

Dynamic Existence

(Translation from German revised. Extended by Individuality and the Physical Paradigm)

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

What is real?

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

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

The computer screen is supposed to be something of me? And if my daughter sits next to me, is it something of hers? And she herself would be a component of me?

Consequently, it must be so.

But why is the screen something of her? Why aren't both components of me right away? Why the detour via her?

One could do without this detour. But that would not be consistent:

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

Then I can put myself in my daughter's place and thus also experience a different perspective and individuality. Is that the one of my daughter? No, of course, it is only a

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

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

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

What happened? I constantly alternated standpoints (attention, angle of perception, own life), but was always only in one. Is that logically possible at all?

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

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

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

¹ Only in infinitely small (infinitesimal) points the individuals can meet. Because these are *nothing* without individual derivation.

² Also the individual itself, because of course every standpoint is just as much a dynamic individual, which „derives“ from the others etc.

So why do we rarely think of things as being so changeable? We say they are *relatively* constant. Although we know that basically *everything* moves, *every* individuality changes. Or we say, the movement is *relatively* continuous, thus the whole is itself in every moment. In general, the whole is whole and the part is a part.

All correct. All these phenomena result from the *structure* of the dynamic, of the alternation. Approximately closed sequences of alternations produce relative constancy. Finely gradated alternations appear relatively continuous. And different extent of alternations makes the difference between „part“ and whole.

Before we can explain this in more detail, we have to accept consequently that dynamic existence reaches into the infinitely small. No entirety is elementary, because without structure it would be infinitesimal, *could not have an effect*, not even as a pinprick. After all, we measure everything by its effect. Even an energy quantum can't shirk, because it has a certain „size“; and it can be measured (perceived) only if it reveals an effect structure, at an electron for example. But structure means alternation between individuals (see above). In the case of the energy quantum between the states of the electron, from which the quantum *results*. To attribute the effect to an elementary quantum would therefore not be consistent. Without structure no effect (and vice versa) to whom ever one *assigns* the effect. Exactly this effect is also expressed in the energy size of the quantum (and not vice versa).

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

The form of the alternation is therefore the form of the infinitesimality structure. If an individual would never return, would „exist“ only an infinitesimal moment, nobody could grasp it. If it would return *exactly*, nobody could perceive its change. So there should be besides the change from A to B and B to A' also a change from A' to B' as well as B' to A'' etc.³, so that an *approximate* unity of A and B is woven.

In the middle (unity!) between A and B a *quasi-static approximation object* of the alternation thereby emerges. Not the said tissue, but rather a symbolic form circumscribed by it. This already resembles what we usually call thing.⁴ If the unity prevails, the object is

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

⁴ To be exact: For the individual A which becomes aware of its phase B, the approximation between them is a *potential* for the existence of B. If it becomes aware of the alternation between two *other* phases of itself, the approximation appears object-like.

denser, like the tissue. If the difference prevails, it is thinner, sometimes barely perceptible, because it stems from a more peripheral fabric.

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

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

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

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

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

The alternation does not necessarily happen physically (whatever „physically“ means). It depends only on the standpoint of perception. The necessity of the infinitesimality structure to grasp this dynamic shows that we can just as well speak of consciousness or focusses of consciousness. Because nothing is fixed, everything are back-coupling alternation structures of alternations.

These must also not be spatio-temporal. That is only our usual perception. Alternation can and will take place in every state space, which is spanned by completely different coordinates. How these alternations are *ordered* in perception, is also open. Dreams and associations are an example of it.

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

The logical consequences are bigger, however: If everything exists only in the alternation of the individuality, then this alternation must include the whole universe! No alternation can be completely separated from the other, run parallel for example, because this would mean an absolute division of the universe. That is, we speak of one *single* alternation.

If the universe is unlimited - and there is no reason for a final limit *in any direction* - then the standpoint alternation must occur at infinite speed. („Speed“ as its spatio-temporal interpretation.) This is the basic speed from which every relatively limited consciousness is filtered out by the *form* of alternation. Such filtering forms are tight back-couplings that reduce the *foreground* frequency of the alternation, seemingly slowing down the movement so that the faster frequencies only operate in the less conscious background. Just like when I concentrate on the screen and „forget“ my daughter next to it, but am still aware of her and many other things. Even the universe has not completely disappeared. Only the details are no longer resolved.⁶

If the form results in a finely gradated structure, it appears solid. If it also drifts, we have a continuous movement. If it is tightly knit and interwoven in many ways, it will not dissolve any time soon. If it allows more spontaneous change, it will develop new but related structures.

What does it actually mean to say „we“? Do „we“ see something? This „we“ and „our“ something are also created in the exchange of standpoints - while transforming (!) subjective information back and forth and thus creating an approximate collectivity.⁷

A paradigm shift is needed from the view of "objective" objects to the awareness of a dynamic individual alternating through all realities and determining itself by the form of this alternation. Even if it is very unusual: The infinite base speed leaves every room for it.⁸ Even with a relatively constant awareness of my individuality, a self-filtered consciousness, as I sit here, I am at every moment a phase of unlimited alternation. The terms awareness, individual, standpoint, consciousness, focus *are basically synonymous*. I am just using them to structure the all-encompassing dynamic. When I sit down from one place to the other, I do nothing else than relate phases of my unlimited alternation to each other in a back-coupling way and thus form a change of place.

⁶ This results in the reality funnel as I described in my e-book „How Consciousness Creates Reality“ in the chapter of the same name. This is the very abridged version of my book [How Consciousness Creates Reality. The Full Version](#).

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

⁸ I have thought through all the fundamental questions that arose in connection with this result. Their discussion here would be too extensive. Please read for this my [Dialogue on Alternating Consciousness](#).

What is creation?

The infinitesimality structure of focus dynamic has two more important consequences:

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

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

2. All consciousness is also in *immediate* connection to each other - not only by immediate focus alternation, but by the central identity in every „braked“, at seemingly finite focus speed. I have explained this too in the mentioned e-book.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 and total consciousness out of the unity with these centers are *also* identical.

If we in addition consider the described presence of all individual realities in the awareness of our own, then we get a shimmering, flexible „consciousness net“, from which each consciousness constantly chooses its reality. Depending on the structure of the web, one reality is more probable and the other less. If the consciousness makes one probable reality its current one, the others „fall down a bit“, lose probability. They become potential.

Since our current awareness is linked to all other awareness mediately and immediately, consciously and less consciously to subconsciously, it can coordinate with them on a collective approximate reality. Most of the coordination will take place subconsciously (nevertheless, always *within* awareness) for capacity reasons, so we don't have to worry to

⁹ Chapter „Consciousness – the infinitesimality structure“.

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

much about the shape of the world. Its stability is also sensibly maintained subconsciously. We have recognized the general structure for this, although we do not yet know most of the concrete processes.

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

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

How much we can consciously create is thus left to our joy of experimentation and personal development. There is no lack of guides for this. In my experience, our possibilities are clearly greater than materialists believe, but their probabilities often not as high as many others promise. „Matter“ is condensed consciousness, but the „Matrix“ wants to be taken along.¹¹

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

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

In short, the journey is more than the destination. True, each individual is a phase of all others. But its awareness is a unique hierarchy of probabilities which exists only when it is

¹¹ Allusion to the feature film of the same name in which the „Matrix“ stands for the collective web of consciousness.

just taken. It is generated again in every moment, but the *filtered*, slower way from peak A to peak B is not! Although it represents a partial frequency of the infinite, it exists only here and now where it is walked on.

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

This question is related to the previous one, and so the answer is simple.¹² The unique slow way does not repeat itself most probably, because it is infinite. It can also hardly be 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 choices.

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

Individuality and the physical paradigm

The physical paradigm contains serious distortions or inconsistencies:

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

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

¹³ „How Consciousness Creates Reality. The Full Version”, Chapter „Value fulfillment“.

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

Quantum physics describes another form of alternation than classical physics. There seems to be a basic unity, an elementary quantum. To perceive (or think) such a quantum, however, needs circumscription of "it", condensation of a movement. Again, there is no quantum in itself, although we treat it as such – and limit our focus on it.

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

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

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

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

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

www.free-will.de



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International [License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). First published 2009-2010.