was the beginning point in the evolution of our idea of Being from something both total and unified to something that is partial and fragmented. Husserl discovered the first chink in the armor of Being which was always the highest concept and the most empty until Continental Philosophy discovered that Being had a structure. We have been exploring this structure ever since. The explorers of this new horizon of Being have been Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Derrida and many others whom English and American Analytic Philosophers claim to not be able to understand. They do not understand them because of the paradigm shift brought

about by phenomenology which focuses our attention on presence rather than the other aspects of being which are identity, truth and reality. Phenomenology has uncovered the realm of what Husserl called the lifeworld and Heidegger called being-in-the-world in which our presence to the world and its presence to us is negotiated. Part of that negotiation appears as the protocol of the structure of Being itself, i.e. the differentiation of being-in-the-world. We will summarize a century of work by phenomenologists and their followers by specifying the various kinds of Being that have been discovered along the way:

Meta-levels of Being	Modalities of being in the world	Psychological concomitants
Ultra Being^n	unhandedness	setting free as a relation to a being
Wild Being^4	out-of-hand	encompassing as a relation to a being
Hyper Being^3	in-hand	bearing as a relation to a being
Process Being^2	ready-to-hand	grasping as a relation to a being
Pure Being^1	present-at-hand	pointing as a relation to a being
Concrete Being^0 entities, things, beings	Being-in-the-world or Lifeworld	being the thing itself

One of the disconcerting things about the development of phenomenology on the Continent is the plethora of terminology that has been developed and differences between the various philosophers over approach to understanding ontology in the light of the close examination of the phenomena that appear in the lifeworld or being-in-the-world. My own contribution to clearing up this confusion has been to realize that the plethora of terms for the various kinds of Being may be understood by using Russell and Whitehead's ramified theory of types as explained by Copi, as the basis for understanding the kinds of Being that have been discovered. What I realized was that we can understand the various new kinds of Being as meta-levels of Being and contrast those to the various types that appear as the aspects of Being. Thus we find that there are four kinds of Being arranged as conceptual meta-levels with a differentiation of aspects as types at each ramified level of typing. Russell developed the theory of types to disambiguate paradoxes. Here we use them to disambiguate the biggest paradox of all within the Western philosophical tradition, i.e. the paradox of Being. Thus we have four meta-levels of Being which we can distinguish as the various kinds of Being and we have at each level a differentiation of the aspects of being as various types which take on different characteristics at each level. What is interesting about this schema is that the kinds of Being do not go on infinitely but only exist up to the fourth level. There are no kinds of Being beyond the fourth level even though we give a designator of Ultra to what ever might be left of Being beyond the fourth level just in case someone discovers how to think beyond the fourth meta-level of Being. But this limitation to four thinkable and experienceable meta-levels of Being is what renders Being disunified rather than unified. There are sui generis emergent levels of Being which are

introduced through discontinuities that destroy the unity of Being and render it into fragments. The aspects of Being, i.e. truth (x is y), reality (x is), identity (x is x) and presence (this is x) take on different characteristics at each meta-level as the various types are produced at the various meta-levels are accommodated to the emergent properties of that meta-level. So truth is different at the level of Pure Being where it is concerned with verification as compared to what it is at the level of Process Being where truth becomes a process of uncovering like that undergone by Oedipus. At the level of Hyper Being truth becomes like that of Teresius who warns Oedipus. At the level of Wild Being truth becomes that like the oracle who banishes Oedipus, driving him out with a fate worse than death, which eventually turns into a sacred truth that appears in Ultra Being. The Oedipus myth is central because it displays to us all the various kinds of truth that appear at all the meta-levels of Being and beyond. When we say beyond what we mean is that beyond the fourth meta-level, in what we call Ultra Being we enter the realm of existence rather than Being. We leave Being behind and there we discover the meaning of Existence which is fundamentally different from Being. The aspects of Being there become the aspects of Existence and continue to exist at these higher levels of ramification. What is the case for truth is also the case for the other aspects of reality, identity and presence; they are adumbrated at the various levels of ramification of Being and existence. This then is the summary of the results of a century of phenomenological research. Each philosopher attempts to define certain of these meta-levels with respect to the others and there is a progressive discovery of higher meta-levels as the century goes on. Pivotal in this process is

Merleau-Ponty who starting from the work of Heidegger went on to define Hyper Being as the hyper dialectic between Heidegger's *process being* and Sartre's *nothingness* and to define Wild Being as what lay beyond it. Derrida has done the most to explore Hyper Being which he calls differance and which Hiedegger called ~~Being~~ crossed out. It does not seem that Heidegger unearthed the fourth meta-level. But after Merleau-Ponty discovered it Deleuze and Guattari went on to attempt to build a philosophy at that final meta-level of Being in Anti-oedipus and Thousand Plateaus. We also have the work of John S. Hans in his book The Play of the World as someone attempting to reproduce that work in a less nihilistic form. This sketch of the progress in fundamental ontology should suffice us as a jumping off point for attempting to understand the implications of these developments for the theory of consciousness and unconsciousness as well as awareness.

As a beginning we will follow the lead of Pauli Pylkko in his work The Aconceptual Mind by distinguishing between consciousness, unconsciousness and a-consciousness which we will call awareness. We will identify consciousness closely with Being as such and thus we will see that consciousness has the same sort of stratification as does Being as seen from the viewpoint of fundamental ontology. There are then different meta-levels of consciousness. We will associate unconsciousness with the discontinuities that inhabit the realm of consciousness which is fragmented into the various kinds of Being. And we will associate a-consciousness of awareness with existence that lies beyond the highest meta-level of Being in the realm of existence. In this way we will translate out of the rubric of fundamental ontology into the domain of consciousness studies. However, if we

follow Pylkko further we must admit that if we consider something within consciousness like concepts, then the aconceptual only bring us to the realm of Process Being, and so we need to introduce terms to talk about taking the conceptual into the other levels of Being. We will then talk about the de-conceptual as the appearance of the conceptual in Hyper Being, and the zygo-conceptual as the appearance of the conceptual in Wild Being, and finally ex-conceptual as the appearance of the conceptual in Ultra Being or in the realm of Existence. Further we will transpose the terminology of Being to that of Consciousness and speak of Pure Consciousness, Process Consciousness, Hyper Consciousness, and Wild Consciousness as well as Ultra Consciousness. In general this gives us a platform for the exploration of consciousness in a new way which sees the structure of consciousness as homeomorphic to the structure of the lifeworld of Husserl or being-in-the-world of Heidegger. Husserl's work was updated and extended by Gurwitsch who took it from the formal orientation and introduced gestalts. Schutz placed that work in a Sociological context and pursued the question of intersubjectivity as did Fink. We would also like to change the focus and introduce other phenomenological constructs which comprehend consciousness not as a system but as a meta-system that entail certain special systems. We appeal to the work of Arkady Plotnitsky in his book Complementarity and In the Shadow of Hegel as a basis for these extensions. Plotnitsky has brought together the work of Bohr, Bataille and Derrida in a way that underlines the difference between restricted and general economies a concept developed by Bataille in The Accursed Share. When we apply this concept to Consciousness then we eventually realize that we cannot

consider it as a restricted economy any longer and must instead consider it a general economy and this bursts the barriers between consciousness, unconsciousness and awareness in a fundamental way. In other words consciousness studies must consider the unconscious. Our cognitive psychology and phenomenology become darkened. We see that Archetypal or Imaginal Psychology of Jung and Hillman, i.e. Psychologies of the Soul become relevant. We cannot merely subscribe to a Science of Consciousness without considering its magical or alchemical underpinnings. However, this does not mean entering into a realm of incomprehensibility because there is a theory that can help us negotiate these dark and troublesome waters. That is the theory of special systems and meta-systems (general economies) as opposed to systems (restricted economies). In fact what has been discovered by the author is that there is an interleaving of the special systems and the kinds of Conscious Being. In other words, the gaps in Conscious Being are filled with the existence of the Special Systems that are inherently existential. Existence does not just lie beyond the threshold of Wild Being but within the realm of Conscious Being as well. The theory of Special Systems is based on the discrimination between Systems defined as Social Gestalts and Meta-Systems defined as Social Proto-Gestalts, i.e. the background to the perception of the gestalts, in an analogous way to the way to the background of a figure that combines to give us a gestalt. Systems are seen as *wholes greater than the sum of their parts* while Meta-systems are seen as *wholes less than the sum of their parts*. Special Systems are then seen as *wholes exactly equal to the sum of their parts*. It turns out that there are exactly three kinds of such Special Systems which we call *Dissipative* after

Prigogine, *Autopoietic* after Maturana and Varela, and *Reflexive* after O'Malley and Sandywell. These Special Systems are defined mathematically in terms of complex and hyper complex algebras and the Meta-system is defined in terms of non-division algebras. Systems are defined in terms of real algebras. This mathematical basis gives these systems some very peculiar properties that are worth investigating[1]. Here we will merely note that the interleaving with the various kinds of Being gives us an extremely interesting structure to consider with respect to its implications for the study of consciousness. The configuration of the emergent levels are as follows:

Kinds of Being	Systems of Existence
	Meta-system (Sedenion or above non-division Algebra)
Wild Being	
	Reflexive Special System (Octonion Algebra)
Hyper Being	
	Autopoietic Special System (Quaternion Algebra)
Process Being	
	Dissipative Ordering Special System (complexion Algebra)

Pure Being	
	System (Real Algebra)

---

[1] See Reflexive Autopoietic Dissipative Special Systems Theory at
http://archonic.net/autopoiesis.html

An important point concerning the special systems is their ultra-effaciousness, i.e. ultra-effectiveness and ultra-efficiency, that is the dual of differance of differing and deferring. Ultra-effaciousness means that entropy is marginally and probablisticly circumvented by special systems structures giving them an incredible advantage in the world over all other forms of systems. These systems starting with the dissipative ordering special system are neg-entropic as Pirgogine has shown. Each higher system is a combination of dissipative special systems that are neg-entropic so that the concatination of neg-entropic systems only spreads the effect of neg-entropy building on it at higher and higher co-evolving and co-arising interdependent levels. At the autopoietic level we see symbiosis come into being as living organisms. At the reflexive level we see social relations arise. AT the dissipative level we might see the ultra-efficacious result as being the arising of consciousness. Consciousness is dissipative ordering. Life is autopoietic ordering. Sociality is reflexive ordering. All these are marginally ultra-effacious phenomena. This is what gives them their special properties. The embedding of the Special Systems at the center of the emergent layers of Conscious Being is very significant as that is what gives Consciousness, Life and Sociality their ultra-effacacious qualities, i.e. the qualities that make them so hard to explain in relation to everything else we know about the world. Consciousness itself has an effortlessness quality in most circumstances, as does living and

socializing. We find ourselves embedded in an seemingly transparent medium in which we function seemingly effortlessly. This seeming effortlessness of our actions in consciousness, in life, in the social world comes from the ultra-efficacious quality of these emergent phenomena that are based on the structures of the mathematically unique Special Systems. Efficaciousness is the complementary opposite to differance. Effectiveness and Efficiency are complementarities to Differing and Deferring. When we go into an ultra efficacious mode the burden of entropy is lightened slightly. But anything that the burden of entropy is lightened for gains supremacy because the pressure of entropy is very heavy on all things in the universe. This is why consciousness, life and sociality take over and thrive where ever they are established as we have seen on this small planet in a neglected corner of the Milkyway Galaxy. Understanding this point is a key to understanding the nature of Consciousness and its similitude to Life and the Social.

In this scheme existence not only limits but also permeates Conscious Being in the form of Special Systems that have an algebraic ordering. The recognition of the importance of the algebras gives a specific structure to Consciousness on the analogy with Mathematical Model Theory. In that theory there is a relation between Mathematical Models of Mathematical Categories and First Order Logic. Here the algebras provide the models and associated with each hierarchical level of the models there is an associated level of logic which relates to a level of language and its logic. Being is the core of our Indo-European languages. Each level of Being is an articulation of that core. With the unfolding of the models there is a concomitant unfolding of the core of language where each allows the other to

unfold further into an emergent potential space made possible by the unfolding of the other.

We can see this best by using Plato's theory of the divided line as our basis for exploring these levels of unfolding.

supra-rationality	meta-system (beyond the limits of the divided line)	insanity
Wild Action	Wild Being	Wild Words
communal grounding	reflexive special system	absurdity
Hyper Action	Hyper Being	Hyper Words
mutual grounding	autopoietic special system (symbiosis)	Viscious circles
Process Action	Process Being	Process Words
self-grounding	dissipative ordering special system	paradox
Pure Action	Pure Being	Pure Words
ratio -- reason (grounding)	system divided line	doxa – opinion

What we notice is that both doxa (opinion or mere words) and ratio (reason as basis of action) transform into various emergent levels in a progression from the restricted economy of the divided line toward the general economy

of the meta-system. On the side of doxa or mere words we can see this unfolding as a movement from classical logics to deviant logics. If we pick the Diamond Logic of Hellerstein which is based on that of G. Spencer Brown's Laws of Form as an example, then we can see that this logic allows for paradox by the definition of fixed points of *true but false* = **i** and *false but true* = **j**. There are thus two complementary paradoxes in this logic. When we cycle between them we produce a vicious circle and when we fuse them we produce an absurdity. However, the Diamond logic needs to be expanded into a **Vajra** logic that deals with each of the aspects of Being rather than just Truth. A Vajra Logic would concantinate Diamond Logics for each aspect of Being, i.e. also reality, identity and presence. Finally these Vajra Logics would need to be integrated into a Matrix Logic of the sort described by August Stern which contains value vectors that are orthogonal as *bra* and *ket* allowing the expression of the orthogonality of the various aspects of Conscious Being. On the side of reason we will see the use together of the various aspects of Being as a basis for grounding actions. So on the side of words the aspects are separated while on the side of action the aspects are combined. Reasoning uses all the aspects together as they appear at each level of the articulation of the kinds of Conscious Being, in other words various adumbrations of truth, reality, identity and presence ground different sorts of action that occur between the meta-levels of Conscious Being.

This model of Conscious Being on the basis of what we have learned from Fundamental Ontology is already quite complex. This paper will concentrate on exploring some of its implications for consciousness studies which recognizes the necessity to integrate those with the studies of consciousness and awareness as well.

Comprehending the medium of Consciousness

The key idea is that consciousness is itself not a uniform and continuous medium. It is shot through with discontinuities. And these existential discontinuities themselves have structure. This is an idea first breached by Nietzsche who pointed out that the self is a social swarm where we can say *it* thinks more easily than we can say *I* think. This broken medium functions more like a general economy (meta-system) than a restricted economy (system) in relation to the system of the ego which appears as the center of consciousness. This is a lesson that Analytic Philosophy in general has yet to learn, but which phenomenology has been slowly learning over the last century. A turning point in that process was the work of Michael Henry called The Essence of Manifestation. In that work Henry talks about that part of manifestation that does not manifest, and never will which he calls the essence. This is the obverse of the distinguishing of differance which is the slip sliding of differing and deferring of phenomena around that which does not appear. It is not just that the self is a social swarm, but the swarming in itself is hiding something that will never appear in consciousness. In other words consciousness has a depth that goes beyond our own being conscious of its contents. There is a fundamental question that brings this subject to the fore. It is the question of whether we are conscious of our being conscious in the act of being conscious. Some say that being conscious of our being conscious, i.e. reflexivity is a separate act from our original being conscious of phenomena.

Others say it is the same act. But the argument usually assumes that consciousness is a homogeneous plenum. Instead what we find, based on our model from fundamental ontology, is that consciousness is not a homogenious plenum but is instead filled with patterned emergent discontinuities. Whe we look at those discontinuities we see that there are three special systems: dissipative ordering, autopoietic and reflexive. This means that we go from the phenomena seen as a gestalt (system) to reflexivity and beyond in a series of qualitative quantal steps. Seeing the phenomena itself is different from our projection of ordering on it, which is different again from a reaching of a balance between various projected orders that is symbiotic, and which is again different from the realization of communal relations between those projected orders which is reflexive. Beyond that is the general economy in which that communion breaks up into myriad competing perspectives. Here reflexivity is not merely a=a which appears at the level of Pure Being. Rather we see that as we move up the levels of Being this property itself transforms. So at the Process Being level we can see reflexivity in terms of the reflex, i.e. an action that occurs immediately without mediation, an action that is just itself, as when one responds to a hammer on the knee by the doctor. At the Hyper Being level this reflexivity becomes more complex as differing and deferring enters into the equation a=a. The action of passing through the equal sign causes differance to interfere so we can no longer tell what "a" is. At this point between Hyper Being and Wild Being we enter the reflexive special system. There we discover reflexivity in the loss of the associative property. Suddenly it does make a difference who sits next to who at the dinner table. This is the sense of communality of reflexivity

that was missing at the level of Pure Being. Finally when we enter Wild Being reflexivity as a=a begins to fall apart. Each a has a different process of differing and deferring as it becomes itself. This is the sense that G.H. Mead talks about in which it takes time for something to become itself. Every equal sign and every "a" has its own temporality and spatiality. Finally as we enter the meta-system reflexivity becomes reflectivity, i.e. the meditation on those differences in the field of all possible a's and all possible "=" that all inherently have their different temporalities and spatiality's. Reflexivity applies to a specific a, and ignores what is happening with all other possible values that might fill that variable. Reflexivity, like so many concepts we use, have different meanings at the various registers of emergent consciousness. Due to the discontinuities within consciousness itself reflexivity is not a given but must be achieved by specific acts that breach the various meta-levels of consciousness. And we feel that when we are suddenly aware of our consciousness of some phenomena. What we need to study is not merely the positive phenomena of consciousness in terms of differentiating its noesis from its noema. But rather the hidden emergent levels and the discontinuities between them. The model from fundamental ontology allows us to do that because it constructs a different picture of the invisible structuring of consciousness itself. That structuring is seen as a series of emergent levels of phenomena that can be described in terms of meta-languages rooted in the various kinds of Being. Lurking within these various discontinuities is the Special Systems that differentiate the kinds of Being. These Special Systems show us the substructure of Existence that lays below and beyond the various illusory projections of continuity, unity and

totality and other philosophical categories.

Consciousness along with the Unconscious and A-consciousness is a mixture of Being and Existence. When we treat it as a medium we assume continuity to that medium and ignore the discontinuities that shatter that medium into fragments based on fundamental discontinuities. Rather we need to recognize the emergent thresholds of consciousness that turn that abstract and ideal medium into a series of essential media that are interwoven as the basis of our experience of the world and which are substructured by existence what appears as a model of interpenetration that has a mathematical hyper algebraic form. The plethora of Un-A-Consciousness of phenomena is more complex than we imagined. We need to explore that complex infrastructure in order to understand the fundamental nature of consciousness. Consciousness is the medium in which our experience swims which like the fish or birds we do not notice because we are completely immersed in it from the beginning to the end of our existence. Making that medium visible to us is a difficult job, especially when it is utterly invisible to us as a translucent medium which we look through in order to perceive and think in relation to phenomena that appears there. What fundamental ontology teaches us by looking at the structure of the world is that even though it is translucent and invisible to us does not mean it is not shot through with discontinuities and has an ordered substructure.

World Structure and the Soul of Consciousness

When we look out at the Indo-European world view we see that it is expressed best by a series of bifurcations:

Bifurcating Branch	Non-Duals	Non-bifurcating Branch
wave	uncertainty	particle
Quantum mechanics	spacetime	Relativity
physics	infoenergy	thermodynamics
physus	orders	logos
limited	rights	unlimited
have	goods	~have
exist	fates	~exist
actualize	sources	~actual
~manifest	root	manifest

There are a series of dualities that are branching bifurcations on one side only. Between these exist the non-duals. We have been concentrating up to now on order which is a substrate of existence that appears between the kinds of Being in our model of consciousness. However, consciousness goes deep into the infrastructure of the worlds expressing the non-duals all the way to the root. So it is possible to look at consciousness from this deeper point of view as expressing the non-duality of right, good, fate, sources and the root beyond the level of ordering. We know the level where right manifests as moral consciousness, which was a horizon that Nietzsche opened up. It is not just enough to describe the ordering of consciousness but we must go deeper than that and describe the moral consciousness we call conscience. Consciousness Studies tends to not go into these depths that Nietzsche

discovered and explored. He was followed by Jung who in turn was followed by Hillman in attempting to produce a psychology of the deeper infrastructure of the soul. Gigerich rightly says that it is this that makes Jung's psychology the most interesting, because it has gone where all other psychology has feared to tread in pursuit of some understanding of the soul. We can understand the soul and spirit (ruh and nafs in Arabic leads to the understanding of these words as "breathing" and "breathed") in terms of the movement down thorough the various levels of non-duality that are at the center of the Western worldview. In this sense what is called for is an exploration of the soul of the world or worldsoul that articulates the various levels of non-duality.

Beneath the level of morality, rightness, there is the level of the good, i.e. the level where the variety of human ways of looking at things is produced. Beneath that is the level of fate in which what exists and what does not exist is determined. This leads on to the level of the sources in which the prototypes of the various human ways of looking at things are found. Finally we arrive at the root which is beyond the duality of Being and Existence in the realm of Manifestation. Each of these are deeper horizons beyond that discovered by Nietzsche that have been explored by various deep explorers of human consciousness. For instance, Faulkner, Dickens and Dostoevsky among other authors have explored the Good by their relating the differences among their characters showing the span of human experience. Beyond Good and Evil the level of the non-dual Good is about variety production and as Stafford Beer said in The Heart of Enterprise human beings must engage in variety production at all costs. You will never figure out a

substructure or formalism that encompasses the variety produced in other things or in themselves. But a variety of literary authors survey this variety and thus teach us something about humanity. Beyond the level of the Good there are very few authors that teach us about fate. That is one of the reasons that the story of Oedipus is so important in as much as it attempts to do that an comes to us from an ancient source. Many of Shakespeare's plays do that as well. But when we get to the level of the sources of the fates then we are left with Plato and a few others. Concerning the root of the sources many of our religions traditions have sprung up around those who have tried to answer that question, like Buddha, Jesus, Muhammad and others.

Consciousness studies needs to explore the roots of consciousness in the non-duals that are at the center of our worldview. Deterministic theories are not enough and ultimately not satisfying if they do not address deeper phenomena. Conscious Being needs to give way to an exploration of the worldsoul as advocated by Nietzsche, Jung, Hillman and Gigerich. Otherwise we will merely remained trapped on the surface of phenomena of consciousness. As Gigerich shows that means going back and taking a deeper look at our philosophical tradition for resources for understanding the nature of the soul and its relation to the world that is at the heart of our Conscious Being. The non-duals at the core of the world, and that are the very soul of consciousness are our guide to understanding inwardly the nature of existence as it manifests in our lives.

Being, Existence and Manifestation

We have said that Consciousness contains within it the Unconscious, just as Being contains within it Existence. Being and Existence are duals of each other as are the Conscious and the Unconscious realms. Awareness is the name of what goes beyond consciousness and unconsciousness as Existence goes beyond Being. The Special Systems are merely the tip of the iceberg of the various kinds of algebras. The Pascal's triangle of non-division algebras is infinitely deep beyond the realm of division algebras. But we need to bring into focus the fact that beyond this duality between Being and Existence there is something else, i.e. Manifestation, in a different sense than that used by Henry. If we use Plato's divided line as a guide then we note that each of the division lines may be given a meaning. So that Doxa is divided into appearances and well-founded opinion (faith). The difference between these, the dividing line, may be associated with the outward non-dual of the void talked about by Taoists. On the other hand ratio is divided into representable and non-representable intelligibles and this difference may be seen as the inward non-dual of emptiness talked about by the Buddhists. In that case the greater divided line between ratio and doxa may be associated with the deeper non-dual between emptiness and void called manifestation. If the non-duals are the core of consciousness, i.e. the soul of consciousness, then this deeper non-dual might be seen as the kernel, or the spirit of the soul of consciousness. Manifestation is the deepest non-dual level at the core of the worldsoul. It is the horizon at which we need to concentrate our efforts to comprehend. In order to understand it we must first see how the duality between Being and Existence plays itself out in consciousness. This is the background for the understanding of Manifestation.

We get some hint of this level in the poetry of Stonehouse, the Chinese Zen and Taoist monk who lived many years as a hermit, who juxtaposes Taoist void and Buddhist emptiness in his poetry. But beyond those hints there is the work of Shaykh Muhyiddin ibn al Arabi and others from the Sufic and other Traditions that attempt to describe what is beyond the non-duals in that complementarity of complementarities. Manifestation is the antipode to the extrema that mixes supra-rationality and the insanity of absurdity and paradoxicality. Manifestation is the non-dual core of doxa and ratio. It appears in the work of Shaykh al-Nafari who discusses spiritual stations (stayings) as opposed to spiritual states of gnosis.

A key point is that consciousness needs to be understood through the anomalous and rare states and stations it achieves rather than through the mundane. By concentrating on the mundane we limit consciousness extremely rather than exploring its limits which really tells us the most about its nature. Studying the works of mystics, especially those who understand genuine spirituality of formlessness, gives us a greater insight into the ultimate nature of our consciousness which cannot be ignored if we want to come to an accurate picture. Thus the study of the works of the Buddhists, Taoists and Sufis is critical to having a picture of the inner possibilities of consciousness.

The Unfolding of Conscious Being

When we speak of the Extrema we are talking about the antipode of manifestation. In Buddism it is called Dukha, in Sufism it is called Dunya, in Taoism it is called Illusion. It is the impossible mixture of Supra-rationality and Insanity within the world. It is the

nature of Being as full blown paradox uncontrolled by Russell's theory of types. It is where the doxa and ratio branches of the divided line collapse together. Besides looking at manifestation it is necessary to also look at this antipode, which is the genesis of the kinds of Being itself. In its genesis the kinds of Being come into existence by splitting. What is prior to this split is the unilith which splits into the bilith and then into the multi-lith. This unilith that splits first into two and then into four phases does so in two ways. One way produces the kinds of Being and the other the aspects. What we are talking about is the unfolding of the theory of types itself. This unfolding proceeds though stages that exemplify the kinds of Being themselves. We can explain them with an augmented set of Peircian categories. Peirce defines his First, Seconds and Thirds and in his phenomenology he believed that all phenomena may be explained by these categories. But to these we add a Buckminster Fullerian category of Fouths and another non-dual category of Zeroths. Thus we see the unfolding of the kinds and aspects of Being as moving thorugh these categories from Zeroth, to First, to Second, to Third, to Fourths and back to the Zeroth. The beginning Zeroth is either void (outward existence) or emptiness (inward existence) and the ending Zeroth is the opposite. The differences between these categories are the proto kinds of Being that are the images of the kinds of Being prior to their existence that occur in the emergent event of the unfolding of the multilith.

Zeroth (emptiness)	
	Proto Pure Being

Fourth = integrity	
	Proto Process Being
Third = continuity	
	Proto Hyper Being
Second = relation	
	Proto Wild Being
First = appearance	
	Proto Ultra Being = Meta Being
Zeroth (Void)	

This schema can be seen as a model of the unfolding of consciousness itself. We see this in Hinduism that talks about Prajnapati or Purusha. The key point is that when the initial bifurcation occurs there can be three different spits that are possible which I call the exotics. When this split occurs with respect to the aspects I call it the esotics. The combination of these possibilities give us 24 different possible multilith configurations for both exotic kinds and esotic aspects which is 576 in all. This gives us a field of possible states of consciousness in which the split of the kinds of consciousness and the aspects of consciousness are differently arrayed with respect to each other. This is a field of the possibilities of the articulation of consciousness rather than consciousness itself. This field is determined by the various kinds of possible algebra that

exist. The kinds of possible algebra determine the kinds of possible consciousness. For instance there are the following kinds of possible algebra $xy=0$, $yx=xy$, $yx=-xy$[2]. These correspond to the differentiation of physus, logos and non-dual. There is a fourth state beyond differentiation of x and y, i.e. prior to the splitting of the unilith into the bilith. We can use this model as a basis for understanding the differentiation of the possibilities of consciousness based on what has been discovered in fundamental ontology. This model shows a possible hidden depth to consciousness and its articulation in terms of its own emergence rather than the emergence of things within consciousness itself.

ultra-Being = Meta-Being						
		1 Multilith Primal Peirce reversed First				
pre-Wild-Being						
		2	// Exotic bifurcatio	**2**		

		n point Peirce Second			
pre-Hyper-Being					
3 exotic/ esotic 1		**3** exotic/esotic 2 Peirce reversed Third		**3** exotic/esotic 3	
pre-Process-Being					

4 pure Peirce fourth	/ Secondary bifurcation	**4** process Peirce fourth	//	**4** hyper Peirce fourth	/ Secondary bifurcation	**4** wild Peirce fourth
pre-Pure-Being						
ons[3], beings, eventities, things						

This is a model of the unfolding of the kinds of Being into existence. A similar model could be constructed with respect to the aspects of Being. Because of the

---

[2]

http://www.maths.utas.edu.au/People/dfs/Papers/GrassmannUAlgpaper/node4.html or http://www.maths.utas.edu.au/People/dfs/Papers/GrassmannUAlgpaper/GrassmannUAlgpaper.html

[3] See Ben Goertzel's paper on Ons at goertzel.org.

relation between Being and Consciousness it is also the prototype of a model for the unfolding emergence of the Conscious Being. Here the proto-kinds of Being prior to their emergence are crossed with the kinds of Being themselves after their emergence. This crossing shows the paradoxicality of Being itself which assumes itself to boot strap itself into existence. This doubling or duplicity of Being is seen in myth in terms of the woman, Hera and Nephele or the eidolon of Helen in Egypt. This duplicity is traditionally projected on women. It shows the intrinsically illusory nature of Being. This is a dynamic Tetrakys which shows how the unfolding of the fragments of Being occurs step by step. The Tetrakys fits between the meta-systems and the system with the special systems interleaved as does the kinds of Being themselves. Even in the process of emergence Being finds itself interleaved with the special systems between systems and meta-system bookends.

Using the Resources of Fundamental Ontology to Explore Consciousness

This paper has been a short excursion into the resources available from fundamental ontology for the exploration of consciousness. The work of that exploration itself has not been undertaken here. In an essay like this it is only possible to mention some of the resources in order to make them available for use. Further explanations of these various resources appear in various papers of the author.

The basic difference between the context of these results from fundamental ontology and the study of consciousness is the engagement in looking at the world rather than consciousness itself of the world. As Plato says it is so much easier to look at things like the soul writ large in the worldview of a people. The study of consciousness by itself will always be limited by inaccessibility which amounts to too great an accessibility. But the world is always more accessible because we share that as a social construct. Consciousness studies needs to look more carefully at its embodiment and embeddedness in the lifeworld as being-in-the-world. In this way it may be able to escape its treatment as a homogeneous medium of experience so that some of its variety and differences may be appreciated. We needn't suffer from the production of false disciplines merely because of terminological differences for what is precisely the same thing. Ultimately Being and Consciousness is the same thing and the advances in the study of fundamental ontology are implicitly advances in the study of consciousness as well.

We began by talking about the different kinds and aspects of Being. These amount to different modes of consciousness related to pointing, grasping, bearing and encompassing as Merleau-Ponty pointed out. Then we saw the relation between these kinds of Being and the Special Systems which brings another level of order into our modeling of consciousness. Then we considered Consciousness as a medium and pointed out its discontinuous nature. After that we pointed out the deep structure of non-duality that exists in the world that must be taken over into consciousness. Then we discussed the nature of Manifestation, the deepest non-dual beyond Being and Existence. Finally we discussed the unfolding of Conscious Being through the tetrakys of Being folding through and doubling itself.

About the Author

Kent Palmer is a Principal Systems Engineer at a major Aerospace Systems Company. He has a Ph.D. in Sociology concentrating on Philosophy of Science from the London School of Economics and a B.Sc. in Sociology from the University of Kansas. His dissertation on *The Structure of Theoretical Systems in Relation to Emergence*[4] focused on how new things come into existence within the Western Philosophical and Scientific worldview. He has written extensively on the roots of the Western Worldview in his electronic book The Fragmentation of Being and the Path Beyond the Void[5]. He had at least seventeen years experience[6] in Software Engineering and Systems Engineering disciplines at major aerospace companies based in Orange County CA. He served several years as the chairman of a Software Engineering Process Group and is now engaged in Systems Engineering Process improvement based on EIA 731 and CMMI. He has presented a tutorial on "Advanced Process Architectures[7]" which concerned engineering wide process improvement including both software and systems engineering. Besides process experience, he has recently been a software team lead on a Satellite Payload project and a systems engineer on a Satellite Ground System project. He has also engaged in independent research in Systems Theory which has resulted in a book of working papers called *Reflexive Autopoietic Systems Theory*[8]. A new introduction to this work now exists called *Reflexive Autopoietic Dissipative Special Systems Theory*[9]. He has given a tutorial[10] on *Meta-systems Engineering* to the INCOSE Principles working group. He has written a series *on Software Engineering Foundations* which are contained in the book *Wild Software Meta-systems*[11]. He now teaches a course in "Software Requirements and Design Methodologies" at the University California Irvine Extension.

---

[4] http://dialog.net:85/homepage/disab.html You man also try http://dialog.net or http://think.net for any of the web related material.

[5] http://dialog.net:85/homepage/fbpath.htm

[6] http://dialog.net:85/homepage/resume.html

[7] http://dialog.net:85/homepage/advanced.htm

[8] http://dialog.net:85/homepage/refauto2.htm

[9] http://dialog.net:85/homepage/autopoiesis.html

[10] http://dialog.net:85/homepage/incosewg/index.htm

[11] http://dialog.net:85/homepage/wsms.htm