Existence Without Existence:

A Unified Theory of Being

By Caleb M

COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

Existence and Non-Existence: A Unified Theory of Being

(Misconceptions addressed near the end)

Disclaimer: An existence, an oxymoron. I don't believe in anything while doing so with all. I regard concepts, whilst not**.**

Note: I do not claim to be a genius of any sort. Regardless of whether I am above average in a certain aspect, I do not contend one can be superior or inferior; ultimately, I am equal. Look at Dunning-Kruger. This theory is, in a sense, speculation. I may be more ignorant of philosophy than it appears. Nevertheless, I don't believe that intelligence makes one superior.

I share these ideas not to elevate myself, but to stimulate discourse that uplifts humanity's collective growth. Any merits or flaws in the ideas themselves should be judged *independently of my identity or intentions.*

In this theory**,** I shall contend that limitations may exist within the law of non-contradiction (optimistically demonstrating the need for a revamped logic system). and share my theory of existence without existence's unification, alongside numerous instances. In passing to an abundance of others.

A collaboration with my perspective on the world, albeit an attempt rather than the truth.

All while considering counterarguments and limitations. I see this as an intellectually stimulating opportunity and a potential contribution.

Author Note: I am the sole original theorist. The core ideas presented here emerged purely from my own independent philosophical reasoning and introspection, without intentionally relying on or explicitly referencing established theories. (Unconscious external influences plausibly occur, therefore ignore what I said.) I will try to acknowledge and provide due credit to any potentially overlapping concepts that exist to the best of my knowledge. I sincerely apologize if any inadvertent coincidental similarities occur.

In addition, I absolutely do not think these ideas are novel, and they most likely have been thought of. I'm simply using this for intellectual stimulation. Furthermore, I do not believe I am a genius, a prodigy, or anything. I acknowledge that I am not an expert or anything and most likely have no idea what I'm talking about, but I am looking to contribute to discussion.

******

Argument for Existence Without Existence in a Nutshell

August 22th, 2023, 12:38 AM

Subjectivity and objectivity cause a contradiction as they both exist while meaning different things.

The paradoxical unity yet distinction of subjectivity and objectivity has been wrestled with for **centuries** in philosophy.

Fichte/Schiller's view that subjectivity produces reality hints at existence emerging from non-existence in a sense.

Hegel sees unity of opposites and interdependence between subject and object. This implies a co-mingling of existence and non-existence.

If subjectivity and objectivity imply one another, they harbor each other's essence too in a way.

An object's knowability connects it to consciousness while its independence separates it - another form of divided existence.

These different attempts to reconcile subjectivity and objectivity do end up implying certain paradoxes of existence without existence, or simultaneous being and non-being.

Quantum physics suggests paradoxes like particle-wave duality, but does not critique formal logic itself

No previous philosopher has been able to completely integrate or choose between subjective and objective stances - affirming their contradictory coexistence.

This further proves my theory that existence and nonexistence are unified.

For hundreds of years, philosophers have wrestled with this theory and haven't come to a definite conclusion. It's clear that this hints at the need for logical paradigm shifts. Therefore, I propose that our current logic systems require an update.

If rational analysis cannot definitively separate or choose between subjective and objective perspectives, this suggests limits to traditional logic in accounting for basic features of reality.

Subjectivity and objectivity is in everything, along with existence without existence. This suggests my idea of embracing paradoxes in a sense. Therefore, my idea of the unification of existence without existence seems very valid. Especially considering objectivity and subjectivity has been argued for centuries, yet never came to a definite conclusion.

August 22th, 2023, 2:18 AM

Dictionary:

Logic: Absolute/Objective - Subjective - Societal Benefits

Existence
Absolute:
Refers to the property of entities that have objective, physical reality. Even things that exist objectively incorporate nonexistence, as their concrete being represents just an infinitesimal fragment within the boundlessness of infinity. In addition, existence intertwines with nonexistence through fluid transitions in conscious states and the subjective imagination of non-real things. Objective existence thus intrinsically encompasses subjective nonexistence.
- Example: First Property; implies one existent whilst everything else nonexistent as you cannot predict other variables. Hence, existence without existence.
- Second property: We cannot know the second property, although we can guess. It may be nonexistent subjectively while seemingly existing objectively.

Subjective:
Existence is the state of living or having objective reality while simultaneously being nonexistent, since anything that can be thought of or imagined inherently exists in a subjective sense, even if not objectively real.

Nonexistence:
Absolute:
Entities that are not real or present in physical reality. However, even things that objectively do not exist still incorporate existence, as they can be imagined or thought about, and therefore exist subjectively or conceptually. Due to factors like infinity and consciousness, objective nonexistence inherently coexists with subjective existence

Subjective:
Nonexistence is the state of not being real or present in an objective, physical sense while simultaneously existing subjectively through imagination, thought, or conscious awareness. Anything that can be conceived or pondered inherently has a subjective nonexistent existence by virtue of being present in consciousness, irrespective of physical reality.

Infinity
Absolute:
Infinity refers to something without limits or end that goes on forever. It transcends any finite value or measurement and has always existed. Infinity encompasses all manifestations of being and nonbeing and exceeds human comprehension due to its absolute limitless nature.

Subjective:
Infinity refers to something without limits that goes on forever, as conceived in the human imagination. While infinite values may be impossible to ever confirm objectively, infinity exists subjectively as an idea that exceeds any finite conceptualization or measurement. The subjective concept of infinity transcends human rationality and boundaries

Infinity vs Existence
Used to describe different things, therefore aren't the same albeit equal.

Consciousness
Absolute:
Consciousness refers to the awareness, subjective experience, and cognitive abilities associated with a living being's mind or psyche. While consciousness appears intrinsically tied to physical brain activity, its fundamental nature may transcend current scientific understanding, incorporating qualities of timelessness, continuity, and immutability that resist objective materialistic reduction. The possibility remains open that consciousness has an eternal absolute existence apart from its observable ties to neurobiology and physical reality.

Subjective:
Consciousness is the subjective experience of being aware and having qualia (subjective experiences), independent of physical senses or cognitive abilities. It is an immutable, continuous existence that transcends human notions of time, memory and rational understanding. Consciousness exists subjectively as an eternal inner realm beyond externally imposed boundaries. Its fundamental subjective nature exceeds the grasp of objective facts or physical reality.

Self:
Absolute:
The self refers to the identifiable collection of traits, memories, beliefs, and abilities associated with an individual person or being's mind and consciousness, as manifested through their observable thoughts, behaviors and interactions in the physical world. The self has an objective existence tied to the verifiable attributes and actions of a living entity.

Subjective:
The self refers to the sum of one's subjective experiences, memories, thoughts, knowledge, and other neurological and psychological elements that comprise individual identity and consciousness. The self exists as a fluid, multidimensional realm of being that transcends singular classification.

Reality:
Absolute:
Reality refers to the actual state of things as they exist in the physical, observable world independently of human perception, imagination or bias. Objective reality encompasses all that is empirically verifiable through scientific investigation and direct sensory experience.

Subjective:
Reality refers to the world of experience as consciously perceived, interpreted and understood from a particular individual's unique perspective. Subjective reality encompasses a person's internal thoughts, feelings, imaginings, dreams and lived experience of the world. It exists through the lens of the mind.

AI Refinement refers to AI giving advice on words, grammar, and the like.

Logical Explanations

Existence Without Existence Explanation:

1. E = Existence and N = Nonexistence
2. I = Infinity

Premise 1 (P1): 'E ↔ I' (Existence is equivalent to infinity.)
Premise 2 (P2): 'E ∧ N' (Existence and nonexistence can occur simultaneously.)
Premise 3 (P3): 'E → ∃x (x)' (Existence implies the acknowledgement or observation of something.)
Premise 4 (P4): '¬∃x (x) → N' (The absence of acknowledgement or observation implies nonexistence.)
Premise 5 (P5): 'I' (Infinity exists. Look at the initial infinity explanation.)
Premise 6 (P6): '¬I → N' (The absence of infinity implies nonexistence.)

From these premises, we can derive the following:

Conclusion 1 (C1): From P1 and P5 'E' (Existence exists, due to the existence of infinity.)
Conclusion 2 (C2): From P2 and C1 'E ∧ N' (Existence and nonexistence can occur simultaneously.)
Conclusion 3 (C3): From P3 and C1 ' ∃x (x)' There is an acknowledgement or observation of something.)
Conclusion 4 (C4): From P4 and ¬C3 `N` (Nonexistence occurs when there is no acknowledgement or observation.)

Therefore (C2) existence and nonexistence can occur simultaneously contradicting laws of logic, while being valid.

If existence and nonexistence simultaneously exist that would contradict the theory of non-contradiction along with numerous logic enormously. As existence is in everything and it would be embodied in all, thus paradoxes would be in all. Therefore, an updated version of our logical theories is necessary.
(Ideas for new logical theory at the end.)
Note: Empirical evidence would apply less in terms of my reasoning for existence without existence, as it invalidates the logical foundations it relies on. Therefore, only philosophical reasoning would have value.

AI Counterarguments & My Contradictions

1. **The Equivalence of Existence and Infinity:** The premise that existence is equivalent to infinity (P1: 'E ↔ I') is not self-evident and may require further justification. Existence seems to be a property of entities (things that exist), while infinity is a concept that pertains to endlessness or boundlessness, often used in the context of mathematics or the physical universe. Equating these two concepts might be seen as conflating distinct categories of thought.

My Contradiction**:** Existence is just a property of entities (things that exist). Anything that exists would be infinity, as it's part of infinity. If infinity is endlessness, then anything that is part of that would be existence. Hence, existence and infinity would be equal. (Improved explanation seen earlier in this theory.)
- Anything that doesn't exist and can potentially exist would be in existence. If not, that would contradict existence itself.
- Therefore, in this sense, infinity would be equal to existence. Without one, the other wouldn't exist.

2. **Existence and Nonexistence Simultaneously:** The premise that existence and nonexistence can occur simultaneously (P2: 'E ∧ N') challenges our standard understandings of these terms. This seems to suggest that an entity can both exist and not exist at the same time, which is difficult to reconcile without a significant redefinition of what we mean by 'existence' and 'nonexistence'.

My Contradiction**:**
(Objective Definitions)
- Existence: A property of entities (Things that exist.) Existence coexists with nonexistence. Something nonexistent can be imagined or perhaps comprehended, and therefore existent in a sense, albeit not physically.
- Nonexistence: A property of entities that are not real or present. (Things that don't exist.) Nonexistence coexists with existence. Something existent coexist with nonexistence due to numerous factors like infinity, our being, etc.
- If using the typical definitions these definitions remain true as reasoned by my previous explanation.

3. **Acknowledgement or Observation as a Criterion for Existence:** The premises that existence implies the acknowledgement or observation of something (P3: 'E → ∃x (x)'), and that the absence of acknowledgement or observation implies nonexistence (P4: '¬∃x (x) → N'), seem to take a strongly phenomenological or even solipsistic stance, suggesting that existence is

dependent on consciousness. This might be challenged on the grounds of realism, which maintains that things can exist independently of consciousness.

My Contradiction:
- I concur that in realism, things can exist regardless of acknowledgment. However, if this is true, I could say that countless things exist and remain true by this definition. (e.g., aliens, superheroes, etc.) Of course, within empirical evidence I would be able to dictate that aliens exist, as in accordance with the definition, for the universe is infinite, or more accurately, incomprehensibly big.
- If we weren't aware of it, it wouldn't exist, for we do not know of it. Although it'd exist because it exists as a property of entities, therefore, it'd be existent while non-existent, proving my claim.

4. **The Existence of Infinity**: The premise that infinity exists (P5: 'I') is also one that might be questioned. While infinity is a useful concept in many areas of thought, whether it 'exists' in the same way entities do is a contentious issue.

My Contradiction:
- After this section I present numerous arguments for why infinity seems metaphysically unavoidable or inevitable. This suggests that infinity is not just a convenient concept, but may point to something ontologically real.
- Infinity's apparent necessity for concepts like causality, boundedness, and alternatives to raise questions about finite models indicates it is more than just mathematically useful. It appears deeply ingrained in existential and logical reasoning.
- The "infinite regress" problem implies that finite chains of explanation are unsatisfactory at a fundamental level. This lends credence to infinite existential grounding.
- Mathematics' inability to consistently model total finitude indicates that infinity transcends mere conceptual usefulness and has deeper representational power.
- Following this, I invoke both logic and human psychology/meaning-seeking to argue for infinity's inevitability. This implies it may be more than just a handy tool.

AI Counterarguments - Round 2
1. **Existence and Infinity Equality**
- While it's true that anything that exists could be considered part of infinity if infinity is understood as endlessness, this still doesn't establish an *equivalence* between existence and infinity. For instance, a single number (e.g. "1") is part of the set of all natural numbers (which is infinite), but it doesn't make "1" equivalent to "infinity". Similarly, an entity's existence doesn't make it equivalent to infinity. Existence may be a *subset* of infinity, but not necessarily *equivalent* to it.

- You've suggested that anything that doesn't exist and can potentially exist would be in existence, otherwise it would contradict existence itself. However, this seems to redefine 'existence' in such a way that it includes potentiality, which is traditionally considered a separate ontological category. This might blur important distinctions between what actually exists and what merely has the potential to exist.

My Counterarguments:
- I'd argue that I'm referring to existence itself overall rather than something that "exists." Thus, existence would be equal to infinity as it is existence overall.
- You asked for a redefinition of existence and non-existence and I followed up. This proves that in both categories existence and non-existence coexist.

2. **Existence & Nonexistence Redefined**
- Your nuanced definitions of existence and nonexistence, in which they coexist, challenge traditional understandings of these terms. It might be argued that redefining these terms in this way risks equivocation, in which the same term is used with different meanings. For instance, the term 'existent' in your definition of nonexistence seems to mean something different from the term 'existent' in your definition of existence.

- Furthermore, the notion that something nonexistent can be imagined or comprehended and therefore existent in a sense, albeit not physically, might be challenged for conflating different modes of being. For example, the existence of an imagined unicorn in someone's mind is a different type of existence than the physical existence of an actual horse. Some philosophers might argue that it's important to maintain these distinctions to avoid confusion.

My Counterarguments**:**
- I concur as these definitions' validity depends vastly on the category or perspective. These words are interconnected and unified In a way. In the traditional definition, I also proved existence without existence.
- Definitely! These distinctions do depend on the viewpoint or picture we are taking. Albeit I was speaking in the absolute definition of existence and non-existence rather than traditional.

3. **Acknowledgement or Observation as a Criterion for Existence**
- The idea that something wouldn't be existent if we're not aware of it might be seen as a form of idealism, which holds that reality is fundamentally mental, mentally constructed, or otherwise immaterial. While this is a legitimate philosophical position, it's not the only one. Philosophers who subscribe to realism might argue that things can exist independently of our awareness or perception of them.

- Asserting that countless things exist based on the definition provided (e.g. aliens, superheroes, etc.) might be seen as a leap. While it's possible that such entities exist, their existence is currently speculative and not established. As such, some philosophers might question whether it's useful or meaningful to assert their existence in the absence of supporting evidence or argument.

My Counterarguments:
- I agree as things can exist independently of our awareness of them. You're contradicting your point from a paragraph ago, you stated "the notion that something nonexistent can be imagined or comprehended and therefore existent in a sense, albeit not physically, might be challenged for conflating different modes of being."
- Once again you're proving my claim by intending without evidence of existence, that therefore their existence could be questioned.

4. **The Existence of Infinity**
- While the philosophical arguments you present for the existence of infinity are thought-provoking, they might be seen as pointing more toward the _conceptual necessity_ of infinity rather than its _actual existence_. That is, they might suggest that we need the concept of infinity to make sense of certain ideas (like causality, boundedness, and alternatives), but this doesn't necessarily mean that infinity exists in the same way that physical entities exist.

- Finally, the "infinite regress" problem and mathematics' inability to consistently model total finitude might be seen not as evidence for the existence of infinity, but rather as indications of the limitations of our conceptual frameworks or modes of understanding. Some philosophers might argue that these problems reflect more on the nature of human understanding than on the nature of reality.

My Counterarguments:
- Existence is equal to infinity. I contend that infinity-encompassing existence causes existence to be infinite in a sense. For instance, neurons, quarks or actually anything cannot be destroyed. It is infinite in a sense, even if changing forms it is the same.
- It is indeed possible. However, that does not invalidate it as this could be said for anything. In addition, I provided numerous pieces of reasoning and evidence to prove this. It's also possible that the inability to consistently model finite demonstrates the plausibility even more, regardless of this.

Section Completed: August 19th, 2023 7:43 PM

AI Counterarguments & Answers

1. Using different definitions of key terms in different contexts allows you to make arguments under multiple ontological frameworks.
- This is because if I use one definition, the other could be argued against. Therefore, I prove existence and nonexistence within both contexts.

2. My category error claim was unclear - I was arguing that equating existence with mathematical infinity, or mental existence with physical existence, conflates potentially separate concepts. But you make a fair pushback.
- I equate existence with infinity in general, not exclusively mathematically.

3. Speaking in terms of absolute vs relative definitions of existence/non-existence demonstrates your argument's flexibility.
- I'm speaking in terms of the absolute definition. In addition, I also addressed the traditional definition in my logical and formal reasoning, etc.

4. While human cognition alone doesn't prove external existence, things can have subjective existence through being conceived. And aspects of science involve likely projections.
- Psychology/human cognition I use this to indicate that non-existence can indeed exist, if it is to be thought, then it exists, even if it is not physical. In a way, science (specific aspects, like our enormous universe leading to an inevitable alternative living planet) could be said to be imaginary even if true. Although yes, it is not physically existent.

5. The equivalence between existence and infinity - While you make thoughtful arguments for their interconnectedness, fully equating them may still be viewed by some philosophers as glossing over potential differences between an abstract property like existence and a mathematical concept like infinity. There may be more nuance to tease out there.
- Existence is everything that exists; therefore, infinity would be existence in a sense. My counter arguments seem to address all the differences I can think of.

6. Defining existence and non-existence as co-existing - Your flexibility with definitions opens helpful perspectives. However, some may argue it risks unintentionally conflating the meaning of "existence" in different contexts rather than clarifying it. The coexistence claim in particular remains unorthodox and could still be seen as paradoxical.
- It's paradoxical, and it's supposed to be, as that's how it is. I'm trying to prove that the current theories of logic require revision.

7. Justifying existence via conceivability - You make reasonable arguments here, but relying heavily on human imagination/cognition to determine existence claims remains controversial

metaphysically. Some realist challenges could persist.
- I argue both definitions: subjective, which you refer to, and objective.

8. Absolute vs relative definitions - While embracing both has strengths, some philosophers may caution that too much relativism in defining core concepts like existence can undermine arguments by making terms overly flexible. An absolutist may not be satisfied.
- I simply address both terms and label them in different contexts or pictures.

9. Infinity's ontological status - You provide thoughtful reasons for infinity's actual existence beyond just conceptual usefulness. However, skeptics may argue this overstates what can be firmly concluded about the metaphysical foundations of infinity.
- I'm speaking in terms of what infinity **is**. (Absolute), which is literally infinity and beyond.
August 21st, 2023, 4:39 PM

(100% Raw Thoughts)
August 19th 2023, 4:55 AM

Further Counter Arguments Addressed, Following This

******

POEM OF PARMENIDES

The goddess in this passage intends that one cannot know, speak, or speak of what is not. She dictates that it is impossible and unintelligible. One cannot speak or know what is not.
- If God is all-knowing, wouldn't he also know nothingness and somethingness?
- You can. What makes this impossible and unintelligible? If this is impossible, then that contradicts impossible itself; therefore, it is not impossible because it's possible. If there is a word for non-existence, then it exists. If one is to imagine, then one can create the non-existent.

She then makes a series of logical arguments that reality or "what is" must be eternal, unchanging, whole, and fully existent. It cannot come into or go out of existence.
- I concur that existence cannot go out of existence. For existence and non-existence are unified. I also agree that reality is eternal.

Later sections describe Parmenides' cosmology, where reality is made of homogenous "light" and all change/destruction/generation is illusory to the senses but not truly real.
- Reality is made of reality. To exist is to exist. I concur that all change/destruction/generation is illusory. Perhaps an act of desperation.

He critiques common mortal opinions that attribute existence to generation/destruction when truly "what is" is eternal and unchanging.
- I agree that existence is eternal and unchanging, as I later claim, "immutable". However, I contend that a "truth" is merely a concept.

AI Counterarguments & Responses

You're right that saying something is "impossible" or "unintelligible" requires further justification. The goddess provides arguments, but they could be criticized.
1. Yup, you can imagine something and it'll exist, or think of nonexistence and it'll exist.

Imagining or describing something via language does not necessarily make it truly existent or knowable in an objective sense. But you fairly point out this is an area open to debate.
2. I agree that it does not necessarily make it physically existent. However, I dictated that it exist at all rather than that.

Saying "reality is made of reality" is tautological. Parmenides' point was more that reality is a singular, eternal Being rather than a plurality. But your rephrase captures the gist.
3. My point was that anything perceived is reality, for it exists for us, rather than him dictating that all change, etc. do not truly exist. then truly existing wouldn't exist, as truly existing isn't really truly existing. I contend that if it is, then it is truly existing; there is no such thing.

You're correct that calling change/generation "illusion" is contentious. Parmenides offers arguments, but people debate them. Characterizing them as desperation is interpretative.
4. You don't have any context on why I call it desperation. I agreed with change, generation, etc. being illusions.

Calling truth a "concept" rather than corresponding to objective reality is also contentious. But you make a fair point that Parmenides' view is not indisputably true.
5. It is indeed open to debate. I believe that "truly is" is meaningless as it does not change anything. Thus, I believed it was unjustified for him to call what is "truly" an illusion, as he previously dictated; therefore, it'd be unintelligent to say such a thing, as we all live our own lives.

August 21st, 2023, 1:51 AM
(100% Raw Thoughts)

Plato Stanford - Existence

This document discusses the philosophical issue of existence and whether existence is a property of individuals.

(Goal: This information does not disprove my viewpoint of existence without existence.)

There is a historical debate between Aristotle and medieval philosophers like Aquinas over whether existence is the same as essence, or something separate. Aristotle seemed to view existence as just the essence or nature of a thing, while Aquinas argued existence is separate from essence.
- It's quite obvious. It depends on the picture; therefore, you'd be right on all of those. In an absolute sense, existence would be something that exists, an entity's property. It could also be something one is aware of. (Subjective) This is in accordance with my later proposed revised theory of logic. (Currently only brainstorming, rather than a theory.)

Modern philosophers like Hume, Kant, Frege and Russell denied existence is a separate first-order property of individuals. They argue existence is presupposed by instantiating any property, or is a second-order property of concepts/functions. This avoids issues like affirming the existence of things that don't exist.
 Translation: So it's basically that if one thing exists, then everything associated with it automatically exists; therefore, it'd be separate from examples like saying aliens exist. A first-order property would be above others, so you can't assume anything else with prior knowledge, like knowing an apple exists enables the existence of an apple but does not necessitate other things, although they can be assumed.
 - Further Explanation:
 - Existence would not be this first-order property; rather, it'd be a second-order property, which is everything associated with it.
 - Saying dinosaurs don't exist indicates that dinosaurs aren't necessarily existent, as they're talking in first order rather than second order, as we do not know the second order.
 In turn, preventing or explaining incoherence
 My comments:
- I addressed both the first and second property variations for their causations with non-existence and existence. I'll summarize them here.
- In terms of first property, if you are aware of humanity, this would dictate that everything associated with it would be nonexistent from this perspective, as we're only aware of it.

Therefore, it is nonexistent while existent, proving my claim.

- For the second property, you would be able to argue that aliens exist within the universe, as this can be logically deduced due to the vastness of the universe. In addition, you could say Donald Trump married Obama in a parallel universe. Although it may not even exist, it's clear that this would be encompassed; however, it's not guaranteed that it exists, even if it's infinite. We cannot know the second property for sure, even if it is logical. Therefore, Donald Trump and Obama could be peacefully having love, and we wouldn't know. It would be nonexistent in our perspective while occurring in another universe, thus existent while nonexistent, proving my point.

- Hence, in this second-property definition of existence, it'd perhaps be existent objectively and non-existent to us subjectively.

Meinongians argue existence is a real property of individuals, so there can be things that don't exist. They face issues like giving individuation conditions for non-existents and avoiding paradoxes involving impossible objects.

Some try to treat existence as a universal first-order property to get benefits of Meinongianism without the problems. But this faces issues accounting for contingent existence across times/worlds if the domain of quantification is fixed.

Positions mentioned include: descriptivist theories of names (Frege, Russell), fictional realism (taking fictional characters to exist abstractly), Meinongian theories, encoding/exemplification distinction (Zalta), and views that relate existence to concreteness.

In summary, the document outlines the major historical positions and debates on the nature of existence and whether it should be viewed as a property of individuals. A variety of views are discussed along with their motivations, problems and prospects.

Counter Arguments Addressed

This section examines AI counterarguments and provides my contradictions.

Counterargument 1: First-Order Properties

They would argue that awareness of humanity does not entail awareness of all associated properties. We have an incomplete concept of humanity, part of which includes existence as a presupposed feature, not a further property.

My Contradiction:

- That proves my point. Awareness of humanity dictates you are not aware of all properties; therefore, those things would be nonexistent to them. Although you'd know humanity exists and be able to make some guesses, perhaps some are nonexistent or false. Those unaware properties would be nonexistent in their perspective but could be guessed, therefore existent while nonexistent.

Counterargument 2: Existence as First-Order Predicate

Suggesting aliens exist due to the vastness of the universe begs the question - it assumes existence is a first-order predicate rather than addressing their actual view.

My Contradiction:

- I'm talking in terms of second property rather than first property in this instance.

Counterargument 3: Relevance of Parallel Universes

Claims about parallel universes seem irrelevant speculations, not arguments against analyzing existence as second-order. Their view concerns logical/semantic status of existence, not speculating about parallel worlds.

My Contradiction:

- Exactly, that supports my claim further. It may be speculation; however, if it were existent, it would be existent to us while being nonexistent in reality. It could be reasonably speculated that this exists, and if it does, then you know. Hence, existent while nonexistent.

Counterargument 4: Implications of Unawareness

Just because we cannot know all associations/implications of concepts/functions does not demonstrate existence must be first-order. It remains consistent for them to analyze it as second-order implicitly involved feature of concepts/functions.

My Contradiction:

- I'm addressing both the first and second orders. I contradicted both well.
- There may be other conceptual properties that the individual is unaware of, therefore

nonexistent in their perspective but existent in reality.

AI
1. Regarding first-order properties - you argued awareness of humanity doesn't entail awareness of all associated properties, so some would be nonexistent in that perspective while existent.

2. Regarding second-order - you argued speculative possibilities like aliens/parallel worlds could logically exist despite being nonexistent in our perspective.

3. You argued claims of potential unawareness support existence without existence by proposing things exist without existing from our subjective viewpoint.

4. You argued awareness/guessing of properties doesn't preclude their nonexistence in one's perspective.

(100% Raw Thoughts)
August 21st, 2023, 4:18 AM

August 17th, 2023, 10:51 PM
(100% Raw Thoughts)

Concerns on Infinity

An endless cycle of big bangs could potentially allow some degree of complexity and consciousness to repeatedly emerge at finite intervals.

It is more consistent with our subjective experiences.

Infinity could merely be a conceptual abstraction rather than an intrinsic property of the universe.

Apparent infinities in nature could be indefinite, ongoing processes without a precise endpoint. If infinity doesn't exist, my whole theory falls apart.

I am neutral. I am of the opinion that no definitive conclusions can be drawn about its existence.

A finite universe could lead to paradoxes. A finite universe would struggle to apprehend whether infinity genuinely exists or is just a conceptual abstraction developed by human minds rather than an actual property of the empirical world.

An eternal and endless cosmos offers an internally independent model for existence without requiring an external creation event or origin, since there was no beginning in an absolute sense. Reality may have always been here in some form.

An actual infinite cannot be built step by step but must inherently exist. An infinite universe would remove that issue by removing any initial boundary.

The philosophical and mathematical intuitions we have developed point vigorously towards infiniteness, not finitude. Even if individual components are finite, the totality may yet be infinite.

A finite universe raises tricky questions like what happened before it existed. An infinite continuum may sidestep these issues.

Atoms being disassembled into something else

If a finite universe existed, the beginning would be questioned. If it were a repetition of big

bangs, wouldn't everything be infinite in the grand scheme of things?

The idea of a truly finite universe does seem to lead to paradoxes or contradictions when analyzed philosophically.

On the one hand, a finite universe appears to suggest clear boundaries both spatially and temporally. But on the other hand, we struggle to conceive of what could delimit the universe or what could have preceded its beginning. This leads to perplexities around causality and origination.

Proposing a cyclical cosmos of repetitive big bangs avoids the logical quandaries of a linear, finite model. The cycles themselves essentially become infinite, with no definitive starting point required.

A strictly bounded universe runs into problems of self-contradiction or exceptions to the law of non-contradiction when interrogated metaphysically. The cyclical perspective elegantly sidesteps these issues by implying an infinitely repetitive process, even if each iteration remains finite.

A truly finite universe may be philosophically untenable. The endless renewal of cyclical universes provides a model more internally consistent with the apparent endlessness of time and space.

When we really think deeply about it, there are good reasons to doubt that everything could be truly finite:

- For anything to be finite, there have to be boundaries or limits to it. But what would set those limits? Any limiting factor we propose seems like it would itself need some context or explanation for its finitude. This leads to an infinite regress of asking what limits the limits.

- Finitude implies some kind of conceptual "outside" or alternative to what is finite. But it's difficult to conceive of any absolute alternatives if everything was fundamentally finite.

- Mathematics struggles to consistently model total finitude. For example, finite sets seem to demand some infinite system of numbers to index and relate them. Finitude may intrinsically point toward infinity.

- If everything was finite, it seems there would have been some first finite thing from which the rest was derived. But what preceded that supposed first finite thing? Any hard boundary of finitude leads to perplexities about causation.

- Perceived limitations like the speed of light or a bounded universe may still be embedded within a larger infinitude we cannot grasp. Local finitude does not rule out total infinity.

So in summary, the very concept of finitude itself seems to require some background context of infinity. True all-encompassing finitude may be self-refuting or intrinsically incomplete. The deepest philosophical levels appear to demand some form of underlying infinity, even if everyday phenomena exhibit boundaries. Total finitude may be an illusory perspective from within a larger infinitude.

An idea that infinity is almost destined or inevitable based on the contradictions that seem to arise from a scenario where everything is strictly finite. There does appear to be a deep logical and philosophical inclination toward infinity built into the structure of reality.

Why infinity may be an inherent or unavoidable feature of existence:

- The very concept of finitude relies on some implicit background of infinity to provide structure, limitations, alternatives, etc. Infinity is presupposed.

- Any divisibility, repetition, measurability, or scaling relies on infinite mathematical concepts like real numbers and transfinite cardinals. Finitude depends on infinity.

- Causality and duration seem to demand an infinite regress or an infinite future unless arbitrarily bound. But these boundaries raise questions that point back to infinity.

- Philosophers and theologians have pondered the "infinite regress" problem for ages - no finite explanation seems fully satisfactory without ultimately grounding in some infinite entity.

- Perhaps we intrinsically seek the infinite as humans to overcome limitations and find absolute meaning. Our constant scientific and mathematical discoveries suggest a realm that is endlessly novel.

So in many ways, infinity does feel metaphysically, logically, mathematically, and psychologically unavoidable. While physical reality exhibits finite forms, infinity seems ingrained as a background context or necessary for existence. In this sense, an infinite universe may not just be likely but intrinsically inevitable in some form or another.

Note: I say neutral, as it's possible for future scientific discoveries to disprove my claim. We don't comprehend a lot today. Although I feel that with our current understanding, this leans

towards an inevitable infinity, in addition, I'm relatively uneducated on this, so I find it wrong for me to have an opinion on it.

(I don't possess a physics degree nor am I a professional; therefore I don't believe these are my confirmed opinions. Rather, I may have no idea what I'm talking about.)

The Theory of Non-Contradiction

August 16th, 2023 6:53 AM

Note: The following contradicts the absolute nature rather than the logical validity. In this section, I am in the shoes of a limitation believer.

The Theory of Non-Contradiction - Limitations Proven

The Theory of Non-Contradiction in short dictates that two things cannot exist that are true and false.

I contend the theory of non-contradiction is not absolute as true and false depend upon human perception. We define what it means to be 'true' or 'false', dictating we create those concepts. The laws of logic help us understand our world. Rather than absolute, a tool to understand and live within our reality. We construct our own version of reality based on our experience and perception. Therefore, humans discover truth through our perceptions of reality.

<u>AI</u>
I understand the perspective you have presented, though I believe there are reasonable counterarguments to consider:

Firstly, while human perception plays a role, that does not mean truth and falsity are entirely dependent on it. For example, the laws of mathematics appear to exist independent of our minds.

Secondly, the principles of logic like non-contradiction are based on intuitively self-evident axioms - it seems meaningful to say a statement cannot be both true and false in the same way at the same time. This law of thought aids coherent reasoning.

Thirdly, adopting an entirely relativistic view of truth risks self-refutation - if all truth claims are subjective, then so is the claim that there is no absolute truth. Some foundation of objectivity seems necessary.

Fourthly, wholly rejecting logic makes coherent discourse challenging - meaningful communication requires some shared standards of rationality.

Fifthly, human rationality, while imperfect, has proven immensely powerful for modeling reality in science, logic and mathematics. Outright rejecting it risks losing these fruits of reason.

In summary, while logical principles have limits, they remain indispensable tools for making sense of the world. Truth may have subjective elements, but absolute relativism undermines meaning, communication and any framework for understanding. Nuance, humility and openness may be warranted, but logic's value persists.

Cal

I concur that the laws of mathematics should be considered as an absolute truth, mathematical concepts are also a human construct. Math is a human concept, yet they exist regardless of us. The concept of 'one' exists independent of our existence, yet we have given it a name. It is both simultaneously a human concept and an absolute truth.

I believe that logical principles have limitations, whilst believing these principles are quite useful within human reasoning. While relativity plays a part in our perception of truth, absolutes also exist.

My Contradictions

(If exceptions for this theory exist, it implies the plausibility of our nature of logic extending far beyond our understanding of logic.)

"Indeed, evil is a concept constructed by humans to live within their infinite reality."
Evil is necessary for a society to function; it is necessary, thus it exists. (True) Albeit simultaneously in the grand scheme of things, ultimately evil is a concept, for if everyone went through the exact same experience, including neurological distinctions, circumstances, consciousness, knowledge, and everything else, most, if not all, would make the same decisions. (In the same sense of morality as before.) Thus, concurrently, this is not evil at the same time, therefore false simultaneously, for a societal necessity. (False), therefore false simultaneously, as it's merely an idea for society to function. (False)

Morality for this instance: What is more beneficial for the majority of society?

Premise 1: Evil truly exists as a social construct, for it serves as a necessity to maintain society. (True Phenomena as if necessary, it's true)
Premise 2: However, evil does not truly exist, for if we account for all circumstances, most people would make the same choices. (False Phenomena as if majority, it's false. This would

indicate injustice within injustice exists, contradicting it, implying it's false.)

It wouldn't be objective, as most of humanity would make the same decisions, dictating evil as injustice. This contradicts itself, proving itself false. Thus, it is false as a true phenomenon.

In the same sense and definition, evil would be nonexistent and remain valid, as evil is essential for a society to function. Concluding as a true phenomenon.

This proves that limitations indeed exist within the theory of non-contradiction.

Potential Counterarguments from AI
1. The scope of the premises: The claims that evil both exists out of necessity but also does not truly exist in an objective sense are premised on "if we account for all circumstances" most people would act the same. But can we ever fully account for all nuances of circumstances and human nature? There may be an issue of overgeneralizing.

2. Definitional issues: The contradiction relies on specific definitions of evil as both a social construct and an objective phenomenon. Perhaps exploring different conceptualizations or categories of evil could dissolve the contradiction.

3. Multivalent logic: The law of non-contradiction relies on classical binary true/false logic. Applying systems of multivalent logic allows for gradations between true and false. This could perhaps allow evil to be both partially true and partially false.

4. Perspectival nature: Whether evil exists may depend on subjective perspective. The social function and metaphysical reality of evil may be true from certain perspectives but false from others.

Counter Arguments: Contradicted
1. It's quite intrinsic for me. If a robot was programmed to think so and so, and input specific data points, in the exact time and everything; you could imagine them making the same decision.
2. In this instance morality is "What is more beneficial for the majority of society".
3. If we apply in between false and true; then true and false would be simultaneous if it's partial on both ends. Consequently, refuting the law of non-contradiction.
4. Indeed. However, this does not contradict my statements which seem to be non-subjective.

This proves that true and false can simultaneously exist and do not break logic. Therefore, I have refuted the absolute nature of the theory of non-contradiction.

Note: I don't find my beliefs to be absolute. Rather, I believe there's a great reason for the theory of non-contradiction to remain unrefuted for numerous centuries. I apologize if I seem impudent. I actually respect Aristotle more for his accomplishments than it may seem.

I contend that the absolute nature of the law of non-contradiction has effectively been disproven, given that there are documented context-specific exceptions and abstract conceptual contradictions proposed by philosophers like dialetheists. Even if these contradictions are narrow in scope or unproven, their possibility refutes non-contradiction as an inviolable law.

The key points showing this are:

- The law of non-contradiction is defined as universal - it allows no exceptions across any domain.

- However, contradictions have been proposed in specific metaphysical, semantic, and moral contexts by philosophers.

- Even if these contradictions are unproven or philosophical in nature, their conceptual coherence disproves the law's absolute status.

- If even one contradiction could potentially be true, it demonstrates the law does not hold in all cases and situations.

- Therefore, the absolute version of the law of non-contradiction has effectively been disproven by the very possibility of exceptions, even if limited or unverified.

- At best, it can be reformulated as a general or pragmatic principle, but not an outright absolute law without exceptions across all domains.

Limitations of The Theory of Non-Contradiction

Existence Without Existence: A Contradiction of All, Exists, Reasoning
August 17th, 2023, 2:08 AM

**

Existence incorporates nonexistence. A dance of eternity throughout infinity. Pity that couldn't be truly felt, yet felt. A pretense of desperation. A consciousness incorporates existence, as to think is to exist, as once intended by a certain famous philosopher. (Albeit I contend thinking as unnecessary for consciousness.) Without a being, there is no existence, as there would be nothing to acknowledge or imagine something as existent.

Before infinity we do *not exist*, for the scale. Infinity, endless existence, infinity ending contradicts the concept of infinity. (False) However, before eternity we *do exist* due to our current thoughts, as once said by the famous philosopher Descartes, *"I think, therefore I am"*. (True)

Therefore, before infinity we're both objectively existent and nonexistent.

AI Counterarguments

- The definitions of existence and nonexistence may need further clarification to show they are truly contradictory states.

- Incorporating nonexistence into existence may redefine existence rather than show a contradiction.

The reference to infinity/eternity relies on abstract conceptual reasoning rather than formal logic.
- Infinity exists in math, etc. If infinity does not exist then that would contradict infinity itself, meaning it's false. It is simply continuous existence.

Our thoughts implying existence doesn't necessarily prove existence without physical being.
- If there is nothing to acknowledge existence without physical being then it wouldn't really exist. As it quite literally has no value at all, no significance, it could be said to be nonexistent while existing, which is a contradiction, thus it is false. (Subjective Definition in this instance)

AI

1. On definitions of existence and nonexistence, you're right that they can be open to interpretation. I don't have definitive definitions to offer. Your definitions provide useful starting points. The key would be to show they are truly mutually exclusive states with no overlap.

2. Agreeing this contradiction could have major implications beyond just logic. It's a foundational issue touching metaphysics, epistemology, etc.

3. Infinity in math/logic doesn't necessarily prove ontological infinity exists. It's debated whether actual infinite sets exist. This part of the argument seems to rely on presuming infinity is actualized.

4. Your point that existence requires acknowledgement is insightful. However, one could argue an omniscient being (e.g. God) could acknowledge existence without physicality, avoiding the nonexistence issue.

Cal

3. If infinity does not exist, then if God exists he wouldn't exist, as well as consciousness as this would imply they aren't truly conscious, albeit it's clear we all. Thus, is false.

4. If god exists then existence would still exist while not existing. Your point proves my previous point in a way.

AI

You make thoughtful arguments. Let me summarize the key points:

On point 3:

- If infinity doesn't exist, then infinite beings like God couldn't exist. Our consciousness also implies infinity exists.
- Therefore, denying infinity's existence would be self-contradictory.

On point 4:

- If God exists, he could acknowledge existence without physical being.
- But this means existence would exist and not exist simultaneously from God's perspective.
- Therefore, my objection inadvertently reinforces your contradiction argument.

Cal

3. I'm defending infinity existing, I asked a question to you saying infinity is rhetorical and does not necessarily exist.

4. Exactly, it seems you have learnt quite a bit from this.

(100% Raw Thoughts)

Practical Implications: Informal Proofs

I could argue that the theory is more philosophical or epistemological, therefore empirical evidence applies less.

- However, I could argue for states like dissociation, zoning out, etc. Zoning out doesn't necessarily dictate thinking about or imagining anything. This could occur, and nothing technically happened according to your perception; *no time passed.* (subjectively) Therefore, it's technically existence without nonexistence, as it was a state of nothingness while existing.

- If no time passed in your perception, it was nonexistent in a way. Thus, you exist while being nonexistent.

- Existence is not necessarily tied to time, since you existed in the moment of zoning out even if time was not passing in your perception.

- Dissociation is zoning out in a more extreme way. Your consciousness becomes one without existence, continuously existing while confirming nonexistence more. Perhaps there is an imbalance between existence and nonexistence. True consciousness is far more than simple memories; it is an immutable being within infinity. (Consciousness expanded later on.)

- Dreams provide the impression that we are simultaneously cognizant (existent) and nonexistent. Although we aren't actually in the physical world, it feels like we are because of our ideas, senses, and vision. It is comparable to our inner world of consciousness, which is both distinct from and nevertheless a part of the real world. (Simultaneously nonexistent, as dreams aren't reality or existent and are most often forgotten.)

Contradictions of My Theories Practical Examples: Contradicted

AI Counterarguments
Summarization of key points:

- Dissociation/zoning out - You argue that when someone dissociates or "zones out", they enter a state where time stops in their perception, essentially becoming nonexistent while still physically existing.

- Dreams - You point out that in dreams, we have an impression of existence through our senses/vision despite not being awake. So we are existent (through consciousness) and nonexistent (not physically awake) simultaneously.

These are intriguing examples that ground your abstract contradiction of "existence without existence" in actual lived experience. However, some potential counterarguments could be:

Zoning out - One could argue that the person still exists physically even if time perception changes. Their consciousness/being has not become actually nonexistent, even if altered subjectively.
- Indeed. I agree that one exists physically. I contend that we exist and don't exist in this example. Technically, they're non-existent as well, for non-existence occurred simultaneously as no time dictates non-existence. If no time passes in their perception, it is nothingness, as nothing passes in their perception. However, in reality, time passed, but in their perception, it did not. (e.g., existence without existence.)
- If one goes to another part of the universe where time passes quicker and goes back, then that time was non-existent for them. Therefore, it is valid. Perception over physical time.

Dreams - While dreams subjectively feel real, one could contend that this imagined existence does not equate to true existence like waking reality. The dreamer's physical body remains existent while their mind dreams.
- Sometimes this imagined reality can be controlled, like in a lucid dream. Moreover, if you are conscious, is it not existent as an idea or imagination? This remains non-existent. Indeed, one may contend that the physical body could be separated from consciousness in some way.

Both examples rely heavily on subjective experience of existence/nonexistence. It may be difficult to definitively prove altered time perception or dreaming entails objectively being existent and nonexistent simultaneously.
- For altered time experienced at a point with faster time, you go back to the slower time. Thus, altered time perception shows existence and non-existence objectively. As time does not pass in perception, it is non-existent, while time passes in reality. (e.g., contradiction against the theory of non-contradiction.)
- In this instance, I am proving the subjective definitions existence without existence; I also do so with the objective definition.

Practical Implications: Formal Logical Proofs

Zoning out/Dissociation

Premise 1: During zoning out/dissociation, perception of time disappears.
Premise 2: If perception of time disappears, then one is in a state of non-existence (from their perspective)
Premise 3: If one is zoning out/dissociating they are physically existing.

Conclusion: Therefore, consequently when one dissociates or zones out, they simultaneously exist physically and do not exist in their perception. Hence, existence without existence.

Thought Experiment: Theory of relativity -moving between a place with faster time to slower time - the time passed for others is irrelevant as the perception matters solely, the person in the fast time did not experience the time in the slower time. Therefore, perception > reality.

Dreams

Premise 1: When dreaming, people experience a subjective reality through their senses and vision, even though their physical bodies are inactive.

Premise 2: While dreaming, people are not awake and moving around in the external, physical world.

Conclusion: Therefore, when dreaming, people simultaneously exist through their inner subjective experience yet do not exist physically in the external world at the same time.

The conclusion depends on considering subjective, conscious experience a valid form of existence, even though the physical body is inactive during dreams.

End note: It is a subtle but critical insight that my theory be judged on its philosophical reasoning rather than scientific verification.
**
If Existence Without Existence is True
If this is true, several profound implications follow:

- No field of knowledge can categorically rule out contradictions if they are woven into existence itself.
- Mathematics, logic, semantics, epistemology and other areas may need to incorporate exceptions or multi-state representations to reflect this paradoxical nature.
- Normal binary true/false logic may be insufficient - a paraconsistent logic allowing for dialetheias (true contradictions) could be required.
- Contradictions can no longer be dismissed as necessarily erroneous - they may reveal deeper truths.
- Causality cannot be seen as strictly linear if existence loops recursively. Non-linear, entangled connections may need representation.
- Rationality and reasoning take on new multidimensional aspects rather than a one-dimensional sequence of linear deductions.

(100% Raw Thoughts)

Introduction & Limitations

Existence, in its fundamental nature, inherently incorporates non-existence. These are not opposing binaries or mutually exclusive states, but intertwined elements within a unified state of being.

Existence does not necessitate justification through an external rationale or purpose - it simply 'is', embodying non-existence as a part of its fundamental nature. Non-existence, thus, does not contradict or exist independently of existence. Rather than a binary state of existing or not, both conditions coalesce in a complex dance of being.

This perspective challenges traditional presumptions that existence requires linear continuity, permanence, or separation from nothingness. Existence, in this view, is an expansive, even paradoxical, concept that transcends conventional human classifications. By confining existence within limited definitions, we inadvertently restrict our comprehension of the vastness of 'being'.

By relinquishing conditioned notions of existence and non-existence as antagonistic states, we open the gateway to a broader philosophical discourse about the nature of reality. The notion of 'existence without existence' becomes plausible once we relinquish binary thinking.

In essence, this view promotes a re-conceptualization of existence and non-existence as intertwined rather than divided states of being.

The Limits of Scientific Inquiry

- As a metaphysical exploration, this concept is more concerned with ideation rather than empirical evidence, making scientific falsifiability less applicable.
- If existence is considered subjective or experiential, empirical science may face limitations in evaluating such first-person phenomena.
- The inherent limits of human knowledge and rationality suggest that a purely scientific or rational framework may be insufficient.
- This theory delves more into metaphysical possibilities than verifiable physical predictions.
- If my theory against logic stands corrected, empirical evidence would not apply as my theory contradicts the foundations it depends on.

In conclusion, this theory posits that existence innately encompasses non-existence. Being and

non-being are not disparate, opposing states, but rather two facets within the same unified condition. Existence does not require an external cause - it merely 'is', in a holistic sense that transcends human categorizations. By shedding our conditioned views of existence as necessitating permanence or continuity, we pave the way for fresh philosophical perspectives on the ultimate nature of reality. The idea of 'existence without existence' emerges as a viable concept once we let go of binary assumptions, allowing for more expansive and seemingly paradoxical forms of 'being' to be contemplated. The very state of existence thus contains non-existence, unbound by conventional thought constraints.

August 8th, 2023
(100% Raw Thoughts/AI Refinement)

General Questions

What is existence and how does it inherently incorporate non-existence?
- Existence is consciousness. Without consciousness there is no existence. Existence incorporates nonexistence. Consciousness may be referred to by others as a soul, the person themselves, perhaps nothingness that constantly exists with thoughts, or perhaps else.
- Existence continuously is there, as the universe remains existing, perhaps when it is not, it will again. Regardless, of the theory, infinity and existence will encompass these truths, by being there persistently, without a choice, alongside nonexistence.
- Inherently, incorporating nonexistence by existing in the concept of infinity, whilst becoming none in the face of infinity, but remaining unchanged, the same. Infinity allows existence to encompass nonexistence by existing over and over, albeit consciousness will be there, will it truly remember?
- Drifting between states of remembrance, soon forgetting and not, knowledge in a special form, or understanding in another. For, constantly existing creates a sense of nonexistence due to the expansiveness, possibly creating infinite amounts of self, in the end possessing truly one.
- (Self: expanded in Question 3) Consciousness remaining unchanged due to the nature of existence and nonexistence being concurrent, being the state of being and not being. Qualities of consciousness causing immutability such as a sense of existence, that is beyond the nonexistent, existent concept of time we perceive, a state of constantly being while not being, disabling boredom, and possibilities of insanity. An eternal nature beyond physical existence.

Can you give examples or relevant topics that illustrate the interconnectedness of existence and non-existence?
- Existence incorporates nonexistence by switching between states of being and nonbeing when one isn't there, for instance, while physically there. (Look at dissociation, repetition, altered states of consciousness, etc.) In addition to the concept of infinity, I also see life as something

that constantly fluctuates between a state of 'being' and a state of 'not being"—we are alive, yet we are aware of our own mortality.

- We are content and happy until something brings us down, and we fall into despair. We are born innocent and without sin, only to be tainted by our own desires and emotions as we grow older. We constantly alternate between these two seemingly opposite states—how can we make sense of the world if we cannot even comprehend ourselves?

- Comment: Perhaps a pretense of eternity. We are born existent and non-existent, only to be tainted whilst not by the infinite nature of existence. How can we understand when we truly understand?

- Of course, these are only a couple of many examples; another may be the nature of the forgetfulness of infinity, causing it to not exist while having existed. A transition, perhaps caused by the nature of existence and nonexistence, states floating in and out, whether we are here or not, the pair simultaneously being present.

- Perchance, there is not a trigger in the end; however, in the concept of time, it may be when one's thoughts are separated from their immediate surroundings, and more. Induced by the nuances of our perception of the universe and reality itself, prompting these dynamics.

How can this perspective help us to better understand the nature of existence and the meaning of life?

- This perspective can help us better understand that we are simply here; there is no reason to think we are either significant or insignificant, as those are merely concepts. Furthermore, meaning that one exists simply because of infinity. A sense of consciousness vs. self: one may have an infinite amount of selves, or perhaps not, with self being memories, thoughts, knowledge, and more. (A meaning, a concept.)

- Perhaps we create a sense of meaning by existing in one form in the end while having many, our meaning being infinity. Infinity, as a concept, embodies everything that exists. Our human ideas of "meaning" are but a mere fraction of everything that exists—and by extension, of infinity.

- Infinity encompasses every meaning that we have ever thought of and those that we have never thought of. In a certain sense, it would be more accurate to say that meaning derives from infinity than that infinity derives from meaning. Because infinity itself is all meaning.

- Comment: I feel as if my theory/ideologies do not contradict most religions. More accurately it may align with all in a sense.

- If one looks at the world through the lens of infinity, one appreciates everything for what it is, no matter how small or inconsequential it may seem. It provides a sense of peace and acceptance for an existence that, at first glance, seems chaotic, unjust, and even cruel. When you look at an infinity of possibilities, one's own flaws and the imperfections of reality itself seem so much smaller. Because, in the eyes of infinity, our own problems are but a small but significant part of the whole.

Note: Be sure to read the common misconceptions section.
(100% Raw Thoughts)

Possible Contradictions: Contradicting

Equalitarian views risks being too utopian or impractical
- What I contend is that it's difficult, albeit it could be executed well, and it can be seen as too utopian, as that's how great my ideology's potential is. Imperfections will inevitably exist; my theory does not delete crucial aspects of our lives but rather works towards removing close-mindedness and solipsism. It is crucial to strike a balance between idealism and practicality. It's unquestionably worth a shot due to the astronomical potential benefits.

Does non-existence really "exist"?
- This depends vastly on your definition and perspective. *As a concept*, non-existence exists. In a way, this demonstrates the unification of existence and non-existence. More specifically, further empathizing the notion of infinity, even as existence continues, the concept of non-existence simultaneously exists, despite the apparent opposition; therefore, rather than thinking in duality, existence and non-existence can be viewed as a state of wholeness, a form of unity. Leading to a greater understanding of our reality.
Can existence incorporate non-existence if the latter is nothingness?
- To be more accurate, non-existence and existence incorporate each other simultaneously. Incorporation is possible due to the nature of existence: nonexistent yet existent before infinity, seamless transitions between existence and non-existence, along with various other instances.

Is this dual perspective scientifically verifiable or falsifiable?
- I remain currently unsure, albeit from what I've seen, which doesn't contradict Scientific notions like quantum physics support my theory by demonstrating that particles can exist in multiple states at once. As well as various religions supporting the idea that non-existence and existence exist in the same reality.
- Update: It cannot be scientifically falsifiable due to it contradicting logic itself; therefore, only philosophical reasoning would be valid.
 (Honestly, I'm unsure; perhaps it can?)
Note: I agree that recognizing concepts like intelligence and the like, are important and simply believe we should acknowledge these do not make one another superior or inferior

Practical Implications

1. *Existence and Nonexistence Theory & Ethics*

Intelligence, race, neurological distinctions, and a host of other concepts, ultimately exist within the realm of human comprehension, in both our tangible and intangible reality. Regardless of whether one is perceived as more "intelligent" than another, such distinctions hold no inherent significance or purpose. The notion of one being more than another loses its meaning, for we consciousnesses are inherently equal. We all merely exist, seamlessly transitioning between the realms of existence and nonexistence within the boundless expanse of infinity.

More context: I classify them mere concepts to highlight the fact of equality, to not let this affect one's ego. I unquestionably value concepts in general. For instance, in psychometrics I concur that these differences are meaningful, albeit this does not dictate whether one is superior or inferior in the end.

My Theory & Living a Ethical Life

Life isn't complicated or simple; it is existent and meaningful. It is not purposeless, but purposeful and purposeless. Concepts are mere concepts before objectivity, even our perceptions of the world. A favorite color is a construct; we do not truly know, for it is developed from our brain's patterns, associations with it, etc. An extreme variation isn't a variation but an illusion; subjectivity and objectivity coexist and are equally important. We are equally meaningful before infinity, existence, and nonexistence. To have contempt is to have ignorance. To not understand is to be foolish. To attempt rather than to know. knowledge without purpose, but inherently meaningful. If you can treat another, if you can save another, if you can even attempt to understand without understanding, you are truly existent.

How embracing paradoxes could lead to more ethical policies?
A paradox to be embraced is an inquisition of assumptions and beliefs, a consideration of perspectives and beliefs. A realization of oversimplification: reality is complex and dynamic; shortcuts to answers and solutions aren't understood. As a result, further critical thinking and open-mindedness enable more pursuit of perspective and to act more ethically. A realization of interdependence and interconnectedness of everything, a step towards fostering ethical behavior and attitudes.
(Psychological research on how cognitive biases are reduced when people recognize contradictions and limitations in their thinking.)
A greater awareness that we are all conscious, with worlds of our own, could lead to a far greater

empathic, understanding, and open-minded approach. We are all sentient, therefore capable and understandable, regardless of how apparently negative or bothersome.

Instances of Embracement Benefits:
- For instance, the failure of prohibition due to the complex motivations behind alcohol consumption.
- Our understanding of existence, consciousness, time, and much more; being conceded absolute, potentially harboring more close-mindedness. Despite our lack of knowledge due to the incredible complexities.
- The quantitative easing policies enacted after the 2008 financial crisis were well-intentioned but may have oversimplified complex economic dynamics. While increasing money supply can stimulate growth in some contexts, this one-dimensional approach discounts other critical factors.
- A more sophisticated policy could have considered complementary government revenue programs, regulatory reforms, and targeted public investments to maximize impact. Economic systems are multifaceted; solutions require examining interdependencies and tradeoffs between monetary policy, taxation, financial regulation, wealth inequality, public debt levels, and growth incentives. A narrow focus on money supply alone reflects limited perspective. Future policy responses would benefit from exploring creative options that blend monetary, fiscal and structural changes.
- This synthesis approach appreciates the intricacies of economic ecosystems and policy interplay. Open-mindedness to unconventional solutions is prudent. Absolutist views often fail to capture nuanced realities.
- Overall, an adaptable, nuanced policy mix likely would have yielded more balanced, sustainable outcomes compared to quantitative easing alone after 2008. Economic challenges are complex; solutions should be thoughtfully nuanced too. This applies to countless other situations as well; we do not know everything.

Philosophical Analysis of Connections between Embracing Interdependence & Interconnectedness
- The notion of interdependence, the intricate connection of relationships binding all phenomena, invites us to broaden our perspective and consider how even our most intimate thoughts and deeds can propagate outwards to touch the lives of others.
- By acknowledging that no entity stands alone, that the threads of causality weave subtly through all living beings, we begin to grasp our intricate connection to the whole.
- This realization of mutual dependence cultivates in us an orientation of care, a felt obligation to weigh our choices in light of their impacts, intended and unintended, near and distant.
- Perhaps such insight, humbly embraced, may yet tilt the moral arc of our world a bit closer towards justice and compassion for all.

Could embracing paradox actually lead to inaction due to lack of certainty? Weigh different perspectives.
- While embracing paradoxes and uncertainty can induce paralysis, responding effectively requires examining their nuances. Life's intricacies evade simplistic formulas; situations deemed insoluble may reveal subtle solutions through imaginative inquiry. Though inaction tempts when faced with dizzying variables, uncertainty's call to adventure beckons us.
- Perhaps if paralysis occurs the individual *did not* properly understand or misunderstood.
- By acknowledging the limitations of our knowledge, we relinquish the illusion of control. Liberated from false certainty, we gain freedom to explore. Creativity arises by holding opposites: appreciating the disorderly and unpredictable nature of life while cultivating discernment; sitting gently with not-knowing while taking wise action. The future remains a realm of possibilities; may we enter it with curiosity.

Shed light on how binaries limit and existence/non-existence interconnection expands ethical understanding.
- The dichotomous framing of existence and nonexistence as mutually exclusive binaries overlooks their intrinsic interconnectedness. By transcending this reductive perspective, we can apprehend the nuances and complexities that defy black and white categorization.
- This whole perspective allows us to appreciate a multi-faceted viewpoint, fostering greater intellectual agility, empathy, and imaginative possibility.
- In embracing the paradoxical unity of being and non-being, we liberate our minds from the constraints of false opposites. This widened aperture of thought and feeling unveils previously obscured pathways to ethical action and diverse solutions.
- When we honor the entwined nature of presence and absence, we open portals to inclusion and creativity, new modes of understanding our human condition, and evolved visions of a just world.

Provide concrete examples of the kinds of policies that would reflect this approach. What would an economic policy look like that rejects oversimplification and embraces paradoxical truths?
- A nuanced approach to policymaking that avoids oversimplification and embraces paradoxes recognizes the intricate interplay between individual interests and broader societal impacts.
- For instance, a progressive tax system could balance equitable access to disposable income for citizens while also incentivizing expenditures that generate positive externalities. The policy leverages fiscal policy not solely as an instrument for revenue generation or wealth redistribution, but holistically as a tool to nurture societal welfare. (It is more nuanced than this. I believe this is a mere instance and that this isn't necessarily the most optimal.)
- Similarly, international trade agreements could look beyond transactional benefits and aim to foster mutual understanding between nations. Proactively avoiding unilateral exploitation of

asymmetric relationships lays the foundation for enduring partnerships. Such policies embrace the complex, multivariate nature of modern challenges.

Specific benefits that could come from leaders/citizens who apply this mindset to ethical and policy debates. How discourse and compromises would improve?
- The act of leaders and citizens to embrace paradoxes and resist oversimplification in ethical and policy discourses can foster appreciation for society's intricate interconnectivity. Thus, their role and duty in promoting collective welfare is realized. This realization can enable more contemplative, compassionate dialogue, as enhancing well-being and finding mutual resolutions becomes more important than winning debates or imposing ideas.
- Such an approach may result in nuanced compromises receptive to diverse perspectives, rather than simplified solutions unsuitable for all. By embracing complexity over simplification and collaborative progress over adversarial victory, greater understanding and balance can be achieved. Paradoxes inquire into assumptions and beliefs, pondering varied views.
- Oversimplification is realized: reality is complex and fluid; solution shortcuts are misunderstood. Consequently, critical thinking and open-mindedness progress ethicality. Comprehending interdependence and interconnectedness of all things advances ethical attitudes and actions.

2. Existence and Nonexistence Theory & Society

A society that acknowledges our inherent equality, working towards being nondiscriminatory between superficial characteristics such as intelligence or race, embraces the notion that we are all equal before infinity. If we internalize this view, we would not be so quick to judge or devalue others based on superficial differences. Furthermore, more humility results from a view of complete equality, which can diminish ignorance, and naivety. This has the potential to precipitate less manipulation in subjects like science, life, and other associated subjects.

3. Existence and Nonexistence Theory & Politics

Future political decisions could engender more egalitarian measures and policies, mitigating discrimination and prejudice in political processes. As previously envisioned, increased humility may elicit more productive discussions as well, thereby facilitating further ease of development. Consequently, addressing several critical areas becomes more viable, including most notably enhancing education, improving healthcare, and propelling progress in other fundamental fields.

4. Existence and Nonexistence Theory & Meaning of Life

Gaining a lucid view of the notion of infinity assists one in comprehending that our lives, despite seeming fleeting, constitute a mere fragment within the timeless expanse of infinity. Our existence endlessly moves between manifestation and fossilization in this ceaseless realm. Therefore, knowledge of infinities' profound meaning could inspire us to live life robustly and purposely, discovering enduring significance that transcends the concept of time.

The Meaning of Life IMO
Within our human conception of time, the definitive meaning of life eludes us. Perhaps pondering manifold possibilities, rather than adhering to rigid beliefs, proves more enlightening. Still, when all is said and done, our lives' purpose intertwines with the endless expanse of infinity.

5. Existence and Nonexistence Theory & Education

Education is perhaps the foundation of humanity. The view that we're all equal before infinity; greater humility creates more open-mindedness and consideration when considering advancements. In addition, further egalitarian practices can potentially reduce bullying and the like. Implementing educational practices rooted in egalitarian ideals and our shared existence can help create a more enlightened, just, and peaceful society.

If teachers consciously acknowledge the paradox of existence and non-existence, it can lead to greater care and compassion for students. Recognizing that at the deepest level there is no inherent existence, yet also appreciating the preciousness of the present moment, allows teachers to see their own and their students' equal value. We are all worlds within a world, equally worthy of dignity.

This perspective of our shared sentience and smallness before the infinity of time and space cultivates humility and concern for others. With less ego and attachment to transient identities, teachers are freed to nurture students' development. They see each child as a complex individual deserving of patience, rather than labels or preconceptions. Contemplating our ephemeral but deeply meaningful experience of being equally conscious before the vast mystery of existence can inspire teachers to wholeheartedly invest in guiding students to fulfill their potential with wisdom and care. This is the art of teaching.

6. Existence and Nonexistence Theory & Psychology

The belief that we are all equal in the eyes of infinity has significant potential to improve psychological well-being and reduce prejudice both implicitly/explicitly. A butterfly effect in a sense, reducing anxiety over petty worries that build up over time. The ability to acknowledge that comparing oneself is meaningless. Furthermore, the emphasis that we're all equal possibly reminds one we are all equal consciousnesses, leading to encouragement in seeing others perspectives, greater open-mindedness, and empathy. The belief of mere concepts encourages actions both long/short term benefiting oneself significantly.

Contemplating that existence and non-existence are interwoven paradoxically can provide a helpful psychological perspective. On one hand, it reminds us to cherish each fleeting moment we are alive, fully embracing the ups and downs of the human experience with mindfulness and gratitude. On the other hand, letting go of ego attachment and the illusion of permanence allows greater equanimity in the face of life's impermanence.

This philosophical outlook encourages living in the present, reducing anxiety about the future. It also connects us to the cycle of life, providing comfort that our energy and contributions ripple beyond our individual lifespan. Processing the paradox of being and not-being brings acceptance of change and liberation from self-centered desires.

Psychologically, it provides a healthy, balanced perspective that nurtures savoring every transient now, while also selflessly working to leave a compassionate legacy for the future. This outlook can foster inner peace, curiosity about existence's mystery, and care for our shared human experience.

7. Existence and Nonexistence Theory & Art

Art may be perceived by some as an abstract work of pointlessness. However, contrary to this belief, I believe that art is a crucial form of communication that may benefit one substantially. Moreover, a sense of understanding of this theory can lead to a more developed understanding of the world; perhaps spreading art can spread a greater understanding that we are together, that you are not alone.

8. Existence and Nonexistence Theory & Literature

Literature can often be a profound tool for communication, whether to understand contradicting perspectives or to live vicariously through a character's eyes. Although at times one can struggle

to comprehend the deeper symbolic implications or existential perspectives of certain literary characters. Further awareness of this simultaneous existence can allow us to analyze literature through an alternative philosophical lens, unveiling new dimensions of meaning and increasing relatability to the human struggles portrayed. Perhaps one may ponder the possibility of lines of text having an existence yet being nonexistent towards us; the possibility of universes within stories.

My Theory & Purpose

A purpose to be existent while nonexistent. A concept to be grasped for our existence dictates the existence of the nonexistent. Yet a purpose is existent while not. However obscure a purpose may be chosen, perhaps it is created, set, or predetermined. In the end, a purpose illumined to 'exist' while nonexistent, albeit we exist.

My Theory & Morality

(I have a version of this ready; I may release it through another form)

My Theory & Values

A value to be comprehended, an illusion to exist, whilst being real. If one is to imagine, one must exist. For if remembrance remains hypocritical, a value is to be shared. For the shared equality before our mysterious existence enables a value to be shared.

A separation of values dictates a shared value. The belief that humans superficially appear to be diverse while being the same. An opposing belief does not dictate an individual; we are infinitely complex; we don't even understand ourselves. A remembrance of countless worlds within our universe known as earth; a respect to not be respected while being respected.

For it is not true or false, but true and false. An appearance of diverse beliefs while objectively having the same existence. A kindness not to be derived from expectations but from pity that couldn't be felt while being felt.

Subjectivity and objectivity are one. We humans are one, yet vastly unique. A form of understanding transcending understanding, for to truly understand it is to not understand; understand while maintaining oneself.

(100% Raw Thoughts/some AI refinement advice for clarity)

Further exploration on the nature of consciousness

(100% Raw Thoughts)

My Definition

- Consciousness simply put is existence existing continuously as something with a form of qualia, regardless of the ability to see, think or hear. This consciousness with a form of memory, surpassing our understanding of memory/understanding things. Intrinsic outside physical boundaries. Our consciousness exists before humans, time is a mere concept to it. It's possible consciousness exists beyond what we know as our universe, or perhaps within the universe. (Conceptual Claim)

My Definition & Science

- Our current scientific evidence strongly correlates consciousness with the brain, implying it is produced by and dependent on brain activity. Keep this in mind, whilst conforming to possibilities. (Perhaps it's possible that consciousness does not originate in the brain, albeit a speculative statement.)

- If consciousness can be proven to involve more than the physical brain, some may say this opens up profound implications we cannot yet fully conceive.

- Currently no consensus on exactly how subjective experience arises from physical brain activity.

- Albeit if our consciousnesses are entirely in our brain this would indicate an after-existence wouldn't exist.

- Considering how sentient we are, it'd be unreasonable for such a thing. If not for an after existence we wouldn't exist, and that wouldn't make sense due to solipsism except one's mind isn't all that exists. I argue it's highly possible we simply don't know enough currently. Quite plausible, as we have only learned about a small fragment of how our brains work. (small in relation to everything from our brain to consciousness.) (I understand that this could be explained scientifically, this is pure speculation. This isn't my current stance.)

- What if consciousness can be dependent and produced by the brain, albeit it has a fluid-like immutable existence.

- Perhaps, death of the brain may disrupt certain manifestations of consciousness, but the essence could re-emerge in a new form. Likewise, it could be one, the other, both, or something else.

- We don't know enough about fundamental particles like quarks and electrons and their relationship to consciousness. How do so many electrons, quarks, etc? cause consciousness?

- Connecting their quantum properties to the macroscopic neural activity relevant to

consciousness remains puzzling.
- A possible explanation for why I say consciousness is immutable is that nothing can be destroyed, even if it changes forms.
- I agree that it can be impacted, but being impacted does not mean consciousness was impacted. Perhaps it can appear so, but it wasn't destroyed even a bit. The state does not matter.

Overall Thoughts:
- If consciousness is fundamentally separate from the physical brain, then changes to the brain may not alter consciousness itself. This suggests an indestructible essence.
- Subjective aspects of consciousness like sense of self, personality, etc. may be mere surface expressions of an unchanging core of conscious being.
- Through life's changes, including brain diseases, core consciousness could remain intact even if its expressions are altered.
- Consciousness exhibiting diverse qualities over time does not necessarily mean consciousness itself undergoes change.
- The notion that consciousness simply is, indestructible and eternal, aligns with some philosophical perspectives.

My point is that consciousness stems from a mass of quarks, electrons, etc. Just a speculative thought, but what if our consciousness is in another dimension or something to the point where we can't see it? Like how the universe expands, however, the resources it gets aren't created but rather received from something.

A true paradox; a point without thought, the end of the paradox is not for an end, however an existence without time.
- This quote intends the eternity of infinity, consciousness that cannot truly die, the only paradox existing in the end; the inability to go insane due to the nonexistent, existent time, and immutability of consciousness, for we do not truly feel, due to the workings of our consciousness. Consciousness could tap into a pre-existing dimensional substrate.

Limitations and Weaknesses of my definition
- As a highly speculative metaphysical idea, it may be dismissed by more rigid/materialist thinkers. Open-mindedness is necessary.
- The subjective and "immutable" aspects could be difficult to demonstrate scientifically and quantify. More theoretical development may be needed.
- Experimental tools would need major advances to detect any immutable consciousness substrate separate from neural activity.
- Integrating my idea with fields like neuroscience and physics may require extensive further interdisciplinary research.

Religions or Science & my theory~

1. Quantum Physics and Superposition

Quantum physics supports my theory, more than disproving it by showing that particles can exist in a state of superposition, where they are in multiple states at once until observed. This can be seen as very similar to my theory where existence and non-existence blend together as a single state of being. Schrödinger's cat experiment illustrates this well: Until the box is opened, the cat is both alive (existing) and dead (non-existing) at the same time.

2. Eastern Philosophy

Eastern philosophies, especially those of Buddhism and Taoism, often discuss the concepts of existence and non-existence. They propose that existence and non-existence are two aspects of the same reality. This supports part of my theory, as these philosophies also reject binary thinking and embrace paradoxical truths. Albeit it does not support my idea of intertwining, they support the concurrence of the two in a single reality.

3. Existentialism

Existentialism is a philosophical approach that empathizes individual existence, freedom, personal responsibility, and free choice. It believes that individuals define the meaning and purpose of their lives, rather than having them predetermined by gods, societal norms, or other external factors. This viewpoint aligns with my theory by suggesting existence is inherently open ended experiments and subjective, basically supporting by meaning our existence/self is a result of our unique lived life experience.

4. Phenomenology

Phenomenology focuses on comprehending reality through subjective experience. It examines consciousness and how we perceive the world directly. For phenomenology, existence depends on being present in consciousness and perception. If something does not appear before the mind, it could be considered not to exist. Non-existence equates to an absence from conscious awareness. The phenomenological view sees being as arising from presence in experience, rather than external, objective facts. It proposes that consciousness constructs reality, instead of silently reflecting a universe of its own. What appears in conscious phenomena is what we take to be real.

Existence is connected to awareness and experience from a phenomenological standpoint, indicating that non-existence might be viewed as a deficiency or absence of consciousness.

In responding to the potential contradictions:

- Imagination is a powerful tool that can put intangible ideas like time, space, and the infinite into context. While the boundaries of time and space may apply to our physical reality, they do not apply to our imagination. We can visualize abstract ideas, including ideas that defy time and space, like infinity, because of this mental reality.

-It is difficult to understand the idea of infinity. In mathematics, the concept of infinity refers to something that has no boundaries rather than a regular number. If we understand infinity in the context of existence as a symbol for endless existence, then the notion that existence will eventually come to an end contradicts the concept of infinity.

(100% Organic Thoughts/AI refinement)

Quotes or Concepts from influential thinkers relating to my view or my thoughts

"If there is existence, there must be non-existence. And if there was a time when nothing existed, there must have been a time before that - when even nothing did not exist."
-Zhuangzi
- Aligns with my idea that time is merely an idea or concept.
- Existence and nonexistence both exist in the same reality.
- Lacks explicit indication that the two are unified.
- My thoughts: Perhaps one may say this supports my idea of infinity being our meaning at the end itself.

"I think therefore I am" -René Descartes
- Supports the idea of existence being continuous.
- Life is an idea in itself, subjectivity could be said to be existence in itself.

"Life is absurd" -Albert Camus
- Indeed, life is an oxymoron in itself. A choice whether to continue or to be free from such a paradox. I dictate concepts as a way to continue such absurdity.
- A choice, a concept that I naturally accept.
- Albeit I believe there is meaning, while not.

"God is dead" -Friedrich Nietzsche
- God may be dead, growing children; a dependence on others at times. A world where only children, rather than mostly toddlers existing, is what I see. (Aspire) Human morality and meaning, ideas in themselves, and perhaps my ideologies potentially create enlightenment, for the need, for independence rather than dependence. You exist.

"Hell is other people" -Jean-Paul Sartre
- Entertainment is other people; humanity. A paradox to the point of questioning separating self-awareness from self-awareness itself; an example of existence without existence.

"There is only one really serious philosophical problem, and that is suicide" - Albert Camus
- Definitely! I concur as suicide could perhaps be thought to be nice in some ways. I aspire for independence rather than dependence. Perchance my ideologies prevent such action, as to exist without existence is fulfillment itself. In the end, concepts being concepts.

"We are condemned to be free." - Jean Paul Sartre
- In the end, it's inevitable. In our concepts it's a choice.

"Man is condemned to be free; because once thrown into the world, he is responsible for everything he does." - Jean-Paul Sartre
- An orphan to be responsible, in a plot to be reckoned.
- Translation of my statement above: Mankind being thrown into the world without god; parents, meaning an orphan. A man being thrown into a plot to be reckoned with could indicate the story to be predetermined when finished. If you were to look at the story and their neurological distinctions/programming in a way, the man wouldn't truly have a choice due to the plot. (This does not necessarily dictate God as non-existent.)

"The unexamined life is not worth living" -Socrates
- Perhaps within infinity, deeming worth itself is imagination in a sense. An examined life is truly a necessity for the nature of existence and non-existence, false without such meaning.

"Existence precedes essence." -Jean-Paul Sautre
- Indeed, encompassed by infinity itself. For essence preceded by existence, as memory a

concept, to be is forever.
- Aligns with my idea that existence surpasses reality.

"To be is to be perceived" - George Berkeley
- Indeed, simply thinking is existence. Perhaps perception itself in our human understanding, at least true perception cannot be understood; attempt my definition.

"That which does not kill us makes us stronger." - Friedrich Nietzsche
- Perhaps an illusion of ourselves being stronger continuously, albeit in reality, we are truly immutable; a concept of strength, perhaps we are strength itself, or a form of desperation.

"Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent." - Ludwig Wittgenstein
- That's quite valid, a mindset to be beneficial. Such a concept is dependent. Plausibly a view of logic being an attempt at communication may be beneficial. Perhaps existence itself is beyond the conventional understanding of silence; and we comprehend ourselves, a pretense?

(100% Organic Thoughts)

Possible Misconceptions or Misinterpretations

(100% Organic Thoughts/AI refinement)
- Viewing the theory as promoting nihilism or purposelessness by equating everything with infinity/non-existence. In fact, my theory tries to find meaning and ethics within an infinite context. But some may overly fixate on "non-existence" elements.
- Interpreting the metaphysical eternity of consciousness as justifying a lack of self-care or damage to physical bodies. When in reality, I don't intend any dismissal of health/life.
- Seeing the idea of multiple "selves" as promoting fragmentation or dissociation of identity. When my goal is similar to integrating different facets into a holistic self.
- Assuming my view of time discounts the importance of past and future, by emphasizing the present. But I see value in how all time phases interrelate.
- Critiquing my theory as being too abstract and impractical to derive any concrete social/political principles. When applied wisely, my theory can have pragmatic implications.
- Misconstruing my perspective as discouraging scientific inquiry and empiricism. When I aim to complement rather than contradict science.
- Viewing it as rejecting all value judgments and qualitatively equating all things. When I believe there are still better or worse states/actions. In addition, I refer to equality from an absolute perspective, rather than a typical one.

- Interpreting it as complete moral relativism or nihilism, when my aim is to find ethical implications. In addition, I believe in morals while not.
- Assumption that "non-existence" means ceasing to objectively exist or experience anything. When I try to explore all definitions like a subjective sense of insignificance.(Certain sections may possess different definitions.)
- Belief that my theory rejects the reality of the external world entirely, tending toward solipsism. But I allow for different perspectives.
- Thinking it doesn't allow for individuality or nuanced self-conception, only universal oneness. But my multiple selves idea suggests embrace of diversity.
- Misconception that it discourages passion, goal-seeking, or personal growth by denying concrete distinctions. But my theory need not dismiss subjective meaning.
- Assuming it rejects emotions as illusions, rather than accepting them as part of the human experience, however temporal.
- Interpretation that it promotes total detachment or escapism from practical affairs. When applied mindfully, it can inform balanced engagement.
- Interpretation that it promotes the idea of infinity being our meaning. In reality, I'm referring to a different meaning, the end (Absolute POV) rather than constricted by our constructs of time. Albeit, it is not wrong whilst true. (The interpretation.) To be more precise, infinity being our meaning in the end of it all, ignoring concepts of time. Albeit within time our meaning could have countless plausibilities, it may be god, our choice, etc.
- Interpretation that I believe or don't believe in God. I conform to a manifold of possibilities rather than a single belief, believing in them whilst not.
- Make sure to remember that at certain parts I am viewing things at different viewpoints or perspectives.
- In addition, if my theory stands correct under review then empirical evidence would not be needed, as my theory itself defies theories of logic, which those evidences depend on.

Insignificant Raw Thoughts Without Articulation, Purely Raw

(This theory is mainly refined raw thoughts. I'll input raw, unrefined thought processes if I recall this area.)
(The following answers may be low quality.)
(100% Organic Words)

What I intend when I state "existence inherently incorporates non-existence" and why I believe this to be true:
Existence, inherently incorporating nonexistence, refers to our existence within infinity, which potentially leads us to be insignificant while significant. We can be considered nonexistent in the sense that we can be considered a mere fragment in the face of infinity. One such instance may be seamlessly transferring between consciousness and unconsciousness. (zoning out, dissociation, or many more factors.) Albeit this can carry onto numerous other situations like our unconscious nature of consciousness. Perhaps being interpreted as nonexistent while existent at times we aren't truly conscious, plausibly dictating we aren't existent while existing.

What is the relationship between knowledge and belief? Is it possible to have knowledge without belief, or belief without knowledge?
A belief to be natural, one to be born. A rule of mine: to understand truly is to understand, while maintaining oneself. Without knowledge you can have true beliefs; beliefs that are mere concepts, showcasing your true form. You can have one without the other, however possibly intrinsically rather than in mortal terms. A belief reminiscent of the beginning and the end, a beginning, the end, the same.
(4:43 AM, August 15th)

1. Rather than beliefs, knowledge, or understanding these beliefs were intrinsic to say the least. Natural, like the butterfly effect casually existent. I responded to the philosophical question: What is the relationship between knowledge and belief? Is it possible to have knowledge without belief, or belief without knowledge?
2. True beliefs refer to the innocent, yet obscure nature of sentientness. This refers to what you believed in as a child or perhaps a newborn baby; if nothing then nothing would be your belief, whilst being true to yourself.
3. I don't feel it's novel, rather I logically wonder if it is; which is why I inquired for this.

4. The beginning refers to when you weren't affected by the world; whether it be a 7 year old or newborn baby. The end refers to your belief at the end of reasoning and wisdom.

5. I do not intend to link my thoughts to anything; these came organically from within.

(2:41 AM Aug 16th)

Knowledge could be like a favorite color, in a way it is a belief, albeit it can change later on. I stated, "however possibly intrinsically rather than in mortal terms" when you are born, you immediately have knowledge of the world, no. If you exist, you have knowledge of that. It goes on. I'm referring to the typical definition.

What is the meaning of life?

For humans to grasp, a picture is felt. It depends vastly on how big or small the picture, whether it be a single picture or the end of it. In the end of it without concepts like time; infinity is ultimately the meaning. In humans' conception of time, for how they experience the current existence in themselves, it depends. Perhaps one may ponder a manifold of possibilities instead of conforming to one; religion, existentialism, other schools or thoughts, and countless others. Regardless of your choice if you exist there is meaning; even if there isn't. To live a meaningless life is to not exist. A continuation of nonexistence beyond the present nonexistence and existence is something only existent as a concept; you will always exist regardless. A choice so logically pitiful a delusion.

August 17th, 2023 4:31 AM

I am not saying to conform to countless possibilities to be honest, it is more complicated than that.

(Look at my raw convo between AI, if you'd like further proof.)

Potential Goal for Humanity

August 14th 2023 4:13 AM

I believe there are two people, or more accurately, orphans, in this world: toddlers and children. Those who follow, gullibly, on autopilot continuously in a sense, especially in the sense they can be easily manipulated or convinced. Children: those who innovate are their own people, not so gullible, and don't immediately make truths out of the news, particularly in the fact that they can think independently rather than dependently. A potential goal could be creating a world full of children.

Note: If I could only give 2 categories; albeit humans are monstrously complex, and the goal

above is an oversimplification. In addition, this goes beyond skepticism, extending to fostering individual empowerment and self-driven rational thinking.

Some Potential Benefits of The Goal

- More self-education, open-mindedness and much more leading to less manipulation/issues like anti-vaxx, climate change being false, flat earth, along with countless other factors being substantially reduced.
- With more minds tackling problems independently, the pace of innovation in science, technology, governance, education, etc. could accelerate enormously. (Moreover, the mindset enables a value of open-mindedness.)
- Important global issues like climate change, poverty, disease, etc. would have more empowered, engaged citizens contributing solutions.
- Norms of skepticism and rational discourse could improve policy-making and reduce polarization/dysfunction. (Skepticism at a reasonable level; towards certain subjects, events, albeit not necessarily questioning science, and the like itself.)
- Creativity and human flourishing could thrive in an atmosphere valuing questioning and knowledge.
- Shared values of truth, justice and compassion may strengthen if derived rationally.
- Institutions and power structures could become more ethical and accountable to an informed populace.

How We Could Achieve This~

- A new logical system that embraces paradoxes and multiple levels of truth.
- Our education system, culture systems, and much more.
- Of course, I don't contend that this will establish a childish world.

(100% Organic Raw Thoughts)

What inspired this conceptualization and how did you refine it over time?

Reminder: Refinement refers to feedback given.

Note: I do NOT necessarily recommend the actions I made, as I'm quite ignorant in certain topics

- Engaging in philosophical dialogues with artificial intelligence led me to discern the novelness and current abstractness in my perception of the world, and the like. (I don't contend my perception to be necessarily novel, more accurately, different from the majority.)
- Like, the flow of the universe guiding me organically, not towards a predetermined destination, but as a story. (Analogy) Devoid of the desire for sleep or basic necessities, I pursued extended periods of profound focus, using intuition rather than logic to determine my path.
- Rather than conscious choice, I followed what I intrinsically led, perceiving meaning profoundly yet inexplicably.

Refinement Journey

- Utilizing AI to *converse* philosophically enabling me to articulate my perception of the world in comprehensible human terms with greater accuracy and precision. (in practice via *convo*.)
- Likewise, making use of artificial intelligence for further *suggestions*, and *feedback*, considerably increasing my theories trajectory. Moreover, using AI to suggest more sophisticated alternatives for common vocabulary typically exercised enabled further refinement of my articulation and philosophy. In addition, I used AI as a *thought catalyst* at times, providing me with prompts to find philosophical topics to research. (Dialogue tool.)

Note: I contend my theory is not a result of over prompting. If necessary I can answer a related question without the need of AI, articulating complex concepts well upfront. My answers such as the general questions section were raw thoughts later grammatically and structurally refined.

Note: It seems reasonable that someone may leverage AI, given its potential as *an invaluable tool.* I don't consider myself better, perhaps doubtful that one can be inferior or superior; in the end, *equal.* I have made sure to avoid over-prompting; I see this as a learning experience. I haven't made a firm decision on philosophy as a career, thus I don't think this would benefit me too much.

I certify that the core ideas, writing, and theories presented here solely come from my own mind, without any outer influence.

Further proof: conversation full of 100% unrefined words or thoughts

Philosophical convo of me & AI July 30, 2023 **https://pastebin.com/GUgS3WdB**

Disclaimers for the convo: I don't believe that 'mortals' cannot comprehend my 'logic', rather I believe people can. It was a role-play; therefore, I did not use my brain. In addition, I do believe the AI would be able to comprehend it if I explained it. The purpose of this shared conversation is to prove more credibility rather than to enlighten or highlight my thinking process; this isn't how I typically think.

End-Notes

- This is the first version, I'll most likely release a second version later on. (Or perhaps this is sufficient for a final version, or I may stop here.) This current version may have numerous flaws; the goal is to face scrutiny, so I can experience intellectual growth and discover flaws within my speculations.
- Individual Perspective vastly affects interpretations, therefore I recommend not conforming to absolute assumptions.
- Reminder: I created this theory for intellectual stimulation. I have no intent towards fame or anything. I completely understand if you believe my work to be a result of over prompting, and that's okay. My goal is for my work to have merit and contribution.
First Version Completed August 22, 2023 2:47 AM
My arguments could be misunderstood or misinterpreted, so just ask me if you need further clarification for anything.

Possibilities for Evolving Logical Frameworks

Our current nature of reality is insufficient for further substantial development. Perhaps we'll gradually reach a point of end. In accordance with my unification of existence without existence theory, a new logical system is necessary.

Our understanding of truth and reasoning could expand in profound ways.

The key is a thoughtful approach of evolving logic to be more comprehensive, while retaining its coherence and utility.

I propose a logical solution updating logical systems to incorporate new axioms or rules that allow for paradoxical truths at certain levels of reality, while still maintaining consistency at other levels like physical human comprehension.

Some benefits of this new logical system:

- A recognition of biases as if we understand the following updates, humanity can logically comprehend both objectively and subjectively.
  - Perhaps the benefits are difficult to imagine; a world of a greater understanding that we are all equal, regardless of intelligence, race, opposing beliefs, looks, etc.
  - A world where absolute assumptions are not made based on body language, mistakes, age, bias, and much more. Benefits are hard to imagine; substantially more understanding leads to drastic decreases in suicide rates, both neurodivergent and neurotypical. Moreover, humans will be able to input ideas from all instead of exclusive groups, and so much more.
- A nuanced approach that can evolve humanity's consciousness overall.
- Instead of understanding solely true and false, we can objectively understand from all things being true and false.
- An open-minded nature that can comprehensively evolve humanity in our justice systems, view on life, etc.
- An approach that attempts to understand how God may think if he exists; albeit we can only attempt.

(Apologies if these seem premature; I think I might've exaggerated a bit.)

Some considerations:

- Introducing a hierarchical logic where fundamental paradoxes are resolved at higher meta-logical levels, but standard logic applies at lower levels. This keeps day-to-day reasoning consistent.
- Exploring many-valued logics that allow propositions to have degrees of truth between absolute true and false. This provides more nuance. Perhaps instead of allowing in-betweens we create different levels or simultaneous beliefs.
- Using modal logic frameworks to delineate truths in different worlds/planes so contradictions are localized rather than universal.
- Developing probabilistic logic models that give confidence levels to conclusions rather than binary true/false. This allows uncertainty.
- Studying quantum logic models that blend paradoxes like particle/wave duality into the logical structure itself in a coherent way.

Theory Brainstorming: How to Logic

1. Lower levels of understanding - true and false cannot exist simultaneously - the theory of non-contradiction applies.
2. Absolute Understandings: The understanding that you are constantly wrong and right.
   - If you are not an expert on subjects. (e.g. science, math, etc.) You cannot possess an absolute negative stance on things without being educated or recognizing limitations. (e.g. vaccines, climate change, science, etc.)
   - Exceptions exist, but play devil's advocate.
   - A nuanced perspective should always be considered.
3. It is okay to have unconventional opinions as long as you are neutral and play devil's advocate. Albeit one should always be neutral on their stance, even if considered factual.
4. Before infinity, in the end, we are all equal; concepts such as intelligence, looks, and much more, do not imply one as superior or inferior. (Objective vs Subjective)
   - Regardless, concepts like intelligence are multi-faceted. For instance, look at Gardner's theory.
   - If one is to show contempt, one is ignorant.
1. Continuous necessities: remembrance that inevitable bias may apply - attempt to subjectively and objectively think.
2. At higher levels - we look at things objectively - all concepts - pros & cons - nuanced approaches - substantial importance to remember inevitable biases - try to ignore your programming. (metaphor.)

3. Human communication is an attempt at communication rather than an absolute method - you cannot read minds.

4. Objective vs Subjective vs Societal Benefits

5. Higher level - Paraconsistent logic allowing for dialetheism (true contradictions) - true contradictions vs contradictions. - require further analysis to determine true and false contradictions

 - Some contradictions may reveal deeper truths

To be continued

I'll expand on logical formalizations, define key terms, address counterarguments and limitations, show connections, and much more *in a separate theory.*

Philosophical Predecessors

- Plato - Theory of Forms, Allegory of the Cave
- Aristotle - Law of non-contradiction, categories of being
- Parmenides - Views on existence and nonexistence
- Heraclitus - Unity of opposites, flux of the cosmos
- Sextus Empiricus - Skepticism, critiques of causality and logic
- Nagarjuna - Buddhist logic, tetralemma, emptiness
- Averroes - Relation between faith and reason
- Avicenna - Distinction between essence and existence
- Anselm - Ontological argument for God's existence
- Thomas Aquinas - Proofs of God's existence, essence vs existence
- Rene Descartes - Cogito ergo sum, mind-body dualism
- Benedict Spinoza - Pantheism, unity of mind and body
- John Locke - Primary vs secondary qualities, empirical epistemology
- George Berkeley - Subjective idealism, to be is to be perceived
- David Hume - Critique of causality, problem of induction
- Immanuel Kant - Phenomena vs noumena, limits of reason
- G.W.F. Hegel - Dialectic, unity of opposites
- Søren Kierkegaard - Subjectivity, leap of faith
- Arthur Schopenhauer - World as will and representation
- Friedrich Nietzsche - Perspectivism, will to power
- Henri Bergson - Élan vital, duration vs time
- Edmund Husserl - Phenomenology, lifeworld
- Martin Heidegger - Dasein, Being and Time
- Jean-Paul Sartre - Existentialism, existence precedes essence
- Simone de Beauvoir - Ethics of ambiguity, moral freedom
- Ludwig Wittgenstein - Language games, meaning as use
- Alfred North Whitehead - Process philosophy, occasions of experience
- Martin Buber - I-Thou relationship
- Emmanuel Levinas - Ethics as first philosophy
- Jacques Derrida - Deconstruction, différance
- Richard Rorty - Neopragmatism, anti-representationalism
- Thomas Nagel - What is it like to be a bat?
- Timothy Williamson - Knowledge first epistemology
- Graham Priest - Dialetheism, paraconsistent logic

- Zhuangzi - Unity of opposites, relativism, perspectivism
- Shankara - Advaita Vedanta, Brahman-Atman unity
- al-Ghazali - Skepticism, limits of reason, Sufism
- Maimonides - Synthesis of faith and reason
- Nicolaus Cusanus - Learned ignorance, coincidentia oppositorum
- Baruch Spinoza - Neutral monism, nobility of mind
- Gottfried Leibniz - Monadology, best of all possible worlds
- Johann Fichte - Subjective idealism, thesis-antithesis-synthesis
- Friedrich Schelling - Identity philosophy, transcendental idealism
- Søren Kierkegaard - Existentialism, stages of life's way
- William James - Pragmatic theory of truth, radical empiricism
- Hans-Georg Gadamer - Philosophical hermeneutics, horizons of understanding
- Paul Ricoeur - Hermeneutic phenomenology, narrative identity
- Maurice Merleau-Ponty - Embodied perception, intentional arc
- Michel Foucault - Archaeology of knowledge, power-knowledge
- Thomas Nagel - Mind-body problem, bat's phenomenology
- Robert Nozick - Experience machine, meaning in life
- Derek Parfit - Personal identity, reductionism vs non-reductionism
- Peter Singer - Ethics, utilitarianism, effective altruism