

Being

Being is that which constantly engages in a relationship of self identity with itself. It is dynamic in that it forever seeks and secures th s identity with itself, through the persevering and enduring qualities which qualify it as a specific essence. These qualitties, which we can also term a being's personality, persist though the exwercize of material causality. This material causality is exercised in the mode of a characteristic qualification and modulation of the primeval ~~Essentiality~~. Creativity is a pure force, a status quo of the universe, inhbrent in all being, in every personal society, forever impelling it beyond the bonds and limits imposed upon itby its specific essence or personality. It is the ontological property of being which allows it to forever engineer, through causal efficacy the bridge of its own proper self identity through the myriad and constant metamprphosis through which creativity impels it.

What of the concept of form withing this universe of flux? It can, validly it seems, be argued that if being is constantly changint it is never any one thing or essence, for hy form we mean an essence or appearance of a thing which can be designated and delimited as that one thing. It may further be asked that in a universe of constant flux, the concept of change itself becomes mdaningless, for change, it if is to be a significant must mean change from one thing to another from one designated and delimited thing to something possessed of a different set of designations and limitations.

But assuming reality to be the flux, we must conclude that when we speak of a thing or a form we are so to speak taking frames out of the continuous film of reality in order to speak about it meaningfully. To speak of reality is to speak of things; things, however, do not exist in themselves, at least not in the sense in which we can speak about symbolic calculations. The things we speak of are wrapped for our convenience by our perceptive faculties in terms in which our mind can deal with them.

It is a Kantian world where the mind imposes on reality the forms through which we recognize it as meaningful. These forms are not analytic a priori forms, however, for the mind itself is the product of the a universe whose fundamental laws have governed its growth and development, so that the very modes of the mind's perception, such as causality, space time, univty, diversi etc., are the result of the influence of the fundamentall laws of the matter energy universe in which we live. We can speak then, of such things as analytic a posteriori, for it can be historically sestablished that the human mind is a relatively late creation of the universe.

By Francotzo

②

Being -

Being is that which ~~gives~~ ~~is~~ constantly engaged in a relationship of self identity with itself.

It is dynamic in that it forever seeks and secures this identity with itself, through the persevering and enduring qualities which qualify it as a specific essence. These qualities, which we can also term a being's personality, persist through the exercise of material causality. This material causality is exercised in the mode of a characteristic qualification and modulation of the primordial Creativity. Creativity is a pure force, a status quo of the universe, inherent in all being, in every "personal society", forever impelling it beyond the bonds and limits imposed upon it by its specific essence or personality. It is the ontological property of being which allows it to forever ~~persevere~~ ^{engage}, through causal efficacy, and to the bridge of its own proper self identity through the myriad and constant metamorphoses of forms through which Creativity impels it.

What of the concept of form within this universe of flux? It can, validly it seems, be argued that if being is constantly changing it is never any one thing or essence, for by form we mean an essence or appearance of a thing which can be designated and delimited as that one thing.

It may further be asked that in a universe of constant flux, the concept of change itself becomes meaningless, for change, if it is to be ^{significant} ~~real~~

sets the relationships of ~~time~~ acts and motions which

again!

must mean change from one thing to another, from one designated and delimited thing to something possessed of a different set of designations and limitations.

But, assuming reality to be the flux, we must conclude that when we speak of a thing or a form we are so to speak taking frames out of the continuous film of reality in order to speak about it meaningfully. To speak of reality is to speak of "things"; ~~but~~ "things" however, do not exist in themselves, at least not in the sense in which we can here speak about symbolic calculations.

The "things" we speak of are wrapped for our convenience by our perceptive faculties in terms of which our mind can deal with them.

It is a Kantian world where the mind imposes ~~the form~~ ^{the forms} on reality through which we recognize it as meaningful. ~~But~~ These forms are not analytic a priori forms, however; the mind itself is the product of a universe whose fundamental laws have governed its growth and development, so that the very modes of the mind's perception, such as causality, space-time, unity & diversity, etc. ~~are~~ are the result of the influence of the fundamental laws of the matter-energy universe in which we live.

We can speak ~~then~~ of ~~so~~ such things as analytic a posteriori for it can be historically established that the ^{human} mind is a ~~great~~ ^{relatively} late creation of the universe. -

The Self:

The existentialist search for the self, ~~esp~~ that of Sartre and others, seems to be for that moment of consciousness which stands still and allows them a steady look at

the self. This shows a misunderstanding of the very nature of being, which is dynamic and ever reflecting off of itself in order to keep up with its own forward movement through time. ~~Therefore~~ there has yet to take place a change in our conception of reality. The human mind must be trained to regard the Real as that which is flowing and changing, just as in the past it has regarded the Real as that which ~~endures~~ does not change but remains fixed in its transcendence of flux. Once we begin correctly to regard the Real as that which is engaged in constant pursuit of itself will we look upon human consciousness as a Real process, sustaining the existence of a Real Self.

Forgetting the insight of Heraclitus, "ΠΑΥΤΑ ΠΕΙ", the existentialist hopes for a clear reflection of his metaphysical countenance in a still and stagnant Heraclitean River. Not finding it, for a still river would not be a Real river, man is confused and frustrated when he looks within his own flowing consciousness and sees there not a clear ^{placid} reflection, conveniently awaiting his meticulous inspection, but finds his image missing and lost in a swirl of sense data, as well he should find it missing, for in the meantime ~~he has~~ that image has climbed up on the bank for a look at itself and is therefore no longer in the water.

And the existentialist seems unreal to himself because he searches for himself not for in his real form, as the Subject, but in a falsified form, as the Object; he is not Object, therefore he seems unreal to himself.

... the relationships of the acts and notions which concern him. ~~exists~~ ~~in~~ ~~it~~

again!

But to look for himself as the Subject would be not to look for a mirror image of himself within his consciousness, but to realize that he is the activity of his consciousness. His being consists in the fact that this consciousness is dynamically escaping the state of past atomicity and passivity and is constantly reaching out to hang onto the future.

The individual must seek himself in the form of his own dynamic subjectivity, a form most like an "activity." Kierkegaard writes "In so far as the self does not become its own ^{it}self, it is not its own self. but not to be one's self is despair." Despair is exactly the pit into which the existentialist commits himself when he looks for himself in the guise of an object and is thereby grievously disappointed.

In accordance with this view of man's being or true self as being dynamic, we must now proceed to examine the nature of this dynamism or action. To summarize what has been said above for the purpose of clarification and further discussion, we may state that when man looks for ^{his} himself, he must look for an acting self. But when man acts, his action is influenced by his 'past.' A man acquires a characteristic way of acting. A golfer and a baseball player acquire a characteristic swing. In a very real sense it is a new Micky Mantle who steps up to the plate each time, but the new batter can be recognized as Micky Mantle. There is an empirically verifiable ^{personal} continuity ~~self~~ which characterizes the self through temporal succession and

The FRANCOITZ Bandit struck ^{again}

duration. Man forms habits of action through the repetition of single acts through the space-time continuum. Although in a real sense each act brings with it a new subject, there is an entity responsible for the form of each new act and for the continuity in the personality of each new subject. Although no one crosses the same river twice, it is with a characteristic steps that each new subject navigates each new river. The self's past, which stands its influence through to me and characterizes the new action is rendered in its own being then, with the performance of each succeeding act. It is not then only a single subject that acts in each new act, but a multiplicity of selves, which although not possessed of dynamic immediacy, are qualified as true beings by their part in structuring the characteristic form of each new act.

It should be clear by now then, that just as we must update our concept of being from a changeless enduring static essence to that of a dynamic flowing entity, so we must now enlarge the conception of the self which we wish to identify from a single instant or frame from the stream of consciousness to the complete stream. The self must not only be seen as a ~~unitary~~ flickering instantaneous being, but must be considered of in its true light as comprising the past subjects and past selves. ~~The~~ A man's self embraces not a single flicking instant of consciousness, but the memories of a lifetime. To the immediacy of the present we must add the memories of the past and the aspirations for the future, of what is real, true being, to that which acts, then the past, which acts, is real and true being.

* Actually, to distinguish between past and present where the mind itself ^{consciously} is concerned is a concession to ^{the outward} psychology and metaphysics which permitted the fallacies of the misplaced concreteness of time and space.

This was a pre-Einsteinian fallacy no longer tolerable in a universe characterized by Relativity.

** The mind transcends space and time; they are irrelevant for it. For the mind there is only immediacy and degrees of immediacy, determined by freshness of acquisition.

Through a particular succession of acts, even though we may say that there is not a persistence of a particular subject, there is the persistence of a subjectivity.

2 The Francoitz struck again July 9

Time is a dimension which does not exist. Man lives and acts in a universe which knows only of acts and motion. Time is but a fiction, the framework within which man plots the relationships of the acts and motions which concern him. Einstein's insight into the nature of motion made time a relative dimension. For a clear understanding of the nature of being we must think ourselves into a temple

universe; being is that which acts, it is agent. To be means to
be an agent. ^{what acts is what is} and ^{what is is what acts.}
Having understood this fundamental point we can now go on
to an analysis of consciousness.