

Questioning the Terminology of Nonduality

An Exploration of the Foundations of Nonduality

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 1632
Orange CA 92856 USA
714-633-9508
kent@palmer.name

Copyright 2005 K.D. Palmer.

All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.

Started 05.02.25; Version 0.3, 05.02.26; nds11a03.doc

Keywords: Nonduality, Logic, Negation

The Terminology Nonduality

David Loy introduced the term Nonduality to a wider audience with his book on the subject in 1988. What we will consider in this article is whether the terminology of nonduality can be improved upon and whether we can refine our concept of what is meant by nonduality. Nonduality is really a problematic term because it does not preclude the possibility of advocating monism. Advaita Vedanta as presented by Loy in his book is an example of a monistic nondual tradition. However, we would like to restrict nonduality to meaning Not one! Not Two! which is a more stringent criteria. However, this covers over a more basic problem which is the fact that we have given preeminence to countability or quantitative approach to existence and this is misleading. It is this broader concern that I would like to

explore in this essay¹.

The first point is that duality and monism is based on the dialectical categories we see in Kant of plurality, unity and totality, and implicitly wholeness. There are called the Quantative Categories. There are another set of Qualitative Categories and two other sets of Categories in the Kantian System related to Relation and Modality.

a) *Categories of quantity: Unity, Plurality, Totality*
b) *Categories of quality: Reality, Negation, Limitation*
c) *Categories of relation: Substance and Accident, Causality and Dependence, Community or Interaction*
d) *Categories of modality: Possibility--Impossibility, Existence--Non-existence, Necessity--Contingency*²

So when we are talking about Non-duality whether it encompasses monism or not we are really only functioning within one of the groups of Kant's categories rather than across all of them as we would like to do ultimately. Also even if we had a term that spanned all the categories then that would still leave experience out and we want nonduality to apply both to experience and thought, a posteriori and a priori, as that which is unthinkable in it, and non-experienceable in it. So that is why we must look more closely at the term of nonduality and consider other alternatives that widen its scope. Actually even applying the prefix *non-* to the quantatiative is not enough because actually nonduality goes beyond mere negation as suggested by that prefix. So this means that no only the base term but also the prefix of the term are inaccurate in some sense. We will still use the term *nonduality* mostly as it is defined by Loy as our fundamental term because it is widely accepted. But for the sake of the refinement of our concepts we will develop an alternative terminology that will be considered local to this project which will try to clarify as much as possible what we really

¹ The original version of this chapter is a podcast that was done 050225 and placed on the nondual.net website. This essay will develop the themes first breached in that recorded talk

² <http://www.island-of-freedom.com/KANT.HTM>

mean by the looser term *nonduality*.

So let us begin by noting that we can use the Greimas Square as a way of talking about this problem, as we have done elsewhere. The Greimas Square is merely the square of contradiction and contraries from logic. In it we have a term *A* and an anti-term *anti-A* ($\sim A$). What ever is other than that is *non-A* ($*A$). So non-A can be made up of any other pair of terms $\sim B/*B$, $\sim C/*C$, $\sim D/*D$, etc. In other words the *Non* negates the pair of opposites on which we are focused by shifting our attention to everything else. This is a peculiarity of the Tetralemma of the Buddha and Nagarjuna. The tetralemma says *A*, $\sim A$, Both or Neither. In other words the tetralemma includes as logical possibilities the synthesis of *A* and $\sim A$ which might be a higher level Synthesis *X* which at the higher level would have its own negation. So there are at least two types of negation at play, there is a specific negation and a global negation. The specific negation negates the thesis and gives us the anti-thesis. The global negation negates both the thesis and anti-thesis together, and their synthesis presumably, and points us to the horizon beyond them, i.e. to every thing else $*X$, which itself is composed of all other possible sets of opposites whether natural or artificial and nihilistic. Now we know that the tetralemma is the means by which Buddhism points to emptiness. It says emptiness is what is other than the Tetralemma. This can be seen as the center of the logical tetrahedron of *and*, *or*, *nand*, and *nor*. The center of that logical tetrahedron of minimal logical operations is always empty and must be empty in order to distinguish them from each other and thus must be empty for logic to work at all.

Now we can use the Greimas square to think about approaching the question of non-duality. This is because we can see that the Greimas square introduces orthogonality between the *anti* and the *non*. So we can think about extending these both so that we can consider the chiasm between *anti* and *non*, in other words *anti-non-A* and *non-anti-A*. This chiasm or

reversibility is the minimal production of meaning though reversibility of terms. If we consider thinking-feeling or feeling-thinking then there is a slight difference in meaning between them that comes from just reversing the terms. This is the minimal meaning difference that resides just outside nonduality at the level of Wild Being. So when we generate the anti-non-A and the non-anti-A as chiasms we are right on the threshold of the nondual where that difference in meaning though minimal syntax change vanishes.

If we go from this general point to the question of the relation between duality and monism then we see that in Kantian terms the two directions are either unity or totality from the *A* term of plurality. And when we get the chiasm that is really a pointer toward wholeness which encompasses the chiasmic difference and tends toward the nondual. Duality can be the *A*, $\sim A$ and when it is set up then one dual tries to suppress the other and create a monism. But we can also at a hither synthetic level think of the *A* and $\sim A$ as the meta-difference between duality and monism which is itself a higher level duality. So for that reason monism does not escape duality as Advaita Vedanta seems to say. However, on the other hand when we begin talking about Nirguna Brahman as the Godhead then we are definitely moved intellectually far beyond mere countability as a means of discrimination. Thus it is my hypothesis that Advaita Vedanta is really equating Being with Emptiness and that means Ultra Being. Anyway it is up in the air for me whether Advaita Vedanta is really a Monism, and that is really because of the possible indirect influence between Nagarguna and Shankara which would mean that he would have had to recognize that a Monism could not possibly be really nondual in the since which it was meant by the Buddhists which actually meant non-one! not-two!

So what we see here is that the negation in the local and global senses really does not approach nonduality in the pure sense. This is because countability or qualitiveness underlies the

difference between monism as either unity or totality and dualism (plurality). Thus the nondual should actually be called the a-countable or the a-quantitative. This is to say by calling it a-categorical, in general, we are saying that it is unthinkable and unexperienceable in the extreme which is the reality of the nondual-in-itself, i.e. existence. What we are saying of course applies to the other categories so that the nondual is really a-relational, a-modal and a-qualitative as well, thus covering all the categories of Kant. Going even deeper we can say that it is a-spatial and a-temporal as well. But we must also admit that it is a-experiential. We cannot really leave out experience and merely deal with categories. Rather the nondual covers all of life, consciousness, and the social. Kant made the point that Reason is only useful to the extent that it is tempered by Experience to produce understanding. Of course, unlike Kant and more like Hegel we also accept the importance of speculative reason. But the idea that nonduality must cover both reason and experience we note by saying that the nondual is non-experiential and non-thinkable both.

So if we adopt the terminology championed by Pauli Pylkkö³ in his analysis of the meaning of Heidegger's Dasein (being-in-the-world) then we might have a more precise way of talking about what we really mean by nonduality, which goes beyond the global and local negations of mere quantitativity, and looks at the movement to something that is beyond both experience and thought but which is not outside of them, i.e. is not a transcendental but a kind of universal immanence. So looking at Kant's categories we would say it is a-categorical, which means a-quantitative, a-qualitative, a-relational and a-modal. But also it is a-experiential. And if we consider the overlap of reason and experience to produce understanding then we would call it a-conceptual along with Pylkkö. This means we are moving to the empty center of the square of contraries and

contradictions in logic, not just to the center of the minimal system of logical operations. This aligns with the concept of the Tetralemma as pointing to emptiness as what is beyond A, ~A, Both and Neither, because this is again an appeal to the quantitative only. The tetralemma is merely a pointer and what is really meant by it goes "beyond" the merely countable, negatable locally, the synthesis or conjunction, and the global negation of the neither.

But even though we can say a-reasonable, a-experiential, it is difficult to come up with a term that combines the totality of reason and experience to use as a term rather than just their intersection which is what the a-conceptual covers when it is talking about the understanding and the intelligibility of Being. We are so used to dividing our experience into body and mind that it is difficult to say what the negated totality of both of them amount to in this context. But to say negated is not quite right either. If we look at the prefix a- there are three meanings, **without** or **not** as in *amoral*, **in** or **on** as in *abed*, and **continuing on** as in *a-hunting*. These are three interesting meaning to the prefix a- with respect to our problem. That is because we might normally think that a-X was merely another form of negation even different from that of the *anti* and the *non*. But the concept of **without** helps to clarify because it means beyond the anti and the non, in other words beyond the tetralemma itself, which can be seen as outside the tetralemma as what is pointing toward the emptiness, say the emptiness at the heart of the tetrahedron of logical operators, or the emptiness at the heart of the square of contraries and contradiction in the Greimas square. But we should like to include the meaning of **on** or **in** as well. It is **on** if it is outside of the frame that is negated with the anti or non and it is **in** if it is at the center of that framework. So the on or in specifies the horizons of the exclusion of the a- prefix. But let us also think of the prefix as in a-hunting or a-fishing where there is **continuation**. Here we note the ongoing nature of the flux of the activity. We want our exclusion to be something active not just passive. So let us

³ [The Aconceptual Mind: Heideggerian themes in holistic naturalism](#) (John Benjamins, 1988)

apply this to the concept of the a-conceptual as articulated by Pyllkö as the nature of Dasein. We know that Dasein is prior to the split between Subject and Object, and it is this fact that it stands before the differentiation of Subject and Object that Pyllko wants to emphasize with his idea of the a-conceptual. But we cannot deny that it stands outside the framework of the dualism of the subject/object duality. But also it is not just prior in the sense of origin, but also beyond in the sense that dasein governs the articulation of the subject object duality as well. So dasein can be seen as an exclusion either **in** the interstices of or before or **on** top of and beyond the duality. Also Dasein is something that occurs at the level of Process Being and so it is definitely an **continuing** flux that we are in the midst of rather than some reification. So we can say that in the term a-conceptual we can see traces of all these meanings of a- as prefix fused together rather than needing to pick any one of them exclusively. However, when we talk about the a-conceptual we are talking about understanding and intelligibility of Dasein. Dasein is composed of understanding, discoveredness, talk and at the core care. The discoveredness is where we see experience come in as where we find ourselves and our moods that are part of our embedding in our context. Talk refers to the mediation of language, of course ratio, and logos are related to talk, and talk is ordered by the grammar of language. So within the intersection of Reason and Experience in the Kantian model, i.e. in understanding there is Dasein which is a-conceptual which has within it an intrinsic orientation to what it discovers it self within in its fallenness in experience and the moods that produces, but also there is the relation to understanding the intersection, and reason and logos as related to the structure of language. Heidegger finds this prior structure of Dasein on Kant's idea of the transcendental imagination that appears in the first edition of the Critique of Pure Reason. This faculty gets subsumed in subsequent editions. The independence of this faculty Heidegger thinks can be the grounding of his idea of Dasein in

Kant's philosophy, and we see in dasein an intersection of understanding, talk (logos or ratio) and discoveredness. But still this has an emphasis on understanding because dasein is really focused on the intelligibility of everything as Being. So there is no word for the proto-totality that relates proto-unity. If we put this in terms of Jung's psychology we would recognize the difference between the Unity of the Ego and the Totality of the Self. Dasein is a preimage of the ego as subject before it separates from its object. Dasein is not the preimage of the totality of the self. For that Heidegger has the alternative term being-in-the-world where the totality of the world is the framework that gives totality to us as mitsein prior to our achieving authenticity. So if we followed Jung we would say that it is the a-self as totality and a-ego as unity against the plurality of the archetypes and the phenomena of the Psyche. Self is the totality of what we are both rooted in experience (discoveredness) and in reason (talk) including understanding whose inner core is the care of Dasein. But the problem with Self is that we need to contrast that with the Other and rise above that difference as well just as we rise above I-it to I-thou relations, we need to rise above selfishness to self-other complementarity and say that what we are calling nonduality is beyond that duality as well. The good thing about the term non-dual is that we are most of the time negating duals. But we need to keep in mind that we are also negating the meta-duals of duality and monism, and all the others that are associated with the other dialectics in the Kantian Categories as well. But it is good to see that what we are considering is a special kind of negation that is exclusionary, it is **without** what ever is named as the total framework of our thought. It can either be pointed to as what is **in** or **on** the outside of that framework. And what is discussed is a **continuing** flux of exclusion not just a frozen single negation of either a local or global type. So we can think of this as a dynamic exclusion that we signify with an a- prefix as in a-categorical, a-quantitative, a-qualitative, a-relational, a-modal, a-conceptual, a-experiential but related to the totality of the community that

includes self and other, so it is also a-self and a-other as well. In Greek thought we have the Apeiron which is the unlimited that is opposite what ever is limited. The exclusionary aspect of it is that it keeps open horizons as to what it is that we are talking about by continually stepping outside any finite limitations on what it could be that we are specifying. In this sense it is like the Openness that is the opposite of Closure talked about by Lawson⁴. What ever closure we can imagine the a- prefix sets us outside that closure. This exclusionary negation that identifies a framework and then sets it aside, that identifies the exclusion with both what is inside it and what is beyond it, that is an ongoing continuing flux in the openness beyond all closures, beyond all totalizing self-other complementarities is very hard to describe because it is in fact unthinkable and unexperienceable, and unconceptual intrinsically. We could use the term prefix un- but that is mostly used for the global negation, rather than this refined exclusionary negation which is beyond what ever opposites and global negations that open up horizons beyond those opposites that you want to name. It is a-non-anti-specification. In fact if we were clever we might realize that there must be a step further, and that probably there is a negation type for each meta-level of Being.

Ontic: something specific

Pure: A, ~A (anti-A) abstraction

Process: Synthesis (both), *A (non-A, neither)

Hyper: !A, (exclusionary negation)

Wild: #A ???UNKNOWN??????

Ultra: |A ???UNKNOWN??????

Existence: Affirmation.

If this is so then we need to define these more rarified negations on the way to pure existence itself and this will improve our understanding of nonduality. However then we can talk about pure negation, process negation as we see in Hegel, exclusionary negation as we see in the Tetralemma, and other perhaps higher forms of negation that are not yet named. We might

speculate that when you reach the end of these more and more rarified negations then one would reach a state of pure affirmation such as that Deleuze talks about where we have striped away all negation from our comprehension of existence, and existence is no longer seen as the negation of Being, or non-being.

Hyper Negation

We have entered a new territory with our pushing the limits of the terminology of nonduality and encountered a new conceptual landscape unexpectedly. So let us push ahead into this unknown land and see what we might find there. If it is true that the ordinary concept of nonduality is exclusionary negation and if that is actually at the level of Hyper Being then the part of Loy's book about deconstructing deconstruction must be taken as prophetic and thus take far more seriously. In other words if exclusionary negation is in some way a dual of differance then perhaps Loy is right that nonduality is its antidote. Exclusionary negation is something like Hyper Being in as much as Hyper Being is the hovering indecisively before possibilities. If all the possibilities are the framework and the hovering is the exclusion, then Hyper Being has exactly the same structure as Exclusionary Negation. Exclusionary negation takes an exhaustive structural framework and then points beyond that either inwardly or outwardly. Nagarjuna did that with the logical operators by applying the Tetralemma. I am doing that when I talk about the Greimas square and the fact it is empty inside. It is also empty outside. Inside emptiness and outside emptiness are both exclusionary, i.e. they go off into a realm excluded by the exhaustive combinatorial expansion of the framework, and then it takes one further step beyond that framework.

Differance is differing and deferring. I have often said that Efficacy is efficiency and effectiveness. Plotnitsky uses the term efficacy in his book Complementarity in the sense I intend here. These are duals of each other. Efficacy is something that is increased in Special Systems.

⁴ Hilary Lawson - Closure: A Story of Everything

It is increased perhaps by taking advantage of the difference that appears between the system and the meta-system. In normal systems efficacy is held in check by entropy. But in negatively entropic special systems difference is exploited to find ways of avoiding positive entropy and increasing locally negative entropy. Now perhaps what we are saying here is that there is another direction we can go besides this complementarity between Difference and Efficacy. That other direction is perhaps defined by the exclusionary negation. That would be in a direction which is a-differant or a-efficacious. Perhaps even this exclusionary negation is the difference between difference and efficacy. It has to be clear that this is a meta-difference. Perhaps the meta-difference is efficacious at the same time. It is the difference that makes a difference between efficacy and difference. Eventually we have to get to a negation that allows supra-rational constructs. But moving up to the level of meta-difference may cause us to break into the next meta-level of Being in which there will be an emergent property of Wild Being that will be exposed. Thus exclusionary negation must be a meta-difference that is just this side of the boundary where we break into the *sui generis* realm of Wild Being. But clearly this meta-difference must be something other than efficacy and difference. Yet this difference is not something that is yet emergence to the next meta-level of Being, it is just not the two elements at the level of Hyper Being that is being distinguished. As something is differing and deferring from 'differing and deferring' perhaps it can become efficacious too in some strange manner that we cannot readily understand. As something is effective and efficient in its 'effectiveness and efficiency' then perhaps it can become different too in some equally uncanny manner. And perhaps the difference between these two is an exclusionary negation. Efficacy excludes difference and difference excludes efficacy. In other words we can hover over the possibilities of efficacy in the realm of difference or we can hover over the possibilities of difference in the realm of efficacy. For exclusionary negation to work there must be something beyond the

structural framework, as Deleuze would say there must be something beyond the Lacanian Symbolic, and we have seen that in fact there is something beyond the structural which we have named the Generative. But when we go to that realm beyond the structural unfolding of all possibilities then we have just increased the realm of possibility one more step, we have in fact entered the imaginary opposite realm of the given structure which is one from all possible structures. Traditional logic is just one from all possible logics including many deviant logics. The generative takes us back to the Burgess Shale from which all possible frameworks arise, not just deviant but also degenerative logics appear in this field of all possible frameworks. What separates all the frameworks in this field of all possible frameworks, well it must be something exclusionary, like exclusionary negation. So if we exit the realm of one of these frameworks we immediately run into the cell wall that separates that framework from all the other frameworks, and that cell wall is made up of exclusionary negation. We pick the logic we do from all possible logics because we consider it the most efficacious for guiding our thought, but there is still some logics beyond that one and those are separated by an exclusionary negation. If we take the field of the cells walls between the different frameworks rather than the frameworks themselves that inhabit this discontinuous field then we have nonduality in the classic sense, something else beyond oneness or manyness that is a-quantitative, but also a-qualitative, a-relational, and a-modal, but also a-conceptual and a-experiential. It seems like the ultimate horizon of negation. But is it. Can we move up to the level of Wild Negation? Can we pierce through to the next meta-level of negation? Lets try.

Wild Negation

If Exclusionary negation is at the level of Hyper Being then it starts to become clear what Wild negation must be, it must be Inclusionary Negation. That is because Hyper being and Wild Being are opposites just like Pure Being

and Process Being are opposites. So by knowing something about this opposition and how it works it is possible to speculate about the possible properties of Inclusionary negation. Just as Hyper Being is an expansion of being-in-the-world so Wild Being must be a contraction of being-in-the-World. This kind of opposition or complementarity must hold for the negations at the these two meta-levels of Being. This being the case we can readily postulate what inclusionary negation is like, and that is because we know that anomalies live at the level of Wild Being. Inclusionary negation is a form of negation which is like a geodesic, or a gage phenomena in physics, it is an internal negation that does not need the framework as a springboard. It is in fact something uniquely different from the framework that the framework cannot handle, which negates the framework but affirms itself with an existential affirmation, i.e. just by existing without need of the framework. Exclusionary negation is a parasite off of the framework, it gets to the wall between framework and hypothesizes the whole field of such cell walls as the nature of emptiness. Inclusionary negation sits with the anomaly that is independent of the framework, perhaps independent of many different frameworks, perhaps off in an orthogonal direction from the field of cell walls. The cell walls only relate to the Frameworks, but perhaps they do not map very well to the singular and unique anomalies that are scattered about the field. Inclusionary negation forms a geodesic from these singularities out into the field, it exchanges gage particles with the other singularities that form anomalies in the field, and they live their own Wild life that is an existential negation of the frameworks themselves, and perhaps even the network of cells that the frameworks represent including the cell walls that are exclusionary. The metaphor for Wild Being is of course the Mandelbrot set. Each of these points in the complex plane are independent of each other, each has its own escape velocity that gives color to the plane and forms a pattern. But what ever magnification you apply will have a different pattern, self similar to the pattern at

the next higher and the next lower levels of the Mandelbrot set. The exclusionary aspect is the discontinuities between each point in the imaginary plane to which we apply iteration and get accelerations in lines of flight. But the exclusionary negation that separates the different points does not explain the fact that they form an endless self-similar fractal pattern, there is some crossover of the cell membranes of exclusionary negation by an inclusionary negation that allows the singular points to communicate by some geodesic with some sort of gage exchange that creates the overall pattern despite the isolation of the points on the imaginary plane. We can think of this as the reflection of the whole within the part and thus we naturally get to the idea of interpenetration where there is mirroring between the singular points that are doing their inclusionary negation. So this is why emptiness is the same as interpenetration. There is a natural move from exclusionary hyper negation to inclusionary wild negation which have been discovered before in Buddhism and probably other nondual traditions. However, I doubt whether it has been understood in these terms before as the natural unfolding of the meta-levels of negation. So I think that we can say that it is now clearer what the relation is between these two forms of negation. One relates to the cell walls in the Burgess Shale of all possible frameworks which themselves form the anti-pattern to the structural combinatorics of all the possible frameworks. The other relates to the anomalies in the field which are singularities that form geodesics and communicate by gage particles of some sort so that they form a topology within the field different from the cell walls and independent of it. It is this independence that allows us to call this inclusionary negation a *sui generis* form of negation over and above the exclusionary negation at the level of hyper negation. But all this explains even more readily something we already knew which was that emptiness is interpenetration at a deeper level. Mahayana Buddhism has made this clear over the centuries. But it was never explained that this difference was one of meta-levels of negation.

So we have made some important progress here despite the discovery of something we already knew.

If we use the term a-conceptual for exclusionary negation what term should we use for inclusionary negation. What we noticed in exclusionary negation is that it was seen as within or outside of the framework after all the structural possibilities had been exhausted. But in inclusionary negation the inside and outside become the same and are unified as a singularity that is independent of the framework. Inclusionary negation assumes that the field of all possible frameworks and the discontinuous cell boundaries that separate them is a non-orientable surface like a Kleinian bottle where inside and outside are globally the same. I think that inclusionary negation should be de-conceptual, because it has shed the frameworks themselves as the springboard into the field. The frameworks have been denatured by their abandonment in favor of the singularities that form communities on their own despite their not being able to connect with each other through the exclusionary isolating boundaries of the cell walls. There is some type of quantum tunneling going on through those walls that allow patterns despite radical isolation and geodesics are formed and gage particles are exchanged. So we would call the de-quantitative, de-qualitative, de-relational, and de-modal the de-categorical and relate those to the de-experiential which when combined with the de-rational forms the de-conceptual. The prefix de- works fairly well as a way of expressing this level wild negation beyond the a-conceptual of Hyper negation.

Ultra Negation

Now I think things are going to get difficult. And this is because ultra negation is itself an anomaly. In other words in Inclusion negation we have a negation of frameworks by independent singularities. But the negation itself has now become a singularity. At the level of Ultra Negation it is negation itself that becomes a singularity. We already now that something

strange is going on at the Ultra Being level. Here the phase transition into existence takes place and ultra Being is an impurity of Being left in existence. And the reason that this happens is that when we transition into existence, what was dual becomes nondual and what was nondual becomes dual. So there Being which has been supporting dualisms all the way up the meta-levels suddenly becomes unified as the externality of Being as projection, and that now becomes the non-nihilistic distinction between emptiness and void, two possible interpretations of existence, one sported by Buddhism and the other by Taoism. One does not believe that the external world exists and the other does not believe that Life, Consciousness and the Social is any different than nature. So here what ever form of negation we are talking about is a negation of the difference between two views of interpenetration. When we look at the term interpenetration we immediately see why there is a problem because what happened to intra and surface. Why is everything intra and penetration related. There must be another structure, a deeper structure that is immersive beyond the generative where we find the permutations of *inter / intra // penetration / surfacing*. So here we reach another structural pattern that is at the core of all other structural patterns which again must have an empty middle and that empty middle is the ultra negation which is anomalous and immersive. Lets for the moment call this reclusive negation. We will relate it to the hermitage of Stonehouse the Zen/Taoist monk. In the poetry⁵ of Stonehouse on page 51 there are alternating lines that are empty and void. A staggering achievement to combine Zen Buddhism and Taoism in a single embodiment. But he does so by renouncing not just the world but begging, and lives in a hermitage alone, i.e. as a recluse. Reclusive Negation recognizes that the Generative level has beyond it the Immersive level, and at that level there is a deeper structure in which inclusive negation of interpenetration is just one element among

⁵ Translated by Red Pine.

many, and we know that this must be true because we have Taoism and Buddhism as two different approaches to nonduality that demand Ultra Being as their mediation. For this reason Tantra is still practiced in Tibetan Buddhism. There is a necessity of understanding projection completely and accepting it as something in existence, within ourselves, as our possibility of standing outside ourselves toward all the things projected and the existents projected upon. But also in Tibetan Buddhism is rDzog Chen (Ati Yoga) which is a heresy that there is a deeper nondual than the two truths, i.e. that the two truths themselves are two sides of a deeper nondual. This is a heresy in Buddhism. But it also appears in Bon which is the Tibetan equivalent of Taoism. So rDzog Chen (Ati Yoga) bridges the gap between Buddhist and Taoist approaches by positing a deeper nondual. This is similar to Tien-Tai in China which finds a loop hole in Nagarjuna to posit a deeper nondual beyond emptiness but escape the charge of Heresy because the loophole is found in the works of Najarguna who can do no wrong from the Buddhist point of view. I call this deeper nondual than emptiness and void by the term *manifestation*. That is mainly because I do not have a better term that I have found in the English language. But I base this upon the use of the term by Michael Henry in The Essence of Manifestation who uses Meister Eckhart as a basis for critiquing Heidegger and his assumption of Ontological Monism. Ontological Plurality allows us to posit the higher meta-levels of Being such as Hyper Being and Wild Being, because the Monolith that Henry speaks of is the combination of Pure Being and Process Being that Heidegger assumed were the only modalities of Being and which together explained the relation between the positions of Heraclitus and Parmenides, the dualistic opposites in our tradition. But in a deeper reading of Henry's book we might emphasize the work of Meister Eckhart and his descriptions of the Godhead and its emptiness/voidness and its manifestation in spiritual practice. Meister Eckhart talks about

the Godhead boiling and recently I have found the same metaphor in Shams of Tabis⁶. Thus this boiling of the Godhead is what brings about manifestation. And that manifestation is Univocal and Immanent from the point of view of Deleuze. We can see this as the hall mark of the Immersive register. What the Godhead is before it boils we do not know. We call that the Dhat in Sufism, it is the nonmanifest beyond manifestation of the attributes of God. We can say that some like rDzog Chen in heresy and Tien-Tai without heresy say that there is such a deeper nondual. Or we can be satisfied with Stonehouse who merely conjuncts the Taoism and the Buddhism, the emptiness and void, and allows us to draw our own conclusions. Either way we need a difference between emptiness and void as nonduals in order to posit the deeper nondual and it is Ultra Being that provides that non-nihilistic distinction. Strange to think that Being as an externality makes a non-nihilistic distinction when on the inside of the projection there is nothing but nihilism. It is a strange, very strange world we live in, very unexpected things occur even at this rarified level. Or perhaps we should expect strange things to occur when negation itself has become an anomaly. So manifestation as the deeper nondual is the antipode of Ultra Being which is the insertion of the reclusive negation between emptiness and void. Now when you take two interpretations of existence such as emptiness and void and negate them what do you get, well I would say an affirmation. So it must be that the sixth meta-level of Being must be an affirmation of existence which is positive rather than negative in tone. Negation is exhausted at that point. Once the singularity of negation is a card that has been played then it cannot be played again and we must switch over to affirmation from all these meta-levels of negation. This is the sort of affirmation that Deleuze talks about which says *this and that and the other thing and something else and . . .* which is an unbounded multiplicity in some sense. Since existence appears at this level we will use the prefix ex- to talk about the terms at

⁶ See Me and Rumi

this meta-level of negation. So we will talk about ex-quantity, ex-quality, ex-relation, ex-modality, ex²-perience, ex-conceptual. Here we are talking about which means **without** in the sense of exclusionary negation and **outside** in the sense that the anomalies are outside the control of the frameworks as in inclusionary negation and finally **former**. What is new here is the meaning of **former**. In other words, **formerly** both inclusion and exclusion in negation was multiple in its usage, but once ex-conceptuality appears and we get reclusive negation then what was **formerly** dual has become nondual and what was **formerly** nondual becomes dual, and this has implications for the type of affirmation that we can make at meta-level six where existence has no impurities which would cause a complementarity in nonduality differentiated by a non-nihilistic distinction that comes from Being, the source of all nihilism. Talking about the tables turning. This turning of the tables that makes the deeper nondual appear as manifestation is the result of reclusive negation, the last refuge of negation as an activity before the affirmation of existence without impurities of Being. Reclusive negation defines the possibility of the Univocity and the pure immanence that Deleuze talks about. Pure immanence we get in the philosophy of Spinoza according to Deleuze. Spinoza and Leibniz are anti-Cartesian duals of each other. They both developed forms of Expressionism. And that expressionism leads to a rejection of all transcendences, and a search for a ground of pure immanence. We call that pure immanence immersive and have likened it to the immersion in the multi-verse and the denial of the limitation of the universes. The cell walls between the universes are exclusionary. The patterns of likeness among all the universes are inclusionary. And the immersive immanence in the multiverse is reclusive in as much as it withdraws from all the projective worlds that generate transcendences. We can point to the center of the permutational deep structure of interpenetration, intersurfacing, intrapenetration and intrasurfacing to see the anomaly of ultra

negation of the anomaly of ultra being in which negation is the anomaly, and we see that this is because in the projection there is a negation of existence, and this negation causes the disconnect between the noumena and the schematization which the anomalies must arise to resolve. So when we get rid of this negation of existence then there can only be an affirmation of existence. The externality of the projection process is the last impurity that needs to be expunged in order to arrive at the sixth meta-level where this affirmation takes hold and existence no longer has any impurities.

Completely Negated Negation

When we move beyond negation all together, and thus the negation of existence in particular, then we enter the realm of affirmation. In logic there are two forms of negation that are duals of each other and the difference between these is an affirmation of difference. Existence by its own existence is an affirmation, we call it proof by existence. Existence affirms itself. That is just the phenomena itself without any prefix. We return to where we have started but with a difference which is that we have purged negativity from our life in all its meta-levels especially the negativity that denies existence itself by the continual projection of Being. This affirmation is equal to the non-manifest or the Dhat, i.e. the non-boiling Godhead to cite Eckhart and Shams of Tabris.

Affirmation of Existence

Non-duality is the affirmation of existence. But we need a more refined vocabulary to talk about that which recognizes the crudeness of the term *non-dual*. We can develop a more sophisticated terminology as we have done here, and that can tell us things that the term non-duality does not. But it won't catch on and people will continue to use the catch phrase that Loy promoted which is really inaccurate but will continue to define our discourse anyway for some time to come. However, the fact that there are meta-levels of Negation and that it is the purging of this negativity that is in part

what happens as we go through the meta-levels of Being toward Existence. When we arrive at Existence we get affirmation but with a difference, the difference generated by the purging of negation. If we had not purged negation then our affirmation of things in Being would always be partial. But interestingly along the way we recognized interpenetration, and found a reason for the deeper structure that permutes even that to give us the deeper center of manifestation which appears just prior to our entering existence proper in which there is no longer a difference between emptiness and void. Where existence no longer has impurities.

Thus our table of the meta-levels of Negation can be extended in ways we hardly expected.

Ontic: something specific
 Pure: A, ~A (anti-A) abstraction
 Process: Synthesis (both), *A (non-A, neither)
 Hyper: !A, (exclusionary negation) a-A
 Wild: #A (inclusionary negation) de-A
 Ultra: |A (reclusive negation) ex-A(emptiness)
 Utter Existence: Affirmation A (purged of negation)

Negation and the Structure of the World

All of this gives us pause because it suggests that we can understand better the structure of the world. This is because we have been considering the meta-levels of negation and negation is essential to logic. If we look at logic then we know that the minimal logic is generated out of three operators which is **negation** which is unary and **or/and** which are binary. The unary operator is used on each of the binary operators to produce the **nand** and **nor** which gives the tetrahedron of operations that form the minimal system of logic. From this core minimal system of operators then we move to the sixteen operators of standard logic which can be seen in many forms one of which is the Logic Alphabet of Shea Zellweger or as seen in the operators of Matrix Logic of August Stern. But note this that the **and** and **or** operators are images of the limits of the divided line, i.e. paradox and supra-rationality. **And** is fusion which leads to paradox. **Or** is exclusion

which allows one but not the other -- we think this applies in a given logical moment. But it could be that the **or** is modal so we have this mode or that mode at the same time, which is the approximation to supra-rationality where two things are true at the same time *without* interference. In other words there are two modes that run simultaneously with each other which are separate, i.e. exclusive of one another and thus not interfering with each other, but at the same time. If these two operators are images of the limits of the divided line, then suddenly we can understand the structure of the world differently than we did before. When we say that there is a hierarchy of the three ones, we can say that these are the hierarchy of the three nonduals within the divided line, i.e. emptiness, manifestation, and void, and that these come into contact with the two limits of the divided line which is supra-rational **or** and paradoxical **and**. The three lines in the divided lines stand in relation to the limits in terms of negation. They are a hierarchy because it is clear that emptiness is less than void and void is less than manifestation. But they together structure the interval of the divided line by providing separation by introducing discontinuities. So we now have a relation between the three ones and the dual, and this conditions the possibility that there can be the three regions, which are the three types of algebra, but in our terms are the relation between the dual and nondual, which in this case is **negation** and the two operations **and** and **or**. So at the level of the three regions metaⁿ-dimension there is the production of the basic operations of logic. But the next step is that the unary operation is applied to the binary operations to give us the tetrahedron of operations **and**, **or**, **nand** and **nor**. These relate to the level of the four aspects which are truth, reality, presence, and identity. When we place the four operator tetrahedron in the context of the three aspects that define a formal system which are truth, identity and presence, then we generate the set of sixteen basic operations that connect A and B our two operands. These are . . .

A
 $A \supset B, A \supset B$
 $A \supset \sim B, B, B \supset A$
 $A \supset \sim A, A \supset B, A \supset B, A \supset \sim A$
 $\sim A \supset B, \sim B, A \supset B$
 $\sim A \supset \sim B, \sim A \supset \sim B$
 $\sim A$

See Shea Zellweger's figure 10 in "A Shape Value Notation for Elementary Logic" page 309.

When we add the aspect of reality to this mix then we generate significance. And we get from the three properties of the formal system which are consistency, completeness, and clarity (wellformedness), to the other three properties which are verification, validation and coherence. By entering into the meta-dimension of the aspects we produce the basis for the formal system of logic which then produces deviant forms and degenerate forms. The deviant forms of interest are Hellerstein's Diamond Logic and Stearn's Matrix Logic. Stearn's Matrix Logic is both paracomplete and paraconsistent and thus approximates the structure of the tetralemma. Hellerstein's Diamond Logic explains that paradox is itself dual, and shows how this can be expressed as A yet B or B yet A . We need to keep this in mind that paradox related to the **and** operation is dual while supra-rationality related to the **or** operation is unitary intrinsically. The next step is to introduce the seven standings which are the higher logical types if we go downward or the meta-levels if we go upward. We have seen how negation takes on different forms in each of these standings. Finally although we have introduced a complete system of the higher logical type theory of Russell as understood by Copi in order to control the paradox of Being and point to the clarity of Existence, we have to understand that this does not yet bring us into contact with the world. For that we need schematization and the ten schemas that have been identified in our study which introduces the limits of supra-rationality and paradoxicality in a new way as we move from

the facet to the pluriverse. The schemas are projected on the noumena. But the noumena themselves have an internal structure which is the Arche of which there are sixteen. These sixteen of the quadrate of quadrates produce the pre-images in the imaginary realm of the sixteen operators of the full fledged logic. Without that preimage there would be no fundamental differentiation of the sixteen logical operators. Logic is a form projected on the noumena. But actually each schema has its own variation of logic which takes us beyond form into dimensionality which appears with mathesis. Thus the schematization, mathesis and logic are closely intertwined. Schematization gives us contact with an embodied world. Mathesis considers the pure ordering of countability or other pure discriminators as in topology where the discriminator is continuity through homeomorphisms. Logic gives us the ability to reason about language statements in the most basic fashion.

Now this gives us a completely different perspective on the structure of the world based on rational fibered knots. It allows us to see how logic, then schemas, and mathesis connects us to the world in a natural way as a result of the internal differentiation of this structure of finitude within the infinitude of metaⁿ-dimensions. And so we see how our understanding of the various meta-levels of negation gives us more insight into the structure of the world and that this is embodied in logic and its operators relations to each other which mimics the stages of the unfolding of the world which is a kind of microgenesis. The key point is the realization that the three ones are not reified into portents of god, i.e. the three high ones which are Oden or the trinity, but are in fact the three nonduals that divide the divided line between the two limits, so the three and two at the top of the structure of the world refers to the structure of the divided line itself. Within that structure appears the three regions that appear as the two duals and the nondual within Being and it appears as Ultra Being distinguishing emptiness and void in existence. Then we add the four types and the seven

standings and we impose higher logical type theory to deal with the paradox of Being and to defer its poisoning of us. The opposite of Being based on the supra-rational is existence which appears at the fifth standing. Beyond that is the deeper nondual which is Manifestation (sifat), and then beyond that is the non-manifest dhat which is the image of the Godhead. When we have produced the standings and this has differentiated negation as the nondual image in logic, from the duals of the A and B operands which are connected by the sixteen operations of logic then we can see these in terms of the noumena and the projection process through schematization. Schematization unleashes Mathesis in terms of the production of dimensionality itself. But the schemas are finite dual of the infinite dimensions. But prior to the schemas, in the noumenal realm there is still a structure, the quadrate of quadrates, or the Arche which give us the preimage of the sixteen operators prior to schematization and of course that is what makes those operators a priori. We can see that in the relations between the Operands in the Greimas square, and their various relations via the three operators of logic as well as implication, equality and inequality.

We see the elements of logic, mathesis and schematization through the lens of the Peirce/Fuller categories which are First = isolation, Second = relation, Third = continuity, Fourth = Synergy, and Fifth = Szyzgy. But these are mirrored by the Lacanian and Deleuzian registers of the Real, Imaginary, Symbolic, Generative and Immersive. The nounmenal is the real beyond the projection, but at a deeper level it is the archetypal imaginary. But even more deeply it is the symbolic structures that we find that naturally occur. But beyond these Lacanian registers the noumena has to do with the Generative which considers all possible structures, and finally the Immersive register which is related to immanence. The various registers (anti-categories) are our way of seeing the layers of the noumena onto which the metaⁿ-dimensional finitude of the world is projected. So our foray into the realm of negation and its meta-levels

has helps us ultimately understand better the finite structure of the world based on fibered rational knots, where knots are the structure of self-organization. This finite structure of self-organization appears within the infinitude of each ascending metaⁿ-dimension. The clearing of the divided line opens up and then within it is constructed the higher logical type theory and then the schematization which moves back and forth between the limits of the divided line in a different way. And we must understand that the divided line of Plato is only one of four divided lines seen by Blake in his visions of the Zoas, their emanations, shadows and specters related to Urizen, Luvah, Urthona, and Tharmas. Tharmas is like Poseidon, Urizen is like Zeus, and Urthona is like Hades and finally Luvah is Prometheus who is the Titan who challenges the three Olympian brothers. Prometheus brings fire to man. And what is more like a fire in man that love, whether it be eros, or agape. In this way we can see how the unfolding of logic is in line with the structure of the world based on the Fibered Rational Knot structure of finitude within infinitude. We can see how the unfolding of logic leads to the production of Schematization and Mathesis as soon as we leave the haven of the higher logical types. By understanding the levels of meta-negation and how they are related to the standings of the meta-levels of Being and Existence then we have discovered a way to understand better the structure of the world itself better and this clarifies our relation to the three ones and the initial dual as the basis for the divided line. When we realize that there are four divided lines then we have a picture of the Arche though the vision of the four Zoas. It is the interaction of the schemas with the noumena which they attempt to make a first dimensional categorization of which grounds our world in that which escapes it, i.e. that which is projected upon. And we discover our projections when anomalies appear. The exploitation of those anomalies for knowledge is called Science. So we can go beyond this to see how Science which takes into account the structure of the world, and the role that the meta-levels of negation plays in it would be by

definition and nondual science, but also by understanding the role of the meta-levels of negation in defining the alternative viewpoint on things that nonduals afford we improve our understanding of nonduality itself and introduce the science of nonduality. The nonduality of science and the science of nonduality are implicated in each other. By clarifying the meta-levels of Negation we have clarified the meaning of both Nondual Science and the Science of the Nondual. The Science of the nondual is the science of finding alternatives where there are no alternatives, where the combinatorial expansion has been exhausted, this leads to a science of Emergence because emergence also has meta-levels and the first meta-level of emergence is mere combinatorial exploitation, but then by negation we go beyond that to the next meta-level of emergence and so on. It is pretty sure that the meta-levels of emergence and negation will be reciprocally related. Emergence is precisely the term that the Asian nondual philosophies does not handle very well which is handled much better by Western Philosophy. When we introduce emergence into the mix then we see that there is an alternative to negation itself.

Emergence and Negation

In my talk to CSER 2004 I advocated that Systems Engineering should become Emergence Engineering and I suggested that there were different meta-levels of Emergence and that it is only at the fifth meta-level that we achieve genuine emergence and rise out of the realm of artificial and nihilistic emergence. Pure Emergence is merely the exploitation of combinatory difference to make a difference that makes a difference. Process Emergence is where emergence itself becomes an event and we get emergent events. Hyper Emergence is hovering before all the possibilities that present themselves in Design. Wild Emergence is the anomaly, singularity or uniqueness that is added which is *sui generis*. Ultra Emergence is genuine emergence which changes the world, where the seed of a new paradigm, episteme, or interpretation of being comes into the world

which has been cleared of its previous structure, that clearing imitating the rendering empty or void of what went before. Each of these levels of emergence can be seen to be related to the meta-levels of negation in that it is the meta-negations that prepare the way for the arrival of the emergence that appears at the next meta-level. So at the Pure Negation level we get a differentiation between the various combinatorially produced differences which are the basis of nihilism, like the new car or new stereo every year. Just enough different that the consumer will want to buy the new model. Process Negation means that we have something like Hegel recognized as the unfolding of negation in history as a means of driving consciousness forward toward a social self-consciousness. But this assumes that there will be discontinuous emergent events in history where the genetic unfolding takes a leap. Hyper Negation stands beyond the framework, what ever it is, but that framework could be the design of the new system. So the ability to take a perspective outside or inside any framework is what makes it possible for us to produce artifacts that do not appear in nature. Wild Negation is of the anomaly which needs no framework, which then challenges the framework and drives the framework toward recognizing its unique qualities and quantities beyond the schematization projection. Ultra Negation is where negation itself becomes the anomaly and that is where Genuine Emergence of the new occurs where the slate is wiped clean (read emptiness and void seen instead of positive phenomena) and a new pattern is instituted that is genuinely new. Utter negation is Negation of Negation or Affirmation, this is what appears at the sixth meta-level where Existence is no longer impure with Ultra Being. Utter negation is the affirmation of existence. But that affirmation necessitates our continuously changing our frameworks, and thus exploring the field of all possible frameworks, and thus because that field is separated by walls of exclusive negation that means that we must have emergence as we cross those exclusive negation boundaries within the discontinuous field of all possible

frameworks. We can cross them because the opposite of exclusive negation is inclusive negation and in that there is communication despite being walled off. Like the tapping code developed by prisoners in North Vietnam that allowed them to communicate even though they were isolated from each other. That is where the singular unique anomalies themselves have their own geodesics and gage particles that they exchange so that they do not need the frameworks for their own mutual self-organization. These singularities are the seeds of the new structural order of the frameworks which is combinatorially exhausted step by step. So inclusive negation makes possible emergence by allowing us to cross the barriers set up by inclusive negation. We enter the cell of a new framework and the see of the order of that new framework is there in ultra negation. Ultra negation is reclusive, it lives alone in that cell and orders that cell in its own way, just like each of us order our own room, even prisoners order their environments with what little things they can amass. We as recluses in our cells project ourselves on our environments and that means organizing them in a new way based on the tendencies, propensities and latent defects that appear within us as anomalies ourselves. Utter Existence is where this rudimentary projection process itself stops completely and there are not even any impurities of Being left to defile Existence.

When we see that the meta-levels of emergence is the opposite of the meta-levels of negation. Then we realize that what the West has done is explore the horizon of the possibility of emergence while the East has explored the horizon of the meta-levels of negation. Now due to colonialism we bring these two traditions into confrontation with each other through dominance relations imposed by force. But this also allows an intellectual confrontation that can develop a nondual science and perhaps a science of nonduality. When we realize that emergence is an attempt at affirmation negated by inherent nihilism, then we can consider what it might mean to have emergence which was not based on its opposition to nihilism, and that

might be a type of affirmation of existence which goes beyond that known by the Eastern nondual traditions. We purge ourselves of the meta-levels of negation, but what do we take on to make this affirmation new as we come to the same place and recognize that it is different. This new affirmation must be a type of genuine emergence without the corresponding nihilism and purged of negation. That is an openness to the new in every moment. That is much like the stance of Ati Yoga or rDzog Chen. When we are confronted by the unknown new thing then we do extra processing to introduce our schematization actively to the net object. It is this process that allows us to see schematization take place. In that we are feeling out the noumena beyond our projections to discover what is new about it. This openness to the genuine emergence without nihilism needing to be generated as the background of artificial emergence is the new sort of affirmation we seek. It is when we accept our being condemned to an interesting life.