

Claus Janew

Dynamic Existence

What is real?

I am an individual. Nothing and nobody else occupies my standpoint. Otherwise, he would be I.

Thus, all what I perceive is individual, perspective of an individual, part of me.

The computer screen should be a part of me? And when my daughter is sitting beside me: is it a part of her, then? And she herself would be a component of me?

Consequently, it must be so.

But why is the screen a part of her? Why are they both not just components of me? Why the detour over her?

One could renounce this detour. But this would not be consistent:

My daughter differs from the screen, and, nevertheless, I perceive both. That is there is mediation between both within my individuality. This mediation can consist first in my shifting attention from one to the other. While this, my individuality permanently changes a bit, because it is an *entirety* of its components.

Then I can sit down to the place of my daughter and experience another perspective and individuality thus again. Is this that to my daughter? No, of course it is only a geometrical point of view. However, again this point of view is mediated with my first one, while I *alternate* the views mentally or physically, more or less fast.

Now there speaks my daughter and means, the monitor display is poor in contrast from obliquely. This reminds me of my perception on her place, and I conclude from it, her statement must deal something with my perception there. And consequently (alternation!) also with my perception on the present place.

Because she has spoken, at other times, also of other things with me, I have understood her perception, her approach to life, already to a bigger extent and, therefore, subordinate to her an own individuality - with a screen as a component.

What has happened? I have permanently alternated positions (attention, viewpoint, approach to life), though always found me in just one. Does this work logically at all?

Apparently not. Since if I am not any more there, I am evidently here. Can I be, however, only here? Probably also not. Then I would know nothing from there, but only from here, my individual reality. Though this could be enough for me, actually, my individuality itself arises from such standpoint alternations.

This fact results from the uniqueness and entirety of the individual (in Latin „the indivisible“). Because it is not divisible *without changing the individual*, it differs from all others *in any regard*. Agreement at any place would presuppose the division of the individuals, namely in the not unique overlapping and the unique remainder. Instead of an overlapping, we would have thus an own individual.¹ Hence, a static individual could be not even *subdivided*, because everything we consider, for example, as a part (or component) of ourselves just thereby is an indivisible perception position: every organ, every cell, every particle, every wave, every thought. It *completely* differs from the entirety, because it can nowhere agree with the whole. Without *alternation* between the components, we could not become the individual that we regard as ourselves. We would be without structure, *nothing*.

Therefore, every individual exists only in the alternation of the individuality. There is no Here *or* There, but *only* the alternation between all, with a right now priority position. Thus, the standpoint is a phase of the *dynamic* individual. Everything that exists for the individual *exists dynamically*.²

Why then do we consider things seldom as so changing? We say they are *relatively* constant. Although we know that movement is at the heart of *everything*, that *every* individuality changes itself. Or we say, the movement is *relatively* continuous, so at every moment the whole is itself. At all, the whole is complete and the part is a part.

Everything properly. All these phenomena arise from the *structure* of the dynamic, of the alternation. Approximately closed successions of change generate relative constancy. Finely gradated change seems relatively continuous. And different extent of the alternations makes the difference between „part“ and whole.

Before we can explain this closer, we must accept logically that the dynamic existence reaches to the infinitely small. No entirety is elementary, because without structure it would be infinitesimal, *could not have an effect*, not even as a needle sting. After all, we measure everything by its effect. Even an energy quantum cannot shirk, because it has a certain „size“; and it can be only measured (perceived) when it reveals an effect structure, on an electron, for example. But a structure means alternation between individuals (see above). In the case of the energy quantum between the states of the electron, what the quantum *arises* from. To put the effect down to an elementary quantum, therefore, would not be logical.

¹ Only in infinitely small points, the individuals can meet. Since these are *nothing* without individual derivation.

² As well as the individual himself, because every standpoint also is a dynamic individual that „derives“ from the others etc.

Without structure no effect (and vice versa) whomever one *assigns* the effect to. Exactly this effect also expresses itself in the energy size of the quantum (and not vice versa).

Yet, in the end, we find *between* the varying individuals and *in the center* of every individual only an infinitesimal point. That is the alternation happens, actually, between single points. Though, of course these are defined by alternation only, so that alternation turns out again as the basic structure. Because this basic structure extends to the infinitesimal, I call it *infinitesimality structure*.

The form of the alternation, therefore, is the form of the infinitesimality structure. If an individual never returned, „exist“ only one infinitesimal moment, nobody could grasp it. If it returned *precisely*, nobody could perceive its change. Hence, there should be - aside from the change from A to B and B to A' - also a change from A' to B' as well as from B' to A'' etc.³, so that an *approximate* unity of A and B is weaved.

In the middle (unity!) between A and B, a *quasi-static approximate object* of the alternation thereby comes out. Not the previously mentioned tissue, but rather a symbolic form circumscribed by it. This already resembles that what we usually call a thing.⁴ If the unity predominates, the object is denser, like the tissue. If the difference predominates, it is thinner, sometimes hardly discernibly, because it is due to a more peripheral fabric.

The approximation - whether dense or thin - is also individual of course, with an infinitesimal center of identity, so that an alternation takes place between identity and difference of A and B, between oneness and multitude. In the last consequence between the central point and periphery, and again the center inbetween and its periphery etc. In the course of this, also spiral tissue and approximations are produced between all centers and peripheries: there originates an entire, more or less uniform thing.⁵

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

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

³ Moreover, also between A' and A, A'' and A' etc.

⁴ To be precise: For the individual A who becomes aware of its phase B the approximation between them is a *potential* to the existence of B. If it becomes aware of the alternation between two *other* phases of itself, the approximation seems concrete.

⁵ Because the approximation is basically a potential to the reproduction of the in each case other side, she can be *no additional* individual, but was present from the beginning of the alternation - as an *original* change partner who went over to an other one and is now the center.

If I extend the dynamic of my standpoint to the situation as such, now I alternate between relatively independent „parts“ (screen, daughter, I), while I put myself into the position of my daughter, realize a solid monitor etc. I perceive from the respective position an individual totality; and over and over again also from the center of the „whole“ situation, which I arrange individually as well.

Does this mean a universal definition of existence on the base of individuality alternations? Yes, because another existence than an individual one is not consistently generalizable.

The alternation does not happen necessarily physically (whatever is meant by „physically“). It depends only on the position of perception. The need of the infinitesimality structure to grasp this dynamic shows that we can speak as well of consciousness or consciousness foci. Since nothing is solid, everything are back-coupling alternation structures of alternations.

These also must not be space-temporal. This is only our habitual perception. Alternation can and will take place in every state space formed by quite different coordinates. How these alternations are *arranged* by perception, is open, too. Dreams and associations are an example of this.

Nevertheless, the logical consequences are bigger: If everything exists only in the alternation of the individuality, this alternation must enclose the whole universe! No alternation can be separated from the others completely, run possibly in parallel, because this would mean an absolute division of the universe. That is we speak of one *single* alternation.

If the universe is unlimited - and for a final limit there is *in no direction* a reason - then the position change must occur at infinite speed. („Speed“ as its space-temporal interpretation.) This is the basic speed from which every relatively limited consciousness is filtered out by the *form* of the alternation. Such filtering forms are narrow back couplings, which reduce the *superficial* frequency of the change, slow down movement *apparently*, so that the quicker frequencies work only in the little conscious background. Just as well as if I concentrate upon the screen and „forget“ my daughter besides, while I am still aware of her and a lot of farther. Even the macrocosm has not disappeared completely. Only the details are not resolved any more.⁶

⁶ From this the reality funnel originates, as it is described in my e-book „How Consciousness Creates Reality“ (in the chapter of the same name). This is the very abridged version of my German book „Die Erschaffung der Realität“ (The Creation of Reality). They are both available from www.free-will.de.

If the form shows a finely gradated structure, it seems solid. If it proves in addition a drift, we have a continuous movement. If it is closely tied and variously intertwined, it will not dissolve fast. If it more allows spontaneous change, it will develop new, but related structures.

What does it mean, actually, to say „we“? Do „we“ see anything? Also this „we“ and „our“ something originate from the exchange of positions - while we transform (!) subjective information back and forth and create thus an approximate collectivity.⁷

It needs a paradigm change from the view of „objective“ objects to the awareness of a dynamic individual that alternates through all realities and determines itself by the form of this alternation. Despite it is unusual: The infinite basic speed gives every way to it.⁸ Even with a relatively steady awareness of my individuality, with a self-filtered consciousness, sitting here, I am at every moment a phase of the unlimited alternation. The terms awareness, individual, standpoint, consciousness, focus *are basically synonymous*. I only structure with them the all-embracing dynamic. If I sit down from one place on the other, I do nothing else, than to relate phases of my unlimited alternation back coupling to each other and thus design a local change.

What is creation?

The infinitesimality structure of focus dynamic has another two essential consequences:

1. The *freedom of choice* of consciousness is automatically integrated. I have founded this in my article [Omnipresent Consciousness and Free Will](#) as well as in my e-book [How Consciousness Creates Reality](#).⁹

In brief: Weighing describes a back coupling between alternative changes. This indefiniteness circumscribes an entirety and *defines* it thus up to an infinitesimal center. However, in a *decisive situation* the indefiniteness of the progress is also an indefiniteness of the situation as a whole. The alternatives are defined on the other hand as those very well. That is definiteness and indefiniteness of the situation can be separated from the decision-making process at no place, they actually arise from it. Besides, the peripheral structure of the whole and its most internal core establish an infinitesimality-structured unity. This unites definiteness and indefiniteness *also*

⁷ See the chapter „Projection and creating approximations“ in „How Consciousness Creates Reality“

⁸ I have thought through all basic questions, which arose to me from this result. Here their discussion would be too extensive. However, I will answer with pleasure your questions by e-mail (see home page at the end).

⁹ See the chapter „Consciousness – the infinitesimality structure“.

totally. In this totality both are assimilated, are not even partly distinguishable. Hence, from this totality every new definiteness is freely chosen.

2. All consciousness is also tied together immediately with each other - not only by immediate focus alternation, but by the central identity in every „braked“, with apparently limited focus speed. I have explained this in the mentioned booklet, too.¹⁰

The approach: Every consciousness is in infinitesimality-structured relation to all others. In this relation, the center of every consciousness is *also* identified with the center of the totality, because such unity centers are at every place „between“ part and whole. Accordingly, the decisions of partial consciousness and whole consciousness from the unity with these centers are *also* identical.

If we consider in addition the described presence of all individual realities in the awareness of our own, we get a shimmering, adaptable „consciousness net“ from which every consciousness chooses its reality permanently. According to structure of the network one reality is more likely and the other one less. If consciousness makes a probable reality its actual one, the others „fall down a bit“, lose probability. They become potential.

Because our current awareness is tied together with all other awareness indirectly and immediately, consciously and less consciously to subconsciously, it can come to an agreement with them about a collective approximate reality. The biggest part of the coordination will take place for capacity reasons subconsciously (nevertheless, always within awareness), so that we must make not too big thoughts about the form of the world. Also, its stability will be maintained naturally subconsciously. For this we have recognized the general structure, although we do not know most concrete processes yet.

Accordingly, the creation of a collective reality would be the decision of all participant individuals for a priority approximation of their positions and the fading out of others. This can be illustrated by the origin of the screen. From all states to which all individuals are fluctuating permanently, a not too improbable one (the vague „idea“) is „condensed“ in a physical object by the inventor / manufacturer. He raises that advance-felt (or investigated) probability by attention, skill and energy application to 100%. Then it is handed over to us „attention-energetic“, is selected by us *in this form* from the huge number of offers. Other versions are not considered any more. We fade them out. After that, we further construct from the acquired approximate object a more individual screen, our very own one (as described) from which the manufacturer gets as a rule nothing more. However, our screen remains more narrowly related with the prototype than the prototype with the vague „idea“

¹⁰ See the chapters „Consciousness – the infinitesimality structure“ and „Our permanent choice“.

selected by the inventor - this „idea“ has hardened on a higher level. The friends who visit us (!) may now easily construct a similar screen on our desk.

We maintain the stability of the „material object“ partly consciously, because we appreciate it. We also find the way back repeatedly - consciously and half consciously - to the state of screen consideration (i.e. home). And if the object is broken, in the end, we let recycle the atoms. Only how the consciousness net maintains physical laws and human prejudices is widely unsolved.

How much we can consciously create, therefore is left to our experimental joy and personal development. There is no lack of guides to it. According to my experience, our possibilities are clearly bigger than materialists believe, but their probabilities often are not so high as many others promise. „Matter“ is compressed consciousness, however, the „matrix“ wants to be taken along.¹¹

Two subtle questions arise if one considers the *timelessness* of the alternation between all „past“ and „future“ individuals:

1. If every focus, every individual, every reality is run through permanently, how can we *create* then a reality? How can it be really new?

To put it briefly: The way is more than the goal. Though every individual is a phase of all others, however, its awareness is a unique hierarchy of probabilities, which exists only if it is just taken. Though it is generated at every moment again, the *filtered*, slower way from peak A to peak B is not! Although it shows a partial frequency of the infinite, there it is only here and now where it is walked.

2. If everything already exists in the focus movement, is there then a universal development, or is everything merely repeated?

This question is related to the preceding one, and so the answer is easy.¹² The unique slow way does not recur most probably, because it is infinite. Also, it can be hardly repeated by someone else (or ourselves), because our freedom of choice makes it unpredictable. Somebody who wanted to follow it would not make the same decisions.

Another question on the *direction* of individual development leads us to the concept of value fulfillment, which can be assumed maybe from the above if we include the asymmetry

¹¹ Allusion on the feature film of the same name in which the „matrix“ stands for the collective consciousness network.

¹² Both questions can be refined in several directions, which is why I have dedicated to them an own chapter („Die Unzerstörbarkeit des Individuums“) in my German book „Die Erschaffung der Realität“.

between restriction that is more quasi-static and dynamic infinity. I would like to close here with a self-citation: „Value fulfillment cannot be determined by a goal. It exists rather in its own prospering, it is in itself way and goal, an experienced awareness and timeless. It means feeling the own meaning in the world, also the own significance, and living according to this value feeling. This feeling encloses its own growth, as well as the growing awareness of a more comprehensive whole in which it is secured.“¹³

Copyright © 2009 by Claus Janew

www.free-will.de

¹³ „Die Erschaffung der Realität“, Chapter „Werterfüllung“.