

# A Framework for the Science of Nonduality

## *Fundamentals of a Science of Nonduality*

***Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.***

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

Copyright 2005 K.D. Palmer.

All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.

Started 05.03.15; Version 0.3, 05.03.15; snd01a03.doc

Keywords: Nonduality, Logic, Schema, Mathesis, Differentiation, Separation, Gatheredness, Distinction

### **Introduction to the Framework of Nondual Science**

In the last essay in this series about the Science of Nonduality we considered it's possibility. But what we would like to do is graduate from the consideration of its possibility to an orienting framework that can be used to situate the problematic of the Science of Nonduality. Such a framework one would hope would give us a starting place from which we can explore the landscape of the potential science of nonduality. In our exploration to date we have discovered many pieces of the puzzle but until now they have not fit into an overall pattern. The framework we are about to articulate brings together many of these pieces into an overall pattern. The whole framework itself is an experiment which continues our contemplation of the idea of operators other than negation breached in the last essay. That was a very difficult subject to consider and our initial consideration of it was somewhat flawed.

But it was precisely those flaws that led to some thoughts of the broader context that should be established in order to understand those new operators that were suggested. One thought led to another in that contemplation process and slowly what self-assembled was an unexpected framework with a completely unforeseen structure that has formed around that initial insight into a way to generate alternative operations other than negation that might carry us up into the realm of manifestation and non-manifestation beyond Being and Existence. It is as if around that speculation about the possibility of alternative operations there appeared a context within which that possibility might make sense. The framework pieces together many of the sets of ideas recently explored into an overall way of looking at the science of nonduality. This essay will attempt to lay out that framework in order to test out the ideas that have become clearer in this process of attempting to stretch beyond negation, which has been our limitation for so long. If we can stretch beyond negation to other operators then perhaps we can understand better the relation of the surface nonduals (emptiness and void) to the deeper nonduals (manifestation and nonmanifestation).

### **Separation**

If we look at logic and math together what we notice is that they are both made up of combinations of operators and operands, verbs and nouns. Of course in language there are other parts of speech, but in math and logic there has been some attempt to simplify the structure of language to give a basic formalism which appears in both mathematics and logic. So we can imagine a series of unfolding levels in which there are more and more operands connected by operators. Mostly we deal with binary operators which connect two operands. But we can imagine trinary, quadrinary, quintinary, etc. We can also imagine unary operators which just operate on one operand. And what we were suggesting in

the last essay was that one way to get beyond negation as a unary operator is not to find another unary operator other than negation, but to posit a zeronary operator and a neganary operator beyond the unary operator. In other words there is not just a difference in the sort of operator but a difference in meta-level of the operator. We posited that there were zeronary operators which had no operands which corresponded to the level of manifestation, and there were neganary operators which had no operators or operands which corresponded to the level of the non-manifest. So we recognized that if these zeronary or neganary operators existed then we would have a way to delineate the limits of the deeper nonduals thereby. But this very thought was difficult to describe and this threw me back to attempting to analyze the whole series. I realized that an Idea that I had quite a while ago was relevant here. That is the idea that besides binary complementarities there might be trinary, quadrinary and quintinary complementarities. It was Arkady Plotnitsky that had the idea that there might be multiway complementarities in his book on Complementarities. I wrote an essay called Thinking the Unthinkable in which I disputed the idea that there were multiway complementarities and posited that they were all two way. But then I learned when I studied the Octonion that it has a three way complementarity within it. So that opened up the door for higher multiway complementarities and I realized that the Tits Magic square could be an example of a mathematical object that might encapsulate the structure of the Emergent Meta-system as a Quadrinary complementarity. And this of course raises the question if there are even higher multiway complementarities such as Quintinary complementarity and on up to infinity. What I realized as I contemplated the combination of these two ideas, i.e. that there are other operators beyond negation, and that there were multiway complementarities, was that the multiway complementarities are situations where the operators are merged into a single

multiway complementary rather than being made up of separate operators. In other words rather than repeating operators, or repeating operands, either constants or variables, we might have a fused operator that relates simultaneously to multiple operands. That is what these higher level complementarities do. They are fusions of operators into a single multiway complementarity. Fusions of Operands we get by repeating the same constant or variable. Fusion of operators we get by invoking a multiway operator which sets up a structural relation between the operands in question. So triality in the octonion sets up a relation between three elements from the hyper-complex algebra. This sort of three way multiway complementarity only appears at this level of the algebras. After that we move to the sedenion which does not have any special multiway complementarity that I know of, but the move to the sedenion is also a move into existence from the point of view of meta-systems theory and that is where the Emergent Meta-system closes its loop, and the Emergent Meta-system is a four fold multiway complementarity. It appears not in the sedenion but in the relation of all the hypercomplex algebras and the real algebra to each other over the entire series that forms a cycle. So here we get the emergence of a higher level multiway complementarity between four elements. The mathematical object that relates to this four way complementarity is the Tits Magic Square which relates various types of algebra to each other in a matrix form with the hypercomplex algebras. We can imagine that there is also a Quintinary multiway complementarity, and even higher ones. Such a Quintinary multiway complementarity might be associated with autogenesis. Right now it is unknown whether there is such a thing as the Quintinary multiway complementary but we must hold open that possibility, in fact we must hold open all the possible multiway complementarities until we can prove that they stop at a certain level. At this time we

will only consider up to the Quintinary level because that is the first one which we do not know what its mathematical basis might be.

Notice that what is happening here is that we have a difference between operators and operands (verbs and nouns) and we construct mathematical representations out of these by specifying types of operators and types of operands with specific properties. We can imagine multiple operators (n-1) connecting multiple operands (n). But we can also imagine single operators that function on various operands, and we call these *functions*. But if we codify the operators so that we specify their operating on more than one operand then we have the Binary, Trinary, Quadrinary, and Quintinary operators. However, if we consider that these operators produce a multiway complementarity between elements then we have a different structure. So we can intersperse different operators, we can have a single operator that operates on multiple operands, and we can have an operator that produces a multiway complementarity between elements. On the other hand we can specify that the operand places contain either constants or variables, and we can repeat the constants or the variable names so that we can get recursion of the operator working on the various instances of a single operand. Operators act to separate out operands. Operands can be identical and so that is an instance of fusion by the same operand being called in different places in the formal statement. Operators on the other hand set up the structure of the situation that the operands find themselves. Operands are normally not variables, but they could be variables which are substituted based on some rules at the moment of computation. Similarly operands might be recalculated or updated just before calculation. The operators are barriers that keep the operands apart in the structure of the equation or formula. So this is the supra-rational aspect. Operators form barriers that keep operands apart. But what we note is that those barriers can either be different as

different types of operands are applied in sequence, or they can be the same operand which computes all the operators at the same time, or they may be structural separations that produce multiway complementarities, i.e. they can act as pure barriers. So we discover something interesting which is that the operands express the possibility of fusion or paradoxicality and the operators express the barriers of supra-rationality. As supra-rationality and paradoxicality come together and interact as operands and operators we get results when formulas are calculated. Or we get multiway symmetries enforced which effect the way computation of results are performed in various root algebras ( $xy=0$ ,  $yx=xy$ ,  $yx=-xy$ ) or we have multiway complementarities that all at once produce three-way or four-way or five-way effects. The three way complementarities appear in the octonion which is the mathematical model for the Reflexive Special System. The four way appear in the Emergent Meta-system and the Tits Magic Square. The five way is still an open question but may have something to do with autogenesis. Quarternions, Complexnions, and Real Algebras all make due with mostly binary and unary operations. Some of the properties such as the associative property are multiway rules. But the series stops with the unary operator the best example of is negation. But there can be others, like necessity and possibility in a modal logic, or the Existence operator. There are various unary operators, but none of them are more powerful or more necessary to our thought than the negation operator. If however, we want to find another kind of operator than the sorts we have been mentioning the only to go is beyond the unary operator to the zernary or neganary operators. These are not merely different kinds of operators but different meta-level operators that do not appear in normal mathematical or logical notation, but are logically possible given the structure we have been discussing. So the zernary operator negates the operand. It is as in Stern's Matrix Logic when the

operators alone operate on each other without the necessity of operands. But here again we are thinking about the sixteen logic operators operating on each other, and we have not gotten to the heart of the matter, which I think is annihilation. The pure zeronary operators are not just normal operators operating on each other to give a result without the intervention of operands, but the actual quality of the zeronary operator must be to annihilate the operand itself. But this brings up a good point. And that is that once we get rid of the operands, or the existent things, be they variables or constants, then we are left with the relations between things operating on each other so that each relation becomes a meta-relation in some sense, i.e. a relation among relations without operands as an anchor. Stern has a table that shows the legal operations of this type in Logic. The point is that when we get rid of the operands we suddenly see just the relations between things on their own. And that is exactly what the Sifat are for the most part, they are relations between things taken out of their context with respect to the things but in reference to themselves. It should be noted that this is exactly what happens in Mathematical Category Theory, we get rid of the elements and just have the arrows that represent the mappings or operations. So in a way Mathematical Category theory is a conversion of normal categories with elements into something that has only arrows, and then category theory expands on that by imagining meta-levels of operators which takes us up to functors, to natural transformations and modifications. So in math when we annihilate the elements we get Mathematical Category Theory and in Logic we get interactions between logical operators on each other in Matrix Logic. But in both cases the emphasis is on relations among relations once the elements have been annihilated. Manifestation means the focus on the relations among things that do not need the things to exemplify those relations. Mathematical Category theory realized it did not need the elements to describe the various mathematical

categories. Rather the structure of the categories, their organization could be defined by the relations of mapping operations to each other. Just like Mathematical category theory gives us a completely different view of the relations between relations and thus the organization, so to we can say the same thing with the Sifat or Attributes of God, where the relations between things are exalted into a higher realm of manifestation beyond the appearance of the elements. From this the whole theory of n-category theory takes off which we have studied previously. It is possible to extrapolate from that to n-blog theory and n-conglomerate theory as we have done elsewhere. So we actually realize that the zeronary operator is what opens up the vista of the n-category theory, and the operators on operators of matrix logic, but the essence of this operator is the annihilation of the element, the operand. By annihilating or canceling the operator we can suddenly see the relations as independent of the elements or operators.

### **Distinctions**

As soon as we find the zeronary operator has analogs in Logic and Math and we can see how this opens up a similar realm as to that we have identified with the Sifat in those domains, then we can begin to see that what we call manifestation is not something mysterious, it is in fact seeing the meta-relations between relations without the clutter of the elements that have been cancelled or annihilated depending on whether we are living in logos or physus. But then we encounter the negenary operator. That operator vanishes along with the operand. All that is left is the virtual difference between operator and operand. We can call that a distinction. What is strange is that from this point there are two directions we can go. One is to continue down the ladder into the various negenary manifestations of distinctions. For instance, at level -1 we have the pure distinction between the operator and operand without

either of them existing any longer. Then at level -2 the Mark of G. Spencer-Brown from Laws of Form. At level -3 we have the addition of the recursion to the Mark that Spencer Brown derives in Laws of Form. At level -4 we add surreal numbers to the system that G. Spencer-Brown inaugurated. At level -5 we add the concept of Vajra Logic so there are four different marks, one for each of the aspect of being which are rotated in various directions to mark their difference from each other. But what is strange is that we can associate this series of marks that become more complex with Meta-levels of distinction. We talk about the creation of non-nihilistic distinctions. But little have we thought that there might be Pure Distinctions, Process Distinctions, Hyper Distinctions, Wild Distinctions, and Ultra Distinctions. Non-nihilistic distinctions may go through a similar process as the meta-levels of negation. Distinguishing is different from negation, something must be distinguished first before negation can be generated as an operator on an existent element. So this foray deeper and deeper into the negation dimension allows us to specify the meta-levels of distinction that are different from the meta-levels of negation, but like them use as their template the meta-levels of Being. Pure distinctions are those static distinctions that we usually make dogmatically. Process Distinctions are the refinement process of making subtler distinctions over them. Hyper Distinctions hover before various possible distinctions. Wild distinctions are those that are untamed, they are distinctions we make by gut feel, by serendipity, by intuition not necessarily digested or digestible by reason or doxa. Ultra Distinctions are those between different non-duals. We might call them discernments. For instance Ultra Being distinguishes between the nonduals of emptiness and void. This is the first level of discernment between nonduals. We want to further discern between these nonduals and the deeper nondual of manifestation, and the even deeper nondual of non-manifestation.

Ultra Distinctions are similar to Genuine Emergence. The discernments between nonduals are the root discernments.

But this is only one direction we can go as we elaborate the meta-levels of distinctions as the inverse of the meta-levels of separation. The point of our previous essay was that once we get to the negative one we reach a singularity that opens a horizon which in the case of the numbers is the hyper complex algebras. But that in our case has been associated with the Dhat. We know that the Dhat is a singularity that has implications for the ordering of the universe, because the order of creation has to come from somewhere, and it cannot be coming from the Sifat. This opening up of the alternative horizon is key to our understanding of the deepest nondual standing. The number line we have been dealing with is one dimensional while the horizon opened out from the singularity is multidimensional. The realm of separation and the realm of distinction has to be based on this multidimensional realm of ordering beyond what it is possible for us to know and understand. But we get a glimpse of it in our realizations guided by the forms of mathematics. We get a feeling for the infinite depth of the Dhat in relation to everything else. And the Dhat itself though it is not manifest is what causes all the discontinuities and separations and discernments and distinctions in our experience and cognition. The Dhat is the source of the non-nihilistic distinctions which we make, the discernments we attempt to make. So although this standing is non-manifest, it is ever present in its effect on everything we distinguish. The key point here is that the non-nihilistic distinction when we allow it to become two dimensional becomes a Spencer-Brown mark. Spencer-Brown himself adds the third dimension to this mark by making it recursive. This recursiveness gives rise to the possibility of the Hellerstien logic with the two paradoxical imaginaries **i**, and **j** which mean  $A \text{ yet } \sim A$  and  $\sim A \text{ yet } A$ . These

are not imaginary numbers. They are twin paradoxes which serve as limit points for our reasoning in Laws of Form. I myself realized that if we give the forms content of Surreal Numbers then we can approximate Wild Being. Finally we arrive at Ultra Being, and that is equivalent to the Ultra Distinction between nonduals, not just invisibles. But nonduals stand between and before the arising of visibles and invisibles, and any other duality you can name. Finally I realized that this is probably equal to the creation of a type of laws of form with rotated marks associated with the various aspects of Being. Ultra Being is Being as a whole from the outside, that would encompass all the aspects. Ultra Being as distinction would be based on the discernment of emergence. It is a non-nihilistic distinction between nonduals. Of course, separation is dependent on distinction. But that distinction may be a fabrication, or it can be a naturally arising spontaneous schematization. Our point is that schematization is the first categorization, prior to kinds, prior to individual differences, prior to significance or sense. Schematization is spontaneous in almost all cases, and it is only later that we normally realize that we had a choice of schematization, two possibilities in each dimensional envelope. So the various forms of distinction is what builds separation, first by positing the verb/noun (operator/operand) distinction but then by multiple distinctions unfolding the separation. But separation is lost somewhat by operand fusion, but then it is maintained somewhat by operator barriers. Operands tend toward paradox and operators tend toward the supra-rational. The limit of that is multiway complementarity. While the limit of paradoxicality is recursion of the same operand in all positions in the formula. The distinctions are the separation points or discontinuities between all the operators and operands, and they are made by the nondual of the mark itself which itself is discriminated according to the meta-levels as we discovered is true of negation as well.

The real frontier in this framework is to understand Quntinary multiway complementarity, and to understand how the Vajra Logic appears as the mark is rotated in Ultra Distinction. But within this frontier it is fairly clear what the structure means because we are so used to this way of differentiation of operators and operands. We have just not thought before of the Zeronary and Negenary operators. The real surprise is that the Spencer-Brown Marks fit the bill when we start talking about negenary meta-levels beyond negative one. But this model also gives us some indication of the depth of the deepest nondual because its operator gives rise to the singularity that opens the inward horizon beyond the sifat which we have been calling the Dhat. That is the source of the order of creation. It is called the Godhead by Eckhardt, Nirguna Brahman by the Vedantists. It is where all the order of creation comes from. And it is interesting that this is between the various meta-levels of distinction beyond the fundamental distinction between operator and operand AND the levels of separation of various mathematical and logical formalisms that all use operators and operands. To get to the horizon of the Dhat we must destroy both operator and operand and see just the distinction between them without them. This is what tells us that distinctions stand on their own. The production of complex distinctions is not the same as the place from which the order comes that uses the distinctions to produce the ordering of the separations. Separations can express paradox or supra-rationality. Distinctions provide the discontinuities and when we reach ultra distinction we get the discernment between various nonduals. But the motive power of the ordering of the separation by the distinctions is from the Dhat.

### **Differentiation**

Now we switch to a completely different scale and we will talk briefly about a well known subject in my writings the Categories

of Peirce and Fuller and beyond. Peirce posits the existence of three categories called First (isolate), Second (relation) and Third (continuity). To these we add Zeroths which relates to emptiness or void. Then there is Foruths which is Synergy introduced by Fuller. And to that I now add Syzygy which means conjunction. These are the five categories that we find expressed in formalisms. The First is the isolate which we do not actually see. We might call it the noumena. But it is to that isolate that we apply schematization, and then based on the schematization we discover relations which if they are under constraint yields an essence or kind. And then beyond that is the continuity which this individual appears in relation to form a gestalt. The Fourth appears with higher dimensionality when we can reuse terms to build synergetic formations. Syzygy is where we see juxtapositions that break out beyond those synergies. My postulation is that each Schema has its own organization of these categories. In fact I would be so bold as to say there is a congruity between the unfolding categories and the schemas themselves. The schemas can exist in pairs where the highest and lowest are paired. So we can see that the Zeroth is like the facet/pluriverse schemas. The Firsts are like the monad/Kosmos schemas. The Seconds are like the Pattern/World schemas. The Thirds are like the Form/Domain schemas. And the Fourths are like the System/Meta-system schemas. Finally the Fifths are like the Special Systems Schemas. We already know that there is a relation between dimensionality and the schemas. And we now that dimensionality is produced by the Pascal Simplicies. The Pascal Simplicies are an example of a mathematical object that embodies all the special systems characteristics at the same time rather than separately, as we normally observe things to do. Schematization is all about differentiation. We can see that differentiation is different from separation. Separation happens by the application of Logic or Math to things, it projects the basic

structuring of our language in terms of operators and operands, verb and noun, on to things to create concepts of them that are separable. Differentiation has to do with recognition of differences in embodiment in spacetime of kinds that are exemplified with individuals with specific differences that produce changes in signification and ultimately articulate sense. Schemas differentiate that spacetime envelope that is referred to by math and logic. Without that reference the math and logic models would float free of the phenomena. Schematization is so automatic that we don't notice that it is occurring normally. The first thing we notice is the kinds of things, and our tradition has developed kinds at the expense of both individual differences and schematization. It has also developed signification although semantics is a mystery. But if we knew that kinds and semantics is connected to individual differences and schematization that would be a start to understanding this phenomena and making some sense of sense. This other scale we are discussing right now goes in the opposite direction of the first scale that covered separation and distinction. This scale covers differentiation and gatheredness. Differentiation is opposite of Separation. So that means that gatheredness and separation are opposites. One (differentiation) articulates the embodiments of things referred to by the other (separation). In previous discussions we have said that Schemas, Mathesis, and Logic form a triad connected by model theory, representation theory, and philosophical categories. Mathesis and Logic are connected by Model theory. Model theory connects mathematical categories to logic in order to postulate a semantics modeled on the structure of syntax. So the core of Separation is Model Theory. Schematization on the other hand is about differentiation not separation, that is it is about spacetime embodiments identified dimensionally. Representation Theory and Philosophical Categories connect these to Logic and Mathesis. But

the core of schematization is the Pascal Triangle which generates dimensionality. But schemas have a different constitution than dimension, because all schemas have their own organization. That organization is articulated by a particular relation of the Peirce/Fuller/Palmer categories to each other. For instance the lower level schema is the first for the higher level schema. We can specify relations between lower level schemas that are organized by the higher level schema. But each schema is itself its own continuity, or emergent level. That emergent level has an overdetermination of its parts that yields a particular synthetic emergent quality to the schematization at that level. But the relations between schemas themselves are conjunctions, that is they are constituted out of syzygys. They have the quality of the Special Systems and in fact the special systems appear between each level of the hierarchy of the schemas relating restricted economy to general economy in each case. When we take the properties of the special systems together we get the Pascal Triangle that generates dimensionality and we know that the dimensions and schemas are paired, just like the schemas themselves are paired and in their pairing they represent the various levels of the Peirce/Fuller categories. The schemas represent the nondual between the logic and math modes of separation. That nondual is needed because though it the math and logic models are related to spacetime embodiments. These spacetime embodiments are organized according to different architectures of the schemas that correspond to the differentiation of the Peirce/Fuller/Palmer categories. All this is the positive side of the new scale of differentiation which stands opposite the separation side of the other scale. What we must do now is understand what is the opposite of the Distinction end of the other scale, and that is the registers.

### **Registers**

If on this new scale we go in the other

direction toward the negative then we enter the registers. It is Deleuze that points out that the registers of Lacan play this role. Negative one is the Real register, Negative two is the Imaginary register. Negative three is the Symbolic or Structural Register. This has led in a previous paper to the exploration of even deeper registers that we have named the Generative and the Immersive registers at levels Negative four and five. These negative registers are the meta-levels of gatheredness that are opposite the meta-levels of differentiation, but contrary to the meta-levels of separation and contradictory to the meta-levels of distinction. In gatheredness it is difficult to make distinctions. But yet it separates out into meta-levels that can be described and explored. One way to think about it is that the negative one is related to the aspects of real and true while the one is related to presence and identity. The isolate is a present identity. The Lacanian Real something inexplicable that actually happens. It may be a Truth actually told. Note that this reality or truth as aspects of Being are merged in Arabic as Haqq. I would venture that it is Haqq that is the horizon opened up by the singularity at negative one. Haqq is something that the various prophets share in common. It is a different horizon opened up from a different scale than that of the Dhat which opens up out of separation and distinctions. On the two scales the places of the negative and positive meta-levels are reversed. The imaginary, sometimes called the imaginal after the usage of Corbin and explored by Jung and Hillman as the Collective Unconscious or Psyche is according to Deleuze the realm of mirroring. Beyond that is the symbolic or the structural level explored by Piaget, Levi-Straus, Foucault, and other structuralists and post-structuralists. The Symbolic is the realm of the empty signifier within the double series of repetitions. The Symbolic is organized Structurally as far as Deleuze is concerned. The generative is the realm of Microgenesis and genetic unfolding. The immersive is the



immanent and univocal source of that unfolding.

The registers are very different from the Price/Fuller/Palmer Categories. They are the meta-levels of Gatheredness rather than the meta-levels of differentiation. Separation and Differentiation together articulate this gatheredness. But they themselves are distinguished by Distinctions which ultimately must be non-nihilistic and thus come from the nondual. Gatheredness is the invisible realm to which these non-nihilistic distinctions are applied. What we are distinguishing is what is invisible in the depths of gatheredness, which appears at the various meta-levels of the registers. We have to get our bearings on this gatheredness by the schemas differentiation on the one hand and the separation of logic and math on the other hand. Registers are what appears behind the mirror in Alice in Wonderland. It is the alternative organization of everything in the collective unconscious and deeper. We try to discern through a glass darkly within the gatheredness by applying nondual distinctions.

### **Two Scales**

We have outlined the structure of two scales that when conjuncted but not crossed as a Cartesian space line up in a strange way where the two scales are reversed in relation to each other. One thing we notice is that between the meta-levels of distinction appear in the discontinuity between levels the special systems. On the other hand between the meta-levels of differentiation appear the kinds of Being. The Dhat which appears out of the singularity on the first scale relates to the God-head, while the Haqq that appears out of the singularity on the second scale relates to the prophets, it is what is the same for all Prophets. These two horizon that appear out of the two scales are disjoint from each other because the two scales have there positive and negative values reversed. It is interesting that

Zerony operator associated with the first scale is related to manifestation, while the Zeroth Category is related to Emptiness and Void. So in some ways this is giving us a context for the relation between Manifestation as the deeper nondual and the surface nonduals of emptiness and void. Ultra distinction grows out of the first scale and that comes around and distinguishes between emptiness and void on the second scale. Presence and identity of the First AND Reality and Truth of the negative register are also distinguished like emptiness and void. We wonder if every category and register is dual like these central ones? We can see that these two scales are interacting in the structure of the divided line which brings manifestation into relation with emptiness and void discontinuities in the divided line. It could be that what we have here is the first differentiation between the Ratio and Doxa interacting with the sub-differentiation by the insertion of emptiness and void that divides both doxa and ratio. If we just think about this on the side of ratio, then differentiation gives us the building blocks of representation or repetition. We bring to bear on these math and logic as our way of dealing with the differentiation via our own powers of separation. Thus we get the representable intelligibles of say Geometry that reason deals with. But on the other side of the ratio there are also the nonrepresentable intelligibles that are some combination of gatheredness and distinctions. So in this case we have a framework for understanding one half of the divided line. But we need to understand the other side of the divided line as well, the side of Doxa. Does that mean there are two other scales that correspond to these that are different that relate to the Doxa. Or are these scales somehow related to the Doxa as well. It is not clear. Of course, we know from Blake that the divided line of Plato is just one of four divided lines related to the Four Zoas so if this framework is just related to Ratio then this is only one eighth of the overall structure. But fortunately for us this is the most important of the eight to possess

at this point, because it is the one that the Western Tradition is obsessed with. The other three are submerged in the unconscious and the other half of the divided line of Urizen having to do with Doxa is deprecated. Even if this is only one eighth of the entire structure we are lucky to see this much of the framework. It gives us a sense of its complexity, and this is the point where the nonduals are contacted as distinctions in gatheredness. It is the upper part of the divided line that Plato wanted us to arrive at by contemplation of the Good. More study will have to be done to try to relate this eighth to the other four divided line and the other half of the divided line related to doxa.

But what is good about this framework is that it pulls together many threads and patches of theory that have been gathered over the years into a single quilt. It is an unexpected tapestry. But it puts into context the relations between logic, mathesis and the schemas which I have been working on quite diligently for some time. It is the structure I needed to understand for my studies of General Schemas Theory to come to fruition. But also it is incredibly that basis of a science of nonduality as well. It shows how the realms of separation and differentiation which are dual are complementary opposites and that these are crossed by another pair of complementary opposites related to distinction and gatheredness which are related to the exploration of the nondual realm. The depths and heights of these two crossed complementaries are made clear by the meta-levels that are related to each one. Logic and Math are seen as having the same basic dualistic structure while the schemas are their nondual. But on the other hand manifestation is a singular nondual related to the emptiness and void of the zeroth category. And the special systems show up differentiating the distinctions while the categories are distinguished by the meta-levels of Being, what is on the other side of these two scales to balance these is currently

unknown. We can see how dimensionality and the schemas are related to the Pascal Triangle which underlies the category quadrant. The hierarchy of the special systems in the distinction quadrant may be related to the Edward Haskell Coactions which Anthony Judge realized were related to the Mandelbrot set, so that the higher hypercomplex algebras each have their fractals which are achieved by meta-levels of negation and emergence. Thus the meta-levels of emergence, meta-levels of negation and the hypercomplex fractals all exist in this quadrant. That begs the question whether there is a mathematical object related to the special systems related to the other two quadrants (separation and gatheredness). It would not surprise me if there were four representations of the Special Systems related to the four quadrants. Since the special systems are algebras we could see them as related to the separation quadrant. All the special systems up to the octonion can be represented with binary complementarities. The octonion introduces Triality. The EMS introduces Qudrality. And the only thing left beyond that is Autogenesis so we hypothesize that Quintrality has something to do with Autogenesis but leave that for future exploration. So if the Algebras relate to the Separation Quadrant, the hypercomplex fractals relate to the Distinction quadrant, and the Pascal Simplicies relate to the Differentiation quadrant, then that just leaves the gatheredness quadrant without a mathematical basis. So this will be a subject of future research. However, the most important thing about this structure is that it makes clear the role played by the deepest nondual as Dhat in relation to the singularity and its horizon in the Separation/Distinction Scale, and on the other hand the Haqq in relation to truth and reality in the Differentiation/Gatheredness Scale. These two horizons are offset from each other. They are each embedded in their scales. But they obviously relate to each other as the Dhat is what underwrites the Haqq of the Prophets. We don't claim that these are

representational horizons. Representation and Repetition occur in the Differentiation and Separation quadrants. These horizons appear out of the Gatheredness and Distinctions quadrants that are related to nonduality.

Certainly there is a lot more to learn about this framework, but the key point is that the framework, as a patchwork quilt and tapestry now exists as a context in which to explain the position of the schemas and which relates that to the science of nonduality, which this framework makes possible in a way that was not possible previously.

## **Conclusion**

A Science of Nonduality does exist. It is very deep and is built out of a lot of different elements that fit together into a quilt of patches that is a tapestry of an unusual design. It will be some time before we understand this framework for this Science of Nonduality in any depth. But at least an interesting higher level pattern exists.

Eureka!