

The Surjective Monad Theory of Reality: A Qualified Generalization of Reflexive Monism

Indranu Suhendro
www.zelmanov.org

What remains of presence and use in the universal dark (or perhaps, after all, in a too luminous, sight-blinding place), when mirrors are traceless as if without glass, when eyes are both mindfully and senselessly strained: wakeful but not ultimately cognizant enough — being a splendid spark at best, but incapable of self-illumination and shedding light on existents as if (situated) in themselves —, when no reflection remains within and without? Indeed, only that exceedingly singular, somewhat pre-existent (i.e., pre-reflexive) Motion and Moment without reflection inheres, which is our characteristic redefinition of Noesis or Surjectivity. This, since Reality can in no way be reduced to Unreality, even in such noumenal darkness where existence and non-existence are both flimsy, for otherwise at once — at one universal Now and Here — all would cease to exist, “before before” and “after after”; and yet all that, nay Being itself, already exists with or without (the multiplicity of) reflective attributes, i.e., without the slightest chance to mingle, by both necessity and chance, with Non-Being and hence with multiplicity! That is simply how chanceless Reality is in itself, suddenly beyond both the possible and the impossible, such that even Unreality (as it is, without history), which is a lingering “backwater part” of the Universe after all, can only be (i.e., be “there”, even if that simply means “nothing”, “nowhere”) if and only if Reality *IS*, i.e., if Reality is One even without operational-situational sign or space in the first place, and not the other way around. Such, then, is what chance, i.e., the chance of reflection, may mean in the Universe — and not elsewhere: Reality is such that if it weren’t Such, both Reality and Unreality would be Not, ever. He who fails to see this at once — as One — will not be able to understand the rest of the tale, Here and Now (or, as some say, “Now-Here”, “Nowhere”, or as Wittgenstein would have put it, “senselessly”), with or without the Universe as we commonly know it. — A first self-query in epistemic solitude.

1 Introduction: silently in the loud background of things

“Come, like a gush of early bewilderment abruptly arriving at the edge of time. Let us sort ourselves out from the loudness of things here.”

The present elucidation is not a “consciousness study”. It is a conscious expression of Reality. It is a symptom of consciousness, a deliberation of knowing. Or, as some would say, “it’s a proof, like music, rain, or a tempest”. It is a self-orchestrated pulsation and presencing without truncation even by silent objectivity, just as one may paint certain scenes of Sun-brushed magnolia eyes and long coral noons, or perhaps the deep winter rain and the seamless Moon-lit snow — simply like a mindful artist reminded of nudity during certain cavernous moments, nearly without a mirror capturing his inward constellation of motions. And so he moves, as it is, simultaneously before and after reflection, as if moving away from time itself. And so it moves, the entire reflection included.

Despite the possibly glacial theoretical sounding of the title and the way the text shall proceed from here (perhaps inconsistently), it is essentially not another viscid gathering of scholastic words on monism, let alone an ecstatic, bemused

first-time attempt at modeling Reality. It is not a theory in the sense of mental speculation and inspirational belief: it is Presence and Idea before and after philosophy, and a direct presentation and “surdetermination” during philosophy. Thus, it is not a mere representation, for it does not even begin with reflection. Rather, the entirety of reflection is but momentous and strengthened only by what truly precedes and surpasses it. It is not a psychological documentary multi-linearly tinged with philosophical armor and scientific draping. It is not a predictable philosophy in the rear. It is not a lucrative science as the world knows it. It is a mirror for worlds, anti-worlds, and all the non-worlds. And sometimes this very mirror does vanish, for absolute certainty’s sake.

This is an exposition to be enjoyed the most by self-similar “stray falcons”, who can’t help with their epistemic-intellectual speed and Genius, whose taste — upon the wind and beyond distant hills — is beyond that of the herd and the faltering, image-dependent, super-tautological world as a whole. It is not intended to be a secure throne in the sky nor a comfy haven on the Earth. Also, it is definitely not for the hideous, vainly copious one-dimensional intellect devoid of the valley’s affection and the seasons’ intimation. It is a silence-breaking tempest and a self-sustaining root in the most evident evening, entirely independent of the small

sparks of the present age of thought. It calls upon witnessing the Witness (and the Witnessed) in infinite exhaustiveness, intimidation, and silence.

It is incumbent upon the reader to acknowledge that the present exposition's veracity is to be grasped not by merely studying it, but by "studying it, not studying it, not-not studying it, and by none of these" (as to why, it shall be clear later). While Reality is not situational (as we shall see), the surreptitious meta-situation here is that, while there is an entire history of human ideas in the background of the world at any instant, its content moves not on any regularly known ground of being, so basically even the intrepid reader cannot compete with its velocity and vortex, for it is ahead of his reading, behind it, within it, and without it. And it is none of these.

Still, let the burning lines of the night and the time-span of the intellect's long orbit be epistemologically intimidated. For even if there is nothing to be seen and understood by the reader here, that one shall still see "seeing" itself, beyond mere "spiritism", however indifferent.

And so here falls headlong the platitudinous introductory tone first. Granted, it shall evaporate away soon enough, once the most unlikely epistemic sensitivity happens to the reader.

At the forefront of humanity — which is definitely a conscious, self-reflective episode in the evolution of the cosmos, according to the famous Anthropic Principle of cosmology and cosmogony — there is no need to explain why one needs to fully explore the nature of consciousness philosophically and scientifically, i.e., unless one is a dead-end dogmatist who, however taut, probably dares not "swear upon his own life, as to whether or not his beliefs are universally true after all".

The present semantic-ontological exposition centers around a further (or furthest possible) development of the theory of consciousness called "Reflexive Monism" (*RM*) — hereby referred to as the "Surjective Monad Theory of Reality" (*S MTR*).

By contrast, the version of realism called "Biological Naturalism" (*BN*) posits that consciousness is merely an emergent property of inanimate matter: everything that exists is necessarily inside the material brain, possibly as a quantum state. Thus, there is "no world inside the mind" — and so there is no "mind" (only a material brain) — and consciousness is but a field (electromagnetic, perhaps) activity involving the neuronal circuitry. Connected to this (and the theory of "Artificial Intelligence", *AI*), is the theory of Multiple Intelligences (*MI*), which advocates "consciousness" as a collective state of material brains via a global circuit mechanism, necessitating the existence of multiple participants — ultimately leaving no room for an individual brain, let alone an individual mind in the Universe (and hence, one could say, no room for a real solitary Genius at all, since *MI*-consciousness is always a collective pseudo-democratic state, no matter how transparent), for phenomenal multiplicity (rather than the self-cognizant, inhering presence of a single universal intel-

ligence) is at the very core of this form of materialism. Yet, consider this now-generic example as, e.g., conveyed by Velmans [1]. Suppose, convinced like many merely collectivistic scientists today, one accepts *BN*, then by definition one also accepts the whole world (nay, the Universe) as contained in the material brain. But most of every-day objects, including the skies and the horizons, seem to be located "out there" — that is, outside the brain. Thus, in order to encapsulate all that in a single material brain, one must accept that there is a "real skull" (whether or not certain "noumena" are known to one here) whose size is beyond that of the skies and the horizons, since physically the brain is contained in a skull. The "real skull" would then be related to individual skulls through some kind of "statistical-holographic averaging". The difference between "is" and "seems" becomes so arbitrary here, as we can easily see.

On the other hand, the history of human thought presents us with "Pure Idealism" (*PI*) — such as that advocated by Berkeley in one of its versions — where the world is but a mental entity, purely located inside the mind. By "world", we mean all that can exist as a single situational adage and corollary of reflective facts, including qualia (the trans-optical reality of color) and psychosomatic sensations. According to *PI*, there is "no world out there". In this approach, the mind is distinguished from the material brain, with the brain being a material self-representation of the mind, and everything is necessarily contained in the mind — yet with serious troubles for, like *BN*, it is without clear epistemic qualifications regarding the notion of individual and multiple entities: according to this theory, one might be tempted to see whether or not the Universe too ceases to exist, when an arbitrary mind (anyone's mind) dies out. Non-epistemologically positing essentially "eternal souls" does not really help either. (As regards qualia, we shall readily generalize this notion to include not just color, but also subsume it in the category spanned by the pre-reflexive "Surject", i.e., "Qualon" — precisely so as not to take the abstract phenomenological entity for granted.)

Such radical, self-limited approaches leave room for both "dogmatism" and "relativism", and consequently have their own drawbacks as shown, e.g., in Velmans' studies. Indeed in the face of Reality, one cannot help but be radical and isolated, whether shivering or rasping, but true epistemological qualification (herein to be referred to as "eidetic qualification") is quite profoundly something else. Velmans himself — formerly a proponent of *BN* — is a cogent philosophical proponent of *RM* and has indeed very extensively explored this reality theory, especially its aspects pertaining to cognitive psychology. Yet, we shall naturally go even beyond him in "imbibing Reality", hence the present theory as our basic ontological paradigm.

As is evident, *RM* is a version of realism adopted by thinkers such as Spinoza, Einstein (but not specifically its associated pantheism), and Velmans — which goes beyond *BN* and *PI*. Reality is said to isomorphically partake of events

(mental and material instances) both inside and outside the brain — and the mind.

Let us attempt to paraphrase *RM* as follows: the most fundamental “stuff” of the Universe is a self-intelligent, self-reflexive (“autocameral”) substance beyond both (the commonly known) mind and matter, possibly without an “outside” and an “inside” in the absolute sense (think of a Möbius strip or a Klein bottle, for instance). And yet, locally and “conspansively” (for the original use of this term, see also [2]: here “conspansion” is to be understood as self-expression and self-expansion within the semantics and syntax of universal logic), it produces intrinsic mind and extrinsic matter — as we know them.

In our present theory, this underlying substance is further identified as a non-composite self-intelligent Monad (“*Nous*”), without any known attribute whatsoever other than “surjective, conscious Being-in-itself”: we can make no mention of extensivity, multiplicity, and the entire notion of knowledge set at this “level” of Reality, whether subjectively or objectively, or both simultaneously. Otherwise, inconsistent inner multiplicity associated with reflection would somehow always have to qualify (i.e., ontologically precede) Being not only as being self-situational or self-representational, but also as being “accidentally none of these”. Such is absurd, for then it must also hold in the sheer case of Non-Being, i.e., without both existence and such multiplicity-in-itself and -for-itself. Being pre-reflexive, and hence pre-holographic and pre-homotopic, the true meaning of this point shall be effortlessly self-evident as we proceed from here. This is the reason why our *Nous* has no superficial resemblance with arbitrary phenomenal intelligence, let alone substance.

And yet the very same Monad sets out the emergent properties of reflexivity, holography, and homotopy with respect to the Universe it emergently, consciously sees (or “observes”, as per the essential element of quantum mechanics: the observer and elementary particles are both fundamental to the theory). It is necessarily, inevitably “intelligent” since it positively spans (knows) the difference between existence and non-existence and thereby fully augments this distinction in that which we refer to as the Universe or Reality’s Trace, which individual intelligences may reflect in various degrees of “motion” and “observation”. Otherwise, no one in extension would ever know (or have the slightest conscious power to know) the distinction between existence and non-existence; between the conscious and the unconscious — and further between absolute singular existence and various epistemological categories of multiplicity. Verily, this forms the basis of our paradigm for a fully intelligent cosmos — and further qualified versions of the Anthropic Principle.

Furthermore, our framework manifests a theory of Reality via four-fold universal (trans-Heraclitean) logic, which is beyond both conventional (binary) and fuzzy logics — as well as beyond Kantian categorical analysis. Given a super-set ($\{A, B\}$), where $\{A\}$ is a collection of abstract principles,

$\{B\}$ is a collection of emergent realities isomorphic to the entirety of $\{A\}$, and the super-set $()$ is “eidetically symmetric” (the meaning of which shall become clear later) with respect to its elements, it contains the full logical span of “*A*”, “non-*A*”, “non-non-*A*”, and that which is “none of these” (how it differs from traditional Buddhist logic will become clear later as well). As such, one may inclusively mention a maximum span of truly qualified universals, including ontological neutralities. This gives us a “surjective determination of Reality”, whose fundamental objects are related to it via infinite self-differentiation, as distinguished from Unreality.

While so far the reader is rigged with limited equipment — for, at this point, we have not introduced the essence and logical tools of the present theory to the reader — we can nevertheless roughly depict Reality accordingly, i.e., we shall start with “thinking of thinking itself” and “imagining the dark”. For this we will need one to imagine an eye, a mirror, a pitch-dark room (or infinite dark space), and circumferential light. Then, the following self-conclusive propositions follow:

P₁. In the pitch-dark room (“Unreality”), there exists an Ultimate Observer (“Eye”) that sees the pure, luminous mirror. The mirror is the Universe — henceforth called the “Mirror-Universe” — which is a “bare singularity” with respect to itself, but which is otherwise multi-dimensional (for instance, *n*-fold with respect to the four categorical dimensions of space-time, matter, energy, and consciousness, let alone the Universe itself).

P₂. The circumferential light augments both the mirror and the sense of staring at it, resulting in the image of an “eye” (or “eyes”, due to the multiple dimensions of the Mirror-Universe) and a whole range of “eye-varied fantasies” — which is the individual mind and a variational synthesis of that very image with the dark background — where that which is anyhow materialized readily borders with Unreality.

P₃. The circumferential light is, by way of infinite self-differentiation (and transfinite, self-dual consciousness), none other than (universal) consciousness.

P₄. Reality is the Eye, the Consciousness, the Mirror, the Image, and the “Eye-without-Eye”. This can only be understood later by our four-fold universal logic encompassing the so-called “Surjectivity” (*Noesis*) — with the introduction of “Surject” at first overwhelming both “Subject” and “Object” (in addition to “Dimension”) in this framework, but as we shall see, only this very “Surject” ultimately defines “Moment” (and not just a universal continuum of three-dimensional space and sequential time) and “Uniqueness” (and not just the “totality of consistent and inconsistent facts”) four-fold: “within”, “without”, “within-the-within”, and “without-the-without”, ultimately corresponding to the paramount qualification of Reality for itself and, subsequently, its associated “class of Surjects” in the noumenal and phenomenal world-realms.

Before we proceed further by the utilization of the above

similes, we note in passing that the underlying monad of any reflexive model of the Universe is none other than mind and matter at once, when seen from its phenomenal-organizational-relational aspect, a property which constitutes — or so it seems — both the semantics and syntax of the Universe, especially when involving conscious observers such as human beings. That is, noumenally (in-itself, for instance in the Kantian sense), the Universe is consciousness-in-itself, and phenomenally (in relation to the way its intelligibility inheres by means of extensive objects), it is a self-dual reality with a multiverse of material and mental modes of existence. But, as we shall see, there is a lot more to our adventure than just this: hence our generalization.

So much for a rather self-effacing introduction, in anticipation of the irregular dawning of things on the reader's mental window. Before we proceed further, let us remark on the rather speculative nature of "excess things" regarding the subject of *RM* in general: while, in general, mind cannot be reduced (transformed) into matter and vice versa, there exists subtle interactive links between them that should be crucially discerned by pensive research activities so as to maximally relate the philosophical dialectics of consciousness and technological endeavors, i.e., without causing philosophy, yet again, to get the "last mention". For, to partake of Reality as much as possible, humans must simply be as conscious as possible.

2 The gist of the present epistemology: the surjective qualon

"Mere erudite logic often turns — as has been generically said — philosophy into folly, science into superstition, and art into pedantry. How far away from creation and solitude, from play and imagination, from day and night, from noon and silhouette it is! How Genius is precisely everything other than being merely situational, alone as the Universe."

Herein we present a four-fold asymmetric theory of Reality whose essence — especially when properly, spontaneously understood — goes beyond the internal constitutions and extensive limitations of continental and analytic philosophies, including classical philosophy in its entirety (most notably: Platonism, neo-Platonism, atomism, dualism, and peripatetic traditions), monism (Spinoza-like and others), sophistic relativism and solipsism (which, as we know, has nothing to do with the actuality of the Einsteinian physical theory of relativity), dogmatic empiricism and materialism, Kantianism and neo-Kantianism, Hegelianism and non-Hegelian dialectics (existentialism), Gestalt psychology, symbolic logic, hermeneutics, and all phenomenology. This, while leaving the rather arbitrary self-triviality of major super-tautological (collectivistic, ulterior, inter-subjective) and post-modern, post-structural strands of thought in deliberate non-residual negligence — for, abruptly starting at the level of axiology and being generically "not even wrong" in short or at length,

these are devoid of real ontological-epistemological weight in our view.

The new ontological constitution under consideration is four-fold and asymmetric in the sense that there exist four levels necessitating both the Universe and Unreality, i.e., Reality, the Reflexive Mirror-Universe, the Projective World-Multiplicity, and Unreality, whose *eidetic connective distances* (i.e., "foliages" or "reality strengths") are *telically* (i.e., multi-teleologically) direction-dependent and not arbitrarily symmetric among themselves unless by means of *Noesis*, by which the very theory is said to be *eidetically qualified* (i.e., qualified by *Eidos*, or Suchness — be it Alone without even specific reference to the Universe at all, or when noumenally and associatively designated as All or All-in-All) — and hence self-unified and self-unifying with respect to an entirely vast range of phenomenological considerations.

It is to be noted that Surjectivity, as implied by the very term *Noesis*, in our own specific terminology is associated with *Nous*, or the Universal Monad, which is none other than the *First Self-Evident Essence* through whose first qualitative "Being-There" (*Ontos qua Qualon*) the ontological level, and not just the spatio-temporal level, is possible at all, especially as a definite, non-falsifiable concentration of knowledge.

Thus, in particular, the classical Socratic-Hegelian dialectics of thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis is herein generalized to include also *Noesis*, but rather in the following *asymmetric, anholonomic* order: *Noesis* (via the Ontological Surjective "Surject", i.e., "Qualon"), *Synthesis* (via the Epistemological Reflexive "Dimension", i.e., "Prefect"), Thesis (via the Reflective Dimensional "Object-Subject", i.e., "Affect"), *Anti-Thesis* (via the Projective Dimensional "Subject-Object", i.e., "Defect"). This corresponds to the full creation of a new philosophical concept, let alone the Logos, by the presence of self-singular points and infinitely expansive perimeters.

The ontic (i.e., single monad) origin of the noumenal Universe is Reality itself, i.e., Reality-in-itself (Being-qua-Being) without any normatively conceivable notion of an internally extensive (self-reflexive) contingency (e.g., the usual context of cognition, information, syntax, simplex, and evolution) of inter-reflective, isomorphic, homotopic unity and multiplicity at all, let alone the immediate self-dual presence of subjects and objects (i.e., representational and observational categories, such as space-time and observers).

Thereafter, extensively, upon the emergence of the notion of a universe along with *universality*, i.e., *reflexivity* (encompassing, by noumenal and phenomenal extension, both *reflection* and *projection* — with the former being universal, ultimately akin to singularity and non-dual perception but still, in an austere sense, other than Reality itself, and with the latter being somewhat more inter-subjective and arbitrary, still bordering with the dark, shadowy vanity of Unreality), Reality is said to encompass primal, pre-geometric (i.e., "mirrorless", trans-imaginary, or *qualic*) singularities and transformational multiplicities (modalities) at successive levels capa-

ble of fully reflecting essence and existence in the four-fold Suchness of “within”, “without”, “within-the-within”, and “without-the-without”, where original noumena inhere only by means of *eidetic-noetic instance* (*Surjection*) without the necessity of phenomena whatsoever, but only the presence of the so-called “*Surject*” — that which is not known to regular epistemologies, for in a sense it is other than “subject”, “object”, and “dimension”. Only then do both noumena and phenomena appear *info-cognitively* by means of reflexive omnijectivity involving arbitrary subjects, objects, and epistemological dimensions (i.e., in fundamental semantic triplicity), which in turn is responsible for the reflective and projective self-dual modes of all abstract and concrete phenomenal existences — hence the emergence of the universal syntax, nearly as circular self-causality.

In elaborating upon the above allusions, we shall also introduce a post-Kantian four-fold universal logic (not to be confused with four-fold Buddhist logic or that which is associated with non-relativistic, semantics-based process philosophy) associated with an eidetically qualified kind of *non-composite consciousness*, which enables us to epistemologically generalize and elucidate the metaphysics (logical interior) of the so far sound-enough theory of Reflexive Monism (i.e., “sound-enough” at least at the “mesoscopic” stage of things, and in comparison with the majority of competing paradigms).

In connection with the elucidatory nature of this exposition, we shall adopt a style of narration as intuitive, lucid, and prosaic as possible — while being terse whenever necessary —, due to the otherwise simple ambiguity inherent in the association of Reality with a potentially inert scholastic theory (while there is subtle isomorphism between Reality and language at a descriptive stage, to the Wittgensteinian extent, as recorded in [5], that “that which can be spoken of, must be spoken of clearly, and that which cannot, must be withheld in utter silence”, how can Reality only be a “theory” or “philosophy” after all?): the profundity of the former is ultimately senseless and immediate, with or without deliberate systemization on our part, while the latter is but a singular, cognition-based contingency-in-itself (a logical enveloping singularity and yet always not devoid of the multiplicity of perceptual things, including those of plain syntactical undecidability).

3 Peculiar eidetic re-definitions: aprioristic terminology and essence

“May I suspect, friend, you know — arbitrarily — what appears. But, tell me, what IS?”

It is important to note that some of the eclectic terms employed throughout this exposition do not essentially depend on their scholastic historicity. It is immaterial whether or not they have come into existence through the collective jargon of the multifarious schools of all-time philosophers. (Needless to say, the same applies to scientific-sounding terms, without any attempt towards imparting to the reader’s mind a sense

of “pseudo-science” whenever touching upon aspects other than traditional science, for one must be most acutely aware of the profound tedium prevalent in much of the arbitrary literature of post-modernism and so-called “theosophy” in actual relation to pseudo-science, pseudo-spirituality, pseudo-philosophy, and pseudo-artistry.) Rather, whenever we use these terms, we would only like to further present them in the twice-innermost and twice-outermost sense: phenomenological instances have inner and outer meaning, and yet we wish to also encompass the “twice-inward” (twice-Unseen, twice-Real within-the-within) and “twice-outward” (twice-Manifest, twice-Real without-the-without) akin to Reality beyond simple constitutional duality and arbitrary individual fragments. This is simply a prelude to an amiable over-all description of the four-fold Suchness of Reality and its self-qualified primal noumena, which is not attributable to simple, eidetically unqualified “bi-dimensional” entities (whose common qualification is solely based on “this” and “other”, “yes” and “no”, or at most “yes and/or no”).

Now, in order to be trans-phenomenally readable, we may give the following list of five primary eidetic redefinitions (corollaries) essential to the outline of things here:

- Suchness (*S*) (*Eidos*): that which is manifestly There, as qualified by Being-in-itself, with or without existential reflexivity (the multiplicity of forms and mirrors);
- Monad (*N*) (*Nous*, *Monados*, *Ontos qua Qualon*): the first intelligible self-qualification (“*Qualion*”) of Reality and hence its first actual singularity, the noetic-presential “*U(N)*” of “*Universum*” (i.e., “*Qualon*”), with or without singular internal multiplicity of reflexive things (i.e., “*versum*”, or possible *extensa*) other than a “bare” eidetic (and hence noetic) being in and of Reality-in-itself (i.e., by its simply Being-There). Such is beyond both the traditional “*Atom*” and “*Platon*”, let alone the infinitesimals. It is simply the noumenal All and All-in-All, as well as the first eidetic-archetypal Singularity, with or without phenomenological “allness” (reflexive enclosure);
- Universe (*U*) (*Universum*, *Kosmos*): the noumenal-phenomenal four-fold Universe, i.e., the surjective, reflexive (multi-dimensionally reflective-transformational), projective, annihilatory universal foliation, ultimately without “inside” nor “outside”. The multi-space All by the Surjective Monad — simultaneously a multi-continuum and multi-fractality, being simultaneously Euclidean and non-Euclidean, geometric and pre-geometric, process and non-process (interestingly, see how all these seemingly paradoxical properties can exist in a single underlying multi-space geometry as described in [7] — see also a salient description of the essentially inhomogeneous physical cosmos in relation to random processes as presented in [12]). In other words, Reality’s singular Moment and infinite Reflex-

- ivity, with or without phenomenal space and time;
- Reality (M) (*Ontos qua Apeiron*): that which is the Real-by-itself. The self-subsistent Reality of Reality in-it-self (with or without *realities* — i.e., with or without internal self-multiplicity), the Surjective Monad, the Reflexive Universe, and Unreality. Here the austerity of the symbolic, presential letter “ M ” (for the essentially “Unlettered”) inheres absolutely without any vowel such that it is said that “nothing enters into it and nothing comes out of it”;
 - Surject (g) and/or Surjectivity (dg) (*Noesis, Epoche*): the first self-disclosing instance (“instanton”) of Reality, or such self-evident instances in existence. Reality is said not to act upon itself, for it is simply beyond categorical stillness and motion, and so it “acts” only upon the first reflexive mirror, the Universe, thereby capable of infusing new universally isomorphic *differentia* (“solitons”), i.e., new noumenal instances and new phenomenological events in the Universe (with respect to its trans-finite nature). In relation to it, the Universe is like a light-like (holographic, homotopic) mirror-canvas, a ground-base yet ever in motion, upon which the “Lone Artist” paints his “Surjects”. This is none other than the innermost nature of Genius (which differs, as we shall see here (i.e., by this more universal qualification) from mere superlative talent, just as eidetic surjectivity is beyond mere reflexivity).

As can be seen, each of the notions above is self-singular: these realities are self-similar among themselves, without categorical parallel apart from the ontological level. In other words, simply because Reality is One (Self-Singular), with or without reference to regular phenomenological (arithmetically countable) oneness, so are the Mirror, the Image, and the Shadow in essence.

As we shall witness in this exposition, all That (Reality, Monad, Universe, Unreality) can be given as follows:

$$M : N(U(g, dg)) \sim S,$$

where “:” denotes eidetic-noetic Presence (or Moment) and “ \sim ” represents transcendental equality as well as trans-individual self-similarity among the equation’s constituents. This, in a word, is more than sufficient to end our exposition at this early stage — for it is a self-contained proof of consciousness for itself —, as it is mainly intended for spontaneous cognizance, but we wish to speak more amiably of things along the epistemological perimeter of the intellect.

Non-composite Oneness belongs to Reality, so to speak, without having to be qualified or necessitated by that which is other than itself, simply because the self-necessary and the possible (existent), even the impossible (non-existent), can only be cognitively perceived “there” in and of the Real, not “elsewhere” by any other means, and not even by any presential concentration of singular multiplicity (i.e., ontologi-

cal and epistemological gatheredness). In other words, Reality is not diversifiable — and made plural — within and without, since it has no categorical “inside” nor “outside”, especially with respect to the discriminative entirety of cognition. Even absolute non-existence can only be conceived in, and necessitated by, Reality as a category — hence, in the absence of multiple intelligible things other than the supposedly primal “opposite” of pure existence, there is no actuality of absolute non-existence that can necessitate Reality as it is, nor is there anything phenomenal and noumenal that can cause it to mingle, in and across phenomenological time and space, with chance, causality, and mediation, let alone with singularly inconsistent multiplicity and Unreality. It is boundless not because it lies in infinite space, or because it is where infinite multiplicity inheres, or because it is a representation of eternity, or even because a finite entity is ultimately annihilated by “not knowing” and “non-existence” in the face of some infinite unknown, but because its ontological rank or weight (i.e., ontic-teleological reality) is without either immediate or extensive multiplicity in its own interiority or reflexive dimensionality, not even the entirety of “knowledge”. If this weren’t so, a single arbitrary reflective quantity could then also be shown to inhere intransitively (without existential predication), independently of Being, at any ontological level, *just as Being can always necessitate it predicatively*: for things to be situated in existence (extensivity), Being (Reality) must be there first absolutely without mingling with Non-Being (Unreality), *unlike the way things may phenomenologically mingle among themselves* (be it consistently or inconsistently). The metaphysical connection (the simplex of meta-logic) among ontological categories herein must then be, as will be shown shortly, asymmetric and anholonomic. Or else, there would be no discernment of the ontological weight of some absolute presence-essence (not in the way suggested by mere “essentialism”, where even in the case of arbitrary entification, essence must always precede existence), and there could be no logic whatsoever at subsequent levels of cognition, and isomorphism would be limited to the arbitrariness of inconsistent, self-flawed cognitive discrimination even on the phenomenological scale of things, which is not as trivial as the “arbitrariness of arbitrary things”.

This way, the Essence of Being is its own *Being-qua-Being*, which is identical, only in the “twice-qualified” sense, with the Being of Essence itself, i.e., “within-the-within” and “without-the-without”. Only in this ontological instance does eidetic asymmetry vanish.

It is not “logical”, and yet it is “not illogical” either — for the entirety of “logic”, “anti-logic”, and “non-logic” can only be traced (conceptualized) in its presence, with or without the necessity of accidental particularities. For instance, then, when we say “universe” without this qualification, we can still come up with the notion of “multiverse” while often still retaining space-time categories or attributes, or a plethora of schizophrenic universes “apart” from each other in one way

or another, and yet we cannot anyhow apply the same splitting and extensivity, or diffeomorphism, to Reality itself in order to make it appear as a co-dependent and co-differential among others outside its own necessity.

Reality, therefore, is not a set, not a category, not a functor (or functional), not of the likeness of both objective tangible matter (*materia*) and subjective abstract forms (*forma, qualia*). It is neither regular nor aberrant, as commonsense and traditional phenomenology would have “being” defined at best as “inconsistent multiplicity in and of itself”. It is not a representation of something that has to have a normative representation, be it abstract or concrete, conscious or unconscious. It simply *IS*, even when there is no language and count to express this, without the notion that consciousness is “always conscious of something” in association with the internal multiplicity of knowledge. However, the four-fold asymmetric universal logic to be sketched in the following section is Reality’s exception just as Reality is its exception: we can truly say a great deal of things by means of it, especially consciousness.

Know intuitively (at once, or never know at all) that if Reality weren’t Such, both Reality and Unreality would not only be unthinkable and imperceptible (however partial), they would not be, whether in existence or non-existence, in pre-eternity, at present, or in the here-after, in infinite contingency, finite extensivity, or universal emptiness, and there would be no universe whatsoever, finite or infinite, somewhere or nowhere, transcendent or immanent, — and none of these —, and no one would any likely embark upon writing this exposition at all!

Such is our blatant methodology by *Surjectivity* and eidetic redefinition, instead of both psychologism and the Husserlian phenomenological method of “bracketing”, which often amounts to either the “arbitrarily subjective over-determination” or the “arbitrarily objective suppression” of certain ontological constitutions already present among phenomenal categories.

4 Beyond Kant, phenomenology, and reflexivity: a four-fold, eidetically qualified universal logic with asymmetric, anholonomic categorical connection

“Now, I must tell you of something more tangible than all solid objects and more elusive than all traceless things in the heavens and on the Earth. Behold the highest branches of the tree of knowledge — untouched by reflection —, of which the night-in-itself is the garden.”

We are now in a position to outline the underlying features of our model of universal logic, which shall manifest the analytic epistemological sector of our present theory. In doing so, we will also make an immediate amiable comparison with the crux of Kantian epistemology, for the present case can be seen as a somewhat more universally deterministic generalization thereof.

As we have previously implied, it is important to distinguish between the phrase “four-fold” in our new framework and that found, e.g., in Buddhist empirical dialectics. In the latter, being of empirical-transformational character at most, there is no trace of essential relationship or logical enclosure with respect to the more contemporary Kantian and Fichtean categories pertaining to “das Ding an sich” (the thing-in-itself). Rather, in that ancient framework, given an object of contemplation *A* belonging to phenomena and subject to process — and ultimately embedded in a universe of infinite contingency regarding the past, present, and future —, the associated dialectical possibilities, of the utmost extent, are: “*A*”, “non-*A*”, “non-non-*A*”, and “none of these”, already (though not sufficiently, as we shall see) in contrast to the more usual forms of binary logic. A roughly tangible example would be the irreversible transformation of water (“*A*”) into milk (“non-*A*”), into vapor (“non-non-*A*”), and into curds (“none of these”), by the process of powdering, mixing, and heating however complete.

Though bearing superficial visceral resemblance with this in the use of the similarly expressed four identifiers, our logical strand is more of ontological “unbracketed” (i.e., non-Husserlian) dialectical nature, and not of mere process-based empiricism, existentialism, and phenomenology (i.e., non-Heideggerian). Rather, we subsume the entire phenomenal world of entification, process, and contingency already in the first and second categories (of “*A*” and “non-*A*”), as we shall see, thus leaving the two last categories as true ontological categories. We assume that the reader is quite familiar with essentially all kinds of dialectical preliminaries, so we shall proceed directly to the new elements of the four-fold analysis we wish to immediately convey here.

In accordance with the ontic-teleological unity given in the preceding section, we keep in mind four major constituents responsible for the presence of definite universal existence, hereafter denoted as the following “eidetic simplex”:

$$\{MO\} : \{S(\text{Suchness}), U(\text{Universe}), N(\text{Monad}), M(\text{Reality})\} + \{\text{phenomenal instances}, O(\text{phenomenal entirety})\},$$

where the first group belongs uniquely to Reality (*M*) and the second is due to empirical-dialectical process-based observation whose phenomenological entirety is denoted by *O*. This representation implies that the identification is made from *M* to *O*, i.e., from Reality to phenomena, yielding a true unitary ontic-teleological state for any given elements of *O*. The analytic union between *M* and *O*, in this case, is none other than the Universe, i.e., *U* as a function of its underlying noetic surjectivity (*g, dg*).

Now, just as *M* is singular and four-fold with respect to the above representation, so is *O*. Due to the union between *M* and *O*, there exist common elements between *M* and *O* possessing true ontological weight: the “within-the-within” element and the “without-the-without” element. In short,

given an arbitrary phenomenal instance A , we can write, according to the underlying representation

$$O = (\text{without, within, within-the-within,} \\ \text{without-the-without}),$$

the following representation:

$$O(A) = (A, \text{non-}A, \text{non-non-}A, \text{none of these}),$$

where we shall simply call the four ontological entries “categories” — for the sake of brevity.

Let us note the following important identifications for the associated elements: given A as an object, there is guaranteed, in the empirical necessity of phenomenological space-time, an entity other than A — in fact a whole range of limitless instances of otherness —, including that which is categorized by traditional Buddhist logic as either “non-non- A ” or “none of these”, especially in the residual sense of a given underlying process, as we have seen. But, in our approach, these two are not yet eidetically qualified and simply exist as part of the infinite contingency of phenomena — and so we can regard A already as both entity and process, without the need to make use of the earlier formalized aspects of Buddhist logical representation. As such, a phenomenal object A has no “inside” other than the entire phenomenal contingency in the form of immediate “otherness” (e.g., any “non- A ”): this, when applied to an arbitrary organic individual, without negating the existence of the extensive world, negates the presence of a non-composite “soul” once and for all (but not the “soul-in-itself” as an eidetically qualified microcosm), which remains true in our deeper context of representation.

Meanwhile, at this point, we shall call the traditionally undecided Kantian categories into existence instead, according to which “non-non- A ” (“without-the-without”) is the entire fluctuative phenomenological set O , which is devoid of absolute individual entification, simply due to the fact that Kantianism is undecided about A -in-itself, yet leaving it there, as it is, in existence. This arises in turn simply because of the inherent Kantian empirical undecidability between pure subjectivity (“spiritism” and “relativism”) and pure objectivity (“material dogmatism”) — alluded to elsewhere in a preceding section.

However, given our ontic-teleological equation, the present theory overcomes such undecidability on the epistemological level of things, including the phenomenological problem of the inconsistency of a singular entity (such as the phenomenal mind and its knowledge and abilities): singular yet still constituted by its inevitable inner multiplicity of reflective objects. It is as follows.

Given, for instance, the classic example of “a leaf falling off a tree in a forest”: does it fall, after all, when there is no one observing it? Our response to this, accordingly, is that it truly depends on what kind of observer is present, i.e., how he is categorically qualified in Reality. Thus, an

arbitrary observer will not qualify as a decisive representation: in that case, the leaf still falls due to, e.g., the law of gravity, for the macroscopic laws of physics are “arbitrarily objective-compulsive” in relation to the arbitrary observer. In other words, such a subjective observer is always objectified (or “subjectified away”) by that which is other than himself, which in this case is the totality of the manifest laws of Nature. Hence, his subjective self is bounded by a kind of temporal self-determined objective dogmatism as well, and if he attempts to be objective, he is soon limited to being subjective enough. In all this, he is composed of fundamental indeterminacy not intrinsically belonging to himself — as approached from the “below limit” —, but which is a surjective determination from the “above limit”, i.e., from the Universe itself.

Rather strikingly, the situation is fundamentally different if the observer is the Universe itself: whether or not the leaf falls, it depends on Noesis, according to the representative constitution of the Universe in our “Reality equation” above. In other words, there exists a so-called “Ultimate Observer” as a “surjective instanton” with respect to the entire Mirror-Universe of reflexivity. Since this observer exists at the self-similar singular ontological level of Suchness, it is again self-singular without parallel and indeed without any logical extraneous qualifier (and quantifier), thereby encompassing the Real, the Mirror, the Image, and the Shadow, in the manner of Reality. In other words, such an observer is none other than Reality, in relation to the Universe. Needless to say, that need not be “Reality-in-itself” in the rough sense of the phrase, despite existing also at the primary ontological level and in limitless eidetic oneness with Reality. Rather, it is most uniquely none other than it — and nothing else is directly (presentially) like such “Non-Otherness” with respect to Reality itself. Respectively, such an observer is noetic, i.e., the essence is of the level of the Surjective Monad, and such identification is already beyond all practical phenomenology even in its extended descriptive form.

Hence, up to the most lucid isomorphism, the “within-the-within/non-non- A ” element of an eidetically qualified entity $\{A\}$ (which, unlike an ordinary entity subject to Buddhist and Kantian dialectics, definitely possesses genuine, empathic inwardness and outwardness) can be identified as none other than the Universe, which in turn is the noumenal A itself, while the corresponding “without-the-without/none-of-these” element as Reality itself, whereas the conventional modes of “within” (A_2) and “without” (A_1) are, respectively, the abstract phenomenological A and the concrete (or material) phenomenological A . Hence the following representation:

$$\{A\} = \{A_1, A_2, U, M\}.$$

A straightforward example of $\{A\}$ is the Universe itself, i.e.,

$$\{\text{Universum}\} = \{\text{the Material Universe, the Abstract Universe, the Universe-in-Itself, Reality}\}.$$

Or, in subtle correspondence with that, we may think of the categorical representation of thought itself, which has no equal parallel among arbitrary phenomena other than what is similar yet other than it (i.e., its possible anti-pod):

$$\{\text{Thought}\} = \{\text{Thought, Anti-Thought, Unthought, Reality}\}.$$

Thus, phenomenally, thought always entails anti-thought: both are two intelligible sides of the same coin on the phenomenological horizon. However, note that such anti-thought is not equivalent to the further eidetically qualified Unthought. Simply speaking, this very Unthought somehow allows not the entirety of phenomena to perceive Reality as thinkable in the first place. In this light, the famous dictum by Descartes, “I think, therefore I am,” is indeed far from complete. The more complete phrasing would be something like: “I think, therefore I am, I am not, I am not-not, and none of these.” And this too, in the face of Reality, would still depend on the eidetic qualification of the one expressing it.

“Away” from all matter and abstract dynamical physical laws, the Universe can thus be identified as a singular surjective-reflexive mirror of “superluminosity” upon which Reality “acts” trans-reflectively through *Noesis* and *Differentia* (especially the qualified infinitesimals), hence the sobriquet “Mirror-Universe” (which is particularly meaningful here, and may or may not be related to the use of the phrase in the description of an exciting geometric structure of the physical Universe as revealed in [8] and based on a chronometrically invariant monad formalism of General Relativity as outlined in [4, 9, 11]). It is said to be “superluminal” in reference to the state of “universal unrest” as measured against all the rest of individual phenomena in the cosmos, somewhat in association with the ever-moving, massless photon as compared to the rest of physical entities (but this is only a gross, fairly illegitimate comparison, as we do not aim at sense-reduction at all).

Other examples include fundamental categories such as space-time, energy, matter, consciousness, etc.

Note that, generally speaking, the abstract phenomenological category (e.g., the concept, instead of the actual stuff, of a tree) is not the same for any entity as the noumenal category. Further, whenever an arbitrary, fluctuative entity $\langle A \rangle$ (without eidetic qualification) is represented according to the above scheme, we should have instead

$$\langle A \rangle = \langle A_1, A_2, \{U\}, \{M\} \rangle,$$

i.e., although $\{U\}$ and $\{M\}$ are present in the above representation, as if being $\langle A \rangle$'s linearly valid components in their respective contingency, $\langle A \rangle$ possesses no universal similarity with $\{U\}$ and $\{M\}$, let alone with just Reality, but only with A_1 and A_2 (subject to phenomenological mapping or transformation) — which is why U and M appear “bracketed away” therein, for otherwise they would best be written as “null

components” (but which in turn would carry us away from its deeper ontological representation).

Finally, as we have seen, our all-comprehensive “Reality equation” (i.e., all the above in a word) is

$$M : N(U(g, dg)) \sim S.$$

And we can say something fundamental about the state of Reality and the Universe as follows:

$$\{MO\} = \text{All-Real (} M \text{ and } O \text{ are Real and Self-Evident),}$$

$$\{OM\} = \text{Ultimately Unreal (leaving Real only } M\text{),}$$

$$\{MO\} \neq \{OM\} \text{ (the Reality-condition of asymmetry and anholonomicity),}$$

i.e., the eidetic “distance” (connective foliage) between Reality (M) and Otherness/Phenomena (O) is not the same as that between Otherness/Phenomena (O) and Reality (M) — in part owing to the non-reality of arbitrary phenomena with respect to Reality —, which is why Reality is said to “contain all things, and yet these contain it not”, so long as arbitrariness is the case. In this instance, we may effortlessly witness the generally eidetic, anholonomic, asymmetric connection between categories in the Universe, with respect to Reality. (These categories, in the main, being ontology, epistemology, axiology, and phenomenology.) The word “anholonomic” clearly points to the path-dependence, or more precisely the direction-dependence, of our epistemological consideration: *eidetically, surjectively approaching things from the non-dual ontic-teleological Reality will be substantially different from arbitrarily, phenomenologically approaching Reality from (the transitive state of) things.*

Eidetic symmetry, thus, only holds in an “exotic case” possessed of Qualon, whereby an entity is eidetically qualified, so that it truly bears “resemblance” in “substance” with the Universe and Reality. Ordinary phenomenal symmetry holds in commonsense cases of isomorphism between things in the same category or in extensively parallel categories across boundaries, e.g., between one particle and another in collision, between an actual ball and a geometric sphere, between physics and mathematics, or between language and the world. In this respect, traditional philosophy (as represented chiefly by ontology and epistemology) qualifies itself above such phenomenological parallelism, especially with the very existence of the epistemology of aesthetics, but anyhow remains “infinitely a level lower” than Reality. (Such is in contrast to a famous, epistemologically trivial statement by Stephen Hawking, somewhat in the same line of thinking as some of those working in the area of Artificial Intelligence (AI) or certain self-claimed philosophers who enjoy meddling with “scientists” and “technologists” regarding the current state of science and the eventual fate of humanity, which can

be roughly paraphrased as: “The only problem left in philosophy is the analysis of language,” where the one saying this “intuitively” mistakes post-modernism for the entirety of philosophy. One, then, might be curious as to what he has in store to say about art in general, let alone Being!

It is important to state at this point that the kind of consciousness possessing eidetic-noetic symmetry (with respect to the Universe and Reality) is none other than Genius, or Noesis itself, whose nature we shall exclusively elaborate upon in the last section.

5 The Ultimate Observer in brief

“Who is looking at who? How far away is the Real from the reflection?”

We can very empathically say that the Ultimate Observer is such that if that One stopped observing the Universe by way of Surjection (Surjectivity, *Noesis*), and not only in terms of phenomenological abstract laws and concrete entities, it would all cease to exist at once — at one Now — “before before” and “after after”, noumenally and phenomenally. This, again, is beyond the level of omnijjective reality (omnijjectivity) or conscious surrealism (of “altered consciousness states”) and mere inter-subjectivity, for it is an eidetically qualified noetic determination without parallel and residue.

The respective observer, then, is called a “noetic observer”: he eyes the Universe even before the Universe is “conscious enough to eye him”, with all its noumenal and phenomenal instances, and the Universe takes on *essentia (forma)* only through him. The level of imagination of such an observer, which is equivalent to the very form and interior of the entire Universe, is not as naive thinkers would potentially suggest (with express slogans like “anybody can dream anything into life” and “anything is possible for anyone”): first of all, he is eidetically qualified by Reality as regards his very presence and his observing the Universe. Thus, it cannot be just an arbitrary observer, let alone “consciousness”, in phenomena, and so both typical superficial “science-fiction” and “spiritual pseudo-science” (i.e., “scientific pseudo-spirituality”) ultimately fail at this point, leaving only indeterminate non-universal surrealism.

What has been said of Reality thus far, in the foregoing twice-qualified ontological fashion, has been said enough clearly, exhaustively, and exceptionally. Still, let’s continue to throw some endless surjective light at any of the better-known sciences (such as physics and cosmology) and at the so far little-understood (or completely misunderstood) philosophy of universal aesthetics (i.e., the nature of Genius).

6 On a model of quantum gravity and quantum cosmology: the all-epistemological connection

“Of geometry and motion, however, I must speak, no matter how faint.”

We now wish to briefly review certain aspects of a model of quantum gravity as outlined in [3]. This consideration may be skipped by those interested only in the supra-philosophical aspects of the present exposition. But, as we shall see, there is an intimately profound universal similarity between a primary underlying wave equation there and our “Reality equation” as presented here, elsewhere.

In the truly epistemological dimension of this theory, gravity and electromagnetism are unified by means of constructing a space-time meta-continuum from “scratch”, which allows for the spin of its individual points to arise from first geometric construction and principles, without superficially embedding a variational Lagrangian density in a curved background as well as without first assuming either discreteness or continuity. As a result, we obtain a four-dimensional asymmetric, anholonomic curved space-time geometry possessing curvature, torsion, and asymmetric metricity (generally speaking, the distance between two points *A* and *B*, on the fundamentally asymmetric, “multi-planar” manifold, is not the same as that between *B* and *A*). The symmetric part of the metric uniquely corresponds to gravity while the anti-symmetric part thereof to electromagnetism (which is a generalized symplectic (pure spin) structure), resulting altogether in a unique, scale-independent spin-curvature sub-structure.

A five-dimensional phase space then exists only in purely geometric fluctuation with respect to the four-dimensional physical manifold, in contrast to regular Kaluza-Klein and string theory approaches. Thus, we do not even assume “quantization”, along with continuity, discreteness, and embeddability.

An important result is that both the gravitational and electromagnetic sectors of the theory are “self-wavy”, and the entire space-time curvature can be uniquely given by the wave function of the Universe for all cosmological scales, serving as a fundamental fluctuative radius for both the monopolar meta-particle and the Universe. Needless to say, here the Universe and such a meta-particle (monopole) are roughly one and the same. Also crucial is the fact that outside matter and electromagnetic sources (as both are uniquely geometrized by the dynamics of torsion in our theory, while in turn the torsion is composed of the dynamics of the anti-symmetric part of the metric responsible for individual spin “kinematicity”), gravity uniquely emerges in an electromagnetic field. Another instance is that both gravity and matter appear therein as “emergent” with respect to the entire geometric quantum fluctuation whose primary nature is electromagnetic.

To cut the story short, our quantum gravitational wave equation is as follows:

$$(DD - R) U(g, dg) = 0,$$

where *DD* is the generalized (anholonomic) wave-operator — constructed by means of the generalized covariant derivative *D_i* —, *R* is the spin-curvature scalar, *U* is the wave function of the Universe, *g* is the asymmetric metric, and *dg* is the

asymmetric metrical variation. In contrast to the “spinless description” of the Klein-Gordon equation of special relativistic quantum mechanics and the originally non-geometric Dirac equation, our wave function U is an intrinsic spin-curvature hypersurface “multivariant” (i.e., the hypersurface characteristic equation) and, upon the emergence of a specific toroidal quantum gravitational geometry, becomes none other than the generator of the most general kind of spherical symmetry (especially useful in the description of particle modes).

A complementary wave equation is also given there in the form of a completely geometric eikonal equation:

$$g^{(ik)}(D_i U)(D_k U) = -RU^2 \longrightarrow 1,$$

which goes over to unity in the case of massive particles (otherwise yielding a null electromagnetic geometry in the case of massless photons), for which

$$R = R(g, dg) \longrightarrow -\frac{1}{U^2}.$$

Among others, such fundamental equations of ours result along with the following comprehensive tensorial expressions:

$$R_{ik} = W^2(U) g_{(ik)} \text{ (for gravity and matter),}$$

$$F_{ik} = 2W(U) g_{[ik]} \text{ (for electromagnetism),}$$

where the operations “()” and “[]” on tensorial indices denote symmetrization and antisymmetrization, respectively, and summation is applied to repeated tensorial indices over all space-time values. Note that the above second-rank spin-curvature tensor, represented by the matrix R_{ik} , consists further of two distinct parts built of a symmetric, holonomic gravitational connection (the usual symmetric connection of General Relativity) and a torsional, anholonomic material connection (a dynamical material spin connection constituting the completely geometrized matter tensor).

The strong epistemological reason why this theory, among our other parallel attempts (see, e.g., the work on the geometrization of Mach’s principle by the introduction of a furthest completely geometrized, chronometric (co-moving) physical cosmic monad as outlined in [10] — and the list of some of the Author’s other works therein), qualifies as a genuine unified field theory and a theory of quantum gravity is that, among others, its equation of motion (namely, the geometric Lorentz equation for the electron moving in a gravitational field) arises naturally from a forceless geodesic motion, that the theory gives a completely geometric energy-momentum tensor of the gravo-electromagnetic field — plus room for the natural emergence of the cosmological term as well as the complete geometrization of the magnetic monopole — and that the theory, without all the previously mentioned ad hoc assumptions (such as the use of arbitrary embedding procedures and the often “elegant” concoction of epistemologically unqualified Lagrangian densities, with non-gravitational field and source terms), naturally yields the

eikonal wave equation of geometric optics, therefore completely encompassing the wave-particle duality: therein a particle is a localized wave of pure spin-curvature geometry. Or to be more explicit: elementary particles, including light itself, propagate with certain chirality (helicity) arising purely geometrically due to individual-point spin and manifold torsion, in two geometric transverse and longitudinal modes (hence the existence of two such completely light-like surface vectors in the case of photons, whereby a photon can be regarded as a null surface of propagation with transverse and longitudinal null normal vectors emanating from it, which is the ground-state of all elementary particles).

In short, the theory yields a completely geometric description of physical fields and fundamental motion for all scales, especially as regards the question: “why is there motion in the Universe, rather than phenomenal stillness?” — which is quite comparable to the generically winding epistemic query: “why is there existence, rather than absolute non-existence?”.

The full extent of this physical theory is not quite an appropriate subject to discuss here, but we will simply leave it to the interested reader for the immediate comparison of our following two equations:

$$(DD - R)U(g, dg) = 0 \text{ (for the phenomenal Universe),}$$

$$M : N(U(g, dg)) \sim S \text{ (for the noumenal Universe),}$$

with respect to the manifest epistemological connection between the noumenal and phenomenal Universes.

Additionally, our model of quantum gravity also reveals why the physical Universe is manifestly four-dimensional, in terms of the above-said generalized symplectic metrical structure, and whether or not the cosmos originates in time (for instance, due to a “big bang” ensuing from the standard classical, homogeneous, non-quantum gravitational model of cosmology) — to which the definite answer now is: it does not, but it can be said to be “emergent” as it is entirely qualified (necessitated), in the ontic-teleological sense, by that which is other than space-time categories, and in this sense the Universe is both preceded and surpassed by Reality and yet, due to Noesis, is never apart from it. As there remain categories of infinities, certain physical-mathematical singularities may locally exist in the fabric of the cosmos rendering the space-time manifold “non-simply connected”, but across such local boundaries the cosmic origin itself cannot truly be said to be (traceable) in time, for the Universe-in-itself is Reality’s “Now-Here”, infinitely prior to, and beyond, the evolutionary and yet also encompassing it.

7 Genius: a conversation with noumena — closure

“That leaf, which silently yellows and falls, is — more than all smothering possibilities — a happening unto itself. If only it were to happen up above instead of down here, among us, the celestial domains would all be terrifyingly cleansed at once.”

We are now at a psychological and intensely personal stage where we can truly speak of the nature of Genius in the solitude of certain unsheltered sentiments and unearthed fissures belonging to the individual who sees the longest evening all alone, to which he lends all of his insight. That, he verily sees not outside the window, but entirely in himself. The only helplessly beautiful solace he has, then, arises simply from his soul seeing things this way. By “soul”, we mean that which moves from the pre-reflexive Subject to the reflexive realms as none other than the microcosm, such that others can hardly notice that he is happening to the Universe as much as the Universe is happening to him.

Weren't Genius synonymous with Infinity — while in the synoptic world of countless impalpable beings, like a contrasting taciturn ghost, he is often an infinitely stray, perpetually long personification (acute inwardness) of the noumenal world along outwardly paradoxical, tragic banishing slopes —, Kierkegaard would not have swiftly declared,

“The case with most men is that they go out into life with one or another accidental characteristic of personality of which they say, ‘Well, this is the way I am. I cannot do otherwise.’ Then the world gets to work on them and thus the majority of men are ground into conformity. In each generation a small part cling to their ‘I cannot do otherwise’ and lose their minds. Finally there are a very few in each generation who in spite of all life’s terrors cling with more and more inwardness to this ‘I cannot do otherwise’. They are the Geniuses. Their ‘I cannot do otherwise’ is an infinite thought, for if one were to cling firmly to a finite thought, he would lose his mind.”

Similarly, Weininger is known to have exclaimed,

“The age does not create the Genius it requires. The Genius is not the product of his age, is not to be explained by it, and we do him no honor if we attempt to account for him by it. . . . And as the causes of its appearance do not lie in any one age, so also the consequences are not limited by time. The achievements of Genius live forever, and time cannot change them. By his works a man of Genius is granted immortality on the Earth, and thus in a three-fold manner he has transcended time. His universal comprehension and memory forbid the annihilation of his experiences with the passing of the moment in which each occurred; his birth is independent of his age, and his work never dies.”

(For more such non-dissipating, spectacular universal overtures, see [6].)

Peculiar to Genius is, among other solitary things, an infinite capability for intricate pain (inward ailment), for perpetual angst, which people often misrepresent as arising from mere anti-social loneliness or lack of amusement. But this aspect of Genius cannot be partitioned arbitrarily from the

soaring spontaneity of his infinite ecstasy. Rather, Genius is simply beyond ecstasy and despondence, as well as beyond pride and self-deprecation, the way people are used to these terms. In any case, it is a state of universal sensitivity, inspiration, solitude, and creativity, which is the Eye of Creation, whereby Reality is comprehensively “likened” to a form ensuing from Noesis.

This way, most people are mistaken in their belief that Genius and talent are equivalent, for Genius is, indeed, “separated from all else by an entire world, that of noumena”, and not situated “within the spectrum of all linearly predictable expectations and contingencies”, as Goethe, Schopenhauer, Wilde, Emerson, Weininger, and Wittgenstein would have agreed. Mere belief, assumption, or syllogism is effortlessly devoid of authentic realization, let alone Reality: it is not even worthy of the simplest meta-logical refutation.

Indeed, Genius is in no way the superlative of talent. Talent is, at most, phenomenal-reflective, while Genius is noumenal-surjective and noumenal-reflective. It has been said that Genius does not act as a role model for talent at all: with respect to the latter, the former may appear inane, murky and most wasted, simply because the latter lacks that which is infinitely other than the entire contingency of multiple reflections and projections.

The world of Genius is Moment, Universality, and Creation, where the entirety of noumena is revealed to the persona without residue, which is the greatest, most absolute kudos in existence, be it in the presence or absence of an audience. The world of talent is ordinary — no matter how augmented — time, space, and imitation, i.e., the relative integral power of the inter-subjective contingency and tautology of phenomenal recognition and security.

The ocean of Genius is the heaviest self-necessity of greatly spontaneous assaults and pervasions on any shore without sparing both any large accidental object and a single grain of sand: it evokes creation and destruction entirely in its own being in this world. The pond of talent, amidst dregs, is the relative confidence of “sedimental measurement and experimentation”, albeit still related to intensity.

The intentionality of Genius is a self-reserved “Parsifal” of Universality, while that of talent is always other than the thing-in-itself (and so, for instance, a talent associated with science tends not to embrace the essence of science itself, which is one with the essence of creative art and epistemic philosophy, but only something of populistic, tautological “scientism”).

The essence of Genius is Reality, not just situational “truth” — not the normative, often progressive, collective truths of talent and society.

The way of Genius in the world is traceless originality and thus defies all sense of imitation and expectation. Who shall discover the traces of fish in water and those of birds in the sky? And yet, this matter of Genius is more than that: he is different from all similarities and differences, absolutely

independent of representation. Hence it is said of men of Genius — for instance by Weininger — that “their parents, siblings, and cousins cannot tell you anything about them, for they simply have no mediational peers, no genial otherness”. By contrast, talent is still psychogenetically and methodologically inheritable.

The life of Genius is that of utter sensitivity, and not just volitional silence and loudness. It is one of transcendental consciousness and intensity, and not constituted of mere choice and chance.

As the hallmark of the Genius is authenticity and creativity, which is not situated within the rhyme and rhythm of a mere choice of life-styles, he can do no other than this, and no one needs to tell or teach him anything.

Individuals of Genius exist as universal gradations of the pure eidetic plenum, and not as part of the mere ascending levels of talent. Thus, the particularity of Genius is always simultaneously universal: it is both twice-qualified “*Atom*” and “*Platon*”, Instanton and Soliton. He possesses the entirety of Object, Subject, Dimension, and Surject to unbelievable lengths.

Indeed, as has been generically said: “science becomes pure imagination, art pure life, and philosophy pure creation”, there in the vicinity of Genius.

Genius is Michelangelo, not Rafaelo. Genius is Leonardo, not rhetoric. Genius is Mozart, not the Royal Court. Genius is Beethoven, not the audience and merely connected hearing. Genius is Zola, not psychotherapy. Genius is Kafka, not stability. Genius is Rembrandt, not feminism. Genius is Tolstoy, not chastisement. Genius is Johann Sebastian, not the Bach family. Genius is Klimt, not neurasthenics and Venus. Genius is van Gogh, not art exhibitionism. Genius is Glinka and Gould, not musical recording. Genius is Abel and Galois, not the Parisian Academy. Genius is Kierkegaard, not Hegelianism. Genius is Weininger, not Aryanism. Genius is Wittgenstein, not philology. Genius is Kant, Einstein, and Zelmanov, not the herd of “scientism”. Genius is Goethe, not Prussia. Genius is Cezanne, not Europe. Genius is Emerson, not America. Genius is Neruda, not Chile. Genius is Tagore, not India.

Genius is the Renaissance in motion before everyone else is capable of naming it, not its “timely and subsequent crumbs”. Genius is Dream, not sleep. Genius is Insight, not the day. Genius is Vision, not a report or a documentary. Genius is the austere summit, not the floating clouds. Genius is the ocean, not a river. Genius is gold, not the muddy colliery, not the mining. Genius is youth, not childhood, not adolescence, not adulthood, and absolutely not old age. Genius is all-life, not imitation. Genius is all-death, not barren constancy and consistency. Genius is acutely conscious suicide, not helplessness — but definitely not all suicides are Genius. Genius is love, not crude relationship. Genius is music, not licensed instrumentation. Genius is Self, not super-tautological composition. Genius is sheer nostalgia, not learning. Genius

is Creation, not school, not training.

Genius is the cold North Atlantic, not the luxurious Titanic. Genius is the Siberian currents, not the avoidance of winter for more festive humidity. Genius is the entire Sonora, not urban life of chance-fragments. Genius is character, not yielding sexuality. Genius is Moment, not societal time. Genius is Mystery, not public space. Genius is Memory, not standard coordination. Genius is Nature, not information — and so not recognition. Genius is the full eclipse as it is, not prediction. Genius is the entire night, not a system.

Genius is Motion-in-itself, not a planned sequence. Genius is real individuality in the Universe, not composite institutional, societal, cultural pride. Genius is the singular conquest, not an artificial war. Genius is the universal meteor, not a celebratory fire-cracker. Genius is the rareness of a tsunami, a volcano, or an earthquake, not reported abrupt casualties. Genius is solitude, not sold and given democracy, and not a republic. Genius is the abyss and the sudden voice and force arising from it, not typical antiquity, Victorianism, and post-modernism.

Genius is the Universe, not a specific age of trends, not a destined place of people.

Genius is Reality, not a situation, not an option, not a collection of societal facts.

Genius is Genius, not talent.

Genius is a word not yet spoken (enough) by other sentient beings. And, respectively, a drop not yet consumed, a meaning not yet sighed, a clarity not yet impregnated. A birth not yet celebrated, a sudden electricity not yet channeled, a humanity not yet recognized.

Often, in relation to tragedy, Genius emerges as a funeral song, preceding all births and surpassing all deaths, which people find hard to canonize. Amidst their superficial merriment, a man of Genius is like the night that falls on their eyes and sinks in their souls — to be forgotten at their selfish ease. He is the loneliness of the day on a deep cogitator’s pane, one with the blue nacre of things.

Why then would Genius be most exclusively, among others, associated with tragedy? It is because most people would not mind partaking of “joy as it is”, with or without anticipation and as much and gauche as possible, yet they are ever impotent and apprehensive when it comes to facing “the other thing as it is”, i.e., tragedy. As Genius is the only spontaneous genera capable of infinitely imbibing the noumenal “thing-in-itself”, in universality and in particularity, in representation and in person, a man of Genius would principally never shun tragedy. His objective is inevitably the surjective pure intimation of it.

Thus, tragedy has sought the Genius even from before the dawning of the world. Indeed, he would even volunteer for it. And the entire Universe volunteers for it too, in and through his very individuality. This is why, the theme of tragedy (or death) is rather universal: it is consciously frequented only by very few men and yet by the entire Universe

itself. These men, without losing their Self, which is Reality and the Universe — unlike the way most people understand it —, embrace phenomenal selflessness and defenselessness with full noumenal understanding and bursting innocence: they are “too close” to the torrents of the most unlikely visitation of kisses, “too close” to thunder in the heavy rain, “too close” to the Sun in elevation and peaking radiation, “too close” to the soil and dust in every heavenly intimation, “too close” to the nakedness of Nature in everything raw and full, “too close” to the chiseled understanding of certain winter-banished seeds and underground grains, “too close” to the Cornelian female breast of surreptitiously migrating strengths and silences. They are “too close” to their own prodigious male latitude, in their expensive self-immolating Siriusian nuclear moods, eventually being poured out of life onto the canvas of death as the most splendid of selfless, will-less, unadulterated presence of colors and paintings, while thus rendering themselves too far from incidental admirers other than Reality itself. Such is glory: only due to that does deeply crimson compassion whiten in this world for a few sensitive others to see.

Though this world may see naught but sad wrinkles, the love of Genius is strong in its own unseen furrows, at the core of stars, in the fire of molten things. Genius is strong though weak and peevish in appearance: it is exalted in everything that takes roots and bears its own growth, in everything universal Reality wishes to see for itself. The Crucified is such a rare taste in people’s veins to devour. So either they unveil their own souls in the tragedy of Genius and then die to live anew, or live the life of a heathen forever.

When will this world fall into indigenous silence, like Genius, but not in certain sleep? Where is the soft hand of a lovely, caring female weaver upon Genius’ crushed, blackening fingers emerging from the rugged Earth and its ravines? In an aspect that relates the solitude of Genius and the continuity of mankind, known and unknown Geniuses have been digging the Earth for eons, for this world’s most conscious dreams, so that humanity may gush out with Nature’s own blood of youth: such is done among tormenting rocks, yet in order to reach above the Sun — yes, with the entire humanity.

Who would glue his petty, cowardly self to the secret, yet infinitely open, wounds of Genius? Either humanity caresses Genius the way Genius would touch humanity, until nerves, whips, and scourges become impalpable in humanity’s constitution of clay and fire, and of some might of the Unknown, or it perishes altogether with self-sufficient Genius not repeating itself for its cause ever again.

And to humanity it will then be said, “Either gaze at the red branches in the park of lovers, where Genius lives and dies unnoticed, where life fills its own cup through entwined hearts, lips, and arms through the sacrificial life of Genius at unseen roots, or, perchance, seek another countenance, another reality altogether and die without Reality ever sketching you in its own bosom.”

In this savage world of heavily fabricated walls, who then would want to taste a most tender, fateful wet drop of dew and honey oozing from the pristine skin of Genius, in the rain of tragedy and in the weft of huge solitude, which might just taste like the Universe — all of the Universe?

Who, then, would be able to recapture the moments of Genius, once they pass for good? Would they ever be able to simply rediscover the soul of Genius among many roots, thorns, and tremors and still multiply the silent understanding of love and life that hides in a wide ocean that shall never want to depart from humanity?

Who, then, would abandon the ever-putrefying cowardice, soulless collectivism, and mere conformity with much of this unconscious world and sit with Genius just for one more night — where there shall be no more secrets in the darkness’ midst, other than shadowless man, without flight from destiny, naked, engraved, and unshaken on the scarlet horizon behind a thousand prison features? Who shall be loved and sought by freedom this way?

Genius is a most shunned resonance behind all languages: both “knowing” and “not knowing” recognize it not. Whereas people are sole humans, a man of Genius is, infinitely more acutely, the most solely human: he is the one who understands love and sacrifice the most, who breathes limitlessly upon the flanks of wild flowers and hidden rivulets, yet no one among sole humans dares to love him with enough vastness of space. Indeed, he is the drops and substances in the rain, all the non-existence in dust.

When an individual of Genius desires existence in this world, he comes yielding against everyone else’s direction, cutting the evening on its very edges, unfolding horizons — even if that means undoing fancy rainbows. And when he yearns for an ultimate self-exile, he rushes towards death unconditionally, just as he once arrived in this world not by slow walking, purblind wandering, and empty gazing, but by the crackling spontaneity that impulsively and immeasurably forms fateful symmetries through the soul’s pure motion.

The life of Genius leaves this world a silent place underground for the most solitary and distinguished of understanding, knowledge, tenderness, and pain. Only a few, therefore, know what a “most original Genius” truly means. If only people knew the universal responsibility set upon the shoulders of Genius, and not just its apparent glories, very few of them would dare to aspire to the rank of Genius. Instead, they would be fairly content with talent alone. For, in relation to humanity as a “non-ideal savior”, Genius lives with such a palpitating, lonely chest and uplifting sensitivity in the narrowness of time’s remaining passage. (As Schopenhauer once declared, “*Great minds are related to the brief span of time during which they live as great buildings are to a little square in which they stand: you cannot see them in all their magnitude because you are standing too close to them.*”)

As regards the history of indifference and war that has befallen mankind, the heavens, some say, can’t be errant. But

what idea do they have of a man of Genius whose heart of immense autumns is like a shattered clock, which he hears ticking mercilessly every second until its near cease, even when its fire — of awakening blood — moves from his heart's solitude, to his soul's labyrinth, to his lips, to the desire to possess, to nearness, to excitement, to the redemption of humanity? When the only place he can carry humanity to — for the moments and lost wings to take, to hold, to secure — is his ship of winter, passing through wounding seas, violent winds, and threshing floors? When he himself is one of the branches of the long, solitary night — of azure fate — and hardly a resting place for another soul's existence?

A man of Genius loves humanity beyond its occasional self-pity and vain arrogance, without knowing how to carry the luster and growth of the garden of passion and intimacy elsewhere other than through the often awkward abruptness and intensity of each second. And so, wordlessly, certain hidden things are written in blood and yet shared in moisture, freely given and fully experienced — just as the cup, potion, and tavern are spun only at night — even while personal hope, let alone a future, ever shies away for himself, for soon enough nearly everyone's eyes are to shut at length in sleep, not knowing that Reality itself is present in the darkest ravine of their modulations.

Men of Genius do not cross poignant, dark reefs to merely taste the deeps of depravity for themselves, but to make contact with the entirety of humanity and to love the unconsciously tragic as it is. But, of conversing with the severity and weather of naked love in the most drenching downpour of sentiments, who shall readily repay these men by communing in their names, even without having seen them?

Who, then, can cover the perimeter of Genius like a pure ring? In the Genius, life passes in a single heartbeat, and he happens to the world like the grip of the strangest spontaneous intimacy upon the furthest comprehension of sincere lovers. The nakedness of Genius is just as day and night are inseparably present in the world, unveiling each other — and thus essentially beating in each other — more than just taking turns and partaking of chance.

Verily, before the whole world of people ever does it, Genius is the poetry that immediately captures the high flares of every joy and the disconcerting depths of every tragedy there has ever been and will ever be so long as humanity exists. By the very personification of Genius is the most distant fate of humanity drawn near and the nearest pitfalls thereof redeemed.

People do the Genius absolutely no honor by merely projecting phenomenal attributes and expectations — and by merely scholastically and naively reflecting — upon him. When, coincidentally, certain men of Genius happen to be situated in certain domains of the society (instead of living in relative obscurity and epistemic solitude), which is a very rare case, it is to be understood that a zoo that proudly keeps a lion or a falcon, has no way of knowing whether or not

it fully possesses it; and yet too often the zoo honors the beast and prides itself in the act only in order to praise itself. Genius exists independently of such a contingency and tautology. The entire gist of societal-phenomenal intentionality approaches not the abyss of the Genius, who, alone, is the monad, center, mind, and heart of the Universe. He is the entirely unabridged, naked pulse of Nature. It is the Genius who merely not “eyes the abyss” and “is conversant with it”, but who also exists there with absolute self-certainty, independently of all the objects outside the abyss (out there in the world), and independently of the entire abyss itself. He is not a mere philosopher of “mereology” either. He never has the need to question his own existence nor to “unveil himself”, whatsoever. He is not a mystic in this sense (and in that of Wittgenstein): it is not mysticism that is mystical, it is the way things already are in and of his nature; yet this he often projects onto people as “mysticism” in order to be “roughly understood”, i.e., when forced to speak to the world.

Indeed, Genius is more of the Universal Mind that establishes (and not just imparts to others) the “Suchness” of the Universe entirely through itself and moves things that way from the infinite past to the infinite future, through the infinite moment, instead of just a mere saint and mystic who has to find his way, by following the ways of other adepts, in much of the Unknown. It is the Pure Sword that still glitters and functions (i.e., moves) in the darkest stretch of space, with or without the presence of mirrors and lights. And it is not just a spark, nor a mere brilliance: Genius is the wholeness of unique illumination and pure presence.

The Universe of Genius individuality is four-fold, encompassing an infinite amount of noumenal uniqueness (not just “totality”) and a most extensive category of phenomenal modes of existence. Thus, again, it contains:

- Reality: *Eidos-Nous* — the Surjective Monad, Absolute Unique Singularity,
- The Mirror-Universe — the Reflective Whole, Singularity, Transcendence,
- The Imagery-World — the Projective Particularity, Multiplicity, Immanence,
- Unreality — the Absolute Darkness

i.e., its being-there, entirely in the greatest genus of individuation, is essentially without chance and residue.

The man of Genius, as such, needs no “belief” nor “hypothesis”, nor even any “transcendental method”, be it of religious, philosophical, or scientific dialectical nature, for he, the Eye-Content of Infinity and the Sign-Severity of Oneness, is he whose essence is All-in-All, the All-One, the Unique: “within”, “without”, “within-the-within”, and “without-the-without”. And this is more than just saying that his individual entification is the microcosm — and that he is a particularization of the Universe.

Unlike a mere saint who is the ultimate phenomenal (linear, diametrical) opposite of a mere criminal, a person of Ge-

nius possesses *Animus* (*Anima*, “animate animal”), with respect to the entire Imagery-World, and is therefore the most unpredictable, spontaneous, intense, and creative in his phenomenal actions, beyond the entirety of collective anthropomorphic morality, if not ethics. And, unlike a mere criminal who is the phenomenal opposite of a mere saint, Genius is fully, intrinsically possessed of Noesis. Thus, a single moment of Genius in the Universe enriches existences infinitely, whether the individual is “animal-like” (in terms of instinct, but not merely psycho-pathological: for instance, even when madness seems to have befallen a man of Genius — as Atlas is said to excessively bear the world on his shoulders, alone, more than any other —, it is so without the Genius losing his persona at all, for his essence is absolutely non-composite Individuality and Universality, inwardly and outwardly; madness is a mere “surrealism” the Genius deliberately embraces in order to relatively, specifically “seal” his suffering without ulterior motives other than “inward romanticizing” (for instance, Goethe and Kafka), and the same can be said about the case of a suicidal Genius) of tragedy-in-itself, or whether he is deliberately an entirely new humanity — and, again, not just a new species — beyond the external world’s understanding.

The Genius is he who knows the saint more than the saint knows himself, and he who knows the devil more than the devil knows himself: needless to say, he definitely knows Kant better than Kant knows himself (indeed, he who understands Kant, goes beyond him and thereby “bedevils” him, while most others are stuck, without soul, in mere scholastic documentaries on Kantianism). Whether or not he speaks of what people call “morality”, it is entirely up to him: in any case, he alone personifies Reality and gives its most elusive aspects to his subjects. Unlike the sadist, he suffers not from the outward surreal vacuum of space and, unlike the masochist, from the inward intimidation of time (again, see Weininger’s psychological essay on aspects of sadism and masochism in [6]). His deliberate transgression of established, normative mores is equally non-understandable by most sentient beings as his infinite capacity for tenderness and selflessness. In any of these acts, he truly owns his moments, either by throwing universal light into utter darkness or by annihilating even light in every phenomenal perception. In one respect, he is indeed ageless Momentum: he is child-like, though not exactly a child, and he is sage-like, though not exactly a sage.

As the Genius is he who phenomenally contains the most variegated manifold of attributes, names, and characters, he thus has to represent an entirely new genus of humanity, a whole new epoch in the evolution of the cosmos, beyond the level of acceptance of present humanity. He remains human, simultaneously aloft as the sky — proud as a mountain — and fragile as the sand of time — humbled as a valley — beyond mere acceptance and refusal, and even beyond contemplation. Just as the heavens send down the rain just as much as they reflect sunlight, and just as the great ocean gently inti-

mates sand-grains and yet annihilates shores and settlements, so is Genius the one most capable of sorrow and joy; rage and calmness; destruction and creation — of both infinitely romanticizing and molding the modes of existence.

Thus, while there can be countless linearly, smoothly predictable talented, institutionalized people in the world, “who are just happy and successful enough” without the tinctures of tragedy and without possessing the Surjective Monad of Genius, there is indeed no Genius without a trait of tragedy, for tragedy is the only melodrama in the Universe used as a language to convey and gather known and unknown multitudes: it is a forceful communication among breaths made possible in a largely superficial world and in a truly secluded corner of the Universe — however with the possibility of communication across it. Of this universal epistemic disposition, the Genius would rather embrace moments of melancholia and quiver like certain autumnal sitar-strings, than be merely happy. Again, while not being a merely fateful one, he never shuns tragedy: he voluntarily internalizes any tragedy (especially the tragedy of other men of Genius, whether known or unknown) and still gives it a breathing space and pulse in the Universe (and indeed binds it as a cosmic episode), when most people are wary of it. Nor does the Genius withhold conquest merely for the sake of mercy. He is the virtuoso, and not just the actor. He is also at once the script, the stage, the spectator, and the actor — the very life of the play. In the cosmic sense of the ultimate unification of observers and observables, he is self-observed, self-observing, self-existent.

As such, the following can be said about the dominion and nature of Genius, which belongs to no school and species at all. An individual of Genius is entirely his very own genus, more than a species, of Universality: without him, the Universe is not the Universe, and Reality would never “act upon itself” and “beget an archetype”. No one can teach Genius anything. No school, nor training, nor erudition can beget, let alone produce, the conscious existence of Genius. Its meta-human dominion is that of non-composite Self-Will animating the infinitesimals (i.e., meta-particulars) of the Universe. Its person is the one most capable of infinite self-differentiation (besides his intrinsic, immutable uniqueness), precisely because the Universe — the infinite Memory (Holography), Moment (Presence), and Mystery (Precedence) — is never exhausted when it comes differentiation, especially self-distinction.

Genius is the very vein and veil of Nature. Once people of discernment and reflection witness the Genius’ unfolding the heavens by climbing them up, at once they shall also witness that he has no ladder nor means, that he is the creator of even the Unknown and of perceptual noema. Or even if at first it appears to them that the Genius uses a ladder or means (such as any transcendental logical method of deduction or any style of art), it will entirely fall back upon themselves after being self-thrown, at them and away from him, by himself, and there is no fear in the Genius regarding this, for, again, he

is everywhere Reality's exception just as Reality is his exception. His sheer independence is the sine qua non of existence.

Thus, where are the kisses to leap towards the solitude of Genius, to consume it for last? Hidden in the pure seethe of an ocean's changeless soul, the love of Genius for the Real and the Human is hardly reachable. Even if Genius appears in the faintest human form, among other things in the perpetual sand of existence, people still find it unreasonable to intimate it. Instead, they readily besiege and confine its very incarnation into disappearance, ridicule by ridicule, betrayal by betrayal, kiss by kiss. But they can imprison not the most invisible, most infinitesimal — the most artful grain (meta-particle) in the Universe. Like unknown butterflies and fresh grapes, however short-lived, the Genius swiftly takes for farewell upon the eyelids of beauty, coming home not any later at the coronet noon of that which has communed with him in existence and appearance.

Only Genius knows Genius, and this is no sentimental exaggeration — whether the inter-subjective world of people (not the world-in-itself) is awake or asleep, it is bound to be troubled by the very person. Indeed, for most, “he draws near from farness, and he draws far from nearness”, with respect to perception and non-perception, by the very essence and form of Reality — and Unreality —, for the distance between Genius and people is not the same as that between people and Genius.

Footnote

Suggested parallel reading in philosophy, psychology, mathematics, and physics, especially for the sake of the reader's perspicacity of the present novel epistemological (meta-logical) work in simple comparison with other works dealing with theories of Reality and the Universe.

Submitted on February 29, 2012 / Accepted on March 03, 2012

References

1. Velmans M. Reflexive Monism. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2008, v. 15(2), 5–50.
2. Langan C. The Cognitive-Theoretic Model of the Universe: A New Kind of Reality Theory. <http://www.ctmu.net>
3. Suhendro I. Spin-Curvature and the Unification of Fields in a Twisted Space. Svenska fysikarkivet, Stockholm, 2008 (original doctorate thesis version, 2004).
4. Zelmanov A. L. Orthometric form of monad formalism and its relations to chronometric and kinematic invariants. *Doklady Acad. Nauk USSR*, 1976, v. 227(1), 78–81.
5. Wittgenstein L. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. (The original draft), 1918.
6. Weininger O. *Sex and Character (Geschlecht und Charakter)*. Wilhelm Braumüller, Leipzig and Vienna 1913 (modern online edition with interlinear translation by Robert Willis, 2004). See also Kevin Solway's splinter page: <http://www.theabsolute.net/minefield/genqtpg.html>
7. Mao L. F. Smarandache Multi-Space Theory. Post-doctoral research report, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, 2006.
8. Borissova L. and Rabounski D. Fields, Vacuum, and the Mirror Universe. Svenska fysikarkivet, Stockholm, 2009.
9. Zelmanov A. L. Chronometric invariants and comoving coordinates in the general relativity theory. *Doklady Acad. Nauk USSR*, 1956, v. 107(6), 815–818.
10. Suhendro I. A hydrodynamical geometrization of matter and chronometricity in General Relativity. *The Abraham Zelmanov Journal*, 2010, v. 3, 102–120.
11. Zelmanov A. L. Chronometric Invariants — On Deformations and the Curvature of Accompanying Space. Sternberg Astronomical Institute, Moscow, 1944 (published as Zelmanov A. L. Chronometric Invariants — On Deformations and the Curvature of Accompanying Space. American Research Press, 2006).
12. Shnoll S. E. *Cosmophysical Factors in Random Processes*. Svenska fysikarkivet, Stockholm, 2009.