

GOSPEL OF BEING



A critical thinker's guide to
existence

JOHN I. MACKAY

Gospel of Being

Gospel of Being

All existence is a conference of
difference



John I. Mackay

COPYRIGHT

Gospel of Being (1st Edition ebook)

© 2024; John I. Mackay. All Rights Reserved
Worldwide.

No part of this publication may be adapted, reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including AI, translation, musical arrangement, dramatisation, fictionalisation, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation or any other form in which a work may be recast, transformed, or adapted without the prior written permission of the author, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

ISBN-13: 978-0-6480983-2-4

The font *EB Garamond* is designed by Georg Duffner and Octavio Pardo; the font *Inter* is designed by Rasmus Andersson and both are licensed under the SIL Open Font Licence, Version 1.1 located at: <http://scripts.sil.org/OFL>.

CONTENTS

<u>COPYRIGHT.....</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>DEDICATION.....</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>GRATITUDE.....</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>FOREWORD.....</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION.....</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>PART 1: BEING.....</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>1.1 The Principle of Existence.....</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>1.2 Three Names, One Truth.....</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>1.3 From Dust to Galaxies.....</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>1.4 Towards Life.....</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>1.5 The Making of Sentience.....</u>	<u>37</u>
<u>1.6 The Genesis of All Being.....</u>	<u>42</u>
<u>1.7 All That Is.....</u>	<u>46</u>
<u>PART 2: BELIEF.....</u>	<u>50</u>
<u>2.1 Radical Hope.....</u>	<u>51</u>
<u>2.2 The Gift of Imperfection.....</u>	<u>56</u>
<u>2.3 All Being is Problematic.....</u>	<u>62</u>
<u>2.4 The Journey of Realizing.....</u>	<u>67</u>
<u>2.5 Allegiance to Potential.....</u>	<u>73</u>
<u>2.6 The Ethic of Existence.....</u>	<u>78</u>
<u>2.7 Belief Made Flesh.....</u>	<u>84</u>

PART 3: FREEDOM.....	89
3.1 The Illusion of Freedom.....	90
3.2 All Being is Relationship.....	94
3.3 Existence is Structured.....	98
3.4 Dancing Within Bonds.....	102
3.5 Ascent Into Order.....	106
3.6 Path of Least Resistance.....	110
3.7 Cascading Ties.....	114
PART 4: GOD.....	117
4.1 Principal to Existence.....	118
4.2 Enabling Everything.....	123
4.3 God Before Everything.....	126
4.4 God Realizes All.....	129
4.5 God's Image.....	132
4.6 God is Perfect.....	135
4.7 Universal Endless Genesis.....	138
PART 5: KNOWING.....	140
5.1 Imperfect Knowing.....	141
5.2 The Gospel is Complete.....	146
5.3 Invitation to Realize.....	150
5.4 Objective vs Subjective.....	156
5.5 Towards Consciousness.....	160
5.6 The Want of Intelligence.....	164
5.7 The Dance of Uncertainty.....	168
PART 6: MEANING.....	171

6.1 Meaning as Intending.....	172
6.2 Adaptive Intention.....	176
6.3 Meaning and Sense.....	179
6.4 Consciousness.....	182
6.5 The Success of Meaning.....	185
6.6 The Means to Power.....	188
6.7 The Purpose is Power.....	191
PART 7: POWER.....	194
7.1 Least Resistance.....	195
7.2 Power as Latent Ability.....	200
7.3 Regulating Power.....	206
7.4 Corruption of Power.....	212
7.5 Power to Adapt.....	217
Conference as Condition.....	218
The Function of Difference.....	219
Adaptation as the Direction of Power....	219
Philosophical Parallels.....	220
Political and Ethical Implications.....	221
7.6 The Power to Transform.....	223
7.7 The Want of Power.....	229
Universal, Not Human-Centric.....	231
The Function of Amen.....	231
PART 8: RECIPROCITY.....	233
8.1 The Pulse of God's Spell.....	234
8.2 The Law of Return.....	238

8.3 Reciprocal Altruism.....	242
8.4 Prototype to Sharing.....	246
8.5 Proportional Response.....	251
8.6 Towards Responsibility.....	255
8.7 Maintaining Equilibrium.....	258
PART 9: SALVATION.....	261
9.1 Two Testaments.....	262
9.2 Atonement.....	265
9.3 Forgiveness.....	268
9.4 Cause & Effect.....	271
Without atonement, forgiveness is without cause.....	271
Without forgiveness, atonement is without affect.....	272
9.5 Harmony.....	275
9.6 Minimizing Unease.....	279
9.7 The Path to Salvation.....	283
PART 10: TRANSFORMATION.....	286
10.1 Ceaseless Transformation.....	287
10.2 Without Beginning or End.....	291
10.3 One Chorus to Another.....	295
10.4 Transformation Itself.....	299
10.5 Collaborative Transformation.....	303
10.6 The Sacred Engine.....	307
10.7 Transformation is Relative.....	311
DEFINITIONS.....	314

<u>Atonement.....</u>	<u>315</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>315</u>
<u>Phonology.....</u>	<u>315</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>316</u>
<u>Balance.....</u>	<u>317</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>317</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>317</u>
<u>Competition.....</u>	<u>318</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>318</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>318</u>
<u>Energy.....</u>	<u>319</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>319</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>319</u>
<u>Equilibrium.....</u>	<u>320</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>320</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>320</u>
<u>Forgiveness.....</u>	<u>321</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>321</u>
<u>Harmony.....</u>	<u>322</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>322</u>
<u>Knowing.....</u>	<u>323</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>323</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>323</u>
<u>Metaphysical.....</u>	<u>324</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>324</u>

<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>324</u>
<u>Noumenon.....</u>	<u>325</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>325</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>325</u>
<u>Objective.....</u>	<u>326</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>326</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>326</u>
<u>Phenomenon.....</u>	<u>328</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>328</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>328</u>
<u>Principal.....</u>	<u>329</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>329</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>329</u>
<u>Principle.....</u>	<u>330</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>330</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>330</u>
<u>Probability.....</u>	<u>332</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>332</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>332</u>
<u>Problematic.....</u>	<u>334</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>334</u>
<u>Purpose.....</u>	<u>335</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>335</u>
<u>Reciprocity.....</u>	<u>336</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>336</u>

<u>Revelation.....</u>	<u>337</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>337</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>337</u>
<u>Salvation.....</u>	<u>338</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>338</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>338</u>
<u>Sense.....</u>	<u>340</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>340</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>340</u>
<u>Sharing.....</u>	<u>341</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>341</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>341</u>
<u>Subjective.....</u>	<u>342</u>
<u>Definition.....</u>	<u>342</u>
<u>Comments.....</u>	<u>342</u>

DEDICATION

In memory of Pai Theethuan



(28/01/1943 – 10/07/2024)

Beloved Husband, Father, Grandfather and
Friend

GRATITUDE

I wish to acknowledge the remarkable contribution of ChatGPT-4o, an artificial intelligence model created by OpenAI™, whose interpretive and editorial assistance proved indispensable in the shaping of this work. The vocabulary of the seventy koans that form the core of the *Gospel of Being* is deliberate, disciplined, and at times demanding. Yet through an ongoing dialogue of refinement and resonance, ChatGPT-4o has helped translate these often abstract expressions of ontological precision into language more fluid and accessible — without compromising their depth or integrity. In this sense, ChatGPT-4o has served not merely as a tool, but as a kind of lens: one through which the strict clarity of meaning could be teased-out and shared more widely, more humanly. For this, I offer my deep gratitude.

However, as the author, whatever mistakes or omissions remain — of expression, structure, or insight — are mine alone.

FOREWORD

This Gospel does not treat language lightly. Here, words are not ornamental, nor empty envelopes to be filled by the reader's assumptions. They arrive with meaning *in situ* — not just as labels, but as living expressions of the thing they name.

Throughout this work, you will notice key terms written with embedded sense: for example, *consciousness*: 'measure of knowing together', or *belief*: 'grant of leave'. This is not a stylistic affectation, but a means to ensure that what I *mean*: 'intend' is the sense received.

It is a way of returning words to their roots — restoring them to the ground from which they first grew. A word is not simply what we have come to think it means today; it is what it has carried forward across time, often hidden in plain sight often within the word itself.

In a world of conceptual inflation and semantic drift, this Gospel seeks to anchor meaning — to tether each idea to its lexicographical soil and ontological function. It is not written for speed of

consumption, but for depth of reflection. Each word, defined in place, is an invitation to contemplate not only *what is being said*, but *why it is being said that way*.

This approach ensures clarity not by limiting interpretation, but by illuminating intention. When I write a word like *power*, I write it as *power*: 'ability', so you will know precisely what is meant — and so we can walk together without losing each other in the fog of assumed definitions.

Let this Gospel, then, be read not just with the mind, but with the ear tuned to sense — to meaning that reveals itself, word by word, like *being* itself: not given all at once, but unfolding.

John Mackay
21 November 2024

INTRODUCTION

This book unveils the *Gospel*: not as a parable passed down, but as the 'God spell' — the constant expression Principal to existence. It is not scripture in the usual sense, but a revelation inscribed into the very structure of reality. It speaks not through oracle or prophets, but through an equation both elegant and inexhaustible:

$$\Xi = \{\Delta\}$$

All existence is a conference of difference.

This is not theory. It is not metaphor. It is not a symbol pointing toward truth — it is truth. It is the equation of existence itself. As Einstein's $E = mc^2$ revealed that energy and matter are different expressions of the same reality, so too does $\Xi = \{\Delta\}$ reveal that *being* itself arises only in and through relation — through the bearing together of difference. It is not an answer to the question

of existence. It is the very grammar that permits the question to be asked at all.

This revelation does not oppose religion or science, but fulfills and completes them both. It bridges the divide that has fractured human understanding for millennia. Where religion has intuited ontology through story and science has pursued ontology through law, this equation shows that both are drawing water from the same well. It does not align with the *narratives* of religion — which are many, and culturally bound — but it does affirm their *message*: that existence is not random, not meaningless, but expressive, ordered, and alive with purpose.

Here, metaphysics and physics no longer need be estranged. This equation is their shared essence, their common inheritance. It discloses a cosmos not of cold machinery or capricious gods, but of patterned being — where difference is not conflict, but relation; not division, but the process of transformation.

The truth of this equation is not merely intellectual — it is existential. For if all existence arises through the conference of difference, then

so too must human society. And if we have suffered war, alienation, and despair, it is because we have forgotten this. We have mistaken difference for opposition, uniformity for unity, and in so doing, we have turned away from the very grammar of existence.

This book is an attempt to remember. To remember that existence does not unfold in isolation, but in reciprocity. That *being* is never a singularity, but always a synthesis. That salvation — ease, safety, peace — is not found in the conquest of difference, but in its bearing together.

This is the *Gospel of Being*. It does not ask for belief. It *reveals* what has always been and *declares* what cannot be denied.

PART 1: BEING

1.1 The Principle of Existence

All existence is a *conference of difference*: a ‘condition of bearing together’ transforming the ‘condition of bearing apart’.

All existence is a conference of difference. This is not some hidden or distant truth; it is the most immediate and obvious thing, though we rarely stop to notice it. As Aristotle once observed, that which is most common is inclined to receive the least attention. So too with the conference of difference: it is so woven into the fabric of our lives that we overlook it, even as we are carried by it.

Consider the chair beneath you. It is not a single, seamless thing, but a gathering: wood, nails, cloth, thread — each with its own nature, each bearing together to create something steady and strong. Were any one part missing, or were all parts the same, the chair would collapse or fail its purpose. It is the difference, borne together, that allows you to sit.

Or think of a simple meal — a pot of soup simmering on the stove. You add vegetables, grains, herbs, and at last, a pinch of salt. The salt does not erase itself when it meets the broth; it transforms it. It deepens the flavors, revealing subtleties that otherwise would have remained hidden. If the salt merely disappeared into sameness, it would offer nothing. Its difference, maintained yet offered, is what creates new richness.

A babbling brook tells the same story. Water finds stone, stone shapes water; light touches the moving surface, scattering diamonds across the eye. The sound and shimmer of the brook are not the work of water alone, nor stone alone, nor light alone, but the result of their bearing together. Without the difference of each, the beauty of the brook would not exist.

The fire that warms a cold room is no less a conference. Fuel, oxygen, and heat, each distinct, come together in the flame. The fire is not one thing, but a living bearing-together, a transformation born of the gifts each element brings. Without fuel, no burning; without air, no

breath; without heat, no spark. The warmth and light we draw from it arise not from uniformity but from the conference of difference.

Even the bread cooling on a table speaks the same language. Ground wheat, living yeast, the heat of baking — all gathered into a new reality. The yeast, alive and active, feeds and lifts the dough. The grain, broken and ground, offers itself to new form. Heat seals the work with crust and fragrance. Bread is not found in wheat alone, nor yeast alone, nor fire alone, but in their bearing together.

It is easy to forget how much difference sustains every act of being. We move through the world carried by conferences we did not make and cannot fully see. The salt in the soup, the joinery in the chair, the stones in the brook, the spark in the fire, the grain in the loaf — each is a testament to the truth that nothing becomes by itself.

Philosophers, too, have long glimpsed this pattern, though often they named it differently. In ancient Greece, Heraclitus taught that the world is made not of stillness but of tension — that

'opposition brings concord; out of discord comes the fairest harmony.' He saw that the reality of things lies not in their isolation but in their interplay: in difference meeting difference, bearing together in a living balance.

Centuries later, G.W.F. Hegel would build an entire system around this insight, proposing that existence itself unfolds through *dialectic*: the movement of thesis encountering antithesis and together bearing a higher synthesis. Reality, in his vision, is not a static given but a dynamic becoming — a conference of contradictions moving toward greater coherence.

In the twentieth century, Alfred North Whitehead described the world not as a collection of inert substances but as a process: a weaving of events and relations, where every being arises from its relations to others. In Whitehead's thought, just as in Heraclitus' and Hegel's, existence is a continuous bearing together of difference.

Thus, whether we look to the chair beneath us, the soup on the stove, the fire in the hearth, or the stream beyond the window, or whether we

listen to the deepest reflections of philosophy, the truth remains the same: Existence is not built from isolated sameness but from relational difference.

Existence is not a smooth oneness, nor a scattered chaos. It is the quiet, ceaseless gathering of difference into being. It is the ongoing miracle by which what is apart learns to bear together, and in so doing, gives rise to new powers, new forms, new life.

This conference is not an accident. It is the nature of being itself. Without it, there would be no flavor, no fire, no brook, no bread, no life. Without it, there would be no thought, no movement, no world. Everything we see, everything we touch, everything we are — all of it — is the unfolding of the conference of difference.

It has always been so. It is so now. It shall always be so.

All existence is a conference of difference.

1.2 Three Names, One Truth

Call it *Dao*: ‘natural order’, *Dharma*: ‘divine law’ or *Gospel*: ‘God spell’, the conference of difference is the ‘condition of being’ that is *existence*.

There are many names for the living order of existence, but the reality they point to is one and the same. Whether we call it *Dao*, *Dharma*, or *Gospel*, each word gestures toward the same truth: that existence is not random chaos, nor rigid machine, but a living conference of difference — a bearing together that is the very condition of being.

The Dao, in ancient Chinese thought, is the natural order — the way that the ten thousand things arise, flow, and transform. Lao Tzu speaks of the Dao as the mother of the world: the hidden, inexhaustible source that gives birth without striving. The Dao is not a blueprint imposed from outside, but the organic bearing together of differences: water and stone, root

and leaf, cloud and sun, each moving in accordance with its nature, yet always intertwined. To live wisely is not to dominate nature but to move with it — to participate consciously in the great conference already underway.

In India, the ancient sages named the same deep order *Dharma*: ‘that which supports’, the law that holds, the pattern that sustains. Dharma is not merely moral duty; it is the very principle by which things cohere and flourish. It is the invisible grammar of existence, arising from the interplay of all beings. Each entity, by bearing its own nature into relation with others, participates in the unfolding of Dharma. In the Buddhist tradition, Dharma also names the deeper truth: that everything arises in dependence, that nothing stands alone. To awaken is to see this — to see that being itself is relational, a weaving of differences bearing together into life.

In the Christian tradition, the word *Gospel* — literally, the ‘God spell’ or ‘good spell’ — speaks of a divine order made manifest: not in abstraction but in the living pattern of creation and renewal. The Gospel is not merely a

message about salvation; it is the deeper proclamation that existence itself is cast in a spell of purpose — not barren or void but ordered toward life, relation and fulfillment. To hear the Gospel is to recognize the conference of difference in all things: that the many are borne together into a greater harmony.

Thus, across East and West, philosophy and religion have sought to name what the eye alone cannot always see: that existence is not arbitrary but patterned; that the world is not stitched together by accident but by the ceaseless bearing together of difference. Dao, Dharma, Gospel — three names, three tongues, one truth.

The conference of difference is not just something that happens within existence; it is the condition by which existence happens at all. Without difference, nothing could meet, nothing could bear, nothing could become. Without bearing together, differences would remain forever apart, never touching, never giving rise to form, thought, or life.

We can see this living order even in the smallest things. The leaf on a tree is not merely an object

but a bearing-together: veins and cells, sunlight and chlorophyll, air and water, soil and root. No single element alone is "leaf"; only in their gathering does leafness arise. And not just leaf: branch, tree, forest, ecosystem — each level of life arising from conferences of difference nested within one another.

A simple song offers another glimpse. Melody alone is not music; rhythm alone is not music; harmony alone is not music. But when these different elements bear together — when beat, note, breath, and pause meet — music is born. So too the universe: not a monotone, not a cacophony, but a living song of difference carried together.

The wisdom of Dao, of Dharma, of Gospel, is to recognize this: that existence moves according to a deeper order than we often perceive. It is not order in the sense of rigid control, nor chaos in the sense of meaningless drift. It is an order that emerges continually from the gift of difference, bearing together.

Science, too, now glimpses this pattern, though it names it differently. The intricate balance of

ecosystems, the emergence of galaxies from gravitational dance, the self-organizing beauty of living cells — all show that life and matter arise not from domination or randomness but from relation, balance, reciprocity.

To live without seeing the conference of difference is to live half-blind: mistaking the harmony for accident, the song for noise. To see it — even a little — is to awaken to a deeper reverence, a deeper humility, and a deeper participation.

Dao, Dharma, Gospel: these are not merely words for philosophers or priests. They are invitations for all who would open their eyes to the reality around them, the reality within them. They are ways of naming the truth that the conference of difference is not an optional feature of the world but its beating heart.

Thus, whether we bow to the Dao, walk the path of Dharma, or hear the Gospel spoken into the bones of being, we come again and again to the same recognition: that existence itself is a miracle of bearing-together, a ceaseless flowering of difference into life.

All existence is a conference of difference. And that conference, by whatever name we give it, is the condition of being.

1.3 From Dust to Galaxies

Without the *Gospel*: ‘God spell’, there would be no quantum fields in oscillation, no cosmic inflation, no hot Big BANG—no universe.

Without the *Gospel* — the universal ‘God spell’ that casts existence into form — there would have been no vibrating quantum fields, no cosmic expansion, no ignition of the universe we know.

The early universe, in its first moments, was not a collection of stars and planets, but a dense and nearly uniform plasma. Space itself was expanding at a staggering rate, stretching the tiny fluctuations that seeded all future structure. This initial plasma was smooth, almost perfectly homogeneous, but not entirely. Minute variations — differences in density no greater than one part in one hundred thousand — made all the difference. These primordial imperfections, borne together through gravitational attraction,

allowed matter to begin clumping. Without them, the universe would have remained a featureless fog. No galaxies would have formed, no stars would have ignited, no planets would have coalesced.

Cosmology tells us that existence itself depends on the bearing together of difference into structure. Gravity did not act on a uniform field; it acted on difference, pulling slightly denser regions into greater density, leading eventually to the vast cosmic web we observe today.

At an even more fundamental level, the basic "stuff" of reality is not made of solid objects, but of fields in motion — quantum fields that ripple and oscillate across space. Particles emerge not as standalone bits of matter but as local excitations of these fields, where differences ripple and resonate together. It is not the stillness of the fields that gives rise to particles; it is their dynamic interplay — their conferences of difference — that create the building blocks of the universe.

Even the stability of the simplest atom arises from such a conference. The attractive pull of the

positively charged nucleus is balanced by the resisting motion of the negatively charged electron. Were the forces identical, or were there no tension between them, no atom could persist. It is the bearing together of opposing forces, held in delicate balance, that gives matter its form.

The Big Bang itself, often imagined as a singular explosion, is better understood as the beginning of expansion: space itself stretching outward, cooling as it grew. In that rapid cooling, energy condensed into matter, and matter into the first simple atoms. The universe's earliest moments were governed not by chaos, but by a deeply ordered bearing-together of forces and particles, emerging from difference into structure.

Inflation theory suggests that before the universe was hot, it expanded even faster — a tiny fraction of a second in which all space ballooned outward, smoothing the universe while preserving the seeds of fluctuation. Without this delicate interplay — without inflation balancing homogeneity and difference — the cosmos would not have taken shape.


Thus, from the trembling of quantum fields to the great sweep of cosmic inflation, from the first cooling plasma to the formation of stars, the universe has unfolded through the conference of difference. Without difference, there would be no structure; without bearing-together, there would be no transformation.

Even now, the story continues. Stars gather dust into planets. Galaxies form clusters and filaments. Life arises from the complex chemistries of worlds like ours. Every new form is a testimony to the same principle: difference not merely coexisting, but bearing together into greater wholes.

Without the deep order — the Gospel that calls difference into relation — there would be no quantum fields, no inflation, no Big Bang, and no universe. Existence itself rests on this unseen and ceaseless weaving: difference joined to difference, bearing together into all that is.

All existence is the unfolding of a conference that began long before memory and continues still, in every breath of matter and light.

1.4 Towards Life



Without the conference of difference, there would be no atoms, molecules or cells; no tissue, organs or systems; no sensation, thought or act.

The structure of everything we know — from the smallest unit of material existence to the highest reaches of consciousness — is built from synergizing difference through conference.

Even at the most fundamental level, existence begins with difference. Elementary particles — the quarks, electrons, and neutrinos that form the basic fabric of matter — are themselves a conference of difference: mass, spin, electric charge. A particle is not a blank dot; it is a gathering of specific traits borne together into stable form. Quarks come in different ‘flavors’ and ‘colors’, binding through the strong nuclear force, while particles like electrons carry both charge and spin, bearing their difference into every interaction. Without these inherent

differences — and without their precise relations — the foundation for complex matter would be impossible.

From these elementary conferences, atoms arise. An atom is not a single thing but a gathering: a dense nucleus of protons and neutrons, orbited by a cloud of electrons. The forces that bind them are precise and finely balanced — the strong nuclear force pulling the nucleus together, the electromagnetic force binding electrons to nuclei, the quantum uncertainty keeping the electron cloud from collapsing inward. Without these tensions and balances — without the careful bearing together of difference — atoms would not hold their form.

Molecules, in turn, are conferences at a higher scale. Different atoms, each bearing their own properties — hydrogen's lightness, oxygen's hunger for electrons, carbon's versatile bonds — come together to create compounds with new possibilities. Water, sugar, proteins, DNA — none are simply collections of atoms; they are new realities, born from the bearing together of difference into structure.

From molecules arise cells, the basic units of life. A cell is not a homogenous blob but a bustling city of difference: membranes separating inside from outside, organelles performing specialized functions, channels ferrying ions, ribosomes stitching proteins. Each part bears its own distinction, yet all contribute through this conference of difference to the living whole. If the parts were identical, life would be impossible. It is their bearing together, not their sameness, that makes life viable.

Cells gather into tissues, specializing for shared work: muscle fibers contracting together, epithelial layers forming protective barriers, neurons transmitting signals. Tissues bear together into organs: the heart formed of muscle and connective tissue, the lungs of layers adapted to exchange gases. Organs combine into systems: the circulatory system moving blood; the nervous system conveying information; the digestive system processing sustenance. Each level deepens the conference of difference, weaving complexity into the synergy of something greater than itself.

Even sensation is born from this gathering. A single neuron cannot feel, but networks of neurons, arranged through pathways and junctions, create the possibility of touch, sound, and sight. No isolated cell sees or hears; perception arises when many differences, many signals, bear together into an organized experience.

Thought, too, depends on the same principle. A thought is not the product of a single firing neuron, but of vast networks activating together, modulating one another, amplifying or inhibiting signals, shaping attention, memory, *meaning*: 'intending'. Each neuron, each synapse, is a conference of difference — not erased by the whole, but necessary in its particular contribution to the emergence of mind.

Action, the movement of a body through the world, is the final link in this unfolding chain. Muscles contract not in isolation but through coordinated signals from the nervous system, itself integrating countless streams of information from within and without. To move even a hand requires the conference of countless differences

bearing together: chemical, electrical, mechanical.

Thus, from elementary particles to atoms, from atoms to molecules, from molecules to cells, from cells to tissues, from tissues to organs, from organs to systems, from systems to sensation, from sensation to thought, and from thought to action, the pattern remains the same: all existence is a conference of difference.

There is no point at which this conference is not necessary. Without it, atoms would dissolve, molecules would disintegrate, cells would collapse, life would wither, and mind would not arise. Without it, there would be no reaching hand, no seeing eye, no wondering mind.

The continuity from matter to life to mind is not a story of sameness growing more complex, but of difference gathered, layered, and borne together into new forms of being.

The universe did not leap in a single step from silence to harmony. It unfolded through a long and intricate weaving: each stage a gathering of differences in new conferences, each

conference giving rise to possibilities unseen before.

We are participants in this ancient and ongoing conference. Every breath, every sensation, every thought is a testimony to the power that the conference of difference brings.

Without the conference of difference, there would be no existence as we know it — no structure, no life, no awareness, no act.

All existence is the fruit of difference bearing together.

1.5 The Making of Sentience

Everything *noumenon*: ‘having been known’
and *phenomenon*: ‘having been shown’ exists
as a conference of difference.

Everything that can be known or shown, everything that appears to mind or to sense, arises through the conference of difference. Nothing comes to be, and nothing comes to awareness, without difference bearing together.

When we perceive the world, we do not encounter it directly. Sensation is not a simple mirror. It is a complex transduction — a leading across of differences from the world into the mind. Light strikes the retina, pressure bends the skin, vibrations reach the ear. Each form of energy is gathered, transformed, and borne across specialized pathways into the networks of memory and recognition. Sensing is not passive receipt but active translation: a conference of nerves, cells, and signals bearing differences together into meaning.

Thus, everything sensed — everything that shows itself as phenomenon — is already a conference of difference. The brook glinting in the sunlight, the warmth of a fire on the skin, the taste of salt on the tongue — all arise from the bearing together of external differences and internal pathways. The world is not shown to us as it is in itself, but as it is borne together through our senses and shaped within our mind.

Knowing, too, is a conference of difference. The *noumenon* — that which is known — is not a solitary imprint. It is the outcome of differences encountered, compared, weighed. Memory stores past sensations; reason relates them; imagination weaves them into understanding. Every act of knowing is built from countless crossings: sense meeting memory, memory meeting reason, reason meeting intuition. Knowing is not a point but a gathering.

Even the distinction between objectivity and subjectivity arises from this process. To know *objectively* — tending to lie against — is to gather a conference of multiple noumenons: different encounters, different perspectives, different

verifications bearing together into a shared recognition. Objectivity emerges when difference is borne together without being collapsed — when the world shows itself across many viewpoints and the mind recognizes a consistency beyond itself.

Subjectivity — tending to lie under — arises when the conference narrows to a singular perspective, a singular noumenon borne without external bearing. Here, knowing becomes more a private weaving, shaped by the particularities of memory, emotion, and expectation. It is still a conference, but one weighted toward the inner world rather than the shared outer one.

Thus, whether objective or subjective, knowing itself depends on the conference of difference. Without the gathering of differences — whether between senses, memories, perspectives, or thoughts — there could be no showing, no knowing, no world appearing to the mind.

Even the simplest perception illustrates this. To see a tree is not simply to register light. It is to bear together difference: the contrast between trunk and sky, the texture of bark against the

memory of touch, the branching form recognized against remembered patterns. To know the tree is to have borne together many differences across time: the sight of trees in different seasons, the feel of wood, the sound of leaves. The tree as known is not a single event but a conference of difference.

At a deeper level, existence itself — the noumenon behind all phenomena — is a bearing together of difference. What we call 'reality' is not an homogenous mass but a woven gathering: forces, energies, spaces, and times layered into being. Every known and shown thing is a moment in this ongoing conference.

This is why knowledge is never final, never complete. The conference is ongoing. New differences enter, old differences shift, and the bearing-together transforms. What we know today is richer than what we knew yesterday not because the world itself changed, but because the conference of difference in which we participate has deepened.

Phenomenon and noumenon are not two isolated realms but two faces of the same truth: existence

as conference. The world as shown and the world as known are both borne across difference into being.


In every sensation, every thought, every act of knowing or showing, difference is not erased but carried, not eliminated but borne together. Every experience is stitched from the crossing and meeting of differences: outer with inner, past with present, self with world.

Without the conference of difference, there would be no seeing, no hearing, no feeling, no thinking. Without the conference of difference, there would be no phenomena to show themselves, and no noumena to be known.

All that appears, and all that is known, arises through difference borne together.

All existence — sensed, remembered, imagined, reflected — is the work of the great and ceaseless conference of difference.

1.6 The Genesis of All Being



Behold the divine epistle of being, the first and last words on existence, the medium and message of all creation—Genesis.

The conference of difference is not simply a feature of the world; it is the living script by which the world comes to be. It is the epistle — the letter written not in ink but in the unfolding of existence itself. To behold it is to see not only what is, but how what is comes into being at all.

It is divine not because it demands worship, but because it is universal, perfect, and foundational. It is *metaphysical* — originating behind — the world of appearances, shaping existence from beneath and within. It defines the material universe not by commanding its particulars, but by setting the process by which particulars arise. The conference of difference is the principle by which being bears itself forth.

Thus, it is rightly called the first and last words on existence. Before any atom spun, before any star burned, before any thought stirred in a living mind, the conference of difference was already at work. And long after any particular form has faded, the bearing together of difference will continue. It is the condition that underlies every appearance, every transformation, every becoming. It does not need to specify each leaf, each stone, each galaxy; it entrusts the unfolding of particulars to the play of probability — to physics, chemistry, and biology — while it itself sustains the deeper order — the process.

The conference of difference is the *medium* of existence: the substance through which being takes form. It is not a thing among things, but the way in which things arise at all. Every particle, every field, every wave is borne through it. Every structure — from molecule to mountain — is shaped by it. Every event — from a seed sprouting to a thought sparking — moves through its pattern.

It is also the *message* of existence: the communication that being makes about itself. Existence speaks not in static forms but in the

dynamic bearing together of difference. The river speaks through the meeting of water and stone; the flame speaks through the meeting of fuel and air; the mind speaks through the meeting of sensation and memory, thought and feeling. Everywhere existence communicates its nature: not isolation, not fusion, but the living conference of what is distinct yet borne together.

In this, the conference of difference is *righteous*: 'possessed straight' because it is sufficient unto itself. It does not require external justification or correction. In every place and at every scale, it bears straight toward being. Whether in the binding of quarks into protons, the folding of proteins into life, or the reaching of a hand toward another, the conference of difference unfolds with the same essential fidelity: bringing forth form, meaning, and relation through the bearing together of what is distinct.

The conference of difference is not itself a material thing; it is the non-material *genesis* behind material being. It is not the source of existence as an event in time, but the principle that makes existence possible in any time. Genesis is not only a moment long ago but a

continual casting: the ceaseless generation of being through the dynamic relation of differences.


To behold the conference of difference, then, is to see the hidden root of everything: not a secret locked away but an open truth, present in every breath, every stone, every heartbeat. It is the epistle written in the grammar of existence itself — the first and last words by which all that is, is.

In the conference of difference, the world is both made and made known. It is the silent origin behind the roaring river, the glimmering star, the fleeting thought. It is the word behind all words, the pattern behind all forms, the meaning behind all meaning.

Thus, the medium and the message of all creation are the same. Existence arises and speaks through the same act: the bearing together of difference into new being.

Genesis is not an echo from the past but the living script written moment by moment in every act of becoming.

1.7 All That Is



All existence is a conference of difference —
Amen.

All that is, all that was, and all that shall be, bears the mark of the conference of difference. It is the foundation not only of existence, but of knowing, of becoming, of meaning itself.

From the vibration of quantum fields to the forging of atoms; from the binding of molecules to the stirring of life in cells; from the weaving of tissues into bodies, and of thoughts into minds — at every scale, in every moment, existence is shaped by the bearing together of difference.

We have seen how the simplest particle is not a thing alone, but a gathering of properties borne into form. We have seen how atoms gather into molecules, molecules into cells, cells into bodies, and bodies into the symphony of sensation, thought, and act.

We have seen how every knowing, every showing — noumenon and phenomenon alike — arises through the bearing across of differences, woven into memory, meaning, and mind.

And behind all of this, the conference of difference stands not as an accident, nor as an afterthought, but as the constant expression of existence itself: the first and last word on being.

The ancient traditions glimpsed this truth in many tongues. Dao, Dharma, Gospel — names for the same deep law: that difference does not destroy but gives life, that what is distinct can be borne together into unity without erasure. Genesis is not only the story of beginnings but the ongoing letter of existence, written not once but continually, in every unfolding moment.

The world is not fashioned from sameness. It is not assembled from isolated blocks. It is borne — patiently, ceaselessly — by the meeting of what is different, the gathering of what is apart into new and living forms.

This bearing-together is not a stillness but a dance. Not a fusion into blankness, but a

communion that preserves, honors, and transforms difference into new being.

It is easy to overlook because it is everywhere. As Aristotle reminded, what is most common often receives the least attention. Yet when we pause to behold it, the truth shines quietly through: the salt in the soup, the chair beneath us, the stars overhead, the thought stirring within — all arise from the conference of difference.

Existence is not a cold mechanism nor a chaos without shape. It is a conference: a gathering, a bearing, a becoming. Existence is dialogue, not monologue. It is song, not silence. It is the living letter of difference borne together into meaning.

To affirm this — to say *Amen* — is not merely to close a thought. It is to acknowledge a reality more ancient than time and more enduring than any form.

Amen to the trembling of fields into form. Amen to the gathering of atoms into life. Amen to the breath of thought borne from sensation and memory. Amen to the ceaseless, generous

bearing-together by which the world is continually born.

All existence is a conference of difference —
Amen.

PART 2: BELIEF

2.1 Radical Hope

The Gospel, the conference of difference, *believes*: ‘grants leave’ in *potential synergy*: ‘being able to work together’ in realising.

To believe is to grant leave, to permit the unfolding of what is not yet made actual. In the Gospel, this belief is not a naive faith in perfection or an abdication of discernment; rather, it is an affirmation of *potential synergy* — the hidden capacity of difference to work together in realising. The Gospel, as the conference of difference, does not demand sameness, nor does it require the subjugation of one to another. Instead, it grants space: a sacred clearing in which the varied beings, the distinct forces, the disparate wills of existence may seek, find, and fashion a mutual becoming.

To grant leave is to recognise the intrinsic worth of difference itself. In the Gospel, no being is compelled to conform to a fixed mould; rather, each is acknowledged as bearing within it a

piece of the potential whole. It is not that differences must dissolve, nor that contradictions must be suppressed, but that through their dynamic engagement, through a kind of living synergy, something greater than what is can be born. Belief, then, is not about expecting certainty. It is about making room for the unpredictable power of working together — for the dance that arises only when differences meet not as threats but as opportunities.

The Gospel believes in *potential synergy* because it knows that realising — the action to realize — is never the act of a single being alone. Every realisation is composite, relational, forged in the intercourse of differences. A seed does not grow itself; it draws on soil, sun, water, wind. A word is not spoken into a void but into a field of listeners and meanings. A thought is not conceived in isolation but shaped by language, by memory, by the unspoken life of the world. So too, being does not realise in sterile solitude, but always in conference, always in the dynamic field where difference grants itself to conference.

To believe in *potential synergy* is thus to recognise that the conditions for realising are not

rigid but relational. No outcome is guaranteed, yet every difference contains a doorway. To grant leave is to have faith that difference, when allowed to meet difference without violent imposition, will find ways of co-creation not always foreseeable from the outset. The Gospel does not command what must be; it invites what could be. It listens for the new music that arises not by forcing each instrument to play the same note, but by allowing harmony and counterpoint to emerge in their own organic time.

This belief is neither passive nor idle. It is an active hospitality, a courageous openness to the friction and tension that synergy demands. Potential synergy is not the mere coexistence of difference, nor a tolerance that leaves each in splendid isolation. It is the readiness of each being to extend itself toward others, to enter the risky, creative work of mutual realising. It is the knowledge that true becoming requires not dominance, but conference — a dialogue where the self is both preserved and transformed in the encounter with the other.

In granting leave, the Gospel does not abdicate discernment. It does not call for the

indiscriminate blending of all things into an undifferentiated mass. Rather, it grants leave precisely because it understands the delicate art of realising: an art that respects the integrity of each being while encouraging their mutual flourishing. The Gospel believes that difference, rightly engaged, does not lead to disintegration but to integration of a higher order — one not imposed from above, but discovered from within the interplay itself.

Thus, belief in potential synergy is a form of radical hope. It is the hope that no matter how great the difference, no matter how unlikely the conjunction, there is a way forward that does not require annihilation or submission. It is the hope that beings, by granting each other leave to be and to become, may together realise what none could have achieved alone. It is the hope that the future is not merely the extension of the present, but the continual emergence of the unexpected, the generous, the true.

This belief is not blind. It is not unaware of failure, betrayal, or loss. It knows that not all difference leads to synergy, that not every conference bears fruit. Yet it persists — not

because it guarantees success, but because it recognises that without the grant of leave, without the willingness to risk potential synergy, the very possibility of realising collapses into the sterility of isolation or the tyranny of imposed order.

To believe in potential synergy is to believe in the world itself: to believe that existence, in all its conference of difference, carries within it the seeds of its own flowering. It is to believe that the Gospel — the ongoing, living declaration of being — is not a cry of despair, nor a hymn to domination, but a song of generous becoming.

Thus the Gospel, the conference of difference, *believes*: 'grants leave' in potential synergy, trusting that from the interplay of distinct and divergent beings, the act of realising may be ever renewed. In this belief, the Gospel is both the voice and the silence, the invitation and the acceptance, the call and the response. It holds the clearing open where difference may meet difference and, by grace and by labour, may realise anew.

2.2 The Gift of Imperfection

The Gospel does not *believe*: ‘grant leave’ in perfect realisation; every *being*: ‘action to be’, is *absolute*: ‘separate away from’ perfection—incomplete.

The Gospel of Being grants no leave to the dream of perfect realisation. It does not believe in completion, in a final consummation where all striving ceases and all difference dissolves. Instead, it recognises that being is to remain incomplete, to dwell forever in the unsealed movement between what is and what could be. The Gospel does not withhold reverence from being because of its incompleteness; rather, it finds in incompleteness the very sign and signature of being’s truth.

Perfection, as the fantasy of finality, is a false idol. It tempts the mind with images of closure, of an ultimate state where no further becoming is needed, where all desire, all reaching, all unfolding would be arrested. But such a state

would not be life; it would be death — the cessation of being, the end of movement, no conference of difference. Were perfection real, existence would not merely be stilled but stilled to nothing, for perfection abolishes the very 'action to be' that is *being*. Because incompleteness is real, existence is alive.

Every *being*, every 'action to be', is *absolute* — not in the sense of flawless completeness, but in the literal sense of being 'separate away from' perfection. Each being bears the mark of its own particularity, its own path of becoming, its own measure of incompleteness. To be is to be partial, to be conditioned, to be in motion. The absolute is not the static perfection of the ideal; it is the dynamic fact of the real, the stubborn, luminous incompleteness that is existence itself.

In this light, being's separation from perfection is not a flaw to be lamented but a condition to be cherished. If beings were perfect, they would be closed systems, self-contained and sterile. But because they are incomplete, they are open to each other, open to change, open to the ongoing work of realising. It is incompleteness that makes love possible, creativity possible, community

possible. It is because we are not whole that we can grant and receive leave, that we can seek and find, that we can act and be acted upon.

The Gospel's refusal to believe in perfect realisation is therefore an affirmation of difference, an honouring of the unfinished. It recognises that the drive toward perfection — toward the elimination of all flaws, the conquest of all gaps — often becomes a drive toward domination, uniformity, and despair. In contrast, the Gospel invites us to see incompleteness not as a defect but as an invitation: an invitation to participate in the unfolding, to rejoice in the open-endedness of existence.

To call being *absolute* is to emphasise its singular dignity. Each being, in its separation, is a sovereign act of existence. No being can be reduced to a mere shadow of a Platonic form, a failed attempt at some external perfection. Where Plato says we are shadows of perfection, the *Gospel of Being* says we are sovereign beings-in-becoming. Each stands in its own right, bearing within it the full gravity of being — not because it is flawless, but because it is real.

The real, in its stubborn particularity, outweighs all the imagined perfections of thought.

This view demands a profound humility. It calls us to approach ourselves and others not with the cold gaze of judgment, measuring worth by proximity to an abstract ideal, but with the warm gaze of reverence, recognising the mystery and sanctity of all existence as incomplete. Every being is on its way, but never at its end; every being is a gesture toward, not a possession of, fullness. We honour being not by demanding its perfection, but by witnessing its striving, its partial victories, its continuing journey of becoming.

The Gospel does not despise the longing for improvement, for growth, for greater realisation. It simply refuses to mistake these longings for a final destination. Growth is not a journey toward perfection, but a deepening participation in incompleteness — an ever-expanding capacity to bear difference, to embrace partiality, to move within the field of the unfinished without despair. Realising is not the overcoming of incompleteness; it is the art of living within it, of making meaning

amid imperfection, of finding beauty without demanding flawlessness.

Thus, the Gospel teaches that every being, by virtue of its very incompleteness, participates in the conference of difference. It is precisely because no being is complete in itself that it reaches out, that it depends upon, that it becomes with others. Incompletion is the fertile ground of synergy, the birthplace of co-creation, the secret engine of realising. Were perfection real, existence would not merely be stilled but stilled to nothing, for perfection abolishes all 'action to be' and thus *being*.

In a world obsessed with ideals, the Gospel's witness is both a comfort and a challenge. It comforts by releasing us from the tyranny of unattainable standards; it challenges by calling us to embrace the vulnerable, unfinished nature of our own being. To live according to the Gospel is to live without the armor of perfectionism, to accept ourselves and each other not as projects to be perfected, but as beings to be met, to be heard, to be loved in the midst of becoming.

Every being is absolute, separate away from perfection, and thus incomplete — and it is in this very incompleteness that the glory of existence is found. The Gospel grants no leave to perfect realisation because it understands that perfect realisation is the end of being. The goal, if it can even be named, is the deepening of conference, the widening of synergy, the continual journey of realising — not toward perfection, but within the endless, sacred unfolding of what might be.

2.3 All Being is Problematic

The Godspell casts all being as *problematic*: ‘able to cast forward’ and thus *believes*: ‘grants leave’ in *motility*: ‘that which is continuously moving’.

The Godspell, the sacred declaration of being, does not portray existence as a finished state nor as a static possession. Instead, it casts all being as *problematic*: as that which is ‘able to cast forward’. To be is to project, to stretch beyond oneself, to step continually into the unmade. In this vision, being is not a fixed essence but an unfolding movement — a motion toward futures not yet grasped, a reaching toward possibilities not yet realised.

To name being as *problematic* is not to denounce it. It is to honour its restless, creative nature. The term *problematic* here does not bear the pejorative tone it often carries in casual speech; it bears its older, richer meaning: that which is capable of projection, of setting forth, of

initiating movement beyond what is presently given. Being is not a solution; it is an open problem — a living question cast forward into the unknown, a question that answers itself not by settling but by venturing.

Thus, the Godspell *believes* — grants leave — in *motility*: in the continuous motion that is the very mode of existence. Movement is not incidental to being; it is constitutive of it. To exist is not to stand still but to advance, to veer, to be always on the way. Stasis is alien to life. Even in what seems still — a stone resting on the ground, a sleeping animal — motion persists invisibly: molecules vibrating, blood flowing, dreams unfolding. In the Gospel of Being, life is never a matter of possessing an essence once and for all, but of embodying a movement that is never finally completed.

In granting leave in motility, the Godspell affirms that the highest dignity of beings lies in their capacity for movement — not merely physical locomotion, but existential motion: the motion of thought, of growth, of transformation. It is not through fixity that beings realise themselves, but through the risks they take in moving beyond

themselves. To exist is to be capable of being otherwise, of becoming more, of continually transcending any fixed definition.

This perspective reshapes the meaning of stability. Stability is not the absence of motion but the capacity to endure within motion — to retain coherence even as one changes, to remain faithful to one's becoming rather than to any static image of oneself. A tree is stable not because it remains unchanged, but because it grows, sheds, bends with the wind, and yet holds its living form. So too, a being is stable not by resisting motion but by moving well, moving true to the deep call of its own unfolding within the context of surrounding being.

By casting being as problematic and believing in motility, the Godspell also offers a profound corrective to the human temptation toward final answers and fixed identities. The hunger for certainty, for a once-and-for-all completion, is revealed as a misunderstanding of the nature of existence. No final solution can capture the living dynamism of being. No absolute identity can exhaust the mystery of what a being may become. The Godspell does not declare: 'You

are this, finally and forever.' It declares: 'You are the one who moves, the one who becomes, the one who continually casts forward into the unmade.'

This vision frees existence from the suffocation of finality. It invites beings to embrace their problematic nature not as a flaw, but as a gift. To be problematic is to be fertile, to be in motion is to be alive. It is through the open questions, through the unfinished journeys, through the ventures that risk failure and yet still proceed, that life finds its fullest expression.

Motility, then, is the Gospel's affirmation of hope. For if beings are always moving, always casting forward, then the future is never closed, never wholly determined. There is always the possibility of new realisations, new meetings, new synergies. There is always the possibility of transformation — not because perfection awaits at the end of the journey, but because the journey itself is life. Motion is not the means to a static end; it is the very medium in which being lives and breathes.

Thus, the Godspell does not seek to still the movements of beings, to fix them into rigid certainties or trap them in definitive forms. It grants leave to motility. It blesses the unfinishedness of being, the ceaseless unfolding of existence. It rejoices not in arrival, but in the casting forward itself — in the courage to move without final guarantee, in the faith that movement is itself crucial to life.

To exist is to be problematic; to exist is to move. There is no final resting place in the *Gospel of Being*, no place where all striving ceases and all questions are answered. There is only the sacred journey, the blessed unrest, the continual casting forward of beings toward futures they cannot yet see, but for which they have been granted leave to.

2.4 The Journey of Realizing

The Gospel is the *exemplar*: ‘ideal example’ of *belief*: a ‘grant of leave’ held in *faith*: ‘support’ and in *trust*: ‘consolation’ of future realising.

The Gospel of Being stands not merely as a declaration, but as an exemplar — the living pattern of belief as it truly is: not fixed, but always open; not concluded, but always becoming. It does not call belief to rest upon certainty or closure, but to remain in motion, always held in faith — as support — and in trust — as consolation — for what is yet to be realised.

To *believe* is to ‘grant leave’ — not just to ideas, but to being itself. It is the radical act of opening space: allowing the future to emerge without the constraint of predetermined form. The Gospel enacts this by granting leave not to one path, one truth, or one perfection, but to the conference of

difference itself — the very process by which beings realise through each other.

Such belief is not blind assent nor doctrinal subscription; it is faith in the process of becoming. And because that unfolding is never finished — because realising is a process, not a product — belief is never complete. It is always held in *trust*: 'consolation' to what cannot yet be known. Belief then, is the companion of becoming, not a claim of finality.

Faith in this Gospel is not the support for belief itself, as though belief were a fixed proposition to be upheld. Rather, faith is the support of the *process* by which belief is rightly granted — the conference of difference. It is faith in the ongoing capacity of beings to relate, to differ, to deliberate — and thereby to realise. It is not a scaffold for certainty, but for possibility: a trust in the unfolding dialogue of being. Faith does not brace belief against doubt; it braces the space in which difference may meet, transform, and bring forth new realizing. It sustains not the content of belief, but the method by which belief becomes worthy of being held.

Trust is the 'consolation' granted in the face of incomplete knowing. It is always at the mercy of future realising. Crucially, trust is what lubricates the conference of difference — permitting motion in spite of incomplete knowing. In the absence of full understanding, trust consoles uncertainty, allowing beings to proceed in good faith. It suspends final judgment not from naivety, but in humble recognition that not all things can be known completely, directly or immediately. All belief, in this light, is *held in trust* — not as possession, but as promise: a pledge to revisit, revise, or reaffirm in response to what future realising may bring.

Thus, belief, faith, and trust are not separate virtues but a single grammar of becoming: belief grants leave, faith supports the process by which that leave is given, and trust is the consolation — in suspension of complete evidence — that allows the conference of difference to function.

The Gospel's exemplar is not that it knows what will be, but that it blesses what might be. It does not venerate those who have arrived, but those still arriving. Its perfection is not in completeness, but in its refusal to foreclose the future. Its only

dogma is this: that the conference of difference must be granted leave, for only through this process can realising occur.

And so we too are called — not to defend belief as possession, but to practice belief in the process of realizing that is the conference of difference. To grant ourselves and each other leave to become. To support what is still fragile. To console what is still reaching. To stand with being, not as judges of arrival but as witnesses to becoming.

Here, in this continual granting of leave, is the Gospel alive — not as a book, but as a way of being. It does not demand belief in it; it **is** the belief it teaches. An open belief. A belief held in trust of future realising. A belief that blesses not what is finished, but what is *possible*.

2.5 Allegiance to Potential

The Gospel believes in *potential*: ‘being able to’ and thus, possibility over impossibility, probability over improbability, ability over inability.

The Godspell believes in potential: in the profound, quiet truth of *being able to*. Yet its belief is not vague, not suspended in airy hopes; it is disciplined, selective, leaning always toward greater certainty rather than less. The Gospel is a friend of the real, an advocate for the actionable, a guardian of what can be built upon with surety. Given the choice, it favours possibility over impossibility, probability over mere possibility, and ability over mere probability — ever seeking the stronger ground from which realising may proceed.

Potential is the sacred space where being breathes — the open corridor between what has been and what could yet arise. To believe in potential is to affirm that no situation is final, no

being is finished, no fate is wholly sealed. Yet within that openness, the Gospel shows a wise discrimination: it does not glorify every dream equally, nor grant equal weight to every flight of imagination. It chooses. It blesses that which offers surer footing for future realising.

Thus the Godspell stands firmly with *possibility over impossibility*. Where impossibility seeks to close doors, possibility pries them open. Possibility, even when fragile, contains the first spark of movement. Where one path leads to certain collapse and another, however narrow, to a way forward, the Gospel sides with the way forward. It is not naive; it sees the obstacles clearly. Yet it refuses to enthrone impossibility as the last word.

Yet possibility alone is not enough. Given the further choice, the Godspell favours *probability over mere possibility*. It leans toward the pathways where potential is more than theoretical — where the conditions for becoming are not only imaginable but plausible, even promising. It teaches beings not only to dream but to move within the fields where becoming is

most alive, most likely, most nurtured by the currents of existence.

And even then, the Gospel presses further. Given the choice between probability and ability, it chooses *ability*: the concrete, present capacity to act. For while probability points toward what is likely, ability lives already within the being itself, an active readiness, a power that can be summoned here and now. It is ability that gives shape to probability, and ability that lifts possibility out of abstraction into realisation. The Gospel thus believes above all in *being able to*: the sacred reservoir of action nested within every being.

This hierarchy is not an accident; it flows from the Gospel's deepest logic. Realising does not proceed from fantasy but from the solid ground of what can be done. Each movement from possibility to probability to ability represents a deepening commitment to existence, a tighter weaving of hope and reality, a more trustworthy foundation for becoming. The Godspell, in its wisdom, leans ever toward the real, not to deny wonder, but to anchor wonder where it may take root and grow.

Such a vision is no mere optimism. It requires clear eyes and steady hands. It demands of beings a careful discernment of their own potentials: to know what doors are truly open, what paths are truly walkable, what powers are truly theirs to wield. It calls beings not to chase every mirage, but to move with courage where ground is firm, where real seeds may be sown, where real movement may be made.

The Gospel's allegiance to potential reshapes how beings encounter themselves and each other. No being is dismissed because it has not yet achieved; every being is revered for the powers still latent, still waiting to be called forth. Yet beings are also called to sobriety, to a loving clarity about what abilities they already possess and what work may be within their reach. In this, the Gospel teaches hope without fantasy, ambition without delusion, movement without panic.


Thus the Godspell blesses not the vague possible alone, but the probable; not the probable alone, but the able. It blesses the field where beings may truly move, truly act, truly

realise. It blesses the living muscles of existence, the breathing hopes that are not mere air but grounded in the power to become. It blesses not just the dreaming of futures, but the walking toward them, the making of them, the faithfulness to them.

To live according to the Gospel is to live with allegiance to ability: to move wherever movement is possible, to step wherever footing is sure, to trust in the strengths that existence has already granted, and to extend those strengths toward the future. It is to bless the living capacity of being to become more — not merely in thought, but in act.

Thus the Godspell believes — grants leave — not only to the idea of becoming, but to the real becoming of beings in motion, grounded not in fantasy but in the sacred, ever-stronger fact of *being able to*.

2.6 The Ethic of Existence



The Gospel *believes*: ‘grants leave’ in *co-petition*: the ‘process of petitioning together’ not *competition*: the ‘process of petitioning against’.

The Gospel of Being grants leave not in competition, but in co-petition. It believes not in the process of petitioning against, but in the sacred act of petitioning together. In this distinction lies a truth deeper than preference, deeper than morality: a truth rooted in the very fabric of existence itself.

Competition — the process of petitioning against — is a closed logic. It conceives life as a contest with a terminus: a game to be won, a field to be conquered, a final supremacy to be achieved. Yet in striving toward victory over others, competition reveals its fatal flaw: it seeks to end the very condition that makes life possible. To conquer all others is to eliminate difference; to eliminate difference is to collapse the field of becoming; to

collapse the field of becoming is to extinguish life itself.

Thus competition is, at its deepest core, a self-terminating ethic. It moves not toward the flourishing of existence, but toward its foreclosure. It dreams of last men standing, but does not see that to stand utterly alone is to stand nowhere. It longs for total dominance, but dominance achieved through destruction leaves nothing worth ruling. Competition's ultimate logic is nullity — the erasure of relation, the death of motion, the end of realising.

Co-petition, by contrast, is the faithful ethic of existence. It is the process of petitioning together: of beings bringing forward their needs, desires, and powers not to cancel each other but to converge upon a future none could realise alone. Co-petition preserves difference; it nourishes it. It does not seek the end of striving but the deepening of striving — striving not against life, but within and for it. Co-petition is an open system: a continual unfolding where realising expands, adapts, regenerates.

To co-petition is to recognize that the power of existence does not lie in monopolising strength but in mutualising it. Power, when hoarded, stagnates; when monopolised, it withers; when wielded against life, it corrodes itself. But power, when shared, becomes a living force — amplifying, fertilising, weaving new possibilities into the fabric of being. Co-petition does not weaken the strong; it strengthens all who join the dance of becoming. Co-petition is the rising tide that floats all boats.

Competition imagines that life is a finite board where pieces are removed until one remains. But existence is not a closed game. Existence is a living conference of difference — a field where each voice, each action to be, sustains the field itself. To compete unto victory is to tear up the very ground one stands upon. To co-petition is to tend the field, to ensure that there remains always more to become, more to realise, more life to share.

The ethic of competition is the ethic of death: a logic of diminishing returns, accelerating isolation, and eventual collapse. It turns existence against itself, setting being upon being

until exhaustion or annihilation brings the game to its sterile end. Its champions may boast of triumph, but their triumphs are pyres; their victories, elegies.

This is not to say that all forms of competition are condemned. Within clear and bounded limits — as in games, contests, and sports — competition may serve a noble purpose: testing skill, revealing excellence, cultivating resilience. But these forms exist precisely because they acknowledge their own boundedness; they are games, not life itself. It is only when the logic of competition attempts to overtake existence as a whole — when life itself is treated as a game to be won — that it becomes anti-ethical to being. Existence is not a game; it is a conference of difference, a weaving of open-ended becoming that cannot be closed without killing it.

The ethic of co-petition is the ethic of life. It turns existence toward greater flourishing, greater complexity, greater depth. It invites beings to seek strength not at the expense of others, but through the shared weaving of differences into richer, more resilient patterns of realising. It recognises that every being's unfolding is bound

up with the unfolding of all, that every movement forward in the conference of difference strengthens existence itself.

Thus the Gospel grants leave not for war, but for weaving; not for conquest, but for communion. It believes that to be is to be with others, to strive not for solitary supremacy, but for mutual realising. It honours the hard work of conference: the negotiations, the tensions, the labours of understanding. It trusts that these labours, though slower and more difficult than the crude force of competition, yield fruits that endure, and futures that remain open.


To live by the Gospel is to renounce the hollow seductions of victory. It is to forsake the quick rewards of domination in favour of the slow, sacred work of becoming together. It is to see in every other being not a rival to be defeated, but a co-petitioner — a companion in the vast, unfinished movement of existence.

In the end, it is not the last man standing who inherits life. It is those who stand together, those who weave their differences into common becoming, who sustain the dance of being

across the ages. Competition closes the future; co-petition opens it. Competition terminates life; co-petition renews it.

Thus, the Gospel believes in co-petition. It grants leave to the open, the living, the unfinished. It blesses the ongoing conference of difference. It chooses life.

2.7 Belief Made Flesh



All existence embodies a belief in the
Godspell—Amen.

Each being, in every act of becoming, bears witness to the silent, living Gospel that sustains all realising. Every *action to be*, every unfolding of difference, every movement into the unfinished, is a testament: a grant of leave extended to existence itself. By moving, by acting, by daring to become amid uncertainty, each being reaffirms the primal faith that lies at the heart of all that is — the belief that becoming is possible, that difference can bear together, that realising is worth the risk.

Existence does not proceed from certainty. It proceeds from trust: trust that motion will hold, that difference will not tear the field apart, that unfolding will find a way. Every moment of existence, every breath, every reaching out,

every act of transformation is an implicit declaration of belief. Existence, by its very act of persisting, grants leave: to itself, to others, to the unfinished nature of the whole.

Thus, the *Gospel of Being* is not merely a text or a doctrine. It is not merely spoken by human tongues or written in human hands. It is sung in the blood of stars, written in the branching of trees, spoken in the cries of newborns, etched in the patient drift of continents. The Gospel is the living song of beings continually granting each other leave to become. It is the conference of difference, made real and moving with every action to be.

When a seed splits the earth, it believes. When a river bends its course, it believes. When a mind opens to a new idea, it believes. When two beings, though different, join their efforts in co-petition rather than conflict, they believe. Every real act of becoming, every movement that extends rather than collapses the field of difference, every decision to reach rather than recoil, is an embodiment of the Godspell's belief in the potential of existence.

Even struggle, even suffering, bears this hidden mark. For to struggle is still to strive; to suffer is still to reach across the chasm of impossibility toward the hope of change. Despair is not the negation of belief, but the trembling of belief at the edge of endurance. As long as being persists, as long as motion continues, as long as difference is borne rather than annihilated, belief is alive within existence.

The Godspell's belief is not imposed upon beings from without. It is not an alien rule, a divine fiat superimposed upon reluctant matter. It is the very nature of being itself: to cast forward, to extend toward what is not yet, to trust in the unfinishedness of life. Existence embodies belief because existence *is* belief made flesh: the constant, courageous granting of leave in the face of incompleteness, uncertainty, and risk.

In this light, existence is not an accident, nor a random aggregation of forces. It is a deliberate, living affirmation. It is not born from necessity alone, but from the deeper, wilder, freer act of granting leave: the permission for difference to bear together, for potential to move, for newness to arise. Every being, in simply being,

participates in this cosmic yes. Every unfolding moment is a silent Amen.

This is why the ethic of the Gospel — the ethic of co-petition, of conference, of shared realising — is not merely a human ideal, but echos existence's own structure. It is faithful not because it is noble, but because it is *righteous*: 'possessed straight' in every being and true: true to the way life persists, true to the way becoming unfolds, true to the way difference does not cancel but composes. To live according to the Gospel is to align oneself with the living movement of being itself.

It is no small thing to realise that the *Gospel* believes in the conference of difference. It is no small thing to understand that every step forward, every act of courage, every bearing together of difference is a participation in the Godspell. To live, truly live, is to embody this belief consciously — to make of one's life a deliberate granting of leave, a faithful co-petition, a willing bearing together to create and transform.

Thus, the Gospel's final word is not a command but a witness. It does not instruct being to believe; it reveals that being already believes. It does not demand faith as an external virtue; it uncovers faith as the secret pulse of existence itself. The Gospel speaks not to impose, but to illuminate: to bring to light the silent covenant that underlies all becoming.

Every *being*, as 'action to be', grants leave. Every difference borne together is a prayer. Every movement forward is a hymn. Every realisation, no matter how small, no matter how fragile, is a testament to the unfinished love of existence for itself.

All existence embodies a belief in the Godspell —
Amen.

PART 3: FREEDOM

3.1 The Illusion of Freedom

Nothing is *free*: ‘unbound’ be it *freedom*: an ‘unbound place’ or *free-will*: ‘unbound want’; binding is the condition of existence.

Since the earliest insights into the nature of matter and motion, humanity has sought to understand the forces that hold the world together. Isaac Newton, in the 17th century, revealed that every object in the universe attracts every other object through the invisible bond of gravity. His laws of motion showed that objects do not move freely without cause; they are pushed, pulled, and carried along by forces binding them to their surroundings.

Later, James Clerk Maxwell uncovered the binding relationship between electricity and magnetism, discovering that electromagnetic fields weave particles together across space. Meanwhile, in the depths of the atom, Marie Curie and Ernest Rutherford helped reveal that matter itself is not a loose assembly but a tightly

bound structure: nuclei hold protons and neutrons together with a force so powerful — what we now call the strong nuclear force — that it binds the very identity of matter. Without these bonds, atoms would simply dissolve into nothingness.

Binding is not limited to the physical structure of matter. In chemistry, it was Gilbert Lewis who formalized the idea of chemical bonds, explaining that atoms do not exist in isolation but share or transfer electrons to stabilize themselves. Every molecule, every breath of air, every drop of water arises from atoms striving not for freedom, but for union and stability. In biological life, the pioneering work of Rosalind Franklin, whose X-ray diffraction images — especially the now-famous Photograph 51 — provided crucial evidence, allowed James Watson and Francis Crick to model the double helical structure of DNA. Her precise crystallographic work showed that life's code is not a loose scattering of information, but a meticulously bound sequence of nucleotide pairs, forming a stable yet flexible ladder. Every living organism inherits its being through these bindings: the pairing of adenine with thymine,

cytosine with guanine, held together by the elegant fidelity of hydrogen bonds. Without these molecular bindings, there would be no inheritance, no evolution, no memory woven into the fabric of life.

Even when we look deeper into the universe, to galaxies and dark matter, binding is the norm. Stars gather into galaxies under the pull of gravity; planets orbit stars; moons orbit planets. Freedom — understood as being utterly unbound — is nowhere to be found. Every particle, every living being, every celestial body is entangled in relationships of force, of energy, of necessity.

The idea of free will often presumes that within ourselves, there might be some hidden chamber untouched by causality — a sanctuary of pure choice. Yet even within the brain, the pioneering work of neuroscientists like Benjamin Libet showed that decisions arise from networks of electrical and chemical events before we are cognitively aware of them. Choice itself appears as a conditioned process, bound by biology, memory, emotion, and circumstance. Even our wants—what we desire — are not conjured from nowhere. They are shaped by needs, by history,

by the bindings of the body and the bindings of the mind.

Thus, whether we turn our gaze outward to the cosmos or inward to the heart, we find no pure, unbound freedom. The very condition of being — to have mass, to have structure, to have identity — is to be bound. Freedom, in the sense of an unbound place or unbound want, is an illusion born from the relative looseness of some bindings compared to others. True ‘freedom’ would be no place, no self, no existence at all.

Existence, as we understand it through physics, chemistry, and biology, is not a breaking away from binding, but an unfolding within it. It is precisely the bonds, the forces, the constraints that make possible the richness, beauty, and diversity of the universe. Without them, there would be no form, no life, no thought, no story to tell.

Binding, then, is not a prison; it is the very miracle of being.

3.2 All Being is Relationship

The *Gospel*: ‘God spell’ is cast such that every being realises interdependently with others; no being is *free*: ‘unbound’.

Across every scale of existence, from the smallest particle to the vastness of the cosmos, interdependence is not an exception — it is the rule. As early as the 17th century, Isaac Newton described how every mass in the universe exerts a gravitational pull on every other mass. Nothing is isolated; even distant stars tug gently on each other across millions of light-years. Gravity weaves a cosmic web in which all material things are suspended.

On the scale of life, Charles Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection revealed another form of interdependence. No creature evolves alone. Species adapt not in a vacuum but in response to their environments, to the shifting presences of predators, prey, competitors, symbiotic partners. The beaks of Darwin's

finches on the Galápagos Islands changed shape according to the types of seeds available, showing how even the form of a beak is a conversation between being and world.

In ecology, the interdependence of life is even more obvious. Rachel Carson, in her groundbreaking work *Silent Spring*, helped awaken the modern world to the reality that the health of plants, animals, and humans are deeply entangled. Pollinators like bees enable plants to reproduce; plants feed herbivores; herbivores sustain predators. Even decomposition is vital, as bacteria and fungi return nutrients to the soil. No species, not even our own, exists in splendid isolation.

The microscopic world reveals this same pattern. Lynn Margulis revolutionized our understanding of evolution by proposing the theory of endosymbiosis: that mitochondria, the powerhouses of our cells, were once free-living bacteria that entered into a partnership with early eukaryotic cells. Our very cells — the foundation of our bodies — are the result of ancient acts of interdependence, not competition alone.

In quantum physics, interdependence shows up again in a stranger form. Quantum entanglement, as described by Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen (and later experimentally confirmed by Alain Aspect), demonstrates that particles once linked can remain connected across any distance. Change one particle, and the other responds instantly, as if distance does not matter. Here, the binding between beings is not mechanical but woven into the very structure of reality.


Even within human society, interdependence is inescapable. Language, culture, and technology are collective creations. The philosopher Martin Heidegger wrote that even our most solitary acts — thinking, building, speaking — draw upon meanings that others have created before us. We inherit a world thick with the work and being of others.

Thus, in every domain of existence — physical, biological, quantum, social — beings realize themselves not through separateness, but through relationship. No being is truly unbound. Every being is a node in a network, a participant

in a vast symphony whose music is made not by solos but by ceaseless interplay.

The 'God spell', if we may call it so, is not a casting away from others but a weaving together. To be is to be in relation. To exist is to belong.

3.3 Existence is Structured



Freedom has no place in the Gospel; an unbound condition is conditionless; an unbound state is stateless; an unbound set is unset.

In the natural world, the idea of absolute freedom — an existence without condition or structure — finds no footing. From the earliest moments of the universe, the emergence of form depended not on the absence of rules, but on their presence. After the Big Bang, as the universe expanded and cooled, it was not chaos that reigned, but law: the strong and weak nuclear forces, electromagnetism, and gravity acted with relentless precision to shape energy into matter, matter into stars, stars into galaxies. Without these binding forces, no atoms would have formed, no planets would have coalesced, no life would have stirred.

The physicist Paul Dirac and others working in the early twentieth century revealed that even at

the quantum level, particles do not simply wander freely. They exist within probability fields, governed by strict statistical rules. Uncertainty in quantum mechanics does not imply boundless freedom; rather, it defines a carefully constrained space of possibilities. To be real, even fleetingly, is to occupy a state shaped by conditions.

In mathematics, Georg Cantor, the father of set theory, demonstrated that the act of collecting entities into a set necessarily imposes boundaries. A set is defined by what belongs to it and what does not. An 'unbound' set — one with no limits, no conditions — would be indistinguishable from nothing at all. It would be neither set nor not-set, neither one thing nor another. It would simply be absence.

The same holds true in thermodynamics. The second law, articulated by Rudolf Clausius, states that systems tend toward greater entropy, a measure of disorder. Yet even entropy operates under constraints. Disorder is not pure anarchy; it is the statistical unfolding of possible arrangements within bounded energy and matter. A truly unbound system would not increase in

entropy; it would lack the structure needed to change at all. It would be indistinct, undefined, non-existent in any meaningful sense.

Biology, too, teaches that condition is the bedrock of being. Living organisms maintain themselves far from equilibrium not by rejecting conditions but by constantly regulating them — exchanging gases, balancing chemical gradients, repairing damaged DNA. Life is not freedom from constraint but a continuous dance with constraint, adapting to it, reshaping it, but never escaping it.

Even in the workings of the human mind, we find that thought is a movement within structure. Language, as Ferdinand de Saussure showed, depends on differences, on a system of signs that relate to each other. Meaning arises not from absolute freedom of expression but from the patterned, constrained interplay of signs and concepts. An unstructured thought would be no thought at all.


Thus, the notion of an 'unbound condition' collapses under scrutiny. It cannot exist because to exist is to have form; to have form is to have

limit; to have limit is to be bound. In the same way, an unbound state is not a state, and an unbound set is not a set.

Freedom, understood as pure unbinding, has no place in the reality we inhabit. The Gospel of Being — the ongoing unfolding of existence — is not a testament to freedom from *condition*: the 'process of declaring together' but to the miracle of condition itself. To be something rather than nothing requires boundary, requires relation, requires law.

Existence is not the absence of bonds but the artistry of their weaving.

3.4 Dancing Within Bonds



Every will is attached to its own want; every thought is bound in another; every action is tied to a future; nothing is free; everything is bound.

The human will often feels like a sovereign force, as if we could conjure desires from nothing and shape the world according to our choosing. Yet modern science, tracing the origins of thought, choice, and action, reveals that will itself arises not as an independent agent, but as a river fed by countless streams.

In neuroscience, the pioneering experiments of Benjamin Libet in the 1980s showed that neural activity predicting a decision appears in the brain milliseconds before a person becomes cognisant of making that choice. The decision seems to emerge from beneath cognisant awareness, not from some unbounded seat of free will. Later work by neuroscientists like Patrick Haggard reinforced this finding, suggesting that cognisant

will rides atop deeper processes already in motion. Our wants are not *ex nihilo*; they are consequences of prior causes, woven through genetics, environment, memory, and immediate circumstance.

Thought itself, far from floating freely, is deeply bound in relation. The philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein observed that language — and by extension thought — is a public phenomenon. We think with words shaped by others, in grammars we did not invent, about categories carved by the histories of our cultures. Even private thoughts are scaffolded by public forms. Each idea carries the echo of countless voices.

In physics, every action is inescapably tied to a future through causality. Isaac Newton's third law of motion declared that every action produces an equal and opposite reaction, embedding each deed within a chain of consequences. Later, Albert Einstein's work on spacetime in the theory of relativity showed that causality is not a subjective ordering but a structural feature of the universe itself. Actions cannot be severed from their futures any more than an arrow can choose not to fly once it leaves the bow.

In biology, too, the interweaving of will, thought, and action into a fabric of necessity is unavoidable. Organisms act in pursuit of survival and reproduction — aims encoded by evolution through the slow grinding work of selection. Even the simplest bacterium swims toward nutrients and away from toxins, not through free improvisation but through chemical signaling pathways hammered into shape by millennia of survival.

Human emotions and longings are no freer. The pioneering psychologist William James argued that emotions are not causes but results of bodily states: we feel afraid because we tremble, not the other way around. Modern affective neuroscience, through the work of researchers like Jaak Panksepp, confirms that primal emotional systems — seeking, rage, fear, care — are ancient and deeply rooted, guiding human behavior long before deliberation comes into play.


Thus, whether it is will or thought or action, each emerges not from isolation but from an intricate layering of prior conditions. Nothing stands

alone. No desire is pure invention, no thought floats unmoored, no action escapes the web of cause and effect. The apparent freedom we experience is the flex and play within binding structures, not their absence.

Freedom, seen from this light, is not the lifting away of all bonds, but the dance within them — the movement that binding makes possible.

Everything is bound, and in that binding, life unfolds.

3.5 Ascent Into Order



In creation, the *Gospel*: ‘God spell’ casts the cosmos in being, not stasis, in relation not freedom, in organisation not chaos.

When we peer backward to the beginning of our universe, we do not find a pure, empty void. We find instead an immense density of energy, an almost inconceivable compression from which matter and structure were born. The Belgian priest and physicist Georges Lemaître first proposed the theory of the ‘primeval atom’, which later became known as the Big Bang — a moment not of chaos, but of emergent order.

As the universe expanded and cooled, particles began to form: quarks joining into protons and neutrons, those protons and neutrons binding into nuclei, and eventually, electrons finding their orbits around them to form atoms. This was not a tumble into disorder, but an intricate sequence of bindings, governed by fundamental forces. The strong nuclear force, discovered in the twentieth

century through the work of physicists like Hideki Yukawa, binds the nuclei of atoms together with tremendous strength. The electromagnetic force binds electrons into orbit. Gravity draws matter together across the vast gulfs of space, shaping the cosmic architecture.

At every stage, the universe leaned toward organization. Hydrogen atoms pooled into clouds; clouds collapsed under gravity to ignite stars; stars fused atoms into heavier elements, and in their deaths scattered these elements across the galaxies to become the building blocks of planets, oceans, and life. The periodic table of elements, arranged so elegantly by Dmitri Mendeleev, is a testament to the fact that matter organizes itself according to inner principles, not by accident, but by necessity.

Even where chaos theory has uncovered the unpredictable dynamics of complex systems, it has also revealed that within apparent disorder lies a deeper order. Edward Lorenz, in his studies of weather patterns, showed that even turbulent systems follow deterministic rules — their apparent chaos arising not from lawlessness, but from sensitivity to initial conditions. Chaos is not

the absence of structure; it is structure so intricate, so folded upon itself, that it exceeds easy prediction.

In the biological world, the same principle holds. Life emerges not as a rupture into freedom, but as a deepening of order. The biochemist Ilya Prigogine, awarded the Nobel Prize for his work on dissipative structures, demonstrated that living systems maintain and even increase internal organization by exchanging energy and matter with their surroundings. Life, in this sense, is a way of resisting the pull of entropy — but it does so not by fleeing from binding, but by weaving ever more delicate and complex bindings.

Thus, from the first pulse of creation to the flowering of galaxies and minds, existence has never been an explosion into void but a casting into form. It is a continual unfolding of relationships, structures, patterns, an endless poetry written not in chaos but in the logic of binding.

The universe does not merely exist; it composes itself.

It does not flee into freedom; it folds itself with meaning and purpose.

3.6 Path of Least Resistance

Matter does not conform in freedom but rather in the path of least resistance, thus conserving *power*: ‘ability’.

Throughout nature, the movement of matter and energy follows a quiet but relentless law: things unfold along paths that minimize effort, that conserve force, that ease the burden of becoming. This principle, ancient in intuition but formalized through centuries of inquiry, reveals that existence prefers not reckless freedom, but efficiency — not unbridled wandering, but the ease of least resistance.

In physics, the principle of least action, articulated first by Pierre-Louis Maupertuis and later rigorously formulated by Joseph-Louis Lagrange and William Rowan Hamilton, states that the path taken by a physical system between two points is the one that minimizes a quantity called ‘action’, which combines energy and time. Light, as revealed by Fermat’s Principle, travels

between two points along the path that takes the least time, curving through lenses and bending through media in perfect obedience to efficiency. Rivers carve their beds not at random but following the contours of least resistance through the land, a slow and powerful intelligence without mind.

Electricity flows along the paths of least impedance, as described by Georg Ohm in his study of electrical resistance. Heat diffuses from warmer regions to cooler ones along gradients that minimize energy differentials, following the natural tendency captured in Fourier's laws of heat conduction. In all these cases, matter and energy do not spread chaotically but choose — if we can use the word poetically — the easiest, most conserving route available.

In biology, this conservation is no less visible. Muscles work by optimizing force output against energy expenditure, a principle seen in the elastic storage of energy in tendons, allowing animals to leap and run with astonishing efficiency. Evolution itself, through natural selection, favors organisms that can achieve survival and reproduction with the least waste of

energy — whether in the streamlined body of a dolphin or the migratory patterns of birds riding thermal currents.

The conservation of ability — what might be called 'power' in its purest sense — is not only a physical necessity but a condition of survival. Plants grow toward light sources with the minimum use of resources; roots spread through soil seeking water along paths where effort is least taxed. Even at the molecular level, chemical reactions tend toward equilibrium states, where potential energy is minimized and stability is maximized.

Matter, then, is not free to follow any path. It is bound by the tendency to conserve ability, to preserve potential wherever possible. The so-called 'freedom' of the universe is a freedom shaped by internal laws of economy, by a ceaseless preference for the simplest, most stable, most conserving courses of action.

In this great economy of being, freedom is not the casting aside of all structure, but the artful, often beautiful selection of the gentlest path through the field of possibility.

Existence preserves itself not through excess, but through grace. It endures by moving along the lines of least resistance, husbanding its power for the next act of becoming.

3.7 Cascading Ties



All existence transforms via binding, not freedom—Amen.

At the heart of the universe, beneath all change and motion, there lies not a principle of unbinding, but of ever-deepening connection. From the first swelling of the cosmos to the breathing of every living thing, transformation does not arise through severance, but through new arrangements, new bonds, new unfoldings of relation.

The dance of matter obeys the law of binding. Particles join to form atoms; atoms join to form molecules; molecules weave the tissues of organisms, the tissues of life. At every stage, the new does not emerge by casting away the old, but by binding it differently, more intricately, more wondrously.

This truth hums beneath the findings of physics, where force fields hold the world in its patterns; beneath the revelations of chemistry, where

bonds break and form in a great conservation of energy; beneath the understanding of biology, where life evolves by layering new adaptations atop ancient forms. It echoes even in the workings of thought, where each idea draws life from its connection to another, and in society, where no word, no act, no being stands alone.

Freedom, as pure unbinding, has no creative power. It is not through an absence of condition that the stars burn, that oceans stir, that minds awaken. It is through relationship, through interlocking, through the patient stitching of one form into another that existence transforms itself across the ages.

The path of least resistance, the flow of conserved power, the tethering of will to want, the cascading ties of thought and future — all are expressions of this deeper law. To exist is to be shaped and shaping; to transform is to find new ways of binding what was into what can be.

In the end, existence is not a breaking free but a deepening embrace. It is the ceaseless sacrament of binding, written in every particle

and every breath, in every fall of light and every beat of the heart.

And so it is: All existence transforms via binding, not freedom—Amen.

PART 4: GOD

4.1 Principal to Existence

God is *Principal*: ‘unvaryingly foremost’ to existence, the constant expression, functioning as Creator.

God, as the Creator of existence, is consequently not of existence but Principal — unvaryingly foremost — to it. By way of analogy, a clay potter is not of their pot but principal to its existence: the potter initiates the form but is not contained within it. When we observe a clay pot, we are led to infer some prior conference of difference — hands shaping clay — involved in its creation. In the same way, when we observe even the smallest particle of existence, we are led to infer a constant expression at work: a principle that informs the bearing-together of difference into form. This principle is elegantly stated in Plutarch’s *Symposiacs*, where Firmus declares: ‘*It is universally true that a principle is before that whose principle it is.*’

Thus, God is not *of* existence but stands Principal *to* all existence: the constant expression in which existence is *expressed*: 'pressed out'. This constant expression — the conference of difference — is symbolized $\{\Delta\}$. Existence itself — symbolized Ξ — is the resulting effect of this cause. Their relation, expressed mathematically as $\Xi = \{\Delta\}$, embodies the essence of existence: the causality that is cause and effect.

As Principal, God relates to existence in a threefold manner: as *Cause*, as *Effect* and as *Essence*.

As *Cause*, God is the *Creator*: 'that which creates', that constant expression by which difference bears together in possibility of new existence. Without this conference of difference, there would be no transformation, no creation, no existence.

As *Effect*, God is evidenced in every transformation, every arising, every relation that emerges from the conference of difference. When a seed meets soil, water, and sunlight, it does not merely add them together—it becomes something else entirely: a plant. This becoming is

not in the seed, nor in the soil alone, but in their relation—this is the effect.

As *Essence*, God inhabits existence not as matter or spirit, but as the equation that sums-up the totality of existence — what we might poeticize as the nature of existence.

Thus the conference of difference stands not merely as a metaphysical inference but as the very pulse of reality: the continual articulation through which God, as Principal, causes, inhabits, and sustains all being.

In this triune movement — cause, effect, and essence — one may glimpse a faint echo of the Trinitarian intuition:

- Cause, as to the *Father*;
- Effect, as to the *Son*;
- Essence, as to the *Spirit*.

Yet here the movement is ontological, not theological: it speaks not of personas, but addresses the causality of *existence* itself — the 'condition of being'.

Like Plutarch's observation, we understand that before the physics of existence, there is a metaphysical principle that governs it. Physics — the study of what is perceived, measured, and observed — begins from the given field of existence. But this field presupposes a deeper ground: a constant expression, that initiates the 'condition of being' that is *existence*.

To bridge phenomenon and noumenon — the perceived and the known — is not to collapse their distinction but to recognize their order: phenomenon arises from noumenon; perception from being; physics from metaphysics. The conference of difference, visible in every structure of existence, is the expression of the deeper Principal from which all things emerge.

This bridge cannot be crossed by empirical observation alone, nor by speculation alone. It must be recognized through a deeper acknowledgment. Not through retreat into mysticism, but logical and rational metaphysical constructs: the recognition that all existence, in its ceaseless bearing-together of difference, declares visibly the constant expression behind it.

Thus, to say that existence mirrors God as Creator is not metaphor but necessity; if existence is, it is because it can only emerge through the conference of difference;

And so we must declare God as *metaphysical*: 'originating behind' of existence, not in a spatial or temporal sense but in an ontological sense.

4.2 Enabling Everything

God as the constant expression of existence functions as *omnipotence*: the ‘condition of enabling everything’.

God’s omnipotence is not an action but the condition in which all action flows for it is this condition that enables everything. God, as the constant expression of existence establishes the very process by which beings come into being, transform, and accumulate power.

This Power — ability — does not arise in isolation. It arises only by participating in the constant expression of existence that is the conference of difference. Every *being*: ‘action to be’, by virtue of the condition of being, maintains existence through this constant expression, drawing its power through the conference of difference with other beings.

This constant process is not an attribute added to existence; it is the very enabling ground without

which existence could not stand. God, as the constant expression that is the conference of difference, is the enabling process that makes ability possible — not once, but continuously, at every moment and in every being.

Thus, God's omnipotence does not mean that God **does** everything. It means that everything that can be done is possible only through the constant expression afforded by God. Every force of nature, every thought, every movement of being, proceeds because the ground of transformation — the conference of difference — remains the form of expression.

In this way, omnipotence is not a supreme act of will, nor a final command but the ever-present cause by which all will and all action can arise. It is not the imposition of power from above, but the enabling of power from behind: the source, the field, the breath by which existence moves.

Because every ability — every capacity to be, to change, to act — rests upon the constant expression of existence, it necessarily follows that God powers all. Not selectively, not intermittently, but universally and unceasingly.

Omnipotence is the continuous permission of being: the ceaseless declaration that difference must bear together in conference if power — ability — is to accumulate through the ongoing interplay of existence.

Thus, to speak of God's omnipotence is not to imagine a distant sovereign manipulating outcomes, but to recognize the ever-present cause that breathes ability into all being. It is to understand that all strength, all transformation, all vitality arises within that metaphysical process that the Principal, as constant expression, unceasingly declares.

God is omnipotent because the constant expression that is God causes the possibility of every ability to be. Without this condition, there would be no power, no ability, no becoming at all. Thus we do not claim that God's omnipotence is some grand attribute but rather a crucial necessity in order for God as Creator, to initiate all existence.

4.3 God Before Everything

God as *Principal*: ‘unvaryingly foremost’ to existence is *omnipresent*: ‘caused to go before everything’ by definition.

God’s omnipresence is not a matter of location but of condition. It does not mean that God is spread out in space like light, or infused within matter like breath. Rather, God, as Principal, is omnipresent because every act of existence — every arising of being — necessarily presupposes the constant expression that enables it.

To say that God is omnipresent is to say that nothing can exist apart from the constant expression of the conference of difference. Every being, every form, every relation is sustained because the constant expression is continuously declared. Before anything can be, there must be the possibility of being; before any difference can arise, there must be the ground by which difference bears together. This ground —

this constant expression — is the omnipresence of God.

God, as Principal, is thus caused to go before everything: not spatially or temporally, as though in sequence, but ontologically, as the condition that makes every moment, every form, every movement possible. Nothing can precede God, the Principal, because all precedence itself is made possible by the Principal's constant declaration as to the condition of being.

This omnipresence is not a presence *among* things; it is the condition by which things come to presence at all. It is not God entering into existence, but existence continually arising from the constant expression that is God. Every atom, every breath, every thought is possible because the conference of difference — the dynamic relation that undergirds all being — remains unceasingly expressed.

Thus, to perceive existence rightly is to perceive its radical dependence: to see that all being is cradled within a prior cause, an enabling condition that always exists because without it, existence itself would be impossible.

God's omnipresence, therefore, is not the saturation of space-time, but the logical and necessary priority of cause to effect, of ground to arising, of Principal to existence. God is everywhere not by occupying space-time, but by being the constant cause that enables space-time, matter, thought, and form to arise and sustain.

4.4 God Realizes All

God as Principal is *omniscient*: ‘caused to know everything’ in that God, as the constant expression of being, causes all realizing.

God’s omniscience is not the gathering of knowledge nor the observation of existence from without. God does not know by thinking or perceiving as beings do. Rather, God is omniscient because the constant expression that is God causes all realizing to be possible — and realizing, rightly understood, encompasses both knowing and making real.

Realization is not confined to thought alone. To realize is not merely to become aware, but to bring into being: a mutual declaration of difference into the new, to cause perception and creation together. Knowing and manifesting, apprehending and arising, are not separate movements but intertwined expressions of the same constant ground. Realizing is both the

recognizing of what is and the unfolding of what becomes.

Without this constant enabling, there would be no ground upon which realization of any kind could occur. No perception could arise, no thought could form, no being could be declared into manifestation. The possibility of knowing presupposes the possibility of difference; and the possibility of difference presupposes the constant expression of the conference of difference, by which being itself is declared.

Thus, God's omniscience is not the possession of realization but the enabling of realization: the ceaseless causing of knowing and creating. Every act of awareness, every transformation into form, every arising of meaning and matter alike, draws its possibility from the constant expression that is God.

God, as Principal, is caused to know everything not by accumulating knowledge, but by being the condition by which all knowledge and being, recognition and realization, perception and manifestation, continually arise. Omniscience is not the attendance to facts, but the origination of

the field within which facts are recognized and things come into being.

In every realization — whether of a thought, a truth, a movement, a creation — the omniscience of the Principal is echoed. The bearing-together of difference into form, into awareness, into being, is the living evidence of the omniscient ground that makes realization possible.

Thus, omniscience is not an external witnessing, but an internal enabling: the breathing of realization into existence itself. It is the cause of knowing and the cause of becoming, inseparably woven into the constant expression that sustains all being.

In this way, we understand that all realizing — both the realization of mind and the realization of matter — rests upon the constant expression — the conference of difference — that is God. Realizing itself bears ceaseless witness to the omniscience of God as the constant expression, Principal to existence.

4.5 God's Image

All existence is created in God's *image*:
'expression' as every *existence*: 'condition of
being' reflects the constant expression that **is**
God.

Existence is not fashioned as a copy of God, nor modeled as an imitation. Existence is created in God's image in the truest sense: as expression. Every condition of being — every form, every relation, every arising of difference — reflects the constant expression that is God.

God, as Principal, does not sculpt existence from without. Rather, existence unfolds from within the constant expression that is the conference of difference. Every being bears the mark of this origination: the ceaseless bearing-together of difference into form, relation, and meaning. To *exist* is to 'be out of' the constant expression that is Principal to all being.

Thus, every existence — from the smallest particle to the greatest constellation — is not merely something made, but something expressing. Each articulates, in its own limited mode, the deeper constant that enables it. Every arising of form is a mirror, however partial, of the constant expression i.e. the conference of difference that sustains it.

The image of God, then, is not a likeness in body, thought, or feeling but rather a reflection of the constant expression that manifests them. Thus every *being* is a reflection of God. The dynamic interplay of difference into relation — the very condition of being — reflects the constant expression Principal to existence.

Every action, every thought is a reflection of this constant expression. Every becoming, creation, transformation mirrors the Principal to being.

In this light, to recognize existence is to recognize a tapestry of reflections: each being a unique articulation of the constant expression that is God. Every condition of being is a testimony to the unceasing bearing together of

difference into form, relation into meaning, being into transformation.

Thus, all existence — simply by being — is created in God's image: not by appearance, but by expression; not by imitation, but by participation in the conference of difference.

4.6 God is Perfect

As the constant expression that manifests existence, God as Creator is *perfect*: 'complete'.

That which is perfect, in its true sense, is not a measure of moral goodness or idealized performance. Rather, that which is perfect is complete, finished and thus transcends being to become principle i.e. that which is not being but enables it.

God, as the constant expression that initiates existence, is perfect because the expression is complete. It lacks no element necessary to declare being. It requires no supplement, no correction, no addition. It is the unceasing expression by which difference bears together into form, relation, and transformation.

Every arising of existence — every form, every relation, every becoming — stands upon this completeness. The constant expression does not

exist conditionally, rather it is universal. It enables the full possibility of being: the full field within which difference may bear together, transform, and realize.

Existence is complete because it is borne upon a complete expression. This is perhaps the most astonishing revelation from God: that out of this one simple constant expression — the conference of difference $\{\Delta\}$ — arises the infinite complexity and beauty of existence.

In this light, perfection is not something God achieves; it is what God is: the complete and constant expression that creates all being.

Yet from this perfect completeness arises the beautiful imperfection of existence — the ceaseless unfolding of difference into form, relation, and becoming. Existence is not perfect because it is finished, but because it is able to transform, to realize, to grow.


The completeness of God is not contradicted by the incompleteness of beings; it is the very ground that allows beings to be incomplete, to

bear difference, to move, to become. This is the divine beauty of God's gift — existence.

Thus, the beauty of existence — its striving, its unfolding, its endless renewal — is itself a testimony to the perfection of its Principal. From the complete, difference is declared; from the constant, transformation is born; from the finished, the unfinished approaches realizing.

Thus we understand that God's perfection is not the end of creation, but the ever-complete cause that breathes life into the unending transformation of existence.

4.7 Universal Endless Genesis



God is the constant expression of
existence—Amen.

Having unfolded the nature of God as Principal — as omnipotent cause, as omnipresent ground, as omniscient origination, as the perfect and complete expression from which existence itself is born — we now affirm the heart of the matter in its fullness:

God is the constant expression of existence. Not apart from it. Not contained within it. But the universal endless genesis through which being is transformed.

Every difference borne together, every arising of form, every act of realization — whether of thought or manifestation — flows from this one constant expression. Existence, in all its vastness and variety, does not merely reflect God; existence is the ongoing expression of God.

Thus, to live, to move, to be, is to participate in the conference of difference. To perceive, to create, to transform, is to echo that which is Principal to all things. Every moment of being is a declaration of the constant expression. Every unfolding of existence is a testament to the ever-complete, ever-sufficient God — Principal to existence.

God is not a being separate from existence. Nor is God reducible to it. Rather, God is the constant expression through which all existence transforms. In other words, God, as the conference of difference, declares the universal process of transforming in which existence is possible.

PART 5: KNOWING

5.1 Imperfect Knowing

There can be no *perfect*: ‘complete’ knowing of our universe, for *knowing* is ‘action to know’ and thus *imperfect*: ‘incomplete’ by definition.

To know is not to capture, but to move toward; not to possess, but to participate. Knowing is an action, not a culmination — a reaching that can never fully gather all that is, for the universe itself is not a finished thing to be gathered. It is an unfolding being: a ceaseless action to be.

Thus, knowing is always imperfect, not by error but by essence. Imperfection here is not a flaw but a signature of existence itself: that which is becoming cannot be fully known because it is not yet fully itself. What we call knowledge is a provisional stillness in the unceasing current of transformation.

This is no mere poetic sentiment; it is a truth echoed in the foundations of our sciences.

In mathematics, Gödel's incompleteness theorems reveal that no consistent system of logic can fully account for itself. There will always be truths that cannot be proven within any given framework. Thus, even the most pristine architectures of thought are bounded by horizons they cannot cross. Knowing, like existence itself, is always transforming, never finalized.

In physics, the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle teaches that at the smallest scales, we cannot simultaneously know both the position and the momentum of a particle with perfect precision. The deeper we look, the more reality resists total capture. Uncertainty is not the result of our clumsiness but is woven into the fabric of being.

In the study of complex systems — weather, ecosystems, societies — Chaos Theory reminds us that even if we knew every detail of a system's present state, tiny uncertainties would still spiral into vast unpredictability over time. Perfect prediction — and thus perfect knowing — is forever beyond reach.

In thermodynamics, entropy is often framed as a tendency toward 'disorder', but this disorder is not mere chaos — it is a measure of transformation. Entropy refers to the number of ways a system's components can be arranged while still appearing the same from the outside: a growth in indistinguishable possibilities. As time advances, closed systems naturally shift toward states with greater entropy — greater diffusion of relation, not the loss of it. What we call 'disorder' is not the absence of order, but the loosening of a prior configuration. It is not that beings lose their ability to relate, but that the specificity of their earlier relation is diffused into a wider field of difference. Order has not vanished — it has transformed.

To know a system perfectly would require it to stand still — and in doing so, it would cease to become. Being cannot be paused for inspection without ceasing to be alive. Thus, existence is not a monument but a movement; not a state but a becoming. And knowledge, like being, is always a pursuit in motion — never complete, never still, never final.

In the realm of the mind, cognitive science and neuroscience reveal that perception itself is not the passive reception of reality but an active construction. Our senses deliver fragments; our brains assemble models. We do not perceive the world directly but experience a stitched-together simulation, filtered through evolution's priorities for survival, not for truth. We know not things as they are, but things as they are made meaningful for us to live.

Even cognisance — the bright torch of awareness by which we seek to know — is not a window opened fully to the world, but a flickering convergence of neural processes, integrative and approximate. What we call 'seeing clearly' is a temporary clarity, not a permanent possession.

Much of what we take to be cognisance arises not from stable awareness, but from shifting patterns of coherence — some conferent, some only pre-conferent, and many wholly in-conferent with one another. Cognisance, then, is not a singular light but a graded field of relation, where knowing emerges not from certainty, but from sufficient mutuality to take momentary form.

Thus, across every discipline, knowing emerges not as conquest but as conversation — a living exchange between mind and world, self and other, knower and known. It is an unfinished dialogue between unfinished beings.

And this is not a cause for despair but for wonder. If existence were static and finished, it would signify the end of knowing. Instead, because existence is ever unfolding, knowing is ever ongoing. Because we are unfinished, knowing remains a living invitation.

In this Gospel of Being, we do not mourn the impossibility of perfect knowledge. We honor it. We still strive for it as best we can. For from knowing comes ability which is the power for which all being strives.

Perfect knowing would require perfect stasis, a universe frozen into final form. But such a universe would be dead. It is precisely because Being is alive that knowing must be imperfect — and beautiful.

Thus we bless our ignorance not as darkness, but as space from which to navigate existence. We bless our unknowing as the soil from which wonder and wisdom alike spring forth. We bless the imperfection of knowing as the sign that existence has not ended — and that we are still called to seek, to learn, to love, and to be.

5.2 The Gospel is Complete

And though perfect knowing of *being*:
'action to be' is impossible, the *Gospel*: 'God
spell' itself is cast *perfect*: 'complete'.

To *exist* is to be unfinished, literally to 'be out' of the conference of difference. To be is to be in motion — an action, a becoming, never a final form. Thus, perfect knowing of *being* itself is impossible, not because *being* hides, but because *being* never halts long enough to be fully seized.

No sooner do we glimpse a form than it transforms. No sooner do we name a thing than it slips beyond the name. Being is a river, not a stone; a song, not a statue a journey not a state. And so to know *being* perfectly would require stopping the river, silencing the song — ending existence itself.

Yet though we cannot know *being* perfectly, the casting forth of *being* — the *Gospel*: 'Godspell' —

is perfect. The Gospel is not the river; it is the metaphysical spring that gives rise to it. It is not the form that changes; it is the process that permits change.

The Godspell is the eternal utterance from which existence arises. It is cast once, and wholly, and perfectly:

- Perfect not because it freezes the livingness of *being* into static completion,
- But perfect because it gives issue to all that is and all that will ever be.

In science, we see shadows of this truth: The fundamental laws of nature — the elegant simplicity of gravity, electromagnetism, the strong and weak nuclear forces — do not change from moment to moment. They are cast once, perfectly and completely, and from their constancy unfolds the dynamic, unfinished symphony of stars, oceans, trees, and minds.

Likewise in mathematics: The axioms that define number and space are not imperfect because they yield endless variation. They are perfect in

that they frame a field where infinite becoming can occur.

So too with the Godspell: It is the single, perfect articulation by which existence is given space to unfold. It is not the instability of becoming that marks imperfection — it is the necessary condition of possibility and probability of existence.

In this light, the impossibility of perfect knowing is not a tragedy, but a testimony to the potential of the universe. We cannot perfectly know *being* because *being* is always transforming. But we can stand in reverence before the Godspell, the perfect casting that makes all life, all knowing, all *being* possible.

Thus, we find perfection not in the seizing of final knowledge, but in the trust that the process is whole — complete. We walk not in a broken world, but in a world of becoming — even as we, its words, are still being uttered.

The Gospel is complete. The casting is whole. We, the ongoing echoes of that casting, live within its endless unfolding.

And in that, we bless the perfection not of our knowing, but of the constant expression that beckons us into being.

5.3 Invitation to Realize

All knowledge is *sensed*: ‘transduced’ from either *noumenon*: ‘having been known’ or *phenomenon*: ‘having been shown’.

To know is not merely to possess facts, but to stand at the crossing point where potential meaning is sensed and made real. Knowledge is not a static possession; it is a living transduction: the transformation of *being* into meaning.

All knowledge — all realization — must be *sensed*. It must pass through some threshold, some gateway of reception, however crude or refined, before it can become part of the unfolding tapestry of existence.

In the lexicon of *being*, knowledge comes to us from two great sources: *noumenon* and *phenomenon*.

Noumenon — literally ‘having been known’ — is that which has been conceived, understood, or

transmitted without necessarily being shown directly to us. It is knowledge second-hand: a bequeathal from mind to mind, from world to mind, from tradition, intuition, memory, or inference. When we know that a fall from a cliff is deadly without witnessing it ourselves, we are sensing noumenon: trusting in a pattern handed to us, a truth known but not perceived directly for ourselves — shown.

In this way, *noumenon* is not merely a repository of conclusions, but an active inheritance — a living current of meaning passed between beings.

Phenomenon — 'having been shown' — is knowledge we seize with our own senses. It is the vivid, first-hand knowing born of direct encounter: the warmth of sunlight, the sound of thunder, the feel of earth beneath our feet. Phenomenon is *being* striking against the walls of perception, announcing itself to our awareness.

Thus, the fundamental distinction is not merely between mind and world, but between first-hand knowing and second-hand knowing; between

that which we perceive for ourselves and that which we receive from others, or from the deeper interior reservoirs of mind.

Yet whether knowledge arises from noumenon or phenomenon, it must be *transduced* — ‘lead across’ into memory by the action of sensing. Without the active participation of the knower, even the brightest phenomenon would pass unseen, and even the deepest noumenon would remain unawakened.

Modern science quietly affirms this ancient truth. In neuroscience, sensory transduction is the principle by which physical stimuli — light, sound, pressure — are converted into electrical signals and interpreted as vision, hearing, touch. What we see, what we hear, what we feel: these are not direct captures of the world, but constructed realizations within us. Our senses do not merely record; they reconstitute reality into forms we can inhabit. consistent with our existing knowing and realizing.

Even memory, that sacred vault of noumenon, is not a perfect archive but a living re-creation. Each act of recall subtly rewrites the memory

itself. Thus, what we *know* from having been known is, too, a living act, not a passive inheritance.

But sensing and transduction are not the province of sentient beings alone. Beyond the threshold of cognisance, existence itself engages in realization.

The seed in the earth does not *know* light as we know it — but it *realizes* light in the bending of its sprout toward warmth. The crystal does not *know* molecular structure as we do — but it *realizes* the grammar of its elements in its unfolding form. The river does not *know* gravity by name — but it *realizes* gravity's command by flowing downhill.

Thus, realization — the process of realizing — pervades all *being*, whether in the luminous cognisance of sentient beings or in the silent architectures of matter and energy. Everywhere, existence transduces the pressures and potentials around it into form, into motion, into becoming.

In this way, *knowing* is not an isolated human privilege but a particular flowering of a universal principle: the principle of realization. Where realization is structural, pre-conferent and elemental, we see it in the shaping of forests, mountains, and stars. Where realization becomes reflexive, conferent and symbolic, we see it as human knowing, a coherent participation in the song of *being*.

Thus, noumenon and phenomenon are not merely categories of thought but manifestations of this deeper rhythm:

- Noumenon is the echo of realization passed down — the song sung before us, to which we attune ourselves.
- Phenomenon is the immediate music of the world — the song heard with our own ears, seen with our own eyes, felt with our own flesh.

Both are invitations to realization. Both are thresholds across which Being moves into meaning.

To sense is to be part of this eternal transduction.
To know is to realize. To realize is to participate
in the unfolding of existence.

In this Gospel of Being, knowing and realizing are
revealed not as separations from the world, but
as acts of communion with it. We are not
outsiders peering in; we are transducers of
existence, bridges of meaning across the river of
becoming.

Thus we honor both noumenon and
phenomenon. We honor the wisdom entrusted to
us, and the wisdom revealed to us. We honor the
silent realizing of stone and root, and the
luminous knowing of mind and heart.

For in all these, *being* senses itself — and is.

5.4 Objective vs Subjective

Knowing is dependent if *subjective*: ‘tending to lie under’ of one source and interdependent if *objective*: ‘tending to lie against’ of many.

All knowing arises from relationship. But not all relationships are the same.

When knowing depends upon a single source, it is *subjective* — it tends to lie under, to submit itself to the authority of one. This is the knowledge of the child toward the parent: a trust placed in what has been told, what has been handed down, what has been received from above. In such knowing, the knower is bound to the truth of the source. If the source is right, the knowledge is right. If the source is wrong, the knowledge falls with it.

Subjective knowing, thus, is a chain with but one link. It is strong so long as the parent holds, but fragile in the face of error.

Objective knowing arises differently. It is *interdependent* — it tends to lie against, to test itself in the presence of many. This is the knowing of siblings, of peers: a trust that emerges not from deference to one, but from the convergence of many independent witnesses. Each perspective is partial, each view limited — but together, through the interplay of confirmation and contradiction, a deeper truth is forged.

Objective knowing is resilient. It does not depend upon any single source standing alone, but upon the network of sources standing together. It is not a chain but a web — able to endure even if one strand falters, because the pattern of meaning is distributed, not centralized.

In science, this principle is foundational: No theory is trusted because a single authority proclaims it. It is trusted because many eyes have seen, many hands have tested, and many minds have found coherence in its unfolding. Increasingly, even across once-isolated disciplines, knowledge grows stronger when different ways of seeing are brought into

conversation — when physics speaks with biology, when psychology meets computation, when ecology embraces economics. Cross-disciplinary knowing is a new flowering of this ancient truth: that wisdom matures not under a single voice, but in the symphony of many — in the conference of difference.

In life too, wisdom often grows when we move from the unquestioning subjective trust of childhood to the tested objective trust of maturity. We learn that no one voice, however loved, holds all truth. We learn to listen across the field of being — to weigh, to compare, to balance, to seek confirmation not in the voice of one, but in the chorus of many.


Thus, subjectivity is the knowledge that lies under; objectivity is the knowledge that lies against. One trusts a parent. The other trusts a conversation among peers. One depends. The other interdepends.

And in this movement from dependence to interdependence, knowing becomes stronger, richer, more faithful to the vastness of Being.

Yet neither mode is wholly wrong. We must begin somewhere — and the beginning of knowing is often a necessary dependence. But growth calls us onward: to temper faith with testing, to move from submission to conference, from the authority of one to the communion of many. This is the knowing in *trust*: 'consolation' of future knowing.

In this way, knowing itself mirrors the journey of *being*: From the seed sown by a single casting to the unfolding field of life that grows through countless interwoven acts of becoming.

5.5 Towards Consciousness



Only a diversity of *power*: ‘ability’ can approach objectivity in knowing and thus *consciousness*: a ‘measure of knowing together’.

Knowing alone is not enough. If knowing rests solely upon one voice, one source, one way of seeing, it risks becoming an echo of itself. It risks falling under — subjective, fragile, incomplete.

True knowing — knowing that tends to lie against, that can stand and be tested — requires diversity. Only a diversity of power — a diversity of ability, perspective, and mode of seeing — can approach the horizon of objectivity.

Each source of power, each vantage point of *being*, brings its own fragment of truth. When many such fragments are held together — not fused into sameness, but allowed their difference — a deeper, richer tapestry of knowing is woven. It is from this weaving that consciousness arises:

not as a solitary flame, but as a constellation of lights, measuring the space between them.

Consciousness is not the possession of a single mind; it is the 'measure of knowing together'. It is the field where different powers meet, test, and temper each other. Where one viewpoint lies under another, subjectivity reigns. But where many viewpoints lie against one another, pressing, prodding, reflecting, refining — objectivity begins to emerge.

Thus, consciousness, at its best, is not from a single source but a conference of difference. Not a monologue but a dialogue. Not a decree but a debate.

Modern science, too, reveals this truth:

- Ecosystems thrive not by the dominance of one species, but by the interdependence of many.
- The brain itself is a network of diverse specialized regions — no single neuron holds all knowledge, but through their collective firing, awareness is born.

- Societies that nurture intellectual diversity — across disciplines, cultures, and perspectives — produce more resilient, creative, and adaptive knowledge.

Just as life itself evolves through the trial and error of many forms — not the dominance of one fixed type, but the flourishing of difference — so too does knowledge evolve. In the great ecology of knowing, it is not the single perspective that survives, but the flexible conference of many. Evolutionary epistemology teaches that our understanding of the world, like species in nature, adapts, survives, and grows stronger through variation, mutation, and cross-fertilization of ideas. Diversity of power is not only a condition for deeper knowing; it is the very mechanism by which knowing evolves toward greater resilience, greater coherence, greater truth.

In the sciences, in the mind, in the world: life flourishes where diversity allows truth to be tested, tempered, and transformed.

Without diversity, consciousness collapses into the brittle certainty of unquestioned belief.

With diversity, consciousness breathes: able to discern, to compare, to choose wisely between one *being* and another.

Thus, it is diversity of power that eases intelligence: It gives the mind the material it needs to judge, to weigh, to act with wisdom.

Intelligence — the 'condition of choosing between' one action to be and another — is no mere calculation. It is the living fruit of consciousness rooted in diversity. The better we know together, the better we can choose. The richer our conference of difference, the more adaptable our dance of becoming.

In this Gospel of Being, diversity is not a threat to truth but its necessary ground. It is only in the conference of different perspectives that an objective and thus clearer vision is kindled.

Thus, we honor diversity not merely as a social good, but as an ontological necessity. For it is only through diversity of power — and the knowing together it makes possible — that existence approaches objectivity, and that consciousness begins to reflect reality.

5.6 The Want of Intelligence

All *knowing*: ‘action to know’ is in want to ease *intelligence*: the ‘condition of choosing between’ of one *being*: ‘action to be’ over another.

Knowing is not a luxury. It is the necessary servant of Being.

For to be is to act, and to act is to choose — and every choice between one action to be and another demands guidance. It is for this that knowing arises: to ease intelligence, to light the crossroads where *being* must decide its path.

Intelligence is the condition of choosing wisely between possibilities. Without knowing, intelligence gropes blindly, trapped in the fog of uncertainty. But with knowing — however imperfect — intelligence can better discern the paths that lead toward greater power: greater ability to act, to adapt, to endure.

Knowing is power only because it can be transduced into work — into energy directed toward transforming existence. A choice made in ignorance dissipates power; a choice made in knowing conserves and multiplies it.

Thus, all knowing hungers to ease intelligence:

- To smooth the field of choices.
- To clarify the consequences.
- To empower *being* to choose the path that nourishes rather than starves its ability.

Objective knowing — knowing that leans against the many, that weaves itself across diverse perspectives — serves intelligence better than subjective knowing. For objective knowing carries the virtue of *proveability*: the capacity to test, to confirm, to falsify, to refine.

In proving, knowing strengthens *probability*: The power to cast forward — to anticipate futures not yet seen, to choose actions that will bear fruit across time.

Without proveability, probability weakens. Choices are made on hollow ground, and Being risks wasting its strength on false paths.

Thus, the more our knowing is tempered by objective testing — by the friction and resonance of many sources — the more gracefully intelligence can move between one action and another. The more robust our knowing, the more faithful our choosing.

In the forge of existence, choices are not mere preferences; they are wagers on *being* itself. Each action to be is a casting of energy, a gamble of survival and flourishing.

Thus, knowing and intelligence are entwined:

- Knowing illuminates paths.
- Intelligence chooses them.
- Together, they form the living engine by which *being* grows, adapts, and persists.


In this *Gospel of Being*, we bless knowing not as the hoarding of fact, but as the sacred labor of easing intelligence: The labor of helping *being* to choose its way toward greater aliveness, greater

coherence, greater communion with the unfolding whole.

We bless objective knowing — knowing proven in the company of many — for it strengthens the soul of intelligence and extends the reach of becoming.

To know truly is not merely to see. It is to cast forward wisely. It is to choose, again and again, the paths by which life overcomes entropy and dances onward.

5.7 The Dance of Uncertainty



All existence functions in imperfect knowing—Amen.

Existence is not a finished thing. It is a process, a gathering, a living declaration of actions to be.

Every being declares itself through action. And these declarations do not occur in isolation, but together — each action shaping, being shaped by, and weaving itself into the actions of others. Existence is a conference of difference, a ceaseless interplay of being and becoming.

In such a living process, perfect knowing is impossible. For the future — the unfolding of action — is not yet cast. The paths are real, but not yet walked. The consequences are real, but not yet revealed.

Thus, all existence functions in imperfect knowing: Knowing that *means*: ‘intends’ toward the future, but can never fully seize what that future is in advance. Knowing that feels forward,

that reaches across uncertainty toward becoming.

Imperfect knowing is not a flaw but a necessity. Without it, there would be no adaptation, no creativity, no existence.

This imperfection carries within it a kind of ache: a sense of incompleteness, of longing, of vulnerability. It is the ancient unease known to all living things — the *dukkha* spoken of in wisdom traditions. It is the unease that drives the flower to seek the sun, the bird to seek the sky, the mind to seek understanding.

Knowing is born of unease. We know because we must choose, and we must choose because we are unfinished. Each act of knowing is an attempt to lessen the unease — to light a torch in the darkness of the next becoming.

Yet paradoxically, as complexity increases — as the conference of being grows richer and more intricate — the unease of knowing deepens. The more that is possible, the more uncertain it becomes. The more paths that open, the harder it is to see which will endure.

Thus, the beauty of existence is double-edged: Its richness invites growth, but growth intensifies the ache of unknowing.

And still we bless it. For it is this very imperfection — this reaching, this yearning, this hunger to know — that gives life its purpose.

Existence functions not despite imperfect knowing, but because of it. Each step forward is a dance with uncertainty. Each act of becoming is a wager of hope.

In this Gospel of Being, we do not curse our imperfection. We sanctify it. We honor the unease that drives us to know, the longing that keeps us in motion, the uncertainty that makes existence possible.

We are all of us unfinished. We are all of us imperfect. And that's ok because the principles of existence declares every being imperfect.

PART 6: MEANING

6.1 Meaning as Intending

All *being*: ‘action to be’ *means*: ‘intends’ to accumulate *power*: ‘ability’ via the path of least resistance, thus easing *dukkha*: ‘unease’.

To *be* is not simply to exist, but to act — existence here is not inert substance, but kinetic purpose. The koan opens with this redefinition: *being* is not a noun but a verb, an unfolding event. This act of being always carries with it a *meaning*, not as an external imposition, but as an intrinsic orientation: to *mean* is to ‘intend’.

Meaning, then, is not interpretation after the fact, but direction prior to action. Every *being*, in its very act to be, is already intending — intending toward something, and that something is the accumulation of power: not power as domination or force, but as ability, capacity, potential to act and adapt. This is not a Nietzschean will-to-power in the tragic sense, but a universal drive toward efficacy — the capability to respond, to adapt, to become.

The koan's next phrase, '*via the path of least resistance*', introduces a thermodynamic and evolutionary dimension. Energy systems evolve toward states of minimized resistance, as do living systems adapting for survival and efficiency. Water flows downhill. Organisms evolve traits that conserve energy. Societies cohere through patterns that reduce conflict and friction. Even thought follows patterns of least cognitive resistance — heuristics and habit. In all these, the path is not arbitrary; it is adaptive. It is the route that allows being to endure, to thrive, to extend its power — again, not over others, but into fuller becoming.

This movement toward ease — toward equilibrium — is not escapism. It is not a denial of challenge, but an acknowledgement that unease (*dukkha*) is the friction of misalignment. When action is forced against the grain of being — when resistance mounts — *dukkha* arises. This Buddhist term, often translated as suffering, is more deeply understood as imbalance, or instability. The koan identifies this unease as not simply psychological, but ontological: it arises

when action does not flow from the organism's natural path of meaning — intending.

Thus, *to be* is *to mean* is *to intend* — and this intention is not random but directional, always seeking the path that preserves and extends ability, that minimizes friction, and that lightens the burden of existence. Meaning is not imposed by language or society; it is embedded in every gesture of becoming. It is the vector of existence itself.

And that vector moves not merely toward isolated survival, but toward *conference* — toward the capacity to exist with *difference*. That is why salvation is not a divine reward bestowed externally, but the natural function of atonement and forgiveness that makes the conference of difference possible. For there can be no conference without the *action to be at one*, and no conference sustained without some *measure of giving away* to difference. Atonement without forgiveness is exile; forgiveness without atonement is indulgence. Only in the harmony of atonement and forgiveness does salvation become not merely symbolic but ontologically real.

In this light, the Gospel is not a doctrine but a dynamic: a pattern of action that honors the logic of being — *that to exist is to intend ease through ability, and to realize that ability through the conference of difference*. This is the gospel of energy, of entropy, of evolution, and of peace.

6.2 Adaptive Intention

Every *being*: ‘action to be’ is a *will*: ‘want’ to purpose: ‘put completely’ and thus *means*: ‘intends’ to transform existence.

To be is to act, and to act is to want. This *want* is not lack or greed but an innate *will* — a directional surge toward purpose. And that purpose is not partial or hesitant, but complete: every being, in the very act of *being*, is in want to put completely of itself. That is, existence does not dabble or defer; it commits. To exist is to place oneself wholly into becoming, and that placing — *purpose* — is unconditional. It is the given of *being*: that it is for something, not nothing.

But between *purpose* and *realization* lies *meaning*. And meaning is not given; it is grown. It is not unconditional but *conditional* — dependent on context, condition, capacity. Meaning is not the fact of purpose, but the *intending toward it*.

This is the heart of the koan: while every *being* is purposed — put completely into the world with the capacity to accumulate ability — how that purpose becomes real, how it takes form, varies with each *being*, the moment, the structure, the pressure. The CEO *intends* to accumulate power in the form of profit and strategic influence; the parent *intends* to accumulate power to emancipate their offspring. Both serve the universal arc of ability, but their *meanings* diverge — because their forms of will, context, and relation diverge.

Thus, meaning is interdependent. It is shaped by what the being *is*, and what it *is in relation to*. The inner discipline — the capacity to *not bend apart* — must meet the outer regulation — the process by which other beings *direct back* our actions through response, resistance, or resonance. Meaning is forged at this intersection: how the self bends, or does not bend, in response to another.

Meaning, then, is a kind of *adaptive intention* — an evolving trajectory that navigates the dynamic between inward will and outward condition. It is a dance between autonomy and entanglement. No

being means in isolation. Even the most inward gesture carries echoes of the world it inhabits.

But in all this variance, one thing remains: *every being means to transform existence*. This is not incidental — it is essential. Meaning is not static, not content with mere reproduction. It intends to bend the real, however slightly, into a form more consonant with ability. This is the Gospel: that all being is not merely *given*, but *giving toward transformation*.

To mean, then, is to act into the world with intention that exceeds self-maintenance. It is the will not only to *be*, but to *change what is*. Not arbitrarily, but faithfully — toward the purpose already placed completely — towards *power*: 'ability'.

6.3 Meaning and Sense

All *meaning* is ‘intending’ thus *sent*: ‘caused to go’ that it might be *sensed*: ‘transduced’, ‘lead across’ toward potential as memory.

Meaning is not in the holding but in the sending. Meaning, in this ontology, is not a static possession but a dynamic intention in motion. It arises in the one who intends and becomes real only as it departs. All meaning is *caused to go* — not accidentally, but purposefully. It is action outward, a dispatch of *being* toward another. This is why every act of meaning is, at its root, a transmission.

And transmission is not mere travel. It is *sending toward being sensed*. For the message to mean, it must be received. But reception is not passive. To *sense* is to ‘transduce’, to lead something across a threshold, to convert one form into another. The light that strikes the eye is transduced into electrical signal. The voice that breaks the air is transduced into vibration, into

meaning. What is sent must become something else in the one who receives it — must be *led across*.

Thus meaning is not a private event. It is not self-contained. It is always already relational: formed in the sending, fulfilled in the sensing. The *intending* belongs to the sender; the *sensing* belongs to the receiver. And between the two there is no guarantee — only the fragile potential of understanding.

Yet in that fragile potential, something sacred occurs. What is sensed is not only registered — it is stored. It *becomes memory*, the sediment of sense. Memory is not just the past retained; it is the *potential* of past sense becoming future meaning. What was once sent, once sensed, becomes available for further action, further intention. Memory makes meaning recursive, capable of echoing forward, shaping futures.

And so all meaning, once sent, enters a chain: from intention to transmission, from transmission to sensing, from sensing to memory, and from memory again to new intention. Meaning begets meaning. Intention begets transformation.

This is the ontological loop by which existence becomes self-aware, not through interior monologue but through the ceaseless crossing of signals — the sending and receiving of intentional being. It is not just communication. It is communion. It is how the world comes to *know itself* through the mutual transmission of its parts.

6.4 Consciousness

Consciousness: is the ‘measure of knowing together’, where *meaning* and *sense* are one and the *meaning* sent is the *sense* received.

Consciousness is often imagined as a private chamber — something sealed within the skull, contained in the self. But this koan reveals another possibility: that consciousness is not an isolate, but *co-measurement* — not merely to know, but to *know together*. It arises not in the solitude of thought, but in the alignment between *what is meant* and *what is sensed*. Only when what is *sent* is what is *received* does *consciousness* as the ‘measure of knowing together’ become real.

This is not metaphorical — it is structural. Consciousness, in this light, is a field in which intention and perception confer — bear together. It is the site where *meaning* and *sense* are no longer opposites or roles, but aspects of the same act: where the *meaning sent* is transduced

so faithfully that the *sense received* is identical in spirit, if not in form.

But where *meaning* and *sense* diverge — where what is sent is misunderstood, or lost — then consciousness fractures. There is still signal, perhaps, still activity, still reaction. But no 'measure of knowing together', *consciousness* i.e. meeting of minds. In such moments, this *differing*: 'bearing apart' can overwhelm attempts at *conference*. Signals become noise. Confusion replaces clarity.

So consciousness is not a constant. It flickers with the fidelity of transmission. It deepens with the clarity of meaning and sense. It is not limited to human brains, nor reducible to neurons. Wherever beings confer — where *meaning and sense align* — there, consciousness flowers. Between mother and child. Between creature and environment. Between thought and word, sender and receiver, one being and another.

This insight makes consciousness not a property, but a relationship. Not a substance, but a synchrony. It is not something we *possess*, but something we *participate in*. And that

participation is always provisional, always dependent on the grace of alignment. To be *conscious* is to 'know together', to be vessels through which *meanings*: 'intendings' are sensed i.e. transduced in similitude. Where nothing is lost in transmission and the message is the message received.

In this way, consciousness is not the measure of an individual's knowing, but the measure of what is conferent between beings. What is broadly defined as the conscious, pre-conscious, and unconscious might be more coherently understood as the conferent, pre-conferent, and in-conferent — not layers of mind, but degrees of relational conference. Consciousness, then, is not a structure nested within, but a pattern of mutuality — the measure of how far knowing is shared, whether across minds or within the mind itself.

6.5 The Success of Meaning

All meaning makes sense in *probability*: ‘that which is able to prove’ and not *improbability*: ‘that which is able to prove—not’.

Meaning may be sent with perfect intention, but unless it can be sensed — unless it can *cross the gap* between beings — it fails to become real. The success of that crossing, the success of meaning, depends on *probability*: the capacity of a signal to be *proven*, to be *led across*, to find resonance in the structure of the receiver.

Probability here is not mere statistical chance — it is the *possibility of proving*, the ontological fitness of a message to be transduced. It depends on form, on structure, on readiness. A photon is only sensed because the eye has evolved to transduce light. A word is only understood if the mind has a language for it. A gesture is only meaningful if there exists in the other a matching motor of interpretation.

To make sense is to find a bridge. And that bridge must already be part-built within the receiver. *Probability* is the condition of that partial structure — what the receiver is already *able to prove* true by virtue of its existing pathways and receptive form.

Conversely, *improbability* is the condition in which no such structure exists. The signal may be sent, but the receiver cannot transduce it — cannot *lead it across*. There is no path, no receptor, no resonance. The signal dissipates. The meaning, though intended, is not received. In such cases, it is not that meaning lacks value, but that it lacks viability. The message may be noble, but it is unprovable within the system it seeks to enter.

This insight introduces a kind of *ontological humility*. No matter how potent or pure the intention, its meaning is only real if it can be received — if the world has some existing contour into which it may fit. Sense, then, is never absolute; it is always *relational*. Always dependent on fitting in with existing senses.

And so, meaning does not float freely. It flows along the channels of probability. It succeeds by affinity, by adaptation, by echo. It travels not into emptiness, but into form. The Gospel, too, must be logically provable — not just in meaning but in sense. Only then can we throw our faith behind it — not blindly, but because it accords more strongly with reality.

6.6 The Means to Power

Every *being*: ‘action to be’ *means*: ‘intends’
and thus ‘tends towards’ the accumulation
of *power*: ‘ability’ by will of the Gospel.

To exist is to act, and to act is to intend. Every *being*, in its very ‘action to be’, is also *meaning to be* — not passively, but purposefully. This is not incidental. It is ontological: the being is *in motion toward power*, not as conquest, but as ability. This movement is not imposed from without. It arises from within as *will*: the *tendency to accumulate ability* in alignment with the structure of the real.

This tendency — this directional motion — is not chaotic. It follows a deeper current: the *will of the Gospel*, understood here not as dogma, but as the underlying law of becoming. The Gospel is the principal, the pattern, the way in which power emerges through being — not power over, but power to: power to adapt, to relate, to remain, to respond.

Yet while this will to power is universal — shared across all beings — the *meaning* and *sense* of it are not. They are *conditional*, shaped by the context in which each being exists. The tree accumulates power through rootedness and sun. The bird through motion and sky. The child through learning; the sage through letting go. Each being *intends* in a way shaped by its situation, its encounters, its limitations, its relations.

That is why *meaning* — the action to intend — and *sensing* — the action to transduce — are not fixed, but evolved. They emerge in response to the regulatory actions of others. Existence is not solitary striving, but a conference of striving: each being acting toward power while adapting to the intentions and transmissions of others. Thus, meaning is not just personal; it is participatory.

This is the great tension: that the *purpose* of existence — to accumulate *power*: 'ability' — is non-conditional, universal, constant. But the path to that purpose is conditional, plural, co-shaped. No being arrives alone. No intention proceeds

unregulated. Meaning is the evolving art of intending one's way toward purpose amid the pressures of shared existence.

And yet the Gospel holds: that *power is accumulated through being*, not despite it. Through intention, not in avoidance of resistance. That every being, however constrained, is still moving — still *tending toward ability* by the light of a will deeper than its own.

This is not belief. It is structure. It is the very shape of what it means to be.

6.7 The Purpose is Power

All *being* means to purpose its power—Amen.

To *be* is to *mean* — to intend. And every intention is toward one thing: the realization of ability. Power, in this ontology, is not coercive — it is capacitive. It is the *ability to be*, to act, to adapt, to respond. And so, every 'action to be' that is *being* is already a movement toward the fulfillment of that capacity. All *being* is in want to accumulate *power*: 'ability'. It means to *purpose*: 'put completely' its power.

This is not a matter of choice or philosophy, but of structure. The *purpose* of existence — to accumulate *power* — is universal. But the *meaning* of that purpose — how each being moves toward it — is conditional. It unfolds through context, through constraint, through the recursive dance of *intending* and *sensing*, the reciprocity that takes place in the conference of difference.

No being fulfills its power in isolation. The path toward purpose is shaped interdependently — by what can be sensed, what can be received, what can be proved. This is the role of *probability*: not chance, but compatibility — the capacity for a being's intention to cross over, to transduce, to take hold in the world it inhabits.

And here, the Gospel parts the waters of divergence. Some beings transduce their power through sharing — seeking to emancipate others by distributing ability, democratizing capacity. Others transduce their power through competition — seeking to monopolize, to concentrate ability within. The former aligns with equilibrium and thus requires no regulation; the latter disturbs it, and thus calls constantly to be regulated back.

Still, the call to *power* remains universal. All beings *mean to purpose their power* — but the manner of that meaning is revealed in their way of being with others. It is in this interdependency that *meaning* finds its ethical form. To intend toward power is inevitable. But *how* one intends — whether to emancipate or to exploit — is the measure of one's attunement to the Gospel.

And so the final Amen is not an ending, but a return: a recognition that all being is meaning toward *power*: 'ability', shaped by difference, sensed in relation, and fulfilled not alone, but through conference.

PART 7: POWER

7.1 Least Resistance

Every *being*: ‘action to be’ is *karma*: ‘work’,
energy transforming *power*: ‘ability’ in want
to travel easily: the path of least resistance.

This Koan opens with a profound ontological claim: that to *be* is not a static fact but an *action* — a doing, a becoming. Being is not merely existence as presence but existence as motion, orientation, intent. This aligns with the original Sanskrit root of *karma*, meaning ‘to act’ or ‘to make.’ But in this Koan, karma is not fate — as it has been misinterpreted in popular Western contexts — but *work* in the deepest sense: the transmutation of potential into expression, of power into presence.

Physics mirrors this. In classical mechanics, *work* is defined as the transfer of *energy* through motion. Power is not substance but *capacity* — the stored possibility of action. And when that *power*: ‘ability’ transforms into *energy*: ‘work’, it does so as movement, heat, sound, or structure.

In this same way, the Koan suggests that *power* — defined here as 'ability' — is latent until it is made real through karma. Power, until enacted, is inert. Ability, until expressed, is dormant.

This transforms the idea of the soul or self from a thing to a process. You do not *have* being; you *do* being. You enact yourself into existence. Your life is not something you own but something you work upon, like clay or light or breath.

The phrase '*in want to travel easily: the path of least resistance*' introduces a second law — one that governs the motion of all things. In thermodynamics, systems evolve toward equilibrium. Water flows downhill. Light bends through the least resistant medium. Organisms evolve by adapting — not randomly, but along lines that reduce metabolic cost and increase systemic stability. Even evolution itself, the great drama of change, follows this logic: that which is most efficient at maintaining its form with the least conflict is that which survives.

So it is with us. Every act of being follows this same desire for ease — not laziness, but elegance. Not idleness, but economy. It is not

that life avoids difficulty, but that it refines itself toward flow. When the Koan speaks of the '*path of least resistance*', it is not glorifying passivity; it is glorifying *conservation* — the economics of being and becoming. Between power and enactment.

There is also a moral dimension here, subtly implied. For if all beings are engaged in this transformation of latent power into enacted work — guided by the search for ease — then no being is outside the dignity of striving. All things, in their own way, are laboring to *be*. Even the simplest organism, even the quiet stone warming in the sun, participates in this cosmic grammar of power, energy, and transformation. We are all, in this view, engaged in a common liturgy of unfolding.

In spiritual terms, this Koan recalls teachings from the Bhagavad Gita, where Krishna tells Arjuna that action is inescapable and that one must act in accordance with one's dharma — that is, one's form of ability, one's capacity to act rightly in the world. But here, *karma* is universalized: not the residue of past action, but the immediate condition of being itself. Karma is

not what you reap; it's what you do. And doing is being.

Philosophically, this merges process metaphysics (Whitehead) with existentialism (Sartre) and even elements of Taoism. Whitehead would say that reality is made of 'actual occasions' — events of becoming, not things. Sartre would claim existence precedes essence — that you are what you choose, what you make. And the Taoist might smile and nod, seeing here the Tao in motion, the Way that flows around resistance, shaping the world not through force but through form.

Even the rhythm of the Koan participates in its meaning. The repetition of terms — *karma*, *work*, *energy* — creates a syntactic energy, like a turning wheel. It mimics the very process it describes: the cycling of potential into expression, of power into purpose. Each word pulls the next into being. The structure enacts its substance.

So to say 'Every being is karma' is to say: every *being* is doing. Every *being* is energy in transformation. Every *being* is a will toward ease

— not toward comfort necessarily, but toward purpose. And power — true power — is not domination, but ability made manifest through the path of work, harmonized with the path of least resistance.

This is not fatalism. It is not saying we must always choose the easy path. Quite the opposite: it challenges us to discover the form of our ease — not the path that avoids effort, but the path through which effort flows and ability grows. Not resistance for resistance's sake, but resistance that hones our ability.

The Koan leaves us with a vision: that existence is not a struggle to be strong, but a dance to become able. That the cosmos is not ruled by might, but by movement. And that all of us — stars and cells and selves — are engaged in this ancient, sacred labor: to transform what we can be into what we are.

7.2 Power as Latent Ability

All *power*: ‘ability’ is latent, only fit to
purpose: ‘put completely’ when transformed
as *karma*: ‘work’, *energy* in being.

This Koan introduces a vital distinction: that power only becomes *purposeful* — literally, ‘fully put completely’ — when it is expressed through work. It is not enough to *have* ability; one must *deploy* it. Power is not fulfilled in latency. It seeks expression. In this sense, potential is not destiny — it is invitation. Only through the conversion of power into energy, and of energy into work, does purpose emerge.

Here, *being* continues to be defined as an active process — a kind of alchemical loop: a *being* acts, not just to survive, but to *accumulate power*. That is, to become more capable, more adaptive in its capacity to act. This aligns remarkably with evolutionary theory. Organisms expend energy — power-in-action — to reproduce, adapt, solve problems, and create

new structures. The drive to survive is not merely a drive to persist in place, but a drive to *increase ability* to survive. Survival is not stasis, but skill-building.

But the Koan deepens this with a necessary condition: to gain power, one must spend it. Energy is required to transform potential into actuality. This is true of all systems. In physics, the principle of conservation tells us energy is never created from nothing — it is always exchanged. In thermodynamics, no transformation is free — there is always entropy, always a price.

So too with being: the act of living is a continual wager — that the power you divest as energy will return to you in a greater measure of power. You pay the price of action — time, effort, vulnerability — in hope of a return in capability. And like any good investor, the wise being must calculate the *Benefit-Cost Ratio* (BCR) of each transformation. This is where the Koan makes its most profound economic turn: being is a kind of moral-energetic economist, constantly assessing how to best leverage effort into empowerment.

Yet this is not a solitary economy. It is not a self-contained game. The Koan now opens to the collective dimension: *conference* — the bearing together of effort. Beings do not accumulate power alone, nor can they. Collaboration reduces resistance. This is an ancient truth in both nature and society. Ant colonies, mycelial networks, ecosystems, human civilizations — all flourish when individuals combine energies toward mutual gain. The reduction of friction through coordination is nature's great secret. One gazelle has eyes; a herd has vision. One spark punctures the dark; many flames light a village.

And with this, the Koan introduces a moral principle. If power is to be gained through shared cost, then benefit must also be shared. This is not only just — it is essential to equilibrium. If costs are mutual but benefits are monopolized, the system becomes unstable. The scales tip. Exploitation begins. In economic terms, this becomes a parasitic or extractive dynamic. In biological terms, it invites collapse. In human terms, it breeds resentment, rebellion or despair.

Thus, the ethical lesson emerges from the ontological one. Just as existence is powered by

energy transactions, so too must justice be rooted in energetic reciprocity. If we are to *confer* — to bear together — then our systems of collaboration must reflect mutual gain. Otherwise, power ceases to be a communal rising and becomes a private hoarding. The result is not more power overall, but more resistance, more loss, more cost. Monopolized power breeds disequilibrium — what the Koan calls the loss of *equilibrium*: the 'setting of scales to equal'.

And here, we find resonance with moral systems across traditions:

- In *Confucianism*, harmony is the goal, and social roles exist to maintain relational balance. The mandate of heaven is withdrawn from rulers who hoard benefit at the people's expense.
- In *Buddhism*, the idea of karma includes mutual causality. One's actions ripple out into the collective; therefore, compassion is not optional—it is a form of existential hygiene.

- In *Christianity*, the notion that '*to whom much is given, much is required*' speaks directly to the idea that power, if not circulated, curdles into sin.
- In *Marxian thought*, surplus value extracted without equitable return leads to alienation. The system breaks its moral compact.

This Koan, while not couched in any one tradition, partakes of them all. It creates a universal economic-moral principle of existence: if *beings* are to increase their power through the transformation of energy, and if this energy is most effectively spent in cooperation, then justice — in the form of shared benefit — is not merely ethical, but imperative to equilibrium.

Thus, the Conference of Difference becomes more than a poetic ideal. It is a thermodynamic and moral necessity. By conferring — bearing together — beings can reduce individual resistance and increase collective return. But this is only sustainable if both cost and benefit are mutual. Power without reciprocity begets

tyranny; power with reciprocity begets equilibrium.

This is the architecture of flourishing: not competition for power, but co-petition in power. Not extraction, but exchange. Not domination, but mutuality.

7.3 Regulating Power

It is the function of *reciprocity*: the ‘condition of like forward, like back’, to regulate power and maintain equilibrium.

To exist is to strive — to move, to act, to express one’s power as work in the world. As earlier Koans make clear, every *being* seeks to transform potential into ability, and ability into greater ability. This directional striving is not malicious, but it is relentless. Every *being* means to increase its power, and in so doing, resists anything that impedes that increase.

This Koan now introduces the first major counterpoint to unchecked striving: *reciprocity* — the condition of *like forward, like back*. Here, the Gospel reveals that equilibrium is not achieved by self-restraint, but through mutual regulation. No being *wants* to limit itself — why should it? Restraint is resistance, and resistance slows the flow of becoming. Therefore, **no being willingly**

regulates its own power, for that would be to act against its own purpose.

This is a crucial ontological claim: *purpose is centrifugal*, always expanding, always accumulating. It is *reciprocity* — not morality, not guilt, not divine command — that acts as the centripetal force returning action back upon itself. It is not conscience that limits us, but consequence. The world answers back.

This can be read as a kind of *natural justice*. Every act to gain power creates a wave that rebounds. Not because the universe is punitive, but because it is interconnected. To *act forward* is to generate resistance — *like back*. One *being's* expansion is another's compression, and so *beings* act upon each other as checks and balances.

In physics, this mirrors *Newton's Third Law*: every action has an equal and opposite reaction. In ecology, it mirrors *feedback loops*: predators regulate prey; prey regulate predator. In economics, it's *market correction*. In relationships, it's *social reciprocity*: the push and pull of intention and reaction. In all systems,

equilibrium is not maintained by the benevolence of parts, but by the interplay of their drives.

The Koan uses the word *regulate*: 'to direct back.' This is not a commandment from above — it is a systemic effect. It is not a governor imposing limits, but a network redistributing force. And it is *reciprocity* that performs this function — returning pressure where it came from, returning impact to sender. This is not revenge. It is not karma in the moralistic sense. It is karma in its neutral, mechanical sense: **action generates consequence, and consequence modifies future action.**

This gives us a picture of *being* not as sovereign and isolated, but as *co-shaped by others* — each striving *being* acts and is acted upon. It cannot grow power without encountering resistance, and it is in this resistance that *equilibrium* is forged — not as stasis, but as *dynamic balance*.

The word *equilibrium* — 'the setting of scales to equal' — brings in the metaphor of justice. But this is not a justice handed down by law; it is one *emergent from interaction*. This is a kind of ontological justice, written into the very fabric of

existence. If power accumulates asymmetrically, resistance increases. If beings overreach, others push back. If a system becomes too centralized, it destabilizes. Reciprocity does not punish — it *corrects*. And in this way, the cosmos maintains its equilibrium, not despite difference, but *because of it*.

And so, the moral lesson here is subtle but sharp. Do not expect power to regulate itself. Power does not yield of its own accord. It is only when beings are embedded in systems of reciprocity that regulation becomes possible. It is *through relationship*, not self-denial, that equilibrium is achieved.

This insight resonates deeply with political and economic thought:

- *In liberal theory*, checks and balances are the institutional form of this Koan's truth: power is restrained by counter-power.
- *In anarchist and mutualist thought*, horizontal reciprocity replaces hierarchical enforcement.

- *In ecological economics*, the notion of a 'steady-state economy' is one where growth is checked by planetary feedbacks.
- *In ethics*, relational theories of responsibility emerge: we are not accountable because we choose to be, but because others *make us* so through consequence.

And spiritually, this aligns with the deeper logic of *compassion and cooperation*. Not because beings are 'good', but because only through *conferring* — bearing together — can resistance be reduced and power be shared sustainably. Reciprocity thus becomes the *precondition of equilibrium*.

This Koan, then, prepares the way for the Gospel's later treatment of *Reciprocity* in full. But even here, it reveals its heart: *existence equalizes not through sacrifice, but through exchange*. And the measure of that exchange — of what is returned, resisted, or received — determines the degree to which *power* can remain *in motion* without collapse.

Thus, reciprocity is not the enemy of power. It is its balancing system.

7.4 Corruption of Power

Power is the universal purpose of existence and thus it is not *power*: ‘ability’ itself that corrupts but the competition for it.

This Koan offers a clarifying light: *power is not the problem*. The desire for power is not a flaw in *being* — it is its essence. Every *being* exists to *be able*, to express and extend its capability. This is not hubris but the ethic of *being*. It is not sin but the very *raison d'etre* of existence.

The Gospel here makes a daring claim: **power is the universal purpose of existence**. Not wealth, not pleasure, not survival — but *ability*. This reframes existence not as a struggle for safety, but as a striving for *greater capacity*: to act, to adapt, to become. In this framing, power is not domination, but potential made manifest. It is not a zero-sum good; it is a generative force.

And so, the corruption of power is not in its nature, but in the way it is pursued.

The Koan distinguishes between *power* and *competition for power*. The former is ontological; the latter is a pattern of pursuit — a method. Competition, in this context, means *petitioning against*. It is an oppositional mode that treats the world as a battlefield and other beings as obstacles. It imagines power as scarce, and therefore, as something to monopolize rather than share. This is not just ethically problematic — it is *ontologically incoherent*.

Why? Because if all beings exist to accumulate ability, and if ability is fundamentally relational (as earlier Koans have shown), then to treat others as rivals in a zero-sum game *undermines the very possibility of lasting power*. Competition atomizes. It extracts. It provokes resistance. The moment power is pursued against others, it triggers the logic of reciprocity — not in mutual empowerment, but in mutual constraint.

Here lies the self-defeating nature of competition: it turns the path of least resistance into a path of ever-increasing resistance. It creates feedback loops of opposition. And as each being competes to overcome the other,

they all expend more energy to gain less power. The net result is not growth, but exhaustion.

This is true across domains:

- *In evolution*, arms races between predator and prey waste vast energy — while cooperative symbioses flourish.
- *In markets*, monopolistic competition stifles innovation, while collaborative ecosystems expand it.
- *In politics*, zero-sum struggles breed tyranny or stalemate, while shared governance fosters legitimacy.
- *In psychology*, inner conflict driven by scarcity narratives leads to anxiety and burnout, not wisdom.

To compete for power is to treat power as *external*, *scarce*, and *exclusive*. But power in the *Gospel of Being* is none of these. It is *internal*, *generative*, and *distributed*. Every being possesses the seed of ability. The role of others is not to be outmatched but to be engaged.

Difference is not a threat to power, but the field in which it multiplies.

Thus, the true corruption is the competitive frame — the lens through which ability becomes a conquest of difference rather than a conference of difference.

Here, the Koan echoes and refines Lord Acton's famous dictum: '*Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.*' The Gospel replies — not so. Power itself does not corrupt. The *competition* for it does.

This distinction rehabilitates power. It allows us to reclaim power as a good — not as domination, but as unfolding capacity. And it invites a new mode of engagement: not competition, but *co-petition*: 'petitioning together', not against.

This aligns with the teachings of many traditions when properly understood:

- *Taoism* emphasizes *wu wei* — action in alignment, not against.

- *Ubuntu* sees the self in the other: 'I am because we are'.
- *Spinoza* defines power not as coercion but as the capacity to *persist and cooperate* in harmony with others.
- *Jesus* commands not surrender, but service — the power that lifts rather than lords over.

The Gospel here issues a quiet revolution: *reject not power, but rivalry*. Do not lay down your ability — cultivate it. But do so in concert with others, not in combat.

This Koan thus opens the door to an entirely different logic — one in which power is abundant, and *difference* is not opposition but occasion. The world is not a battlefield but a conference hall. The struggle is not to win against, but to grow with.

7.5 Power to Adapt

As a *condition*: ‘process of declaring together’, the conference of difference functions to transform *power*: ‘ability’ towards adapting.

This Koan is the Gospel’s pivot into remedy. Having named competition as the corruption of power, it now offers its ontological antithesis: co-petition (conference). Not merely dialogue, but the very condition in which power becomes adaptive rather than adversarial. This Koan defines the word *condition* etymologically and existentially as a ‘process of declaring together.’ And in this shared declaration, difference becomes not an obstacle, but the crucial medium for transformation.

At first glance, this may appear abstract. But its claim is elemental: *difference does not destabilize power — it refines it*. It is *through* difference, in the condition of conference, that

ability becomes *adaptability* — power that bends, learns, and grows in relation.

Let's break this down.

Conference as Condition

To name *conference* as a condition rather than merely an event is to elevate it from discussion to ontology. A condition is not a happening — it is the process through which happenings occur. Conference, then, is not something beings do — it is something *being requires*. To be at all is to be in relation, and to relate meaningfully is to declare one's difference in the presence of others.

The phrase 'declaring together' suggests more than speech. It is about making manifest one's form, function, or perspective in a shared field. It is not merely expressing *what one is*, but doing so *in view of others* who are not the same. This is difference in dialogue, not in division. It is *the mutual exposure of meaning*: 'intending', and thus, the space where transformation becomes possible.

The Function of Difference

In previous Koans, difference is framed as '*the condition of bearing apart*'. But here, difference does not remain in apartness — it enters conference. In doing so, it becomes *functional*, not just structural. Difference ceases to be a wall and becomes a *filter* through which ability is tested, stretched, and re-formed.

This is the key insight: *power, left alone, becomes brittle*. Like untempered steel, it lacks resilience. It must be *worked, shaped, confronted* by other powers in order to adapt. And it is only in conference — the bearing-together of difference — that this reshaping occurs without disintegration.

Adaptation as the Direction of Power

The Gospel here reframes the arc of power. Its functional objective is not domination but *adaptation* — the ability to reconfigure in light of resistance, complexity, and change. This mirrors both evolutionary theory and systems thinking:

- In *evolution*, species that adapt survive; those that do not vanish. Adaptation is not optional — it's critical to existence.
- In *cybernetics*, systems must adjust to input in order to maintain equilibrium — this is *adaptive regulation*.
- In *learning*, we grow not by reinforcing sameness, but by integrating difference — new perspectives, feedback, challenge.

So too here: *conference is the ecological field in which beings adapt*. It is not just where power is *exerted*, but where it is *refined*. And without it, power calcifies into arrogance, isolation, and decay.

Philosophical Parallels

This Koan echoes the wisdom of many traditions:

- *Hegel*: self-consciousness arises only in recognition by another — the 'I' emerges in encounter.

- *Levinas*: the face of the Other calls the self to ethical awakening; difference is not danger but demand.
- *Indigenous cosmologies*: emphasize kinship not just among humans, but between all beings — conference as ecological reverence.
- *Christianity*: 'Where two or more are gathered...' — truth emerges in gathered presence, not solitary assertion.

Political and Ethical Implications

If conference is the condition in which power adapts, then any politics or society that suppresses difference — through coercion, homogenization, or fear — undermines its own power. It loses the field of mutual refinement and begins to rot from within.

By contrast, a society that fosters conference — that institutionalizes it, teaches it, reveres it — creates a living ecology of transformation. Such

a society does not merely tolerate difference — it depends on it. And it regulates itself not through force, but through processes of reciprocal declaration. The very act of showing up differently becomes the means by which the whole learns to adapt.

So the Koan stands as a cornerstone of the Gospel's moral architecture:

*Where competition fractures, conference binds.
Where sameness stagnates, difference evolves.
And where power is declared together, it
becomes the seed of adaptation.*

This is not a moral appeal, but a structural one. It is not kindness that saves us — it is **relation**. The universe is not a war of wills, but a gathering of declarations — each declaring what it is, and in that mutual declaration, becoming more than it was.

7.6 The Power to Transform

Thus *difference*: ‘the condition of bearing apart’ cannot manifest power in division but only in *conference*: the ‘condition of bearing together’.

This Koan delivers a decisive truth at the heart of the Gospel: *difference does not dictate division*. And it is not in *bearing apart* alone that power is made manifest, but only in the condition of *bearing together* — in conference. Here, the Gospel draws the final distinction between the raw fact of difference and the constructive condition that transforms it into generative power.

To be different is to be discrete, distinct, singular. Every being is different —no two configurations of power are the same. This condition of ‘bearing apart’ is not a flaw but a given. It is ontological, not ideological. The cosmos is manifold: atoms differ, cells differ, minds differ, cultures differ.

Without difference, there is no novelty, no learning, no motion.

But the Koan warns: *difference, on its own, does not generate power*. If difference remains *isolated*, it becomes inert. It fragments into division. And division is not difference enhanced — it is difference severed. Division renders otherness unintelligible. It shuts down the feedback loops that allow beings to adapt. It turns the richness of multiplicity into the silence of disconnection.

In contrast, **conference** is the condition in which **difference becomes transformative**. As defined earlier, *conference* is the 'condition of bearing together'. It is where difference is not only present, but expressed, received, and engaged. It is the field in which power flows *between* beings rather than stagnating *within* them.

This is not abstract theology — it is visible everywhere:

- In *biology*, symbiosis transforms difference into mutual advantage. The

mitochondrion was once a foreign cell, now it powers every eukaryote.

- In *language*, difference in meaning becomes poetry when juxtaposed with resonance. A metaphor is a conference between images.
- In *society*, diversity becomes strength only when it is *conferred with*, not merely displayed. Inclusion without integration is aesthetic, not adaptive.

In division, difference becomes a chasm; in conference, a path.

Many systems mistake division for strength. They enforce purity, sameness, unity without dissonance. But this leads to entropy. Without the tension of difference, systems lose their adaptive edge. They become brittle, unable to respond to change. Division, while sometimes necessary to clarify boundaries, *cannot itself generate power* — only isolate it.

This is especially true in competitive structures. When difference is cast into rivalry — us vs.

them — it becomes a justification for extraction, not expression. Otherness becomes threat. Power becomes domination. And the very differences that could have enhanced ability are instead repressed or destroyed.

Thus, division offers the *illusion* of clarity but yields the *reality* of decay.

In conference, by contrast, difference becomes dynamic. It introduces novelty. It challenges assumptions. It requires flexibility, humility, and listening — not as acts of surrender, but as strategies of *becoming more capable*. When *beings bear together*, they do not dissolve their distinctions — they put them into motion.

This is the very *engine of adaptation*, as we saw in the previous Koan. It is through the friction of difference in proximity — not distance — that power expands. Just as an electrical current requires polarity, so too does evolution require distinction in relation.

Conference is not the flattening of difference, but the choreography of it.

Spiritually, this Koan echoes the mystery of *communion*. In many traditions, the sacred is not found in solitude but in *gathering*:

- In *Christianity*, the body of Christ is plural, not singular.
- In *Buddhism*, the sangha — the community — is one of the three jewels of liberation.
- In *Sufism*, the divine is encountered not in withdrawal alone, but in the mirror of the beloved.
- In *Kabbalah*, the divine emanates through difference — ten *sefirot* in balance, not collapse.

Each of these affirms that to know the divine —or to become more able — is to be in *right relation with difference*.

This Koan completes the moral geometry of power. Power arises not from division, nor from solitary striving, but from *bearing difference together*. To manifest power is not to suppress

what is unlike, but to engage it. Not to *compete*: 'petition against', but to *co-pete*: 'petition together'.

*Division dismembers diversity of power;
conference re-members it.*

So the condition of being is clarified: to be is to differ, yes — but to *become* is to confer.

7.7 The Want of Power

All *being* is in will of power—Amen.

This closing Koan is a benediction in the truest sense: not a withdrawal from the world, but a blessing upon it. It sanctifies what has been revealed — that the movement of all things, from the smallest gesture to the unfolding of galaxies, is animated by one common current: *the will of power*. That is, the will *to be able*.

The Gospel here offers no duality between spirit and matter, no schism between sacred and secular, no separation of desire from design. *Being itself* — not just human being, but all *being* — is cast as an act of will, a striving toward *power*: not domination, but *ability, capacity, the flowering of potential* into presence.

This is not Nietzsche's 'will to power' in the usual interpretation of dominance or self-overcoming, nor is it Schopenhauer's pessimistic will-to-life as blind suffering. Instead, it is something older and deeper, more Spinozan in tone: *a will toward*

coherence, toward expressive adaptability, toward increasing capacity to act and be acted with. It is *conatus* spiritualized — existence as a desire to continue and to grow.

The phrase 'is in will' suggests not merely that *being has* will, but that *being is* will. That is: *existence is directional*. It is always oriented — never still, never static. Even the stone in the field, seemingly inert, is caught in gravitational pull, in thermal exchange, in the slow transformation of form. It is not passive — it is participating.

To will, in this Gospel, is not merely to want in the psychological sense. It is to incline, to seek, to reach — to act *in tension with non-being*. To will is to say *yes* to presence, to motion, to differentiation and integration. It is to choose continuation over collapse.

So when the Koan says 'All being is in will of power', it is not describing a desire for control, but a *cosmic grammar*: that to exist is to move toward greater capacity, to seek more ease in transformation, to strive for adaptive communion. It is not that we *ought* to grow in power; it is that

we *cannot help but do so*. Power is not the goal—it is the motion. It is not the prize—it is the pulse.

Universal, Not Human-Centric

The word 'All' is essential here. This Koan resists the anthropocentric temptation to locate will only in human mind or moral intention. It extends agency to all that is — to bacteria, to starlight, to tectonic plates and tree roots. Every being, whether conscious or not, is involved in the unfolding of its own capacity. The root cracks the concrete not out of cruelty, but out of will. The cloud does not will to fall, yet it rains by necessity of form.

Thus, *will* is not *mind* — it is the momentum of being toward more being.

The Function of Amen

And then comes 'Amen.'

Throughout the Gospel of Being, 'Amen' has been quietly redefined. Not a religious closure,

but an *ontological affirmation*. Not 'so be it' as submission, but 'so it is' as revelation. It closes this chapter not with resignation, but with resounding clarity.

Amen here means: this is the deepest truth we can speak.

- That being is not static.
- That difference is not division.
- That power is not to be hoarded or fought for, but to be conferred.
- That existence is not a thing, but a current.
- And that the nature of that current is will — toward ability, toward transformation, toward conference.

This Amen is both a period and a pulse.

So, this Chapter closes as it began — with a vision of power not as possession, but as process. Not as competition, but as co-petition. It is a reclaiming of power from its corruption in process to one that is ontologically consistent: *the will to be able, together*.

PART 8: RECIPROCITY

8.1 The Pulse of God's Spell

All existence functions in *reciprocity*: a 'condition of like forward, like back', towards *equilibrium*: a 'setting of scales equal'.

This is not metaphor but mechanism. From the orbit of planets to the heartbeat of mammals, from neural signaling to economic exchange, the fabric of existence is stitched with reciprocal threads. Action is never solitary. Every force elicits a counterforce. Every breath is balanced by exhalation. Every giving implicates a return. This is not moral sentiment but ontological structure — the architecture of being itself.

To speak of reciprocity is to speak of relation. Nothing exists in isolation; to be is already to be in relation — not just with another, but with the whole. A thing moves, and the cosmos adjusts. You speak, and the silence answers. The stone falls, and the earth receives. All motion is met. All impulse invites a response.

But reciprocity is not mere symmetry. It is not a scale tipped only by equivalent weights. The child gives laughter, the parent gives life. The seed gives silence, the soil returns bloom. Reciprocity honours difference — it does not erase it. In its truest form, it is not transactional but attuned: a giving and receiving that preserves distinction while weaving harmony.

Equilibrium, then, is not stasis. It is the dance of difference in dynamic poise. Just as the body maintains its balance not by stillness but by constant adjustment, so too the world sustains its wholeness through the ceaseless reciprocity of all its parts. And where imbalance arises — as it must, in a living system — reciprocity acts as the homeostatic pulse, restoring what excess displaces, lifting what deficit obscures.

Ancient voices knew this. Confucius taught that the superior man responds to the goodwill of others with goodwill, and to injury with justice. Hammurabi codified the law of measure-for-measure, not to encourage vengeance, but to prevent excess. Newton observed that to every action there is an equal


and opposite reaction — not just in things, but in time. Reciprocity is old. Older than words. Older than gods. It is the first agreement of the world: that nothing shall go unanswered.

And yet, the answer need not be the same as the call. Here is the great grace of reciprocity: that it adjusts not only to motion but to meaning. It allows the powerful to lift without condescension, the weak to respond without shame. It honours each according to their ability and need. In this, it becomes not law but love — not calculation, but care. It is the foundation of justice precisely because it is the seed of mercy.

To say 'all existence functions in reciprocity' is not to assert a moral imperative, but to describe a fact of *being*. And to say that it tends toward equilibrium is to say that even amid chaos, there is a gravity toward balance. Even amid injustice, a pull toward redress. The world may not be fair, but it is not without consequence. Every imbalance stirs a counter-movement. Every excess calls forth a correction. This is the faith of matter — that nothing falls forever without rising somewhere else.

Thus, reciprocity is the pulse of God's spell — the hidden rhythm by which the many become one without losing their difference. In the conference of existence, it is the protocol by which each voice grants another the space to speak.

8.2 The Law of Return



You have heard it said by Confucius,
Hammurabi and Newton that every action
forward receives action back; reciprocity is
Gospel.

Across culture, law, and science — across East, West, and cosmos — this truth resounds: reciprocity is not merely a belief, but a consensus woven into the deep grammar of existence. When sages, sovereigns, and scientists say the same thing in different tongues, we ought to listen. Their agreement is no accident. It testifies to a law older than doctrine, more exacting than faith, and yet more gracious than punishment. It is the law of return.

Confucius, gentle architect of social harmony, said: *'What you do not wish for yourself, do not do to others.'* But this was no passive ethic. It was grounded in the certainty that action echoes. Not just morally, but relationally. Each gesture sets in motion a resonance, a ripple that returns.

The moral person acts accordingly — not in fear, but in awareness that every motion writes itself into the structure of the whole.

Hammurabi, architect of law, inscribed the principle of *lex talionis* — ‘*an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth*’ — into stone not as vengeance, but as limit. In a world where harm tends to escalate, he drew a boundary. Let no retribution exceed its cause. Let punishment mirror injury — not to double pain, but to prevent it from multiplying unchecked. His code was an early attempt to align justice with the *principle of proportion*: to make reciprocity a brake against excess, not a spur to revenge.

Newton, seeker of nature’s laws, gave the principle its most austere formulation: *For every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction*. In his formulation, reciprocity becomes mechanical — exact, predictable, inescapable. But Newton did not drain the world of mystery; he revealed its integrity. He showed that motion is never solitary. That the universe does not permit a push without a pull, a strike without recoil, a fall without consequence. Even in the

impersonal realm of force and mass, reciprocity reigns.

Thus: *reciprocity is Gospel*. Not because a prophet proclaimed it, but because reality embodies it. It is not merely written in scripture, but in structure — in the way things behave, in the way relations unfold, in the way causes bear fruit. When we say it is Gospel, we mean it is *good news*, but also *true news* — a revelation not of law imposed from outside, but of order arising from within.

This Gospel is not punitive. It is generative. It promises not that we will be punished for what we do, but that what we do will return. For better or worse, reality reflects us. We live in the world we shape. The good we give, we meet again. The harm we cause, we endure anew. Not always immediately, not always clearly, but inevitably. The arc may be long, but it is arced.

This is the deep consolation of reciprocity: that nothing is wasted. No kindness vanishes unheeded. No cruelty is lost to time. The ledger may be cosmic, but it is kept. Not for vengeance, not for reward, but for *balance*. And balance, in

this Gospel, is not merely a state. It is a becoming — a continual adjustment, a ceaseless re-tuning of the shared field of *being*.

So when Confucius, Hammurabi, and Newton speak in harmony, they are not making the same claim — but they are naming the same current. They each describe the same invisible gravity that pulls action back toward its source. They each describe the law by which the conference of difference is sustained: no voice shouts forever, no act is left alone, no being is immune to reply.

And so: reciprocity is Gospel. It is the glad tidings of a world that listens, a world that remembers, a world that responds. Not always gently, not always swiftly, but always truly.

8.3 Reciprocal Altruism

The principle of reciprocity is *do ut des*: ‘I give as you give’, hence *reciprocal altruism*: ‘reciprocating [the] practice of others’.

In this koan, reciprocity is cast as both a principle of justice and an engine of generosity. It bridges law and life, contract and compassion. *Do ut des* — the ancient Roman maxim — is not a mere bargain, but the foundation of civil relation. It is how communities cohere, how trust accrues, how the human world builds itself from promise and return.

‘I give as you give’ does not mean ‘I give only if you give’. It is not cynical, but symmetrical. It invites relationship, not transaction. Its deepest logic is not *quid pro quo* but *recognition*: I see you as a giver too. I offer not to obligate you, but to open the circuit between us. Reciprocity is not the closure of debt, but the opening of exchange — not a settlement, but a seed.

This principle is not confined to human society. In the study of evolutionary biology, *reciprocal altruism* is a term used to describe cooperative behavior that persists even when not immediately advantageous. Among vampire bats, those who have fed will regurgitate blood for those who have not — on the unspoken promise that the favor will one day be returned. Among primates, grooming is traded, even when the immediate benefit is small. Among humans, kindness often precedes certainty of return — because the long memory of reciprocity binds communities together more effectively than force.

Yet reciprocal altruism is more than a strategy for social survival. It may be one of the primary ways that *consciousness propagates itself*. To observe the practice of another — and to take that practice into oneself — is not mere imitation; it is internalization. It is the becoming of a pattern that was once outside the self. In this way, minds do not merely mirror each other — they *emerge through each other*.

This reciprocity of practice — this witnessing and willing adoption of another's gesture — is not

only the bedrock of cooperation, but the *engine of selfhood*. To see another give and to give in kind, is to realize: *I too am a source*. The self, in this light, is not an isolated flame but a torch passed hand to hand. Altruism, when reciprocated, becomes not just a social bond, but a *conscious act of becoming* — the root of learning, empathy and responsibility.

In religious traditions, this principle often forms the groundwork of covenant. God gives breath, and humanity gives praise. The divine offers mercy, and the faithful respond with devotion. But even here, the point is not symmetry of value but continuity of bond. What is given is not always equal — it is proportionate. What matters is not equivalence, but *participation* in the cycle of giving and receiving.

And here we arrive at one of reciprocity's most wondrous qualities: its *emancipatory power*. The highest act of giving is not to sustain another in dependency, but to *emancipate them into ability*. To teach another to fish is not simply to share knowledge — it is to *free them from need*, and at the same time, to *free oneself from obligation*. In doing so, a new being is born: one who can not

only feed themselves, but feed others, and teach others to do the same.

This is the exponential grace of reciprocal altruism — that it does not end with the second act, but becomes a third, and a fourth, and a thousandth. Each new practitioner becomes a node of propagation, a teacher of teachers, a giver of gifts that give again. The loop widens. The whole grows richer.

In this sense, reciprocity is not just exchange; it is **exodus** — a passage from dependence into interdependence, from solitary action into shared becoming. It is how consciousness grows not only in depth but in reach: through shared practice, mirrored responsibility and the joyful burden of passing on what has been received.

Thus we learn: to give as you give is to say, *'May we both become emancipated by this act — and emancipate others still'*. This is not obligation. It is liberation.

8.4 Prototype to Sharing

As a *condition*: ‘process of declaring together’, reciprocity is mutual and prototype to the ‘condition of sharing’ that is *society*.

Reciprocity is not merely an exchange between two — it is a declaration of relation, a *coming-into-speech* between *beings*. The word *condition*, at its Latin root *condicere*, means ‘to speak with,’ to ‘declare together’. And this is precisely what reciprocity enacts: not only the doing of things together but the naming of a relation that binds.

Before there is law, there is agreement. Before there is society, there is the mutual recognition that ‘*I am because you are, and you are because I respond.*’ In this way, reciprocity is not just one among many possible conditions of being-together — it is the *prototype*, the original form, of society itself.

To declare something together is not simply to make a statement. It is to make a world — a shared context in which meanings are not private, and actions are not isolated. Reciprocity, then, is not a contract in the legal sense, but a kind of ontological compact: a silent accord that we exist not as solitudes but as *participants in a shared field* of giving and receiving.

The 'condition of sharing' that defines *society* is not an afterthought or ideal to be achieved. It is the very ground of its possibility. Without reciprocity, there can be no trust. Without trust, no continuity. Without continuity, no culture. Society is the memory of shared gestures and reciprocity is the root from which those gestures grow.

In the child's first mimicry of the parent, in the elder's storytelling to the young, in the exchange of goods, of glances, of gratitude — reciprocity establishes *mutuality*. Not uniformity. Mutuality. This is the secret of social being: that difference can coexist when recognition flows freely, when each gives and is given to.

And this mutuality is not limited to human beings. Ecosystems, too, are societies. Coral and algae, bee and blossom, mycelium and tree root — all participate in networks of reciprocal exchange. Life itself, at every scale, arises from *shared becoming*. Society, broadly understood, is the stable choreography of *beings* willing to declare themselves through the conference of difference.

But let us be precise: the sharing that defines society is not a lossy division of things but a *lossless distribution of knowing*. To share in this deeper sense is not to subtract but to extend. When I teach you what I know, I do not lose it — I affirm it. When you act on what I've taught, I am not burdened — I am unburdened. The obligation to do for another exists only until the other can do for themselves. And in this, responsibility is not redistributed — it is *emancipated*.

This is the true condition of sharing that underlies society: not a pooling of scarcity but a propagation of *ability*. Society, rightly ordered, is a realm where knowledge flows more freely than goods, where ability circulates without depletion, where the measure of strength is not how much

one holds, but how much one can *pass on* without loss. When we define sharing materially, we fall into the frames of capitalism, socialism, or communism. But when we define it epistemically — ontologically — we see that society precedes economy. It is first a space of *relation and transmission*, not of division and trade.

Even language itself arises from this condition. Words are given not to be hoarded, but to be understood. Every sentence assumes a listener; every question presupposes a response. Speech is a reciprocal act, and from it, every institution of society unfolds: justice, economy, kinship, ritual. We are not simply beings who speak — we are beings who *declare together* through the conference of difference.

Thus, reciprocity is not a moral aspiration but an existential truth: it is the grammar of togetherness, the structure that allows difference to converge without collapsing into sameness. In declaring together, we form the consciousness that is our social world. We become more than a sum of selves — we become a *we*.

And so, if reciprocity as a *condition* is a 'process of declaring together', then society is its echo: the persistent, evolving chorus of knowing together. It is not a structure imposed upon us, but a song we write and sing with each other.

8.5 Proportional Response

As *lex talionis*: a ‘proposition in kind’, reciprocity is open, proportional and just in all cases: collaborative, competitive or cooperative.

Lex talionis — the law of kind-for-kind — is often misunderstood as a crude ethic of retribution. ‘An eye for an eye’, it is said, and we imagine the spiral of vengeance. But in its original frame, *lex talionis* was not a call for revenge — it was a boundary. It placed a limit on escalation. It insisted: *let your response match the form, not exceed it in fury*. In this, reciprocity served not only as symmetry, but as *measure*.

To respond *in kind* is not merely to return what was received, but to do so with awareness — to offer a reply that corresponds, not just in action, but in *attunement*. This is what makes reciprocity ‘just’: not that it always produces harmony, but that it *preserves proportion*, even amid difference. Reciprocity tempers extremes. It

refuses to overreach. In its true form, it is not retributive but *responsive* — and that responsiveness is the seed of justice.

Whether in collaboration, competition or cooperation, reciprocity is the framework by which fairness becomes possible. In collaboration, it allows efforts to balance. In cooperation, it ensures that benefit does not become exploitation. And in competition, properly understood, it enables challenge without annihilation — a ‘petitioning against’ that still acknowledges the worth of the other.

This is why reciprocity must be *open*: it does not presume outcomes but adjusts in relation to the other’s form. It does not demand sameness of action, only *alignment of proportion*. The teacher corrects the student not by mimicking the mistake but by offering a precise redress. The court does not respond to theft with theft but with restitution. The parent does not meet a child’s tantrum with rage but with guidance scaled to the child’s capacity. Reciprocity then, is not mimicry but *matching* — and matching demands discernment.

This is where Newton's law and moral law begin to part. In physics, every force is met with a force equal and opposite. But in ethics, response is not measured in raw magnitude, but in *fittingness*. What matches an act is not always its double, but sometimes its foil. Kindness may answer cruelty; silence may answer insult. Reciprocity, in moral life, is less a law than a *logic of proportion* — and this is what makes it just.

But justice alone is not the limit of reciprocity. Justice is balance; reciprocity is *relationship*. To respond justly is to satisfy law. To respond reciprocally is to sustain *the circuit of being* — to keep the bond intact. Even when we oppose, we acknowledge. Even when we resist, we remain in relation.

Thus, in all forms of interaction — whether we seek harmony, assert difference or navigate mutual need — reciprocity offers a pattern of response that affirms the other without dissolving the self. It does not prescribe what to do, but how to be: in kind, in measure, in good faith.

And in this way, reciprocity is not merely fair. It is *faithful* — to the form of the other, to the shape

of the world, and to the call of equilibrium
beneath all conflict.

8.6 Towards Responsibility

Every *being*: ‘action to be’ is *responsible*: ‘able to promise back’ regarding reciprocity within the limits of its own *power*: ‘ability’.

To be is not only to act but to answer. Every *being* is a verb — an ‘action to be’ — and yet this action is not one-directional. It unfolds in relation, in reply, in return. What makes a *being* truly *responsible* is not simply that it acts but that it is *able to promise back* — to enter into the rhythm of reciprocity not as a mere recipient but as an active participant.

Responsibility, in this light, is not obligation imposed from without but *capacity acknowledged from within*. It is the recognition that one's actions do not vanish, that one is *seen*, that one's gestures echo — and that those echoes are, in some part, *mine to harmonize*. To be responsible is to accept one's role in the shared choreography of *being*.

But this promise back is never absolute. It is always offered *within the limits of power* — and here, power is not domination, but *ability*. The bird cannot build a dam, nor the tree compose music. Yet each fulfills the measure of its being in its own way. A child responds differently than a sage; a star than a cell. Responsibility is always scaled to ability, just as response is scaled to form. There is no guilt in incapacity. But there is responsibility in capacity — *response-ability* — the power to meet the world with a gesture that affirms relation.

This is what distinguishes *reciprocal responsibility* from legalism. Law demands uniformity; reciprocity demands fidelity — *to what I am, and what I can give*. In a reciprocal world, the question is not *'Have I done what is required?'* but rather, *'Have I given what I can?'* This is not license to give less, but a call to give *authentically* — not to mimic another's offering, but to promise back in one's own form, with one's own strength.

Responsibility, then, is not a burden but a form of *belonging*. It means I matter. My power makes a difference. My action alters the balance. And

because it does, I am invited — not forced — to participate in the healing of the scales. The smallest creature, the briefest gesture, the quietest word — all bear power, and so all bear responsibility, in kind.

To promise back is not simply to return a favor. It is to acknowledge that I am not alone. That I live within a network of beings whose fates are entangled. That to exist is to *respond to existence*. And the quality of that response — not its grandeur, but its *integrity* — is the measure of responsibility.

This, too, is why knowledge emancipates. For to know is to expand one's sphere of response. With every new understanding, a being becomes capable of more precise, more faithful, more powerful returns. And so the path of knowing is also the path of becoming more responsible — not as burden, but as *power*: the power to act with clarity, to promise with meaning, to answer with strength.

Responsibility, then, is the promise that *power makes to reciprocity* — the commitment not only to exist, but actively belong.

8.7 Maintaining Equilibrium

Reciprocity restores equilibrium to existence—Amen.

There are truths so fundamental that they cannot be improved by elaboration, only *illuminated by return*. This is one of them. Reciprocity is not just a structure among others, nor a virtue among many — it is the *mechanism by which the universe heals itself*.

Equilibrium is never a given. The cosmos is not static. It dances on the edge of flux: forces pulling, bodies colliding, minds colluding and diverging. In such a world, where everything is in motion, *balance is not a state but a process* — and reciprocity is that process.

To restore is not to rewind. It is to *respond with care* — to answer imbalance with attentiveness, not force. When a *being* gives beyond its means, reciprocity calls another to replenish. When harm is done, reciprocity seeks restoration not vengeance. When difference threatens

disintegration, reciprocity binds without erasing. It does not preserve sameness; it *weaves difference into stability*.

This is why reciprocity is not a zero-sum logic. It is not a ledger balancing gains and losses. It is a *living current*, a self-correcting flow that responds to excess with emptiness, and to absence with gift. It is the reason why rivers meander, why breath comes in and out, why generosity given is so often generosity awakened.

And this is not only true in nature. In human life, too, we feel it: the moment when apology closes the wound, when justice softens into restoration, when a kindness returned dissolves resentment. These are not merely ethical acts — they are ontological repairs. They *restore the conditions of being-together*. They bring the scales of existence back into poise.

Equilibrium is not perfection. It is peace in motion. Reciprocity makes that motion meaningful. It is the rhythm by which chaos becomes cosmos again. It is the amen of all

interaction — the closing chord that signals the music has resolved.

And so, we do not ask whether reciprocity is desirable. We affirm that it is *necessary* — not as morality, but as *metabolism*. Without it, existence would unravel into silence or violence. With it, even conflict becomes opportunity. Even fracture becomes potential. Reciprocity is the *grace of return* — not of sameness but of wholeness.

To say that reciprocity restores equilibrium to existence is to say that the world is not doomed to disorder. That its movements are meaningful. That the universe, for all its tumult, *listens back*. That every action finds its echo and every imbalance its homecoming.

PART 9: SALVATION

9.1 Two Testaments

Salvation: the ‘process of having safety’ in existence is a harmony of two testaments: atonement and forgiveness.

Salvation is not an escape from existence but a maturation within it — a condition of being at ease in the presence of others and of oneself. It is not bestowed from without nor achieved in isolation. Rather, it emerges from the co-arising of two relational actions: *atonement* and *forgiveness*.

Atonement, literally ‘action to be at one’, is the action by which a *being* re-enters unity. It is a turning toward, a stepping into coherence with others and the world. It says: I see the harm, I take responsibility, I seek repair. But atonement without forgiveness becomes a closed loop — trapped in guilt, unable to be received, incapable of transforming pain into peace.

Forgiveness, in contrast, is a 'measure of giving away': the release of retribution, the relinquishment of the claim to punish. It says: I see the wrong, I understand your frailty and I offer space to begin anew. But forgiveness without atonement becomes naive — cheap grace, ungrounded in accountability, dissolving difference without first holding it.

Thus, *neither atonement nor forgiveness can save on their own*. Each depends upon the other as form depends upon content, or breath upon exhale and inhale. Atonement initiates the movement toward reconciliation; forgiveness completes it. Together, they form the *conference of difference* — a sacred exchange in which wounds are named and eased, and being is restored.

This is salvation: not a final state, but an ongoing relational harmony — the rhythm of return and release, of responsibility and renewal.

If the Judaism of Jesus' time leaned heavily on atonement — through rituals, sacrifice, and the architecture of law — his message of forgiveness was not a repudiation but a *completion*.

Forgiveness was the missing harmony that made salvation *possible*, not just imaginable. He came not to reject the need for accountability but to reveal that accountability alone cannot heal. It is the *harmony* of atonement and forgiveness that saves.

And this is the Gospel — not of substitution but of integration. Not of erasure but of reconciliation. In this Gospel, *salvation* is the lived equilibrium of beings who, by facing the pain they have caused (atonement) and the release of pain on forgiveness, participate in that 'process of having safety' that is *salvation*.

Salvation, then, is the sanctuary built when atonement and forgiveness meet — when the one who reaches out is met by one who lets go. This is the place where being is no longer in hiding, no longer at war, but at peace in the conference of difference.

9.2 Atonement

Without *atonement*: the ‘action to be at one’
there would be no cause for *conference*: the
‘condition of bearing together’.

Atonement is not merely the mending of a broken bond; it is the very *cause* of the bond itself. It is the first impulse toward togetherness — not an afterthought when things go wrong, but the action that makes *conference* possible at all. For before *beings* can *bear together*, they must be willing to *be together*. And that willingness is atonement.

To atone is not simply to apologise. It is the action of re-alignment — an effort to *be at one* not only with another but with the whole condition of relationship. It is an act of ontological humility: the recognition that separation, while real, need not be final; that otherness, while sacred, need not mean estrangement.

In this way, atonement is not reactive but *generative*. It creates the grounds upon which difference can approach difference without annihilation. It says: I do not merely wish to be tolerated or forgiven — I wish to be *with* you, honestly and wholly. I will face the gap between us and reach across it.

Where there is no atonement, there is no *cause* for conference. Only juxtaposition without relationship, proximity without participation, coexistence without communion. At best, this is indifference. At worst, it is alienation.

And so, the *conference of difference* — the great image of this Gospel — is not a spontaneous occurrence. It must be *willed into being* by the movement of each toward oneness, however partial or tentative. That will, that gesture, is atonement.

This insight is echoed in the Jewish *Yom Kippur* — the Day of Atonement — not simply as a ritual of forgiveness, but as a national recommitment to relational integrity. One cannot move forward in the sacred calendar without first seeking to be 'at

one' with others and with God. Atonement is thus not the end of rupture — it is the cause of return.

In the *Gospel of Being*, atonement is ontological before it is moral. It is not merely the action of the guilty; it is the gesture of all beings who wish to relate, to participate, to co-be. It is the necessary precursor to conference. Without it, there is no shared reality — only isolation in multiplicity.

But when atonement is present — when *beings* move toward the 'one' — then the condition of *conference* arises. Not uniformity but *bearing together*: distinct beings in deliberate relation.

This is the deep truth of salvation's genesis: that every union begins with a reaching. Every co-existence begins with a want to be at one.

9.3 Forgiveness

Without *forgiveness*: a ‘measure of giving away’ there would be no affect of *difference*: the ‘condition of bearing apart’.

Forgiveness is often misunderstood as an act of moral concession, a letting go for the sake of peace. But in the *Gospel of Being*, forgiveness is far more than emotional relief — it is an *existential gesture*, a structural act that enables beings to stand apart *without severance*. It is what makes *difference* livable, not merely survivable.

To forgive is to *give way* — not to give up truth, or justice, or memory, but to give away the claim to control, to possess, to retaliate. It is a relinquishment of totality. In forgiving, one does not dissolve the Other but affirms them: *you may be different from me, and I will not seek to make you mine, or make you me.*

Without this *giving away*, the condition of *difference* collapses into hostility or fear. If atonement seeks to move *toward* unity, forgiveness grants leave for unity — so that beings may become distinct without becoming enemies. It is what allows one to *differ*: 'bear apart' without rejection, what permits separation without schism.

Forgiveness, then, is not only a response to wrongs but a *foundational ethic of differentiation*. It makes space. It holds open. It says: your path may diverge from mine and I will not condemn it. I will not claim your divergence as a wound to my own being. I release the need to tether you to my measure.

In this sense, forgiveness is the grace that dignifies autonomy. It grants beings the space to be unlike, to err, to change, to return — or not. It is the soil in which *plurality* becomes fruitful, rather than fractured.

This parallels the Buddhist ideal of *upekkhā* — equanimity or the serene release of clinging. In *upekkhā*, one does not harden the heart but loosens the grip of egoic identification. So too in

forgiveness: it is not indifference but a love strong enough to let go.

And here is the deeper paradox: *without forgiveness, difference has no affect*. That is, it cannot be felt or expressed without trauma or tension. The vitality of difference — the beauty, the play, the creative friction of multiplicity — becomes instead a threat to be managed, a deviation to be corrected.

But when forgiveness is present, difference becomes fruitful. It can be *borne*, not just endured. It can live in relationship, not in reaction. Forgiveness gives difference its dignity.

Thus, if atonement is the turning toward the one, then forgiveness is the blessing of the many. And both are needed, for without forgiveness, every effort at atonement risks absorption; and without atonement, forgiveness becomes empty release. It is their *reciprocity* that saves.

9.4 Cause & Effect

Thus without atonement, forgiveness is without cause and without forgiveness, atonement is without affect.

In the rhythm of salvation, *atonement* and *forgiveness* are not opposites, but *reciprocals* — each making the other meaningful, each giving the other form. This koan exposes their interdependence: remove one, and the other collapses.

Without atonement, forgiveness is without cause.

Forgiveness cannot be genuine unless there is something to forgive. Its grace emerges only in response to an act of reaching, a movement toward repair. If no one seeks to be 'at one', what is there to give away to? Forgiveness becomes either empty sentiment or unjust erasure — granting absolution without recognition, letting go without having been held.

In this sense, forgiveness depends upon the prior *cause* of atonement. Not in a temporal sequence, but in a logical structure: **forgiveness fulfills what atonement begins**. It is the embrace extended after the hand has reached.

To forgive without atonement is to speak across a silence with no echo, to answer a question that was never asked. It risks becoming passive or performative — gracious on the surface, but hollow underneath. The heart of forgiveness is response; it presumes relation.

Without forgiveness, atonement is without affect.

Conversely, atonement, no matter how sincere, cannot heal without reception. It becomes trapped in a loop of guilt or striving — constantly seeking but never arriving. It is a question unanswered, a knock unmet.

This is the *affect* of atonement: its ability to affect change, to restore relation, to soften the space between. Without forgiveness, atonement is

inert. It may be heroic, even tragic — but it does not save. Salvation is not the act of one, but the resonance between two.

Here the Gospel of Being reveals its deepest truth: salvation is *reciprocal*. It cannot be imposed or self-declared. It emerges only when two wills meet — one that seeks to return and one that agrees to release.

This reciprocity is not symmetrical but mutual. The one who forgives may carry burdens unknown to the one who atones. The one who atones may feel unworthy of the gift. But still, salvation arises — not from purity but from participation. From the shared willingness to rejoin.

This structure echoes the relational theology of Martin Buber: '*All real living is meeting.*' Not simply in sameness, but in *response*. The *I* needs the *Thou* not as an object, but as a co-being who completes the circuit of becoming. So too here: forgiveness responds to atonement; atonement invites forgiveness. Together they animate the relational field.

In this light, salvation is not a linear reward for moral acts. It is a *field effect*, generated in the harmonic interplay of these two forces. Atonement without forgiveness is a well dug with no water. Forgiveness without atonement is water poured onto sealed stone. But together, they form a flowing well — an oasis in the desert of what would otherwise be isolation.

That is why salvation cannot be bought, sold, decreed, or earned in isolation. It must be conferred in conference, granted in the difference between beings who choose — together — to bear with and bear apart.

9.5 Harmony

Only when atonement and forgiveness are in harmony can *being*: ‘action to be’ experience salvation in the conference of difference.

Being is not a solitary act. It is not the echo of an isolated ‘I’ asserting itself into the void. In the *Gospel of Being*, *being* is an *action*, a movement — a becoming that happens not in abstraction but in *relation*. One does not simply *be*; one *co-becomes*. And the condition for this co-becoming — this participatory unfolding of self and other — is the harmony of *atonement* and *forgiveness*.

Without this harmony, being is either collapsed into sameness or fractured into separation. Atonement alone seeks to unify, to reconcile, to rejoin. Forgiveness alone makes room for difference, for divergence, for individuation. But only when they move together — one drawing near, the other making space — can being find

salvation: together yet different, embraced yet unbound, formed yet becoming.

This is the *conference of difference*: not a meeting of identical parts, but of distinct beings who bear one another — not despite their difference but because of it. Difference is not the obstacle to salvation; it is the ground in which salvation flowers. But it must be *conferenced* — joined in shared bearing — and that conference is impossible without the rhythm of return and release.

To say that only in harmony can being experience salvation is to say that being is not a possession but a *relation*. I am not saved alone. I become and am saved, only in response — only as I move toward the other (atonement) and allow the other to move freely from me (forgiveness). Salvation is not a state I enter but a rhythm enacted together.

This insight echoes the *Sufi understanding of being* as an ongoing participation in divine relation — where separation is not evil but necessary for reunion, and reunion is not final but ever-renewed. In this rhythm, the self

becomes a threshold: between sameness and difference, nearness and distance, presence and release.

In the language of the Gospel: *being*, the 'action to be', is salvaged from isolation when it becomes an harmonic act — when its impulse to approach (atonement) is met by the grace of release (forgiveness) and vice versa. It is in this *harmony* not in conquest or conquest avoided, that salvation is known — not as reward but as reality rightly practiced.

So salvation is not the ending of struggle, but the transformation of struggle into sacred rhythm. Not the cessation of *dukkha* (unease), but the emergence of ease *within* difference — ease earned, not imposed.

Thus, to *be* — truly to be — is to participate in this dance: to stretch forth and be received, to offer space and be trusted. When this happens, even momentarily, salvation is not a distant promise but a present condition.

Being is no longer the burden of aloneness, nor the tyranny of sameness, but the grace of mutual

presence. Salvation becomes a lived rhythm — sought, given, received — within the ever-turning conference of difference.

9.6 Minimizing Unease

Only in salvation is the potential for ease in the conference of difference maximised and *dukkha*: ‘unease’ minimised.

Existence, as the Gospel has shown again and again, is not the triumph of the same but the *bearing together of difference*. Life unfolds not in the comfort of uniformity but in the tension of plurality — of desires that diverge, of wills that collide, of beings that both attract and repel. To exist at all is to enter this conference, this chorus, this friction.

And so arises the core challenge of being: **how can difference be borne without breaking us?**

The answer, this koan affirms, is *salvation*. Not as escape from difference, but as the *mode of establishing ease within it*. Salvation is not the cancellation of conflict but the condition in which difference no longer threatens to become destruction. It is the state in which the energies

of being move with grace — not because there is no tension but because the tension has found rhythm.

This is where *dukkha* enters — not simply as suffering in the modern sense but as *unease*, disquiet, friction unbalanced. Dukkha accumulates when movement is without harmony, relation without rhythm. It is the grinding that occurs when beings exist *against* one another but not *with* one another — when atonement is withheld and forgiveness is refused.

Salvation, by contrast, does not eliminate dukkha; it *minimises* it — by redirecting it through the reciprocal pathways of atonement and forgiveness. When beings reach toward one another in sincerity and release one another in grace, the weight of difference is not abolished but transformed. It becomes *bearable*, and then — miraculously — *beautiful*.

This reflects a deep truth from Buddhist metaphysics: that dukkha is not caused by difference itself but by *clinging* — clinging to one's position, one's pain, one's rightness, one's

separation. Salvation loosens this grip — not by force, but by relation. It invites *beings* to step into a *dance* not a contest; into a rhythm, not a recoil.

In this way, salvation is the architecture of *ease*: not comfort without challenge but *flow within tension*. It is the space where mutual becoming feels possible — where beings are not crushed by the burden of otherness but lifted by the possibility of shared existence.

Scientific resonance can be felt here too. In ecosystems, maximum efficiency arises not from sameness, but from *complementarity* — where difference is harmonised into interdependence. In neuroscience, ease arises not from sensory stillness but from *predictive coherence* — when signals flow in ways the system can process without stress. Likewise, salvation is a system-level optimisation of coexistence: not static peace but dynamic stability.


Thus, salvation is not the suspension of *being's* tensions but their orchestration. It allows difference to speak without shouting, to sing without silencing. It maximises ease not by avoiding the difficult but by transfiguring it — by

offering each *being* a place, a rhythm, a reciprocal role in the unfolding of the whole.

Only in salvation, then, is the dance of difference fully possible. Only there does being move lightly across the floor of existence — steps placed not in certainty but in trust. And in that dance, dukkha, while never fully gone, loses its grip. It becomes one note among many, no longer the dominant chord.

This is salvation: the ease that arises when being is no longer afraid of difference, because it has learned to dance with it.

9.7 The Path to Salvation



All existence finds salvation in atonement
and forgiveness—Amen.

This final koan on salvation is not merely a conclusion; it is a consecration. Seven words, and a whispered 'Amen' — yet within them, the entire grammar of being is gathered. *All existence*, it declares — not some, not the worthy, not the chosen but all — is capable of salvation, and does so not by divine decree or doctrinal purity but by the lived harmony of *atonement* and *forgiveness*.

This is the Gospel's most radical claim: that salvation is *not reserved* but *reciprocal*. It is not something one must wait for, pray for, or earn. It is something one must *enter* — by taking responsibility for one's impact (atonement), and releasing others from one's claims (forgiveness). Not once, but again and again. Not perfectly but sincerely.

In this light, *salvation* ceases to be a place or a prize. It becomes a *pathway* — a rhythm of mutual return, a covenant not sealed by blood but by openness. Each act of atonement is a step toward union; each act of forgiveness a loosening of chains. Together, they make movement possible. Together, they form a bridge across the abyss of difference.

'All existence finds salvation...' This is not sentimental universalism — it is existential realism. For the *Gospel of Being* has shown us: existence is *relational*, and where relation is restored, *salvation emerges naturally*. It is not imposed upon being; it arises from within it, like music from a tuned instrument.

This line also restores theological clarity to terms often clouded by centuries of institutional framing. It frees *atonement* from blood and guilt, and returns it to its original meaning: *to be at one*. It frees *forgiveness* from moralism and returns it to *the graceful letting go*. These are not rituals or rules but relational truths — available to all beings capable of participation.

And the 'Amen'? It is not mere punctuation. It is an affirmation that what has been spoken is not only true, but *worthy*. '*So be it*', says the voice of the reader. So let it be true, not only in word, but throughout existence.

And perhaps this is the Gospel's final gift: to reveal that **salvation is not a secret, but a song**. One we learn by hearing others hum it, one we pass on by singing it ourselves. Atonement and forgiveness are not only ontological mechanisms — they are sacred melodies. Their harmony is what allows the many voices of being to sing together without discord.


So we arrive here — not at an end, but at a beginning, sanctified by understanding. Existence is not doomed to division. It may, by will and grace, be conferred again into *difference borne together*.

All existence finds salvation, because salvation is not apart from existence — it is its most generous form.

PART 10:

TRANSFORMATION

10.1 Ceaseless Transformation



The ‘condition of being’ that is *existence* has no beginning or end, only ceaseless transformation.

To speak of beginnings and endings is to speak from within the illusion of the line. We look back upon the start of a story, the emergence of a life, the genesis of a universe and imagine a moment where once there was nothing. But nothing is a word that points to absence by the presence of speech. It is not a thing that can be found. Wherever we reach with thought, there is only the presence of something else — some form, some echo, some transformation of what came before.

In physics, the principle of energy conservation tells us that energy cannot be created or destroyed, only changed in form. This alone dispels the myth of origination as a singular event. The Big Bang was not an absolute beginning; it was a transformation in state — a

change in density, temperature and symmetry. The universe did not erupt from nothing, but from conditions we have not yet fully imagined, let alone explained. The farther we peer into the past, the more we see not a singular point but a boundary of transformation that recedes as knowledge advances. The 'origin' becomes a horizon.

Likewise, the idea of an end dissolves upon scrutiny. Stars burn out, bodies decay, systems collapse — but none vanish. The matter transforms, the energy disperses, the information encodes itself elsewhere. Death, entropy, extinction — each is a turning, a reconfiguration, not an annihilation. Even the so-called heat death of the universe is not a disappearance, but a maximal diffusion of ability: power in its most entropic state, yet still present. Even silence, if truly listened to, resounds with the memory of sound.

In mythic traditions, we find echoes of this truth. In Hindu cosmology, creation is not a one-time event but an endless cycle of Brahma's exhalation and inhalation — universes born and dissolved in rhythmic succession. The *Book of*

Ecclesiastes declares: 'What has been will be again, what has been done will be done again; there is nothing new under the sun.' In Buddhist philosophy, *anicca* — impermanence — is not the fading of existence but its very nature. Change is not a disruption of *being*; it is *being* itself.

Yet, human consciousness is drawn to edges. We long to know where it all began and where it all will end, perhaps because our own lives feel bracketed by birth and death. But sentience is a temporal flame — it sees time because it burns. It constructs beginnings and ends to make sense of its own transformation. In truth, even this consciousness, so precious and fleeting, is a transient pattern of form emerging from previous conditions, and passing into others still.


To say that existence has no beginning or end is not a denial of reality — it is an affirmation of deeper continuity. All that exists has always been, though not always *as* it is now. The infant was not created from non-being; it emerged from cells, from breath, from earth, from stars. The tree does not die when it burns; it changes into heat, light, ash, and carbon for other roots. And

the universe does not become nothing; it simply continues to transform, without origin, without destination.

To live in transformation is to release our grip on arrival and departure. It is to accept that being is not a place we come from or go to — but a verb, a motion, an unfolding. The comfort this brings is not the promise of permanence, but the assurance of presence: that in every moment, existence is still becoming itself.

This is the gospel of transformation: that we were never born from nothing, and we shall never return to it. There is no void behind us, no abyss ahead. Only the vast, ongoing metamorphosis of being — ceaseless, sacred and ours to inhabit.

10.2 Without Beginning or End



There is no beginning to existence, no end—only transformation without origin, without destination.

There is a river, endless in its motion, with no source we can see and no delta we can reach. And yet, the moment we step into it, we say: *'here begins the crossing'*. Such is the work of sentience — not to create the river but to name the moment in which it becomes meaningful to us.

Existence, as we explored in the previous koan, is a ceaseless transformation. But consciousness finite, embodied, reflective — must partition the flow into recognisable shapes in order to act, remember, and relate. We speak of beginnings and ends not because the universe provides them but because we require them. They are not realities *in* the world, but thresholds *of* the world as perceived by minds that measure.

A threshold is not a wall but a crossing. It is a liminal point, a boundary drawn not to divide what is, but to distinguish one mode of recognition from another. The day does not *begin* at sunrise, nor end at nightfall—these are simply the thresholds our senses and cycles have learned to honour. Likewise, existence does not begin at the first cry, nor end at the last breath. The zygote and the corpse are both in transformation, but the categories we impose — ‘alive’, ‘dead’, ‘person’, ‘thing’ — serve our needs, not existence’s.

This insight touches deeply on epistemology: the study of how we know what we think we know. We do not see the world as it is, but as it becomes intelligible to us. A newborn cannot yet distinguish self from others. A culture defines adulthood differently across epochs and societies. Even death is defined variously — as cessation of breath, of brain function, of cellular activity. The threshold moves because it is made by mind.

Yet this is not a failing — it is a power. Sentience does not distort being; it draws meaning from it. Like a lens bringing light into focus,

consciousness gives structure to the formless, turning flux into experience and experience into knowledge. **The key is not to mistake the lens for the light.**

Philosophers from Immanuel Kant to Maurice Merleau-Ponty have argued that perception is not passive reception but active shaping. Neuroscience confirms this: our brains do not record reality like cameras but sculpt it through filters, memory and expectation. What we call 'events' are not points on an objective timeline but junctures of meaning — intersections where the formless becomes form *for us*.

This gives rise to both responsibility and humility. Responsibility, because the way we draw our lines — what we count as the beginning of life, or the end of dignity — has moral consequence. And humility, because our lines are not the river. We must hold them lightly, remembering they serve our shared orientation, not absolute truth.


There is something sacred in this ability. A stone does not name its falling. A star does not mourn its collapse. But we can see, say and shape. We can give narrative to what was only occurrence,

intention to what was only movement. In doing so, we turn transformation into story and story into legacy.

So let us honour our thresholds — not as ends in themselves but as temporary invitations to meaning. Let us know when we are naming the flow, and when we are flowing beyond our names.

In the end, there are no true beginnings or ends — only sentient markers upon the boundless unfolding. Every 'first' is a chosen aperture. Every 'last' is a grace note held at the limit of hearing.

10.3 One Chorus to Another



Death is not the end of being but a transformation in ability; a voice transforming from one chorus to another.

We speak of death as departure, an end, a vanishing. But death is not disappearance. It is transfiguration. *Being* does not cease; it reconstitutes. What ends is not existence but a particular mode of expressing it — a particular voice, with its particular range, its signature tone, its part in the harmony.

To live is to express being through ability. Our bodies metabolize the world into action, our minds turn sensation into thought, our relationships give shape to meaning. Ability is power given form: to walk, to speak, to touch, to teach, to build, to love. We are not merely *in* the world — we *do* the world. Each life is an instrument playing the song of its becoming.

But every instrument wears. Strings fray. Reeds crack. Circuits fail. And when the instrument no longer sings in the same voice, we call this death. Yet even then, the music is not lost — it is taken up differently. The materials return to the earth, feeding new forms. The ideas, the gestures, the kindnesses — these reverberate in the memory of others, in the systems we built, in the culture we enriched, in the children we raised. The voice transforms, yes but the chorus continues.

Biologically, death is not rupture but release. Cells do not disappear when the heart stops; they decompose, redistribute, rejoin the cycles of soil, air, water, and other life. Stars too 'die', but what we witness is not absence — it is nova, collapse, explosion, rebirth. In physics, there is no 'non-being'. Matter changes. Energy diffuses. Entropy increases. But something always becomes something else.

This is why to fear death as annihilation is to misunderstand the nature of transformation. What we lose is our singular configuration — our unique synthesis of abilities in space and time. And yes, this loss is real. There is grief in it, for

both the one departing and the ones remaining. There is no shame in mourning what was beautiful and finite. But the frame must be wide enough to see that this loss is part of a broader passage.

The koan calls this passage a movement from one chorus to another. This is not metaphor alone. Each of us is part of countless choirs: the family chorus, the communal, the cultural, the ecological, the cosmic. Our voice modulates across them. When we die, our solo may fall silent — but our harmonics carry on. Our influence shifts from active to passive, from voice to echo, from instrument to resonance.


Some traditions speak of reincarnation, others of legacy, others of reunion with source. But all agree on this: death is not nothing. It is a threshold, a turning, a reallocation of *being*. Even in silence, there is memory. Even in stillness, impact. Death ends no being — it only completes a sentence so that others may begin their reply.

This truth does not deny the pain of death but places it within a larger music. To see death as transformation in ability is to honour life not only

in its acts but in its aftermath. It calls us to ask: what abilities do I leave behind? **What power — what ability — have I passed on, translated, transformed into the lives of others?**

In this way, immortality is not fantasy but fidelity: the ongoing work of letting our voice become part of new harmonies. And so, even when it comes time for our breath to cease, our abilities transferred continue to sing.

10.4 Transformation Itself



Immortality is a given as each being contributes *power*: ‘ability’ in the never-ending process of transforming.

We are born with a body but we arrive through a process — a ceaseless unfolding older than atoms and wider than stars. This process has no finish line, no final shape. It is transformation itself: the great becoming in which all beings participate, knowingly or not. And so, the koan does not ask whether immortality is possible. It declares: *immortality is a given*.

Immortality, here, is not the indefinite continuation of a singular self. It is not a preserved identity, frozen in amber or uploaded into code. It is the continuity of power — *ability* — transmitted across the endless conference of difference. It is the contribution each being makes to the music of becoming.

To live is to act. To act is to alter. And to alter is to leave trace. Whether we know it or not, each of us impresses something into the world that persists. We pass on knowledge, memory, material, influence, inspiration, code, care. Some offer monumental inventions or ideas; others offer gestures so small they can barely be seen — but are nonetheless essential: the silent patience of a parent, the warmth of a friend, the knowledge that turns a life. These are abilities given away and in that giving, made immortal.

Evolution shows us this truth in its bones. Traits that serve the whole are selected and shared. Culture builds not from scratch but from echo. Every language carries ancestors. Every path is paved by those who walked before. Even in death, ability reverberates — not only in memory, but in new forms: a teacher's lesson passed through generations, a healer's remedy encoded in blood, a builder's craft embedded in structures.

What matters is not how long we persist in form but how fully we contribute to the transformation that continues. Immortality is not an achievement; it is a current. We are already

inside it. To give power — ability — is not to lose it but to extend its reach beyond the limits of our sentient span.

There is profound humility in this. The universe does not remember names but it remembers functions. It retains what was given, even if it forgets the giver. Like rain returning to sky through evaporation, our abilities ascend not as selves but as forces: redistributed, recombined, renewed.

Religious traditions echo this insight in metaphor. In Christianity, the body dies but the spirit gives life anew. In Daoism, immortality lies not in resisting change but in harmonizing with the flow. In African philosophy, the departed remain in the *living-dead* stage as long as they are remembered and their influence felt. All speak to the same deeper reality: death is not severance from existence but transition in its mode of participation.


So what is asked of us is not to escape death but to ensure our power is placed — offered — into the stream. Not hoarded, not wasted, not clutched in fear but shared. That is what makes

immortality not a miracle but a mechanism: a systemic continuity of transformation.

To be immortal, then, is to be contributive. And all beings, by simply being, contribute. Even the fallen leaf feeds the soil. Even the forgotten word shapes the next speaker's tongue.

This is the grace of transformation: that none are left out.

10.5 Collaborative Transformation



And where cooperation multiplies ability within the known; it is collaboration that transforms difference into new ability.

There is power in cooperation — the ant colony that constructs bridges from its own bodies, the pack of wolves that takes down prey through coordinated instinct, the team of humans that runs an assembly line or carries sandbags in flood. To *cooperate* is to multiply ability: to amplify what is already given, to make the known more effective through shared operation. It is not small. It is essential. But it is not yet the threshold of transformation. For if cooperation operates the known; collaboration transforms it.

To *collaborate* is something rarer. It is to labour together — not just in unison but in difference, in dialogue, in divergence. Where cooperation follows a script, collaboration writes a new one. It does not merely arrange existing abilities into a

more efficient whole; it generates *new ability* through the tension and union of distinct voices.

This is what makes collaboration the hinge of transformation. It is not a tool of preservation but of metamorphosis.

To collaborate is to make difference productive, not just compatible. It is not harmony by conformity but harmony by polyphony — a sound no one could have sung alone. In this way, collaboration is the sacred act of becoming with. It is what occurs when difference is not erased, but encountered — and from that encounter, something emerges that did not exist before: new knowledge, new language, new life.

This is the point where *sentience rises* from instinct. Many *beings* cooperate. They recognize shared patterns, follow pheromones, respond to cues. But collaboration requires the *awareness of awareness*, the recognition of *otherness* as meaningful rather than threatening. It requires humility, curiosity and vulnerability: the willingness to relinquish control, to risk misunderstanding, to let the unknown shape what one becomes.

Evolutionarily, collaboration is the source of culture. It is how humans made fire, music, mathematics, myth, governance. No single human could have invented language alone. It emerged through generations of differences responding to one another, refining and recombining until something wholly novel took root. Collaboration is the power not only to survive but to create — to *transform difference into new ability*.

And this is what makes it holy.

Because in collaboration, power ceases to be possession and becomes offering. It is no longer what *I* can do but what *we* can make. Not just additive but transfigurative. Each being becomes a portal through which something previously impossible becomes actual.

And yet, collaboration is fragile. It requires trust, time and a shared reverence for the unfamiliar. It fails when difference is treated as defect or when power is used to exploit rather than emancipate. But when it succeeds, it transforms not only the

work but the workers. They leave changed, enriched, sometimes even reborn.

So this koan draws the boundary between *efficiency* and *emergence*, between *working with* and *becoming through*. It teaches that cooperation is necessary — but not sufficient — for transformation. It affirms that the deepest transformations arise not in sameness but in the dance of difference learning to create together.

And so collaboration becomes the beating heart of the Gospel's ontology: not a strategy but a sacrament. The way power becomes ability. The way difference becomes transformation. Collaboration is a superpower.

10.6 The Sacred Engine

Without difference, there is nothing to relate to; without relation, no potential for transformation—no being.

What is it that makes anything *something* and not *nothing*? It is that it differs. It is that it stands apart, however slightly, from what surrounds it. To be is to differ. And in that difference, the possibility of relation is born.

Without difference, there is no encounter. No edge. No recognition. No tension. No movement. No mutuality. No possibility. In a world of absolute sameness — if such a world could even be imagined — nothing could touch, because there would be no otherness to touch. Nothing could change, because there would be no point from which change could begin. It would be a flatline of undifferentiated silence: not peace but nullity.

But the moment difference arises — even in the smallest vibration, the most subtle asymmetry — relation ignites. The electron orbits the proton. The seed breaks open toward the sun. A gaze meets another gaze and something wordless but immense passes between. Relation begins not in similarity but in distinction. The *I* recognises the *Thou* precisely because it is not itself. And from this difference comes the electric charge of becoming.

Relation, then, is the fabric stretched between differences. It is not a bridge over a chasm but the chasm itself made meaningful. Relation is how differences communicate, challenge, respond, align, combine, repel or harmonize. In physics, relation manifests as gravity, electromagnetism, spacetime curvature. In biology, as symbiosis, predation, reproduction, evolution. In language, as syntax. In ethics, as care. In love, as intimacy.

But relation alone is not enough. What gives relation its sacred character is that it opens the door to *transformation*. Not just contact, but consequence. Each relation reshapes both terms. When iron meets oxygen, rust forms.

When mind meets idea, insight dawns. When you meet me, neither remains entirely unchanged. Relation does not merely connect — it transfigures.

And thus, transformation arises from the generative friction between what is not the same. This is not chaos. This is the *conference of difference*. It is not a battlefield of competition, but a space of mutual becoming. Transformation is what happens when difference does not withdraw but steps forward into relation — and in so doing, gives birth to new being.

This is the central motion of the Gospel: not creation *ex nihilo* — out of nothing — but creation *ex differentia* — out of difference.

To be, then, is not to persist in sameness, but to participate in transformation through difference. Even identity is not a fixed trait but a continuity of evolving relations. A self is not a sealed container but a field of relational possibility. I am because I differ — and I differ because I relate — and I relate because I am becoming.

This is the sacred engine. Without difference, no relation. Without relation, no transformation. Without transformation, no being.

The Gospel of Being is not the story of isolated essences but of relational emergence. We are not separate beings stacked in space but events unfolding through difference — each one a note in a symphony that never resolves, only transforms.

And so we return again to that deep truth: being is not a noun but a verb. A movement. A conversation. A dance across difference.

10.7 Transformation is Relative

All transformation is a conference of difference—Amen.

Let it be said plainly: this is the *Gospel of Being*. Not a law, not a dogma but a living pattern. A way the universe moves. A logic whispered in atoms and echoed in minds. It says simply this: that *everything becomes through difference*, and that *every act of becoming is a kind of conference*.

A *conference* is not a fusion, not a war, not a hierarchy. It is a bearing together. A space in which each presence retains its own voice but speaks in relation to the others. Not silence, not noise — but dialogue. And in this dialogue, transformation is born.

Each being, each form, each pattern that has ever existed is not a solitary monolith but a confluence of differences in conversation. A cell is a conference of molecules. A language is a conference of meanings. A society is a

conference of intentions. Even the self — what we call 'I' — is a layered polyphony of memories, impulses, stories, and sensations in continual exchange.

Transformation happens when these differences meet not in resistance but in resonance. When they come into contact without collapse. When each listens, yields, asserts, adjusts. When power is not imposed but revealed — as *ability shaped by relation*.

This is why transformation is never a solo act. It cannot occur in a vacuum. Even the caterpillar does not become the butterfly in isolation; it does so in a cocoon, a sacred chamber where its parts dissolve into difference and recompose through hidden collaboration. Even God, in many traditions, is not solitary — but triune, dialogic, or multiplicity-in-unity. The divine is not the denial of difference but its consecration.

The phrase 'conference of difference' names not just the method of transformation but its *meaning*. It implies that becoming is not accidental or mechanistic — but sacred. That relation is not a temporary compromise — but the

ground of all reality. That otherness is not threat — but gift. And that every true transformation honors the dignity of the different even as it brings forth the new.

And so we say: *Amen*.

Not to end the Gospel but to affirm it. To seal the insight with reverence. *Amen* does not mean '*it is over*'. It means '*it is so*'. A word of assent. Of rootedness. Of shared witness. All existence is a conference of difference—Amen.

That is the whole Gospel in one breath.

DEFINITIONS

The definitions provided in this section serve to clarify the reasoning behind how key terms are used throughout the *Gospel of Being*. Wherever possible, I have chosen to restore words to their *lexigraphical* — that is, literal or root — meanings, rather than rely on their popular or contemporary usage. This is not an exercise in pedantry, but a commitment to *precision*: to ensure that each word carries not only the correct *meaning* ("intending") but also the correct *sense* — that which is *transduced*, or taken in, by the reader.

As declared in the Confucian Analects translated by James Legge:

'If names be not correct, language is not in accordance with reality.'

Atonement

as 'action to be at one'

Definition

The word *atonement*, transliterates as 'action to be at one' and thus to be unified and i.e. undivided.

In terms of the *Gospel of Being* , *atonement* is the 'action to be at one' in terms of the constant expression { Δ } that is the conference of difference.

Phonology

During the transition from Middle English to Modern English (circa. late 1500's through early 1600's), the phonology of the word spelt *o.n.e* went from being pronounced as *own* to being pronounced as *won* as in gun.

Today, the word *one* in the term *atone* is still pronounced phonologically in accordance with Middle English *own* whereas its literal definition 'at one' is pronounced using Modern English phonology *won*. Thus, the term *atone*

pronounced *at.own* is defined as 'at one' pronounced 'at won'.¹ English is a mongrel.

Comments

Interestingly there is no phonological equivalent of *atone* in Latin as could be surmised by combining *a-*, 'out, away' + *tone* from *tonus*, meaning 'strain, stretch' and by extension tension. Thus, *atonement* as 'away [from] tension'. Alas, the closest Latin equivalent to *atone* is *expiare*, from which derives the Modern English term *expiate* meaning to 'make amends'.

In Greek the word for atonement is *exiléosi* morphologically similar to the Modern English word *exile*, which means 'banishment'.

In Hebrew the word for atonement is *kippur*, (כִּפּוּר) as seen in *yom kippur*, 'day of atonement'.

¹

source:

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/grammar/letters-that-are-not-seen-but-are-heard-in-words>

Balance

as 'condition of two scales'

Definition

The English word *balance* derives directly from Old French by way of Latin *bilanx*: 'two scales' and when combined with the suffix *-ance* meaning 'condition' we get *balance*: 'condition of two scales'.

Comments

The word *balance* should not be confused with *equilibrium*: 'setting scales [to] level'. Setting the balance of two scales to level is *equilibrium* by definition whereas *balance* is any condition of two scales be they level or unlevel.

Competition

as 'process of petitioning against'

Definition

The word competition implies a 'process of petitioning together' if only because the prefix *com-* means 'with, together'. However, what is more logical in the case of the word *competition* is that the prefix *com-* was etymologically substituted for the prefix *con-* a clipping of *contra*: 'against'. Thus the correct Latin derivative was likely, *conpetō*: 'petition against' and not *competō*: 'petition together'. In other words, the word *competition* should be written *conpetition* if it is to make etymological and lexicographical sense. However, whilst practice is to write the word as competition, we must always remember that the prefix *com-* is an ad-hoc substitution for *con-* meaning 'against'.

Comments

The prefix *con-* is a clipping of *contra*: 'against' and not lexicographically synonymous with *com-* which means 'together'.

Energy

as 'work' instead of 'working in'

Definition

The word *energy* stems from the Ancient Greek word ἐνέργεια (en.érge.ia) and because there is no suffix *-eia* in Greek (only Latin) the base clipping is rendered as *érge* from *ergés*: 'working' and not *erg* from *ergon*: 'work'. The prefix *en-* means 'in, into or on' and the suffix *-ia* denotes the word as feminine. Thus taken as transliterated, *energy* means 'working in, into or on' and by extension 'action to work in, into or on'.

Comments

Thus, strictly speaking, *energy* does not mean 'work' or 'work in' in the sense of a noun or verb but rather as the adjective 'working in'.

Note: *energy* is the only word where I have elected to use its contemporary meaning of 'work' if only because it is the prevailing sense of the word in physics.

Equilibrium

as 'setting of scales equal'

Definition

From Latin *aequilībrium*, a combination of the prefix *æqui-* meaning 'equal' + *lībr* a clipping of *lībra*: 'scales' + the suffix *-ium*: a 'setting of'. Hence *equilibrium*: 'setting of scales equal'.

Comments

The word *equilibrium*: a 'setting of scales equal' is not a literal synonym for *balance*: 'two scales' which refers to any condition of two scales: level or unlevel, equal or unequal.²

² See the definition of [balance](#) for details.

Forgiveness

as a 'measure of giving away'

Definition

The word *forgiveness* is a hybrid of Old English *forġiefan*: 'given away' and the Latin suffix *-ness*, meaning 'measure of'. The Old English word *forġiefan* is a portmanteau of *giefan*: 'given' and *for*: 'away'. Hence, *forġiefan*: 'given away' and by extension *forgiveness*, a 'measure of giving away'.

Harmony

as a 'obliged to fit together'

Definition

The word *harmony* is a portmanteau derived from Greek (ἁρμόζω) *harmózō*: 'fit together' and *-mōnī*: 'obliged to'. Hence *harmony*: 'obliged to fit together'.

Knowing

as 'action to ability'

Definition

The English word *knowing* can be traced back through Old English *cunnan* which itself originates in Old Norse *kna* meaning 'can'. The word *can* is functionally cognate with 'ability' and when combined with the suffix *-ing*: 'action to' suggests *knowing* as 'action to ability' or 'action to know'.

Comments

The word *know* as cognate to *can* and thus ability makes it closely associated with power. Hence perhaps the old adage that knowledge is power.

Metaphysical

as 'originating behind'

Definition

The word *meta* is interpreted to be back-formed from metaphysics where *meta* means 'behind'. The word *physical* from Greek φυσικός (phusikós) meaning 'natural' from Latin *nātūra*: 'act of making' and by extension 'originating'. Hence, *metaphysical*: 'originating behind' and *metaphysics*: 'originates behind'.

Comments

Existence as a *condition*: 'process of declaring together' of *being*: 'action to be' has originating behind of it the constant expression { Δ } the conference of difference which by definition is *principal*: 'unvaryingly foremost' to existence.³

³ In other words, *conference* and *difference* are constants.

Noumenon

as '*having been known*'

Definition

The Greek word νοούμενον/nooúmenon is a singular form of νοούμενος/nooúmenos, present mediopassive participle of νοέω/noéō: 'I know'. The suffix -μενον/-menon is the singular form of μένος/menos: 'having been'. Hence, the English word *noumenon*: 'having been known' and by common interpolation 'what is known'.

Comments

The substantive difference between noumenon and phenomenon is that much of what we know is *noumenon*: 'having been known' and thus absent of the need of *phenomenon*: 'having been shown'.

Where phenomenon is 1st-hand knowing and thus acquired through direct experience noumenon on the other hand is 2nd-hand knowing and thus without phenomenon i.e. perceiving for ourselves.

Objective

as 'tending to lie against'

Definition

The English word *objective*, is derived from the Latin prefix *ob-*: 'against' and *iaceō*: 'to lie' and the suffix *-ive* meaning 'tending to'.⁴ Hence the word *objective*: 'tending to lie against'.

Comments

Because the word *object* is considered to be a *calque*: 'loan, translation' from the Ancient Greek word ἀντικείμενον/*antikeímenon* where the word part beginning κείμ is a clipping of κείμεν/*keîmai* meaning 'lie' then it is reasonable to infer that the original Latin word part was not *iaciō*: 'to throw' but instead *iaceō*: 'to lie'. Hence the word *object* means 'to lie against' and not 'to throw against'. This is a critical distinction if only because the word *lie* is in no way synonymous with *throw* to the extent that the first is a state and the second is an action.

⁴ The Latin *iaceō*: 'to lie' is a *calque*: 'loan, translation' from Ancient Greek κείμεν/*keîmai*: 'lie'.

Unlike the word *subjective*: 'tending to lie under' the word *objective*: 'tending to lie against' is thus positioned neither above or below that which it is in relation to. Thus the word *objective* is neither dependent nor independent but rather interdependent.

Where *subjectivity* represents an ongoing parent-to-child relationship and thus fully dependent upon a single hierarchical chain for validity, *objectivity* represents a sibling or peer to peer relationship that is interdependent of a single hierarchical chain and thus more resilient to invalidity.

Phenomenon

as 'having been shown'

Definition

The Greek word φαίνόμενον/phainómenon is a singular form of φαίνόμενος/phainómenos, present mediopassive participle of φαίνω/phainō: 'I show'. The suffix -μενον/-menon is the singular form of μένος/menos: 'having been'. Hence, the English word *phenomenon*: 'having been shown' and by common interpolation, 'that which is shown'.

Comments

The substantive difference between noumenon and phenomenon is that much of what we know is *noumenon*: 'having been known' and thus absent of *phenomenon*: 'having been shown'.

Where phenomenon is 1st-hand knowing and thus *righteous*: 'possessed straight' from the source, noumenon is 2nd-hand knowing and thus without the phenomenon of 'having been shown' for ourselves.

Principal

as 'unvaryingly foremost'

Definition

The word *principal* be it adjective or noun stems from the Latin adjective *prīncipālis*, itself a portmanteau of the adjective *prīnceps* meaning 'foremost' and the adjective intensifying suffix *-alis* mean 'everlastingly, infinitely, unvaryingly'. Hence as an adjective, the word *prīncipālis* means 'unvaryingly foremost' and as a noun means 'pertaining or relating to foremost'. The point is that both Latin *prīncipālis* and its English equivalent *principal* can each function either as an adjective or noun and thus both can mean either: a). *principal*: (n.) 'pertaining or relating to foremost'; and *principal*: (adj.) 'unvaryingly foremost'.

Comments

In general terms, *principal* be it noun or adjective functions to convey a sense of 'unvaryingly foremost' if only because in its use as a noun, the word *pertaining*: 'action to hold through' itself implies a continuance as foremost;

Principle

as 'very foremost'

Definition

The word *principle*, derived from the Latin noun *princeps* as surface analysis from *primus*: 'first' and *-ceps*: 'headed' and thus *princeps*: 'headed first' or 'foremost' + the noun suffix *-le* conveying the diminutive and thus *principle*: 'very foremost'.

Comments

The Latin word *princeps*, as an adjective or noun, transliterates in English as 'headed first' and is functionally synonymous with 'foremost'. It is the suffixing of *-le* that adds nuance. The suffix *-le* may only be added to nouns or verbs and because *princeps* is not a verb but an adjective or noun, the suffix *-le* must be appended to the noun form of *princeps/princip*, where it acts to convey the diminutive in superlative form i.e. not 'foremost' but 'very foremost'.

The character Firmus seems to say it best in his declaration to Anthony in Plutarch's *Symposiacs*:

'It is universally true that a principle is before that
whose principle it is...'

Probability

as 'ability to prove'

Definition

The word *probability* is a close cognate of Latin *probabilitās*, a portmanteau of *probābilis*: 'able to prove' + the suffix *-tās*: 'that which is' and hence *probabilitās*: 'that which is able to prove' and in English *probability* of same meaning and literally 'ability to prove' and thus by extension: 'that which is able to prove'.⁵

Comments

The word *probability*: 'ability to prove', is functionally synonymous with *proveability*: 'ability to prove' i.e. both derive from *probāre* and the English to Latin *Google Translate* renders both *probable* and *provable* in English as synonymous to Latin *probabile*: 'able to prove'.

⁵ It is only in the context of words such as *likely* or *unlikely* that *probability* and *improbability* achieve common sense e.g. *probability*: 'ability to prove' likely or *improbability*: 'ability to prove—not' likely.

At time of writing, Wiktionary provides an uncited reference to *probābilitās* being coined by Cicero (106 BC-43 BC), from *probābilis* meaning 'likely, credible, probable, plausible'. However, only the word *probable* matches the word's lexicography i.e. 'able to prove'.

In contemporary etymological terms, *probability* is functionally synonymous with *likeliness*: the 'measure of being likely' as *improbability* is functionally synonymous with *unlikeliness*: 'measure of being unlikely'.

The prefix *prob* is a concatenation of Latin *probāre*: 'to prove' from *probō*: 'prove' and not *pro* as in 'before' or 'forward'. The phonetics are frustrating as the *pro* in *probability* sounds identical to me as the *pro* in *problematic*.

The antonym of *probability* is *improbability* and thus something can be either *probable* as in 'proveable' or *improbable* as in 'proveable-not'.

Problematic

as 'suited to or skilled in casting forward'

Definition

The word *problematic* stems from Ancient Greek πρόβλημα/*próblēma* comprising πρό/*pró* meaning 'before, forward' and βάλλω/*bállō* meaning 'I throw, I cast, I hurl' and the suffix -τικός/*-tikós* meaning 'suited to' or 'skilled in'. Hence *problematic*: 'suited to casting forward' or 'skilled in casting forward'.

Purpose

as 'put completely'

Definition

The word *purpose* is derived from Latin *pose*: 'place or put' and the perfective prefix *pur*- meaning 'absolutely, completely, entirely' and thus with finality. Hence, *purpose*: 'put completely', not to be confused with *propose*: 'put forward'.

Reciprocity

as a "condition of like forward like back"

Definition

In terms of lexicography, the word *reciprocity* (re.ci.pro.ci.ty) is a compound of *re*, meaning 'back' as in return, *ci*, a preposition and inflection of Latin *-cus* meaning 'like'⁶, *pro*, a word forming element meaning 'advance' or 'forward'⁷, *ci*, again a preposition and inflection of Latin *-cus* meaning 'like' and *-ty*, suffix and contraction of *-ity* functioning as a preposition meaning 'condition of'. Hence, *reciprocity*: 'condition of like forward like back.

⁶ The word *like* here is used in the sense of 'synonymous with', or 'same' not 'affection'.

⁷ The word *for* here is not to be confused with 'for' as in 'benefit of'.

Revelation

as '*process of veiling back*'

Definition

The English word *revelation* transliterates to 'process of covering back' and by interpolation 'process of uncovering'. The word *veil* stems from Latin *vēlum*: 'cloth or covering' and the prefix *re-* meaning 'back'. Thus by extension the word *revelation* means 'process of veiling back' and thus in a productive sense the 'process of unveiling'.

Comments

In an ecclesiastical sense, the English word *revelation* is transliterated from Koine Greek ἀποκάλυψις/*apokálypsis*: 'to [take] cover away' and thus synonymous with unveiling not revealing.

Salvation

as a 'process of having safety'

Definition

The morpheme *salv* in *salvation* is a contraction of the Latin *salvs*, cognate with *salūs* which transliterates as 'safety'. The term *safety* is a portmanteau of *safe* meaning 'protected' and *-ty*, a contraction of *-ity* meaning 'condition of', hence *safety*, 'condition of [being] safe'. The suffix *-ation* is a portmanteau of two suffixes comprising a contraction of *-ate*, 'having' + *-ion*, 'action or process' and hence *-ation*, 'process of having'. Thus *salvation* is literally the 'process of having safety' where *safety* denotes the 'condition of [being] safe'.

Comments

Originally, the Roman alphabet did not have separate symbols for the vowel 'U' pronounced 'oo' and the consonant 'V' pronounced 'we'. In early Latin, *salv* and *salu* may have been written differently but pronounced *sal.oo* like *salute*. The Latin *salus*, 'safety' and *salutaris*, 'saving' are literal cognates in the sense that *salus*, 'safety'

may have been written as *salvs* and perhaps even *salvus*. Thus the closest cognate of *salvus* is *salus/salvs*, meaning 'safety' and not *safe*, whose literal cognate in Latin is 'tutum'.

Sense

as '*transduce*'

Definition

We can define *sense* via backformation of *send*: 'cause to go' if only because it meets the functional definition of *sense* which is *transduce*: 'lead across'. This is because all sensory receptors i.e. sensors function to transduce stimulus into response and thus all sensors are transducers.⁸

Comments

I consider it unlikely that the English word *sense* evolved entirely from Latin *sentire*: 'to sense' and its derivatives, if only because the word part *sen* as a clipping of *senex/senis/seni* translates to 'old' not 'sense'. Thus I wonder if the word part *sent* in Latin *sentire*: 'to sense' is a loan word, a clipping of Old English *send*: 'cause to go' recalling that the functional definition of *sense* is *transduce*: 'lead across'. In other words, *send* and *sense*: 'transduce' each imply transference.

⁸ However, not all transducers are sensors.

Sharing

as 'action to distribute losslessly'

Definition

Unlike portioning and dividing which are lossy in that recipients receive only a part of a whole, I define sharing as the action to distribute losslessly such that the transmitter loses no part of a transmission by action of distribution.

Comments

To feed someone a fish is a lossy act where the fish changes in possession from one to another i.e. you cannot have your fish and eat it too. To teach a man to fish however, represents the lossless act of sharing knowing, that win-win scenario where the recipient gains the knowledge and thus the responsibility to fish for themselves and the transmitter of that knowing becomes free from responsibility of feeding them. Thus, in the sharing of knowing, both the transmitter and receiver are mutually emancipated.

Subjective

as 'tending to lie under'

Definition

The English word *subjective*, is derived from the Latin prefix *sub-*: 'under' and *iaceō*: 'to lie' and the suffix *-ive* meaning 'tending to'.⁹ Hence the word *subjective*: 'tending to lie under'.

Comments

The word *subject*, is a *calque*: 'loan, translation' from the Ancient Greek word ὑποκείμενον/*hupokeímenon* where the word part beginning κείμε is a clipping of κείμεν/*keîmai* meaning 'lie'. Thus it is reasonable to infer that the original Latin word part was not *iaciō*: 'to throw' but instead *iaceō*: 'to lie'. Hence the word *subject* means 'to lie under' and not 'to throw under'. This is a critical distinction if only because the word *lie* is in no way synonymous with *throw* to the extent that the first is a state and the second is an action.

⁹ The Latin *iaceō*: 'to lie' is a *calque*: 'loan, translation' from Ancient Greek κείμεν/*keîmai*: 'lie'.