

Claus Janew

# Dynamic Existence

(Revision of the second translation from German)

**Abstract:** *Everything is in motion. "Inertness" arises from (approximative) repetition, that is, through rotation or an alternation that delineates a focus of consciousness. This focus of consciousness, in turn, must also move/alternate (the two differ only in continuity). If its alternation seems to go too far - physically, psychically or intellectually - it reaches into the subconscious. In this way, interconnection is established by the alternation of the focus of consciousness. Therefore, in a world in which everything is interconnected, all focuses must reciprocally transition into each other. "Reality" is a common "goal", a focus which all participants can switch into and which is conscious to them as such, as a potential one. Its "degree of reality" is the probability of its fully becoming conscious (or more simply: its current degree of consciousness). Thus, a reality is created when all participants increase its probability or, respectively, their consciousness of it.*

## What is real?

I am an individual. Nothing and no one else occupies my point of view. Otherwise he would be me.

Therefore, everything I perceive is individual, perspective of an individual, something of me.

The computer screen is something of me? And if my daughter is sitting next to me, is it something of her? And she herself would be a part of me?

So it must be.

But why is the screen part of her? Why aren't both components of me directly? Why the detour through her?

One could do without this detour. But that would be inconsistent:

My daughter is different from the screen, and yet I perceive both. This means that there is a mediation between the two within my individuality. This mediation may consist primarily in my wandering attention from one to the other. In the process, my individuality always changes a little bit, because it is an *entirety* of components.

Then I can put myself in my daughter's place and experience a different perspective and individuality. Is that my daughter's? No, of course not, it is just a geometric point of view.

But again, this point of view is mediated with my first one by *alternating* the angles mentally or physically, more or less quickly.

Now my daughter speaks up and says that the screen is low contrast when viewed from an angle. This reminds me of my perception at her place, and I conclude that her statement must have something to do with my perception there. And consequently (alternation!) also with my perception at the present place.

Since she has also spoken to me about other things at other times, I have already understood her perception, her own life, to a greater extent and therefore assume her own individuality - with a screen as a component.

What happened? I kept changing points of view (attention, perceptual angle, own life), but I was always in only one. Is that logically possible?

Apparently not. Because when I am no longer there, I am obviously here. But can I only be here? Probably not. Then I would know nothing from there, only from here, my individual reality. That might be enough for me, but actually my individuality itself comes from such alternations of standpoints.

This fact results from the uniqueness and wholeness of the individual (Latin "the indivisible"). Because it is not divisible *without changing the individual*, it differs from all others *in every respect*. Agreement at any point would require the division of individuals into the non-unique overlap and the unique remainder. Instead of an overlap, we would have a separate individual.<sup>1</sup> A static individual could not even be subdivided, because everything that we consider a part (or component) of ourselves, for example, is an indivisible point of perception: every organ, every cell, every particle, every wave, every thought. It is *completely* different from the whole because it cannot coincide with it anywhere. Without the *alternation* between the components, we could not become the individual we perceive ourselves to be. We would be without structure, *nothing*.

So every individual exists only in the alternation of individuality. There is no here *or* there, *only* the alternation between all, with one standpoint having priority at the moment. So the standpoint is a phase of the *dynamic* individual. Everything that exists for the individual exists *dynamically*.<sup>2</sup>

So why do we rarely think of things as being so changeable? We say that they are *relatively* constant. Although we know that basically *everything* is in motion, each

---

<sup>1</sup> Only in infinitely small (infinitesimal) points can the individuals meet. For these are *nothing* without individual derivation.

<sup>2</sup> Also the individual itself, because of course each standpoint is just as much a dynamic individual that "derives" from the others, etc.

individuality is changing. Or we say that the movement is *relatively* continuous, so the whole is itself at each moment. In general, the whole is whole and the part is part.

Everything right. All of these phenomena are the result of the *structure* of the dynamic, of the alternation. Approximately closed sequences of alternations produce relative constancy. Finely graded alternations appear relatively continuous. And different extensions of alternations make the difference between "part" and whole.

Before we can explain this in more detail, we must consequently accept that dynamic existence reaches into the infinitely small. No whole is elementary, because without structure it would be infinitesimal, *having no effect*, not even a pinprick. After all, we measure everything by its effect. Even a quantum of energy can't evade this, because it has a certain "size". And it can only be measured (perceived) if it shows an effect structure, e.g. at an electron. But structure means alternation between individuals (see above). In the case of the energy quantum, between the states of the electron from which the quantum *results*. So to attribute the effect to an elementary quantum would be inconsistent. No structure, no effect (and vice versa), no matter to whom the effect is *attributed*. Exactly this effect is also expressed in the energy size of the quantum (and not vice versa).

In the end, however, we find only one infinitesimal point *between* the alternating individuals and *in the center* of each individual. This means that alternating really happens between individual points. But, of course, these points are only defined by the alternation, so that the alternation again proves to be the basic structure. Since this basic structure extends to the infinitesimal, I call it the *infinitesimality structure*.

So the form of the alternation is the form of the infinitesimality structure. If an individual were never to return, if it were to "exist" for only an infinitesimal moment, no one could comprehend it. If it were to return *exactly*, no one could perceive its change. So, besides the change from A to B and B to A', there should also be a change from A' to B' and B' to A'', and so on.<sup>3</sup> so that an approximate unity of A and B is woven.

In the middle (unity!) between A and B a *quasi-static approximation object* of the alternation is emerging. Not the said fabric, but a symbolic form circumscribed by it. This already resembles what we usually call the thing.<sup>4</sup> When unity prevails, the object is denser, like the fabric. When the difference prevails, it is thinner, sometimes barely perceptible, because it comes from a more peripheral fabric.

---

<sup>3</sup> Also between A' and A, A'' and A', etc.

<sup>4</sup> To be precise: For the individual A which becomes aware of its phase B, the approximation between them is a potential for the existence of B. When it becomes aware of the alternation between two other phases of itself, the approximation appears object-like.

The approximation - whether dense or thin - is of course also individual, with an infinitesimal center of identity, so that there is an alternation between identity and difference of A and B, between unity and multiplicity. In the last consequence between the central point and the peripheral points, and again the center in between and its periphery, and so on. Thus, between all centers and peripheries, spiral weaves and approximations are also generated: A complete, more or less uniform thing is created.<sup>5</sup>

In the case of the screen, the thing is dense: We change from edge to edge, from edge to center, from pixel to pixel. All individual settings - identity centers - in the awareness of their dynamically existing alternatives.

Between my daughter and me, however, the difference prevails; no approximate object crystallizes, although we feel an ethereal, quasi-static unity between us.

If I extend the dynamic of my point of view to the situation as such, I now alternate between relatively independent "parts" (screen, daughter, myself) by putting myself in my daughter's point of view, realizing a solid monitor, and so on. I perceive an individual totality from the respective standpoint; and again and again also from the center of the "whole" situation, which I classify just as individually.

Does this mean a universal definition of existence based on alternating individuality? Yes, because an existence that is not an individual one is not generalizable in a consistent way.

The alternation is not necessarily physical (whatever "physical" means). It depends only on the point of perception. The necessity of the infinitesimality structure to grasp this dynamic shows that we can just as well speak of consciousness or focuses of consciousness. Since nothing is fixed, all are back-coupling alternation structures of alternations.

These do not have to be spatio-temporal either. This is only our usual perception. Alternations can and will take place in any state space spanned by completely different coordinates. How these alternations are *ordered* in perception is also open. Dreams and associations are an example.

But the logical consequences are greater: If everything exists only in the alternation of individuality, then this alternation must include the entire universe! No alternation can be completely separated from the other, e.g. run in parallel, because this would mean an absolute division of the universe. That is, we are talking about a *single* alternation.

If the universe is limitless - and there is no reason for a final limit *in any direction* - then standpoint alternation must occur at infinite speed. ("Speed" as its spatio-temporal

---

<sup>5</sup> Since the approximation is basically a potential for the re-generation of the respective other side, it *cannot be an additional* individual, but was there from the beginning of the alternation - as the *original* alternation partner that passed on to another one and now forms the center.

interpretation.) This is the basic speed from which any relatively limited consciousness is filtered out by the *form* of alternation. Such filtering forms are tight back-couplings that reduce the *foreground* frequency of the alternation, seemingly slowing the movement so that the faster frequencies operate only in the less conscious background. Like when I concentrate on the computer screen and "forget" my daughter next to it, but am still aware of her and many other things. Even the universe has not completely disappeared. Only the details are no longer resolved.<sup>6</sup>

If the form results in a finely graded structure, it appears solid. If it also drifts, we have a continuous movement. If it is tightly knit and interwoven in a variety of ways, it will not dissolve in the near future. If it allows for more spontaneous change, it will develop new but related structures.

What does it mean to say "we"? Do "we" see something? This "we" and "our" something is also created in the exchange of standpoints - while transforming (!) subjective information back and forth and thus creating an approximate collectivity.<sup>7</sup>

A paradigm shift is needed from the view of "objective" objects to the awareness of a dynamic individual that alternates through all realities and is defined by the form of this alternation. Even if it is very unusual: the infinite basic speed leaves any room for it.<sup>8</sup> Even with a relatively constant awareness of my individuality, a self-filtered consciousness, as I sit here, I am at every moment a phase of limitless alternation. The terms awareness, individual, standpoint, consciousness, focus *are basically synonymous*. I use them only to structure the all-encompassing dynamic. When I sit from one place to another, I do nothing more than back-couple phases of my limitless alternation to form a change of place.

## What is creation?

The infinitesimality structure of the focus dynamic has two other important consequences:

1. The *freedom of choice* of consciousness is automatically built into it. I have substantiated this in my article [Omnipresent Consciousness and Free Will](#) and in my e-book [How Consciousness Creates Reality](#).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> This results in the reality funnel as I described in my e-book "How Consciousness Creates Reality" in the chapter of the same name. This is the very abbreviated version of my book [How Consciousness Creates Reality. The Full Version](#).

<sup>7</sup> See "Projection and creating approximations" in "How Consciousness Creates Reality"

<sup>8</sup> I have thought through all the fundamental questions that have arisen in connection with this result. To discuss them here would be too extensive. Please read my [Dialogue on Alternating Consciousness](#).

<sup>9</sup> Chapter "Consciousness – the infinitesimality structure".

Very briefly: Weighing describes a back-coupling between alternative changes. This indefiniteness circumscribes a whole and thus defines it down to an infinitesimal center. In a decision situation, however, the indefiniteness of the continuation is also an indefiniteness of the situation as a whole. The alternatives, on the other hand, are as such quite defined. That is to say, the definiteness and indefiniteness of the situation cannot at any point be separated from the decision process, but only result from it. The peripheral structure of the whole and its innermost core form an infinitesimality-structured unity. This unites definiteness and indefiniteness *also totally*. In this totality, the two become one, are not even partly distinguishable. Therefore, out of this totality, every new definiteness is freely chosen.

2. All consciousness is also in immediate connection with one another - not only by immediate focus alternation, but by the central identity in each "braked" at seemingly finite focus speed. I have also explained this in the aforementioned e-book.<sup>10</sup>

The approach: Every consciousness stands in an infinitesimality-structured relation to all others. In this relationship, the center of each consciousness is *also* identified with the center of the totality, because such centers of unity exist at every point "between" part and whole. Accordingly, out of unity with these centers, the decisions of partial and total consciousness are *also* identical.

If we take into account the described presence of all individual realities in the awareness of our own individual reality, we get a shimmering, flexible "web of consciousness" from which each consciousness constantly chooses its reality. Depending on the structure of the web, one reality is more likely and another less likely. When the consciousness makes one probable reality its current one, the others "fall down" a bit, lose probability. They become potential.

Since our current awareness is mediately and immediately connected to all other awareness, consciously and less consciously to subconsciously, it can coordinate with them on a collective approximate reality. Most of the coordination will take place subconsciously (but always *within* awareness) for capacity reasons, so we don't have to worry too much about the shape of the world. Its stability is also reasonably maintained subconsciously. We have recognized the general structure for this, although we do not yet know most of the concrete processes.

---

<sup>10</sup> See chapters "Consciousness – the infinitesimality structure" and "Our permanent choice".

The creation of a collective reality would thus be the decision of all the participating individuals for a priority approximation of their standpoints and for the fading out of the others. This can be illustrated by the creation of the screen. Of all the states in which all individuals are constantly fluctuating, a not too improbable one (the vague "idea") is "condensed" into a physical object by the inventor/manufacturer. He increases its pre-felt (or researched) probability to 100% through attention, skill and energy input. Then it is handed over to us "attention-energetically", selected by us *in this form* from the multiplicity of offers. Other versions are no longer considered by us, we fade them out. We then continue to construct a more individual screen from the acquired approximate object, our very own (as described), of which the manufacturer usually no longer notices anything. However, our screen remains more closely related to the prototype than the prototype is to the vague "idea" chosen by the inventor - this "idea" has solidified on a higher level. Friends who visit us (!) now have an easy time constructing a similar screen on our table.

We maintain the stability of the "material object" partly consciously because we value it. We also consciously and semi-consciously repeatedly find our way back to the state of looking at the screen (read: home). And when the object is finally broken, we let the atoms be recycled. Only how the consciousness network maintains natural laws and human prejudices is largely unexplained.

So how much we can consciously create is left to our joy of experimentation and personal development. There are plenty of guides. In my experience, our possibilities are clearly greater than materialists believe, but their probabilities are often not as high as many others promise. "Matter" is condensed consciousness, but the "Matrix" wants to be taken along.<sup>11</sup>

Two subtle questions arise when considering the timelessness of alternation through all "past" and "future" individuals:

1. If every focus, every individual, every reality is constantly being passed through, how can we *create* a reality? How can it be truly *new*?

In short, the journey is more than the destination. True, each individual is a phase of all the others. But its awareness is a unique hierarchy of probabilities that only exists when it is just taken. It is generated anew in every moment, but the *filtered*, slower path from peak A to peak B is not! Although it represents a partial frequency of the infinite, it exists only in the here and now where it is walked.

2. If everything in the focus movement already exists, is there universal development, or does everything just repeat itself?

---

<sup>11</sup> Allusion to the movie of the same name, in which the "Matrix" represents the collective web of consciousness.

This question is related to the previous one, so the answer is simple.<sup>12</sup> The unique, slow path is most likely not going to repeat itself, because it is infinite. It is also very unlikely to be repeated by someone else (or by ourselves), because our freedom of choice makes it unpredictable. Someone who wanted to follow it would not make the same choices.

Another question about the *direction* of individual development leads us to the concept of value fulfillment, which can perhaps be guessed from the above, if we include the asymmetry between quasi-static limitation and dynamic infinity. I would like to conclude here with a self-quotation: "Value fulfillment cannot be determined by a goal. Rather, it consists in its own blossoming, it is itself path and goal, an experienced awareness and timeless. It means to feel one's own meaning in the world, including one's own "greatness," and to live according to this sense of value. This feeling includes its own growth as well as the growing awareness of a more comprehensive whole in which it is secure."<sup>13</sup>

## **Individuality and the physical paradigm**

The physical paradigm contains serious distortions or inconsistencies:

1. The Brain is seen as the ultimate "perceiver". But who perceives the brain? The brain again? This is a circle, where my concept of circumscription comes in.
2. Reality is seen as physical after all, and by "physical" our paradigm is meant. From this a limited view of information derives. Here, my infinitesimality structure suggests a deeper view from which "information" derives.
3. "Physical" also means "objective", and objectivity is considered to be "not part of the observer" (the term "observer" contains this misunderstanding in itself). So where in this world is the observer? Observed by whom? Or not observed at all?

Infinitesimality structure means, that there is no object in itself. Objects only condense from universal change by circumscription. This change is an alternation between individuals, and these individuals are condensations of this change, too. So neither firm objects nor objective individuals exist. There is only change or alternation in itself (structure of alternation).

Quantum physics describes another form of alternation than classical physics. There seems to be a basic unity, an elementary quantum. To perceive (or think) such a quantum, however,

---

<sup>12</sup> Both questions can be refined in several directions, which is why I have given them their own chapter ("The indestructibility of the individual") in my book [How Consciousness Creates Reality. The Full Version](#). I have also discussed them in the [Dialogue on Alternating Consciousness](#).

<sup>13</sup> "How Consciousness Creates Reality. The Full Version," chapter "Value fulfillment".



needs circumscription of "it", condensation of a movement. Again, there is no quantum in itself, although we treat it as such – and limit our focus on it.

How then can it be circumscribed so stable? This is the question to be asked, while not simplifying it to an object in itself (except for practical use).

In this concept there is no exclusive observer, there are only individual views (= individuals). Every view is unlimited at the end (and so are the individuals), but is limited asymptotically by self-reflection aimed at a controllable world and at building structures at all. (A continuous plenum reflects on limited structure to define itself.)

To view the world infinitesimality-structured means to think beyond elementary quantum and quantum information, because "information" is already a condensation, a permanent attuning of alternating individuals (individual views). No information is transmitted: An attunement takes place – by condensating a change, changing position, and decondensating individually. The whole process is precondensated before of course by developing a "common" language, establishing a "common" infrastructure etc., and by unknown processes, too.

Alternation is unlimited, because logically there cannot be a limit without the possibility to cross it in principle. I know that logic is thought by humans, but on the other hand thinking is seen as an appropriate tool to relate to the bigger world. It must be so, otherwise we would not (self-) exist in it. Although our thinking may be inconsistent, it cannot be meaningless to the bigger extent. Although the "ultimate" observer does not exist, individual standpoints do exist; and so does their attunement.

Infinitesimality and infinity are consequences of limitlessness with respect to the existent meaning of the individual thinking. They can be well a camouflage for unperceived structures, but they always point beyond the perceived ones and they always remain essential values to deal with.

<https://free-will.de>



[License](#)

First published 2009-2011. Translation from German revised in 2022-2023.