The Alchemical Aether of Reciprocal Reality: Potentizing Polarity in a Culture of Contradiction

"A hidden connection is stronger than an apparent one."-Heraclitus

Overview: From Difference to Reciprocity

For the path of humanity to expand beyond any single controlled line of development, both its ideas and its physical embodiment must reach beyond any monolithic systems of science and society. Yet, collective structures of thought and culture are not only necessary, they are unavoidable—and in trying to avoid them, life only becomes trapped by more insidious structures of power.

Consequently, if the world is not to become overly determined along a very limited line, attempts at unity or concrete foundational structures must be *consciously* undertaken and continually justified in their specificity, that is, understood and accepted as a *specific and variable path or system of relations*.

This approach contrasts with the tendency of both systems and relations to be viewed as more or less natural or neutral amalgamations of universal objects and subjects—in other words, as more or less correct arrangements of fundamental substances and identities.

Yet the ostensibly "postmodern" turn away from naively naturalized structures toward a foundation in "open" systems and the creative diversity of *relational differences* needs to be well-conceived if it is to become something helpful and not just another ideology justifying a structure of power.

This means distinguishing structures that genuinely enable a rich relational evolution and innovation from the paradigm of mere growth in diverse identities that has dominated and reinforced the fragmentation of culture in the postmodern era.

It means enacting systems of relations that build off of and reciprocally transform each other's influences, ramifying exponentially rather than merely reinforcing linear growth and additive accumulation. Setting up such a reciprocal activation is not only wise practice, but, as this text will demonstrate, it is also, perhaps ironically, metaphysically correct, as far as such things go.

The reason is that *all difference is itself a pattern of reciprocal relations.* While there may be no one neutral or natural system of truth or justice, nothing can exist without connection—without some kind of *relational coherence*. And while a relative incoherence can certainly exist, nothing gets very far when it is out of tune with the rest. One thing can only grow as far as other things have been consolidated and rooted deep within.

This idea must be not only understood philosophically but drilled down into the most basic concepts of science—an especially critical task for disciplines considered fundamental, such as biology and physics, as their ideas significantly impact the way the medical and sociological management of life is handled by the intelligence-systems of the 21st century.

Instead of seeing things—like an artificial (or managerial) intelligence might do—as *sums* of discrete parts, science and society should be rooted in *reciprocal dynamics*. Such a ground implies a *specific type of openness or freedom* defined by a continuity of relations that is infinitely variable but *inevitably structured by a symmetry distributed across that infinity*.

This is because harmony, whether in thought or existence, does not emerge from a single or static order opposed to or imposed on chaos—nor from discrete units assembling definitively or opening “freely” into larger spaces or wholes. It arises from the resonances and tensions of reciprocity.

This reciprocal symmetry can indeed appear absent at times. But in truth, it is only relatively delayed, complexified, and mediated by the infinity of its distribution—by the differential or contextual structure inherent to relations and situated perspectives.

All systems, whether physical, biological, or otherwise, are shaped by reciprocal interactions. These condition and recondition any structure within and between infinitely other structures, implying codetermination and interdependence, but not a *lawlike* symmetry.

Or rather, the symmetry of law is what happens through endless variation in the expression of (and journey towards) what is always already complete at other levels and across specific reciprocating patterns. The fundamental symmetry is a dynamic harmony that is faithfully maintained only in the sense that its inherent order is what is ultimately distributed across, and between all relative differences and dissonances.

To apply such a distributed view of fundamental reality demands a reconsideration of how humanity conceptualizes space, time, and even the most seemingly straightforward notions of objects in motion. For just as postmodern capitalism’s obsession with difference has tended to isolate individuals from collective meaning, the atomistic bias of materialistic science isolates matter and motion from the conditions that sustain them.

The tendency is to think of everything in terms of abstract laws and concrete things, where connection is only possible through subjection to the same force or law. This approach reinforces static conditions and identities, leaving only opposition or compromise between them, and making contradiction the inevitable base of all truth and meaning.

There are, of course, specific trends in the sciences that, due to structural necessity, have taken a different path. Nonetheless, these have mostly spurred a proliferation of new specialized abstractions and supposedly concrete entities—or else a blurring of the two as sophisticated-sounding theories and models become synthesized technologies and

simulations—but rarely does any of this lead to understanding the reciprocal connections and relational reality that defines all structures.

Without that reciprocity, whether it is theoretical trends that emphasize the plurality of identities and models, or attempts to unify them in some abstract union of structures, neither can escape the impoverished understanding of both nature and experience that lingers from the era of more explicit reductionism.

The following work is an attempt to trace a path through the gaps and dead ends of current knowledge. The intent is to shed some light on the ongoing processes underlying every discrete form through interrogating crucial domains of human culture and knowledge.

In particular, physics is given considerable attention, especially its tendency to treat waves as secondary or at most complementary to the spaces and particles they form. This extended treatment of waves in physics is considered justified because waves are not only a potent symbol of the nature of all processes, wave relations are vital for us spatially bound beings in understanding all relations.

This text also examines other domains of culture and knowledge where a reductive organization of differences seems to cause the most issues. It probes into the cultural and political reasons why 20th-century advances in knowledge have so often failed to lead to or bear the fruit of their initial promise.

Biology and medicine are heavily critiqued due to the social and evolutionary implications of viewing life as a battleground of opposing external agents rather than a dynamic pattern of interdependent but relatively individuating structures of relations. In addition to mere critique, however, this text presents a model of community and individuation that is free from the contradictions inherent in mainstream liberal models of openness and opposition.

Exploring these interrelated problems across some detailed areas of apparently disparate domains certainly risks losing the plot. The advantage, however, is that such a reach can more vividly illustrate that the key to an ever-more expandable understanding of (and growth into) space and time depends on a reciprocal relation with the neglected movement inward and backward in space and time—with what is an ever-adjusting and resonance with what has come before.

This demands more than just the contemporary liberal desire for openness to difference as it appears. It necessitates seeing *specifically* how each apparent thing or idea conditions and is conditioned by the rest. In this way, every idea or phenomenon can reveal not merely examples or iterations of generic laws, but new relations and conditions. It is this which truly advances knowledge.

The idea is that, if one can see how this theme plays out in different areas of knowledge and society, the metaphysical shift in knowledge from fragmentation to reciprocity can become more

possible, not only as a philosophical correction, but as an actionable project to divert our physics, science, and the intelligence networks we build on them from barreling towards the nightmares of our worst sci-fi dystopias.

1. The Current State of Earthly Evolution

"It is not the slumber of reason that engenders monsters, but vigilant and insomniac rationality."
-Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari[1]

Philosophy in the postmodern era has been frequently criticized for its lack of a positive vision—its greater interest in variable meaning than in singular truth—and this criticism *can* seem justifiable. One could, however, see the postmodern era's obsessions with difference and otherness, its frequent equivocation and narrowly critical scope as signs of, at least in its best thinkers, not only an admirable humility, but a profoundly crucial concern for the consequences of ideas, especially a concern to keep thought open to difference and time.

Of course, a *desire* for difference, even when dressed up in fancy philosophy, is indeed a short step from the novelty-fetish of consumerism. It is easy to paint as an extension of late capitalism or the oedipal ambitions of Western individuals, who have long been obsessed with the new. Yet, this is not the same as the true thinker's interest in the role of difference and relation in the structure of society and reality itself.

One doesn't need any particular desires or ambitions to realize how important it is for society to maintain a radical openness to different contexts, new relations, or an ever-changing horizon of time. Indeed, cultural wars rage not only over which side holds *the truth* but also over who is most likely to lead the world to greater truths. It does, however, take a particular kind of mind to delve into the pros and cons of all sides, not only the surface duality of society's power games, but also the inherent polarity that accompanies all ideas.

The horrors of late modernity opened up space in human thought not only to question the foundations of its ideas, but to initiate a process of dialogue between all foundations and horizons. The resulting discourse may have often taken the form of what seemed like an ineffectual skepticism, but the transformation to a new era of knowledge is not complete.

What has come so far was not only a critical sieve through which thought needed to pass, but also a creative advancement on the way towards a metaphysically informed science of relational being. Such a metaphysical orientation doesn't mean a new ideology that forces science to conform to any philosophy. It means an awareness of how every science or philosophy *variably* relates to everything else—both in the realm of ideas and in the contexts of the world that they help structure.

While relentlessly exposing the downsides to every idea undoubtedly has its own downsides, an awareness of the meaningful shadow of limitation inherent to any dominant truth or vision is key to the humility that can keep society receptive to new possibilities and broader trajectories.

Admittedly, critiquing everything and everyone doesn't usually bring to mind a humble openness; it certainly doesn't win many friends in our overly-defensive culture. Yet, when constructive critique emerges from a compassionate listening to problems—from a sensitivity to the potential contrasts and contradictions within everything—it not only does justice to the characteristically honest and open spirit of true friendship and community, it can be what is precisely necessary for the innovative spirit of creative evolution to be sustained in the long run.

After a less humble obsession with being *the* creator of the new that characterized modernism, and the general attitude of overconfidence that has characterized modern knowledge, the desire of thinkers in the postmodern era to ensure *the right conditions* for creative emergence over any one ambitious and overpowering vision was an important gesture that has been too often misconstrued.

To clarify, one could say that, ideally, there is a kind of *selective* openness put forward, where the most critical value of any system of ideas is not in any definitively accountable truth it may lay claim to or the reality it tries to represent, but in the variable landscape of what it can do and what it cannot—how every thought *or thing* necessarily both adds to and subtracts, both *structures and forecloses*, the various paths of life.

What must be made particularly clear, however, is that this additive/subtractive nature of everything, if understood in purely discrete and quantitative terms, indeed creates chaotic confusion and contradiction. It suggests that every addition is not only simultaneously a loss or sacrifice—and every structuring an exclusion—but an *irredeemable* loss and exclusion of connections, thus implying an infinity between things, and a relativity beyond comparison.

However, when the discrete quantities that have become the obsession of human knowledge are instead framed as arising from the multiplicative relations we call ratios, things do not merely accumulate or negate but transform and condition each other in a way that amplifies rather than fragments potential.

Things are never simply added or taken away. Instead, every emergence is an *inflection of interdependencies*, a shift in the balance and distribution of what is *ultimately* connected and continuously reiterated. This implies many routes of transformation, but limits the power and range of sovereign solutions or the liberating promise of mere choice.

So while it is natural to want to accumulate possibility or maximize freedom, if amplifying difference or liberating from constraint is attempted through merely adding arbitrarily different forms, or subtracting undesireable ones with the quick fix, one is sure not to see the forest through the trees.

In fact, as the possible meaningless microstates increase (in other words, the insignificant variations of life, like the endless stupid choices in digital capitalism), the potential for creative expansion into and with other systems *must decrease*.

This trade-off is a form of a principle that lies at the heart of the discoveries of 20th-century science and theory, as will be explored in detail in this work. Unfortunately, this important idea is mostly lost in the mess of modern science. The physics and science fiction of our capitalist society have led us to believe that every choice we could make is another world lying in wait for us.

However, this splintering of worlds is no expansion of possibility; it's the opposite. By seeking discrete difference, exponential expansion through coordinated connection is sacrificed for differentiating diversions. The postmodern subject becomes increasingly fragmented by its contradictory choices and impulses, even as it becomes enamored with them as signs of great freedom and complexity.

In reality, creative richness becomes elusive to the extent that the most basic paradox has been missed—that if all things—even so-called "possible" realites—determine each other, then an expansion of *exclusive* possibilities, what we call "choice" (and the *desire* for accumulating the discrete slices of life) doesn't deepen potential; it dilutes it. It determines life by too many things it cannot possibly incorporate or realize, tying it up in petty details that prevent it from any further—or less exclusive—realities and determinations.

This sad state of affairs is the result of our creaturely tendency to conceive of possibilities as "alternatives", implying disconnection and exclusivity, or at most linear addition. The diverse microstates of existence may pile up and more dizzying seductions beckon, but any higher destiny dissolves into desire. Expanding exclusive possibilities—where each choice forecloses others—diminishes the reach and power of things because it scatters interdependence rather than building on or creatively intensifying it into the fuller forms of freedom.

Following this kind of scientific framing on freedom, one could emphasize the physics term "coherence" as this intensifying ideal as long as one understands it relationally and not as a subjection of difference to a singular whole.

While postmodern accounts often critique terms like coherence, preferring differences to simply coexist or perhaps connect without any implied subjection to harmony, this has contributed to the problems of our fragmented and shallowly connected society, as will be explored extensively below.

Coherence, as this text implies it, counters the creaturely (and capitalist) desire for accumulating discrete options not through totalitarian force but by creatively connecting things whenever possible—and in such a way that expansion is multiplicative and self-reinforcing.

In this sense, true creative richness is not found in the proliferation of arbitrary differences but in the unfolding of a more interconnected and self-consistent reality—one where each element creatively expands its participation in a larger dynamic, rather than merely existing as a disconnected possibility among infinite others.

The postmodern fashion of promoting a diversity of forms and perspectives—especially uncovering ideas, facts, and consequences that a framework or a society based on it has too bluntly assumed, denied, or excluded—is then indeed important, but this is done best through reciprocally forging a vision of their mutual conditions and trajectories, not simply posturing alternatives or promoting differences for their own sake.

Indeed, openness to the repressed or marginal background is so essential because it is crucial to understanding the foreground, together forming a crucial polarity that is obfuscated when these are treated as competing alternatives struggling over an unquestioned center of power and significance.

If simple openness to the marginal and different were all that was needed, then one would assume that since this is a crucial and defining value in the dominant culture of liberal society, an expansive evolution of our species would already be underway. Instead, society is at a crucial crossroads in its ability to expand or “openly” evolve that hinges on reframing the meaning and function of this polarity.

To do this, a more nuanced vision of what it means to be open and affirming of diversity must develop. For instance, if it leads not to distrust, doubt, and disconnected differences, but an affirmative appreciation of the various connections and contrasts between things, a passionate defense of new and alternative possibilities becomes a natural by-product. This would be ideal.

Unfortunately, the dominant principle in contemporary liberal society now is not a sincere appreciation for the relations and conditions necessary to fluidly connect and critique things according to context. And it is not any genuine openness to the new.

It is rather to mechanically produce novel fragments and enforce an insincere, patronizing, and exploitative tolerance of subjective differences. Yet this applies only to what conforms to the mechanism—only what is “open” to exploitation by being divorced from any meaningful fabric of evolving relations.

What could be a virtuous defense of the conditions needed for a lively culture of critically interacting and creatively cooperating differences has so far become little more than a maternalizing matrix of defensive niches, forming and restrictively protecting its constitutive identities from generative and transformative confrontations. This process is occurring in both the realm of discourse and the realm of bodies.

There are, of course, conservative reactions to this. Still, these struggle to fundamentally address the ossification of differences increasingly affecting the ability to produce the new or

develop new relations—even at the most basic level of sex and procreation itself. Healthy human relations are becoming more difficult than ever before as physical and mental health plummet and the all-important social and environmental factors of illness are masked by the branding of new diseases.

But more than that, there is a general trend of devitalization, as meaningful living has become increasingly confined by the compartmentalized categories of our media-saturated and commodified identities, identities that increasingly reflect the chaotic jumble of concepts that incoherently underpin our science and sense of reality.

Vital evolution needs exposure to difference, especially the deep pool of conjugating differences "within" each individual—the thread of connected infinities more or less obscured by identity. However, this well of continuous difference has been made even more inaccessible by the shallow and fragmented diversity unleashed by modern and postmodern society.

The natural "bubbling spring" of creative energy at the root of each being gets cordoned off and buried under the monotonously proliferating concepts and standards of the social system.[2] On the other hand, even if access to the infinity inherently within everything is lacking, the desires and difficulties wed to seemingly external and oppositional differences can nonetheless force the issue on the stagnant system. Such is life. Its conflicts and contradictions make external evolution possible, and this creates new opportunities to continue unfolding the possibilities within.

Thus, life in bodies of desire and the sexual relations that reproduce and reinforce them ensured productive differences in form, with which humanity has been compelled to ever more deeply explore the continuity and richness of relations upon which discrete difference relies.

However, this underlying or "internal" richness and openness, being a genuine openness, is not some separate source of ready-made forms or potentials that passively undergird or projectively generate external or environmental differences.

It is a continuum of connections both between and beyond the oppositions and rigid boundaries of inside/outside, old/new, or any discrete/spatially distinct identities. It is the pulsing, mediating membrane at the heart of every relation, the thread that reaches through and across every boundary and carries each entrenched position into endlessly generative dynamics.

While some amount of radical—even trenchantly opposed—difference is naturally vital to healthy reproduction, even that cannot be forever generated solely by new external differences like those found in novel reproductive pools.

Eventually, new sources of relative novelty are exhausted. The desire for difference or the mere appearance of the relatively new is no substitute for opening to the infinite flux "within" each form, since this is what leads "out" into the greater field of differences not limited by any one

source or center of relation. It is this type of “opening” that sustains the continual gradient of relative differences necessary to fuel the engine of life and “energy” beyond its fleeting forms.

If the productive polarities stretched between the contours of a distributed but variously overlapping relational being become too rigid and shallowly rooted in their fleeting forms, they can no longer drive the long haul of life’s higher horizon. For a planet like ours to keep evolving, the infinite potential of these multi-centered, overlapping gradients needs to be lovingly sustained without the dead end of static representation in knowledge, or over-regimentation by technology.

Unfortunately, the dynamic connectivity required for this is frequently the scapegoat of organized political power. While this has long been the case, for what should be obvious reasons, when heightened fears of viruses and fascism converged and condensed into a biological program with global aspirations and broad support in the early 2020s, humanity entered a new more dangerous era.

For in the wake of these events, the genuine and now common-sense concern for the multiplicity of life and its conservation became usurped by the mere safetyism of biotechnical ideology. In its wake, even when the cultural and genetic diversity of the biosphere gets celebrated, it is also often sanitized and commodified.

Admittedly, antagonism to this continues to grow, but so does its appropriation. The result is that any real cultural alternative to the politicized poles of media gains little traction. Furthermore, any person intent on forgoing the path of biotech management of their genome, and thereby posing a supposed medical threat, has even bigger problems on the horizon.

What happened with the cultural politics surrounding so-called covid vaccines was just an early sign of the entrenched and paranoid polarity that will continue to escalate if this trend isn’t reversed. Ironically, many people resisted covid shots out of their own instinct to protect against not just the immediate dangers of a dubious product from a corrupt industry, but also the fear of “unnatural” vectors of genetic change. This trend further entrenched culture-war fear of contamination from the other side.

Critics were quick to point out what seemed like exaggerated and unwarranted fear of DNA corruption. Legitimate concerns about toxic injections aside, the genome is naturally quite “fluid” and open to the environment.[3] DNA change is quite normal. Organisms can handle or benefit from the inevitable flux of circulating genetic material, including what are called viruses, whether man-made or otherwise, and even use them to adapt their evolution.

Regardless of the nature or reason for the production of specific genetic material, the viral vectors that emerge from it can be thought of as “horizontally” connecting every species, even playing a role in their generation. The implication here is that the strict barriers between the lines of “vertical” descent defining species through time are a potentially misleading oversimplification.[4]

Furthermore, the ultimate function of these viral vectors of change can never be pinned down, nor can any one design thwart the recontextualizing power of evolving beings, even if the attempt to control them could very easily push evolution down a dark path. Yet this trend in science and politics is not an evil “other” to purify, just a misguided impulse to enlighten.

Science and technology are inevitably shaping the future of life on Earth, and biotechnology will inevitably play a role. The impulse to shape to the evolution of life, however, is best achieved, not through controlling or attempting to minimize its seemingly random nature, but by mediating and harmonizing the cycles of life with seamlessly integrated design. By fractally embedding the niches and scales of time and energy, evolution is allowed and encouraged to expand freely.[5]

While evolution has often been thought of as driven by environmental pressures acting on random mutations, numerous developments in science and mathematics suggest that the process is anything but random.

Randomness, it turns out, is quite relative to context. Even the so-called random number string is more of a sign of maximal information compression and exclusion of redundancy than it is some distinct category of chaos.[6] Applied to the world, it could be thought of as a sign or measure of the irreducibility of life and time, of how much difference is at work in a system relative to another—how much one escapes being compressed into the terms of another.

Science need not reduce this complexity into representational information, nor repress it in any way. Indeed, technology can be made to simultaneously amplify *and* harmonize the creative flow of life without dominating differences or domesticating them into static oppositions and contradictions.

Outside the apparent boundaries of an organism and conventional frameworks that take them for granted, all the “random” mutations and viral vectors of genetic information can be seen not as disorder but as crucial to the order of a complex ever-communicating network of countless overlapping and mutually evolving systems that extend beyond the biosphere—even beyond what we think of as space and time.

In the larger picture, what appears as a random flux in one limited context is a sign or trace of the changing boundaries and relations of more or less open and endlessly interconnected systems. Any creative evolution in the world necessitates this openness to new and changing contexts because this is what provokes differences and individuation within each thing, not random eccentricity. For such an overly random or arbitrary attitude towards difference and individuality inevitably leads to the mere massing of external differences into uniform diversity.

Additionally, the appearance and social modelling of life as a competitive game for survival amongst beings or genes only masks the continuity and conservation of connections that grow and move through the apparent clash and conflict—and that use them to probe, develop, and connect different spaces of possibility. However, does this mean that the individual is merely an

illusion or a passageway for their line's survival, with a cruel nature caring only for one's role in reproduction?

Not at all. The pressures of external difference are mere vehicles to the creative unfolding of new values and connections between all things and hence beyond any two different things, but this grows out from relations that exist within or as each thing and carry every singular irreducible pattern of being out past any definitive end or all-encompassing game.

Relations do not die with the apparent demise of the individual, nor merely use them "selfishly" for an immortal informational passage. For it is discrete identity *and* information that are just bluntly quantified and abstracted traces of unique patterns of distributed reciprocity, which are preserved and extended by every one of their relations.

A different logic emerges when things are seen no longer as definitive parts within a whole but as a variable and centerless system of infinitely distributed and creatively reiterated patterns—uncontainable and unrepresentable structures that can nonetheless be enacted, extended, and extrapolated through overlapping interests.

Indeed, as modern spiritualists have argued along these lines, individual and even bodily salvation becomes a natural ideal for such a system.[7] The development of conservable but increasingly variable vehicles as contexts for further evolution becomes crucial for life to grow past the temporary losses of its merely cyclical dependencies—its niche boundaries creating oscillations of growth, decay, and eventual exhaustion. Indeed, life reaches ever toward something more sustainable, something akin to the continuous expansions and differentiations seen in fractal animations.

This is not to say that life as we know it has some linear or singular direction, that it abhors stability and homeostasis, or that its spirit is only in its progressive evolution. When conditions are suitable for a rich inner life, when the possibilities of a given medium have not become constrained, there is no pressing need for external evolution. Such stability, however, is never static, never just a repetition of the same.

No identical information unit is being mechanically copied or algorithmically hybridized; rather, a valuable medium of exchange is being recursively regenerated. No randomly wrong version of the original is being passed down as the driving impulse of change.

For it is symbiosis that both sustains and drives life, and not in the simple sense of sexual recombinations or other external merging of identities and information.[8] It is rather a symbiosis of systems more or less open to the infinite, but ever-more so as they are allowed to relate in new ways.

Whether it is sex or consumption, contagion, or combination, what emerges is an evolving vehicle of relationships for the exploration of other relations beyond what can be captured in any mere information, or controlled by any one informatic system.

Yet, the more life becomes inscribed within one, its impulse to break free will take more unsettling forms. And the more that happens, those caught up in the system cannot help but follow its logic of “repression”.

So even as diversity and disease, love and sex, get desperately celebrated, they are also devitalized and more or less stunted, their transformative potential hidden under a spell of surface identities and truncated mediation.

While sex may seem on the surface to be less repressed than at any time in recent history, this view mistakes the act and image for its potential power, for the generative energies that sexual polarities can unleash.

While the healthy creation of children is the most obvious example of this, the vital principle behind truly healthy creation is in the way passion attracts problems, oppositions, and contradictions that put pressure on seemingly disconnected differences to find a productive polarity, ideally more than just the one formed by the mere fact of sexual difference.

At its best, sexual polarity can compel the two sides to transcend the insurmountable contradictions inherent in the mere appearance of unity in external identities, and instead discover the continuity within that has no outside, no rigid boundary of discrete desires and oppositions. This spirit of love and connection cannot be replicated in a closed system or laboratory, and even its potential is muted in a culture dominated by a monotonous and superficial “energy” that deifies desires based on identities and appearances.

Diverse kinds of sexual expressions and identities have frequently been brutally and indeed tragically repressed. Yet, by fetishizing stylistic freedom as a sign of legitimate vitality, the actual value of sexuality can get lost, and along with it, the polarity of comparative differences that connects each energy and desire to the deeper gradients of value that spiritually animate them, a polarity that could have channeled their growth into further connections.

The free generation of new ideas—as well as vital energies and bodies—is replaced by proliferating phantoms of the system: by desires created long ago to deal with past traumas and problems that are then reiterated in one form or another, often with very little growth or healing. These phantoms cry out for a critical return to their old wounds and a liberating evolution.

On top of that, the often traumatic but sometimes transformative encounters life has with destabilizing difference are even further muted into a world devoted to controlling them—a world devoid of the powerful gradients of differential tension and fluctuating power that are necessary for old wounds to heal.

If this continues, humanity may become parasitically coddled on an increasingly cosmic scale, and further locked into its old traumas, continually creating but repressing the diseases that desperately emerge, with only a single matrix of power to which all differences must relate.

Peace and health are well and good, but when they are achieved through conformity and dependence, they are not really peace or health. Indeed, since any genuine spontaneity in life will be disruptive to the only vital gradient in such a society—the one between its monolithic center and its pathogenic margins—the healthy force of life will manifest as illness itself.

By this is meant not just illness-like problems to the social system (which cannot help but label challenging differences as a kind of illness), but literal illness for many of the beings dependent on the system, as life painfully pushes for freedom.

While the causes of all trauma and illness could be more or less simply described as variations on the relatively few general categories of conflicts and stressors that condition human life, even these are variations on the same generic event: an organism's too often traumatic encounter with life's novelty and vital complexity.

Yet, each person's wounds cannot help but reflect that vital complexity and singularity—a uniqueness that is inherent in the very event of life itself, as lived, but which, when antagonized, leads to the seemingly expanding diversity of disease and distress on our rapidly changing planet.

Consequently, by turning over our wounds and the incipient individuation process they portend to the hungry gaze of both business and bureaucracy—which renders the sufferings of each fledgling soul's emergence into a dangerous variant to be sanitized and commodified—the novel bearing we might have embodied becomes merely a resource of profitable problems for the expansion of monolithic power's faux-solutions. And when there becomes no choice but to surrender to this logic of technocratic power, the future of our collective evolution is in question.

While the impulse to protect and even transform the violence of nature and the trauma of even subtle forms of violence into something better is understandable, for that to be done without turning the entire planet into a giant laboratory for technocrats, a revaluation of our philosophy and science is paramount.

2. Deconstructing the Postmodern Biosecurity State

“The scientific enterprise of extracting constants and constant relations is always coupled with the political enterprise of imposing them on speakers.”-Gilles Deleuze[9]

One of the most relevant insights for today's society from recent philosophy is the updated expression of a central tenet of esoteric wisdom: that the process of identification—including both the desire to definitively identify and to be identified—runs counter to the creative process of true individuation.

This idea has ramifications not only in the political sphere but across the board in culture—most obviously in the medical field, where the titanic efforts invested in identifying disease variants give the illusion of sophisticated attention to novel circumstances.

As the categories proliferate, however, the actual individual and the singularity of each situation's circumstances are left further and further behind, and with them any hope of understanding the essential factors of their formative problems, or of finding solutions that don't simply cover them over with the differentiating disease of discrete identity.

All of this may sound like quite an extreme reaction to scientific knowledge, for where would we be without its categories? Indeed, creating a vital alternative has been challenging. The characteristic "incredulity towards metanarratives" of the postmodern era has led more to resignation than a mature and critically informed creation of new narratives and values.

While postmodern thinkers have often been notorious critics of liberal modernity and its rationalized myths, with a lineage descending from figures like Friedrich Nietzsche and Martin Heidegger, who are frequently associated with far-right thought (especially Heidegger, given his explicit Nazi support), any enthusiasm for new myths has been unproductively polarized by politics.

Another issue is that the depth of difficulty encountered in postmodern critiques has made them easy to misunderstand or see as just another secular attack on traditional myth and metaphysical values. This problem played right into conservative narratives that new philosophical ideas were inevitably a part of rationalistic culture's long history of destructively undermining explicit belief, or, for liberals, a rationalism degenerating into relativism.

While academic philosophy is hardly a threat to anyone anymore—for instance, postmodern critiques of science certainly didn't undermine science in any impactful way, as some conservatives like to think—it can be distorted and used in politics and culture wars.

Even so, this had more of an impact on non-secular myth and traditional values (which were already weak because of science itself) than it did on, say, the scientific account of sex or gender, or any kind of scientific "progress". Science is corrupted by power and politics, not significantly by any watered-down philosophy, even if the former may use the latter when it can be bent to political ends.

In any case, the expedited decline in tradition merely resulted in a neoliberal compromise of a comforting, universalized relativism, with all myth and value becoming safely subjective, rather than vitally constructed and enacted. Eventually, a strong right-wing attempt to reassert tradition was inevitable.

Indeed, even some serious thinkers today embrace foundational myths or culture-defining narratives. However, this is mainly opportunistic or reactionary, seldom a vital tapping of the true

spiritual zeitgeist. Most of the vitalism and metaphysical value that could lend power to developing an alternative to our emerging technocracy has been taken over by the syncretism and eclecticism of the New Age.

And in this day and era, no serious person wants that association unless they are playing guru on the internet. Any alternative stance on the sufficiently rationalized religion of science and the medical management of life is enough to expose one to being a right-winger, or even worse, a countercultural amateur covering up his lack of grasp on serious science with spiritual pretensions.

Whatever the fear or posture of intellectuals might seem to be, the fact remains that when explicit totalitarian tyranny arrived during the height of covid lockdowns, a tyranny that no philosopher should have welcomed, or at least not ignored, they barely noticed.

While there are certainly plenty of “analytic” or scientistic philosophers out there, the continental tradition prides itself on more radical positions, yet only one prominent European philosopher, Giorgio Agamben, dared to question what was happening and link it to the themes that had defined the most vital philosophical tradition for a century.[10] And yet he was treated by his peers as if he had suddenly gone senile and not just rather tamely applied the tradition they claimed to revere.

The culture war being what it was in the wake of an emerging right-wing no longer bound by conservative liberalism, this was not surprising, especially since the liberal religion of medicine had already been growing for decades without much academic “deconstruction”.

However, even if Ivan Illich may have foreseen the convergence towards which society was headed back in the 1970s, this convergence was still in its infancy until covid consolidated a century of various biopolitical and technocratic processes.[11] And by the time covid happened, it was perhaps too late for the academy, certainly for “deconstruction”.

One reason is that the academic movement of “deconstruction” was mostly influential in English departments in the U.S., and even this influence diminished or was thoroughly distorted by identity politics after the 1980s and 1990s. However, it is true that, both through its distortions by power and its influence on real thinkers, deconstruction changed the structure of Western thought and culture forever.

Nonetheless, those primarily responsible for developing contemporary concepts and beliefs, namely scientists, barely noticed this effect. Indeed, to those not initiated into postmodern jargon, deconstruction was especially easy to view as an extension of rational skepticism, this time not only demystifying religion but also analyzing the magic out of literature, the one place where meaning was still allowed for a time.

When, in the 1990s, a few scientists began to realize that some critiques were also directed at their notions of truth, they caused quite a controversy. This trend has only continued in the

ensuing decades, as the term “postmodernism” has become a scapegoat in the culture war, becoming associated not only with a deconstruction of truth but also with its inevitable hijacking by politics.[12] Critiquing meaning is one thing, but relativizing truth brings the Nazis to mind, and deconstruction already had enough problems along these lines.[13]

Even without the political connotations, criticizing science is a risky endeavor. No professional academic wants to criticize a technical field and expose themselves to potential ridicule for misjudging the limits of their understanding. Critique can always be easily levied by specialists against cultural critics who don’t share their founding assumptions, and perhaps ignore what to the specialist are vital details.

Admittedly, tracing the construction of knowledge by power through specific scientific discourses and institutions did occur throughout the postmodern era, especially in the work of Michel Foucault and the sociological fields that followed in his wake.

Indeed, even the connections between industrial medicine, microbiology, and lingering eugenic myths about genetic purity and perfectibility did not go unnoticed, as discussed elsewhere.[14] However, vaccines and virology were an exceptionally touchy subject even before they returned to center stage in the political tumult of the early covid era.

A century or so before had seen widespread popular resistance to vaccines.[15] Yet by the late 20th century, vaccine skepticism had become just one niche part of a large swathe of fringe culture that even the academic champions of the marginal dared not defend.

Nonetheless, the deconstruction of medical concepts of purity—and of the reductive scapegoating of disease agents, especially viruses—should have been a simple extrapolation from postmodern themes in the social sciences. Unfortunately, this kind of sociological work was defined more by historical critique than any metaphysical interest in redefining the concepts of the fields it studied.

While there has been some attention on the social construction of what we call “germ theory”,[16] without some convincing alternative reconstruction of science and especially medicine’s problematic myths, when crises hit, especially crises that threaten people with contamination by a supposed agent of death, more or less socially constructed or not, such academic posturing is quickly forgotten.

Is it any wonder that people dismiss postmodern ideas as, if not outright destructive, then at least “unconstructive”? Even many thinking people with an appreciation for the ideas formed in the postmodern era cannot help but long for an incorporation of this predominantly critical era of thought into some kind of positively integrated system.[17]

Yet, while the postmodern era of knowledge can seem narrowly focused on critique and anti-metaphysical—or opposed to any broad narrative or value system—this is not entirely true. It is certainly not true of postmodernism as a cultural era.

The late 20th century saw an explosion of metaphysics and a resurgence of myth. It was simply that no single metanarrative was dominant or seemed likely to become so in the new global value climate. Even the driving myths of science and liberal modernity had become quite diverse and complicated.

So much so that the liberal mind has in recent decades been angling towards not just a multicultural compromise—although that still dominates the subjective sphere—but a positive synthesis no longer based in any single one of the still hardly-believed founding myths of science, but rather those myths *and* sciences that can be most easily made to work towards the current emerging cybernetic system. In other words: whatever helps dominant capital and various institutional bodies that manage the global ecology and neo-feudal economy.

Such a self-conscious or "metamodern" return to whatever seems to sincerely work in our Enlightenment-era mythology of reason was perhaps inevitable if its deconstruction and decentralization offered no alternative path forward. However, again, this was never exactly true.

Even the negative dimensions of postmodern (or rather, poststructural) philosophy should lead to a very different kind of self-conscious evaluation of working myths than what has been happening in the emerging global culture of scientism and the kind of philosophical pragmatism it has embraced.

While true philosophical pragmatism *can* lead to quite an open and innovative approach to knowledge, what has developed instead has not. Instead of weighing the pros and cons of any idea's consequences to society, or finding ways to plug ideas into each other and helpful new contexts, concepts are created that isolate mechanisms from their structure of meaning and give industry a "cause" as a short-cut or "hack"—basically, some kind of leverage for controlling any given phenomena.

Even if the reduced context often limits such control, it simply puts pressure on science to develop more tools with the necessary mechanisms to address the inadequacy. And while these tools and mechanisms can often be integrated, such a system becomes more of a trap for life than an extension of its development or power.

Restricting contexts, of course, can be very helpful in simplifying things. And within restricted contexts, such as those established in much of scientific research to "repeat" or generalize a phenomenon, causal explanations and concepts are indispensable. It is just that, like the characters in most myths and simple stories, causes tend to draw our attention towards them as independent players, ignoring the background conditions that they express and modify along specific lines.

Consequently, hunting causes tends towards technocratic dominance rather than open-ended growth and understanding, at least if it is not done as a part of charting that larger space of conditions and possibilities.

A good scientific account, just like any good story, helps us understand or empathize with the problems and complexity of life and the universe—not explain them away but confront their unavoidably endless conditions even as the account may model or at least imply how problems can be changed or productively tapped for some use.

Endless conditions, however, imply that changing any set of particular causes can only at most modify the conditions, hopefully for the better, but not remove the problem or deliver one to some pure state of harmony. For the health and harmony of life and society depend precisely on the ability to deal well with the problems and surprises of an irreducibly relational universe.

One must always keep in mind the consequences of removing problematic causes, not only because of what might replace them but also because one may be only hindering *the purpose of the problem* in the first place, which even when failing still in some sense *is to help systems grow better at dealing with and understanding them*—with life in a universe of problems and differences.

This failure to appreciate the value of problems is particularly acute when a single narrative or causal line appears to lead to considerable success in explaining and controlling things. There is nothing necessarily wrong with singling out dominant factors and attempting to control them. This kind of technology has its uses. Its successful use, however, especially after all other lines of knowledge have been neglected, can set up such a complex chain of consequent problems that society gets organized around and dependent on their management.

The conservative desire for some ideal backwoods freedom is hardly the point. Society is built on such dependencies and divisions of labor. Even if they do inevitably cause some amount of dependence on the social and technological system, many people are fine with that, and given that this system has swallowed up nature itself, it isn't exactly an impractical specialization or adaptation.

The point is rather that when allowed to proliferate uncritically, this system renders people incapable of seeing the connections between problems. Indeed, they become incapable of understanding them at all.

More specifically, it is increasingly difficult to see the world any other way than as a random collection of controllable forces or not-yet controllable threats. We may be integrating our sciences but upon the basis of a physics that has no real sense of the reciprocal realities at the core of every phenomena.

It is becoming increasingly complex to see the trade-off that occurs here. When all of society is organized around the control of causes and symptoms—and at the expense of stalling (and falling further and further behind) a manageable and helpful level of exposure to the pressure and challenges of life—the environment of life's harmoniously interrelated issues gets buried under a net of compensatory techno-mediations.

So much so that any gesture towards the broader or deeper picture of background conditions is perceived as, at the very least, denying the immediate danger of the acute crises or the suffering of the victims in whatever the story happens to be.

This perception is crucial to challenge as the narrative of victimization and the heightened alarm around it becomes more often precisely what fuels the problem in the first place, obfuscating a measured response to the conditions with a distracting war on scapegoats to compensate.

As people become increasingly convinced that the dominant system of explanation and control is the only reality, anyone questioning its account of things is not only heartlessly denying the importance of the tragedy, but denying reality itself.

The Myth of the Open Society

"[moral] panic motivates our cruelty, this fear of the dark makes it impossible that our lives shall be other than superficial; this, interlocked with and feeding our glittering, mechanical, inescapable civilization which has put to death our freedom."-James Baldwin[18]

As reality and truth become increasingly dependent on technological mediation, the roles of relation, selection, and narrative become more pronounced. While much of the culture war centers around each side accusing the other of sliding into the abyss of their own post-truth world, it becomes all the more critical to reassert some nuance into popular notions of truth—to hopefully fill in the gaps driving antagonism with context, as well as awareness of its role in determining truth's shape.

This reassertion of nuance has become a shockingly difficult task. The use of the term "denier" as a powerful weapon in the contemporary politics of knowledge is a revealing sign of how black and white "truth" has become, despite the progressive West's supposed pride in respecting different values and perspectives. While accusations of denying fundamental truths are made on both sides of the cultural divide, the explicit use of the term has been more restrictively deployed.

While most notably applied to people who attempt to revise the dominant narrative of World War II, the term "denier" has emerged in recent years in other areas of contentious discourse. Since the standard narrative of the war is one of our most crucial founding myths—not in the sense of fiction, but as a culture-defining narrative—offering a different take has become equivalent to heresy.

Central to the myth and therefore attractive to those driven to add contrasting context is the framing of German atrocities during the war as the essence of evil from which all subsequent human history is poised to hopefully never repeat. Since this is termed "the Holocaust", anyone painting even a slightly different picture has been painted as "Holocaust deniers".

Since then, the term “denier” has also been commonly used during the covid culture wars against some of the most extreme skeptics of the dominant narrative. However, it was used much more broadly and insidiously against those who braved a critique of the HIV causes AIDS myth during a time when so much of today’s social engineering through medicine was first testing its tools.

Calling these dissenters “deniers” turned out to be quite an effective way to silence not just fringe historical opinions but what most people still do not realize was a genuine faction of authoritative mainstream experts. By the time covid came around, the politics surrounding who the actual experts were had become more complicated. There was also a more charged atmosphere of popular conspiracy theories that did question the reality of certain events.

So, naturally, the term “denier” was trotted out again and sometimes applied indiscriminately to all with some question as to how random and natural the “covid crisis” actually was. To the more literal-minded, this was, of course, a question of viral origin, and so not denying “the virus” or denying that people were dying.

But any question concerning the meaning of the event, any shift from the narrative that had quickly become an identity for much of the world, could be felt as denying the experience of dying people, so it matters not.

The mere mention that someone denies what is undeniably a great tragedy evokes such an intense disgust and alarm in most people that they will unlikely look further to see if this label is justified. This pattern is especially true in the case of the Holocaust, for it is the tragedy that defines our era’s historical and political consciousness.

While the trajectory of the emerging global regime seems to be towards building a new consciousness and transnational identity defined bio-politically against the evils of death through disease and disaster through climate, the legacy of liberalism defined geopolitically—as against illiberal totalitarianism and fascism—still looms large.

Indeed, it is the basis upon which technocratic liberalism has struggled to constitute itself and justify its own rather totalitarian biopolitics. So, before beginning a more explicit deconstruction of these biopolitics, an examination of liberalism’s construction of its challengers as a kind of sociological disease is warranted.

Liberalism, of course, stands for universal truth against the provincial ambitions of irrational value. While liberty, equality, and fraternity have their complications, limits, and even liberal dissenters, truth defines modernity for all who stand against the tyranny of local fictions. There is no greater sin than denying truth in the liberal religion, and no better way to link it with evil than an association with modern history’s greatest evil act.

And even when the specific term “denier” is not used, an association with Holocaust deniers and the Nazis themselves is never far away when accusations of playing down a tragedy or victim blaming come up—as they often do when someone shifts the framework on an issue from one of senseless suffering or the singular evil of isolated causes, to one of “banal” and ubiquitous problems in which we are all enmeshed.[19]

Using tragedies to further political concerns can be distasteful, even when the proper problems are highlighted around an issue. Despite the difficulties, however, discussion must and will happen, and this is only made more difficult by an insistence on politically safe scapegoats that obfuscate the most important reasons behind things.

Furthermore, associating those who attempt a critique of establishment media narratives with the perpetrators of the most monstrous event in the modern mind, even if only through word association, is quite insidious; it is also quite common—perhaps more so with attempts to associate all idealistic language and politics, especially that which dares to critique the status quo through philosophy, with the most adolescent or “woke” adoption of critical theories.

Such labels are applied to both left and right when they depart at all from liberal dogma, effectively associating them, not only with the naive condescension of college activists, but with the horrors of Stalinism and fascism. This state of affairs is, however, quite inevitable given the strain that liberalism has been under to hold its center while transitioning into its own form of totalitarianism.

Accordingly, there has been a resurgence of interest in the events of World War II and its aftermath, along with a constructive desire to reexamine their significance. While it was indeed a time of historic levels of horror and tragedy—not least of which befell the European Jewish population—simply framing it as a good vs. evil story has arguably set up a roadblock in the contemporary political imagination.

This roadblock has formed in part because the story solidified our postmodern sense of evil as no longer some spiritual force to be cleansed through religion, or some irrational remainder to be colonized by reason, but the poison of any collective culture, creativity, and imagination—of the vital life itself.

True idealistic passion depends on the most common demon of modern media and narratives: the will to not simply catalog and “correctly” organize prefigured identities—which is considered fine, despite its resemblance to fascist horrors, just as long as it is called democracy—but remake the world with some value beyond utilitarian technology.

To the contemporary liberal, evil is precisely the hubris of subjecting what is supposed to be a democratically negotiated truth to the creative whims of individuals with specific cultural values; it is ascribing metaphysical meaning to what should be a world of community-defined and verified facts.

To the true believers in this scientistic myth, the continuation of the tragedy of war in our supposedly enlightened society is no clash of cultures to be negotiated, or even an irrational remainder of our illiberal past to be reduced if possible, but simply a warning of the destructive arrogance and inevitable evil of those resisting scientific modernity and the neutral mechanisms of its democratic alliance.

Even if it is often admitted that liberalism and even science have their faults and frequently a biased agenda, the liberal West's multicultural face resonates more with the myth of secular democracy than any explicitly cultural or tradition-bound power.

If the popular science notion of truth as that which is approached by stripping away the false can be considered modern liberalism's central epistemological narrative—derived, as it is, from Karl Popper's concept of falsification—then a similar myth, also traceable to Popper, functions as post-war liberalism's defining political ideology.

It holds that the liberal world order is the "open society": the only reasonable alternative left after all the seeds of irrational myth and value—and their insidious connection to "closed," and therefore potentially genocidal, societies—have been stripped away from governance.[20]

Most people recognize this is *only* a myth. Intolerant societies are routinely tolerated—so long as they serve the interests of the liberal core. Authoritarian states are integrated without objection, provided they submit their sovereignty to the flows of finance, arms, and influence, and accept their status as subservient subsidiaries within the broader global apparatus.

Just as liberal science justifies its failures as part of an infinite horizon of refinement, so too does liberal politics mask contradictions under the guise of a "work in progress"—a perpetual deferral of coherence.

The truth, however, is that, despite the West losing its dominance with the rise of multipolarity, liberalism broadly defined has all but conquered the world, just not in accord with its myth. Indeed, after the second world war, liberalism gradually revealed its true nature as a broad cultural paradigm supporting and justifying the transition of society and the planet into a modular network, not a progressive liberation from tyranny.

Take the "international community's" attitude towards the modern state of Israel, for example. This has, for many reasons, often complicated the picture of a gradual subservience of ethno-states to the Western liberal order—or even a realist picture of a necessary conflict or compromise with an independent power.

Putting aside the more commonly discussed reasons for this tragically ironic situation, the strategically modulated and geographically distributed level of "tolerance" the West had as an apartheid-state like Israel gained unparalleled power within its network is due to the fact that Israel is, as its defenders often claim, actually quite liberal, just not in the way they usually mean.

The situation has exemplified what mattered most in the postwar liberal order: it is not ideology or human rights, but a nation's ability to make itself interoperable, and ideally vital to the architecture of global control. In this sense, Israeli nationalists and right-wing power blocs became not a barrier to the liberal project; they have been among its most effective agents.

Cultural particularism is not a threat to liberalism because it is subordinated to systems management, allowing mythic identity to be retooled and deployed when necessary as a superior ideological justification for practices such as data collection, border innovation, and security production.

Especially as the multipolar order emerged, myth sovereignty became not a counter to liberal multiculturalism but the face of a new technofeudal era—facilitating compliance with informational norms while maintaining the illusion of traditional authority. This allows divergent polities to claim independence while remaining functionally integrated within a global matrix of interoperable control.

Multiculturalism was the open society's universalist costume during the neoliberal era: a surface ideology meant to disguise its function as a control protocol. The ideal of borderless progress, of democratic pluralism and shared prosperity, served to soften and synchronize the world for absorption into a cybernetic grid.

While certain aspects of the open-society ideology and its sincere advocates linger on, as it became obvious to the world how much of it was a sham, the real stewards of the system—no longer invested in Western dominance—were already recalibrating.

The center of gravity is now no longer ideological, but infrastructural. Whether draped in liberal civility, Eastern civilizational myths, or ethno-religious exceptionalism, each node plays its part in advancing the same planetary logic: predictive governance, extractive continuity, modular sovereignty, and total system legibility.

The network rewards those who feed it—just so long as they do not sincerely place the integrity of a people, a place, or a tradition above the true logic of the "open society"—which is revealed to mean open not to communion, but to extraction, abstraction, and incorporation into a control system without borders.

In this, Israel was not the outlier but the prototype—a sovereign myth weaponized in service of the machine. Indeed, Israel helped pioneer the fusion of ethnic identity and nationalism with liberal rhetoric and network realism—talking in the universalist tones of Western progress while embedding its sovereignty into the operational code of global finance, security, and influence.

Unlike postwar Spain or Saudi Arabia—where local authoritarianism was ultimately subordinated to external capital and Cold War containment—Israel projected its mythic narrative into the heart of Western power.

It became not a relic of fascist sovereignty but a prototype of ethno-cybernetic integration within the liberal world-system, furthering the development of intelligence architecture and surveillance capitalism while blending it with cultural ambition.

Indeed, its mythic struggle birthed a rationale and a locale for the experimental edge of the cybernetic project. The importance of this site—not only geostrategically (and perhaps geomantically), but as a hub within the West's evolving architecture of control—allowed Israel to leverage its value into a level of political sovereignty and cultural "individuation" without parallel in the West. Even if that individuation, in the end, is revealed to be just another node in the machine, subordinated as all modular identities are to the technocratic logic of control.

Nonetheless, Israel rose in tandem with the postwar liberal order because it pursued a model in which ethnos and technos could be fused without threatening the primacy of the network, revealing something vital: the allied and postwar order's opposition to fascism was never primarily about rejecting racism or nationalism. It wasn't even just a matter of factional imperialism.

As postmodern technocracy emerged, territorial rivalries gradually became merely reshuffling nodes within financial, technological, and intelligence networks that transcend and survive them. This is very much in contrast to World War II, where the Axis powers for a time contained not just a rival empire or network, but a rival metaphysics, rooted in place, blood, and myth.

To the extent that multipolarity gives rise to true rival visions for the future of the planet, then the danger of a World War III rises. For just as the Allies of World War II could not tolerate the chance that someone might build a world based on sincere metaphysics (and not just politicized rhetoric), so the current planners of technocratic globalism cannot tolerate this.

A metaphysics of organic coherence sincerely followed implies a society whose biology, cosmology, and culture cannot be broken into pieces, coded into categories, or fed into feedback loops.

The sincerely "Romantic" and metaphysical science of *some* influential thinkers in Nazi Germany—however corrupted and co-opted—not only had a vision of vital unity between land, people, and cosmos, and a more holistic-field approach to fundamental science, but a technological capacity to mold the future with this that would have fundamentally disrupted the rise of the postwar cybernetic order.

That is why this last gasp of traditional cultural coherence—however corrupted—had to be eradicated. It attempted, however pathologically, to revive, weaponize, and modernize a metaphysical tradition the liberal order had spent centuries dismantling.

It had to be not merely defeated militarily, but culturally erased, biologically pathologized, and epistemologically exiled, so that the last viable resistance to the order of modular extraction and

metaphysical disembedding could be eliminated. This process had begun long before, but it was only after the war that it could consolidate itself without serious ideological rivals.

The victors attempted to ensure that there would “never again” be an attempt to return to rooted order, instead expediting the rise of the empire of perpetual circulation—a regime in which governance became logistics, and legitimacy was replaced by liquidity. This finalized millennia of degradation from the old world-order of relational coherence and co-arising.

In ancient cosmologies, for instance, the ruler’s task was not perpetual expansion, but periodic realignment. Power was judged by its capacity to restore coherence, often through the cyclical cancellation of debts, which served not as charity but as cosmic necessity.[21]

The postwar order was a triumph of the creditors and merchant class, which had long been discussed in esoteric traditions as a sign of the dark age or “Kali Yuga.” In contrast to the sacred king of esoteric and especially Masonic lore, the rulers are no longer people or cultures at all, but abstract networks that preserve and leverage debt while liquidating memory. They forgave nothing, but forgot everything—especially those attachments to myth, place, and shared time that might have anchored a different form of life.

The sovereign mediating between heaven and earth, of course, had long been absent. This disappearance was no usurpation or conspiracy, but a sign of the times—signs of an era where systems become more powerful than any person or people, and where the algorithm administers all in terms of risk and information. The temple long ago gave way to the market, but in postmodernity, all meaning began to dissolve into metrics, and the cultivation that once made one worthy of power was discredited and replaced by code.

The Kali Yuga is not so much a time of universal collapse, however, but rather a necessary inversion of authority that can drive greater individuation for those who recognize this inversion and avoid falling for the modern illusion that capricious power is being undermined through the process of liberalization.

For when priests serve markets, warriors serve machines, and merchants mediate meaning itself, this is not freedom but simply a more abstract power, which *is* potentially liberating *if* it drives one to experience the abstract concretely, and thereby resist becoming dislodged by its relative ephemerality.

For in such a dissociated state, the predominant picture is one where the sacred becomes merely speculative, the formerly grounded essence of things becomes gamified, and the vital spiritual state of true coherence is achieved only with great difficulty by individuals struggling against ubiquitous forces of fragmentation.

While this might change if multipolarity ends up making room for sovereign spiritual forces and communities, the future will no doubt remain quite difficult for any true alternative. This difficulty seems crucial to the true individuation and multidirectional evolution of the human spirit. For it

seems humanity must grow its roots deeper than any one tradition and embrace a knowledge that works through but reaches beyond the patterns of history.

Consequently, the fall of Germany and the Western tradition that the Nazis pathologically tried to defend was more or less inevitable. And to be clear: it was certainly not a victim of any particular people. Israel's position within the unfolding of the new world was a result of millennia of pragmatic adaptation of Jewish people to changing times.

While with the rise of Israel, Jewish people may seem to have gained what others have lost—national sovereignty—that sovereignty is just a surface feature of what is more essentially a control center for a power with no regard for any human culture.

Not having a state during the modern period merely allowed Jewish culture to anticipate the actual end game of liberalism: a world of identities that may be theoretically rooted in and controlled from a particular place, but which are easily reconstituted and refashioned through the grammar of the postmodern network.

Their cultural identity remained quite vital through the trials of modernity, while other religious traditions desperately clung to old, worn-out symbols awkwardly tied to irrevocably changed places, incapable of the abstraction required to adapt to the myths of modernity. By the time that postmodernity arrived, Jewish culture was already long adjusted to the necessity of a modular ethnic identity and a power that transcends all images and forms.

It did not need to desperately oppose or surrender to the dispersive secularity of liberalism, for liberalism was never really about a shedding of belief, just its adaptability to changing power structures, which in the postmodern era finally became the smooth “open” space of the “open society” networks.

It is true that the fascists, especially in Germany, were intent on going their own way politically and financially, and this was indeed a more tangible threat than any of their cultural ideals. Yet because this independence carried with it a model of knowledge and society that was deeply incompatible with the forces then mobilizing in history, they were much more than just a rival within the emerging world of territorially abstracted network power. They were actively motivated to prevent this world from emerging.

This is a threat that would still have existed *even if* Germany had achieved some level of coexistence or abandoned any imperial ambitions. The last vestiges of the old world and its beliefs were one thing, but an ability to chart a different path through the emerging technological paradigm using different knowledge structures, and possibly different technologies, was something that had to be removed.

This is not to say that metaphysics or knowledge-models were explicitly in the minds of, say, the English when they decided to push back against early signs of reemerging German power.

What has often provoked the hostility of dominant capital is simply any resistance to its influence, regardless of the ideology behind it.

Yet, in terms of threats, local control over resources, money, and production is nothing compared to the possibility that these could be used in a way that preserved a real outside to the interiorizing logic of capital.

To be sure, the Nazis did not accomplish this. The culture of science and knowledge in Germany, both before and during the war, with its strong holistic bent, did have a distinctly different trajectory. However, a compromise with mechanistic capitalism was always the reality, and would have been necessary for quite some time, even without the war. Admittedly, given that it was this mechanistic model of reality and society that was the main ideological enemy of German holism, it is not inconceivable that it could have eventually thrown off its yoke.

Still, even if something like this could have happened, it should be kept in mind that there is no unambiguously clear distinction between the two paradigms. The unavoidable realities of contamination between politically opposed philosophies would have necessitated that German holism was always going to become something more or less mechanistic and technocratic. Perhaps it would have been an even shorter route to some form of technofeudalism, completely bypassing the era of neoliberal conquest through markets.

And then there is the darker side of thinking in terms of “wholes” vs. mere parts—and the genocidal slant of concepts like the purity of an essence or vital spirit. These would have emerged at some point, with or without explicit “mechanistic” thinking and excessively mechanistic technology.[22]

Whatever the case, the reality was that the war pressured an alliance between the sides; mechanisms do come in handy when fighting on a massive scale. The more mystical or holistic thinkers in German science—those invested in ideas of organic vitality, coherence, and the irreducible wholeness of the human being—were predictably co-opted or marginalized by technocrats who favored logistical, modular, and scalable forms of control.

Nonetheless, the metaphysical vitalism of the Nazi vision refused to entirely compromise with the dominant version of the mechanistic mode, since this would have rendered Germany into another node in the nexus—as eventually happened to all the formerly fascist nations after losing the war, in the end requiring so much violence and suffering to defeat the naive dream of an imminently vital and mythical future.

In this vein, the war was decisively won by the more explicitly mechanistic or utilitarian paradigm, and was probably inevitable no matter what culture ostensibly won the war. But why? It certainly proved to be most compatible with emerging global institutions. Its success, however, was not due to any intrinsic truth or superiority, but because the times were clearly selecting only what could be networked, standardized, and synchronized with the expanding infrastructures of global governance.

Shedding Nazi ambitions for a unified field physics, for example, allowed a re-entrenchment of atomism. This trend helped ground the other sciences in *hierarchical strata of mechanisms* optimized for local control and discrete interchangeable causal chains.

A kind of *modular* biology then becomes the natural subsequent layer, prioritizing patentable interventions, standardizable treatments, and scalable responses to crises. The reductionist model of disease was then assured, allowing for containment, compliance, and eventually covid-style “security theater”—not true coherence or resilience.

Vitalist metaphysical ambition for the “purity” of organic systems was a dangerously naive and therefore easily co-opted challenge to the incipient form of this network of mechanized power and compartmentalized science. However, its use as a metaphysical justification for atrocities is secondary to utilitarian ideals that can reduce all values to a power calculus. Misguided ideals are nothing compared to the rationalized methods that can scale the necessary violence needed for victory.

These, of course, were embraced by both sides of the war. Indeed, some of the most disturbing and historically significant innovations unique to Nazi technical infrastructure—such as its systems of categorization and biopolitical management—were even more efficiently and sustainably deployed by the West once the opposing cultural project was defeated, allowing these systems to be reinscribed within a new liberal-transhumanist horizon.

Another consequence of this cultural defeat was that the lingering thread of holistic culture could only thrive on the fringes of Western society. Here, it was easily contained or reduced to scientistic reflections or subjectively spiritual reactions against the dominant model, where even so-called “whole” systems are definitively layered and determined from their underlying atomistic assumptions, and all higher things “emerge” from their composite material parts.

Materialistic culture and reductive science triumphed after the war not merely because the then-emerging regimes of managerial liberalism and Soviet totalitarianism demanded it ideologically. Rather, the discrete, statistical forms of science and knowledge proved uniquely suited to the infrastructural needs of postwar state capitalism, no matter how any particular state or power bloc was culturally coded.

These models weren’t chosen out of pure pragmatism either, but rather because their internal logic—discrete causality, standardization, intervention—aligned with the economic and deeper epistemic requirements of reproducible and standardizable power structures.

These structures are marketed as empowering and inclusive, as they can be easily deployed and modified at each site and scale within the system. Yet they render any real relational individuation impossible, transforming even the idea of a coherent individual into a diversely coded surface feature that reduces to an interchangeable cog in the machine.

Even the Soviet Union, although seemingly ideologically opposed to the liberal West, adopted similarly modular paradigms as part of the same convergence between technocratic power and mechanical epistemology.

In this sense, the Cold War was more of a theatrical dance between differently coded nodes within the same network, a dance that helped both sides sustain and further entrench wartime mechanization. While both Cold War powers undoubtedly pursued alternative science models and coherent-field-based technologies in secret, compartmentalization ensured that any threat to the modular model remained contained.

The Nazis not only opposed the financial and industrial networks that had initially supported their power, but also threatened their very logic, making them far more destabilizing than Soviet imperialism, which—despite its ideological posture—functioned mainly as a *predictable* counter-node within the evolving global infrastructure of rationalized control.

In practice, the USSR's mechanization of nature (and even of its privileged class), its industrial biopolitics, and most tragically, a reduction of any lingering Romantic ideals of social harmony into an even more segmented, bureaucratic model than the West, was a great gift to the ideological engineering of Western financial and intelligence networks.

As global capitalism evolved into a less state-bound and more cybernetic order, the Soviet model served as the foil that made neoliberalism appear dynamic, decentralized, and humane by contrast, even as it perfected its own forms of control through smoother, less obvious mechanisms of extraction.

Nazi totalitarianism would have never been compatible with this, not in what were its sometimes sincerely believed Romantic and vitalistic ideals. The parts that *were* compatible became part of the new order precisely because they were not tied to a greater vision or science, or if they were, as in the case of alternative physics, these were shunted into secret programs.

All this history just further illustrates that while the relative peace and ideological control that the liberal West enjoyed for a time allowed it to posture its order as an ethical improvement over Nazi horrors, what their victory secured most at the structural level was not moral progress, but the primacy of an Anglo-pragmatic road to technofeudalism—one that excluded any path to globalization rooted in holistic metaphysics or alternative technological paradigms.

Its sanitization of systemic violence through pragmatic framing made space for Israel's exceptionalism: a sometimes explicitly genocidal national project with mythic dimensions and ambitions that is supported because it embeds these cultural aims within the Anglo-dominated West's myths of liberal utility. Israel speaks the language and models the systems of modern rationalization well enough to justify and gain support for its mythically motivated violence.

While what seems like a return to mythic nationalism in the age of multipolarity is merely the postmodern face of the Kali Yuga: an era in which every emerging pole of power is fated to become just another node, more or less, in the planetary network.

What challenges the network most, then, is not violence or nationalism, but non-modular, non-quantifiable relations and flows. As long as identities are legible, duplicable, and convertible, and any flow is administrable—with its relations subject to a predictive algorithm—they pose no threat.

The “open society”, in this light, is not open to living, dynamically related systems, but only to fragmented flows—of capital, of information, of managed pluralism. It even thrives on violence, disease, and death, provided they are systematically routed.

It only bars what resists segmentation or exceeds the flows allowed by the algorithm. Organic “wholes” are just fine as long as these can be segmented and their relations liquified—or in some way optimized for the growth of the “open society”—that is, open to use by what is ultimately a “cosmic” or transhuman economy of predatory power, since humanity and the Earth are mere resources for some abstract system beyond them.

For these reasons, any genuine alternative to technocratic liberalism must come to terms with the legacy of this recurring modern problem—with deciding the relation between the organic or analog and the discrete or mechanistic: not merely in terms of institutions or ideas, but in terms of the energetic and informational assumptions embedded in the very models by which we conceive life, motion, and relation.

Consequently, the answer is not “holism” or “vitalism” because the problem is not mechanistic science; it is the prioritization of the discrete, spatialized, quantifiable forms of everything over the contexts, relations, and values that make them what they are in their singular flow of living time.

This bias selects and distorts any knowledge models into what can be digested or absorbed by its algorithms—a standard of “openness” that excludes any field-based or organismic reality not easily reduced to data-points, causal chains, or policy levers.

To be fair, the “open society” attitude was a natural reaction of the modern mind to the horrors of two world wars. However, “never again” is no simple attitude of multicultural tolerance or pragmatism; it is a powerful emotion and narrative.

And as understandable and laudable as a sentiment it may be—can also become a myth that blinds us to the ubiquity of myth and selective violence, to the inescapable role of context and narrative in our thinking and therefore biases in the way the world is divided or integrated and society is organized.

Liberalism has a hard time honestly facing the unavoidable paradoxes inherent to all concepts of openness or inclusivity, and this has provoked a strong right-wing reaction. Consequently, postmodern culture and its reactions have gone very wrong.

What began as a growing awareness in modernity—and rendered into a philosophy by deconstruction—that concealed differences and tacit values structure all thought and life, has increasingly devolved into a reactive anxiety over the perceived fragility of liberal society.

This anxiety has given rise to new forms of repression and bureaucratic efforts to sanitize cultural alternatives that fail to conform to the empire of inclusivity. As a result, difference is not affirmed but neutralized, cast as a threat to pluralism itself. Any cultural coherence smacks of being a “closed society”, and is quickly coded as a fascistic monolith, thereby preserving consensus under the guise of diversity.

In many Western countries, laws against questioning the Holocaust have not only been an understandable strategic move to prevent dangerous opposition to the liberal order, but also a repressive cultural move to eliminate legitimate inquiries into the broader causes and dynamics of World War II.

Yet, the insistence on framing the Nazis as a uniquely singular evil that both caused and contained the horrors of that era risks reducing history to a moralistic caricature, closing off deeper examinations of what gave rise to such a catastrophe.

The liberal impulse to protect cultural and historical narratives from potentially harmful interpretations exemplifies the paradox of its power drive. By attempting to eliminate illiberal myths, it constructs a framework that silences dissent and forces all deviations into the same category of moral and political condemnation. The very openness that liberalism celebrates becomes the rationale by which alternative perspectives—on history, culture, and society—are systematically closed off.

Hateful racism understandably provokes condemnation, and indeed, people of this persuasion exist and can latch onto and use narratives that in any way support their power drive. But these hateful or opportunistic margins are only empowered by forcing all dissent into the same camp. The fear of the margin only creates a larger bloc of power there, where what counts as illiberal cannot help but grow with liberal fear, and even grow strong enough to challenge consensus and force a new alignment along less “progressive” lines, as happened in the mid-2020s.

Even so, the extreme liberal in our era of mass democracy is convinced that lurking beneath every opposition to their politics is an incipient evil other, a kind of cancer of cultural homogeneity or burgeoning racism that needs to be stripped away from the democratic core of the social body which without this infiltration would naturally gravitate towards a utopia of pure truth and justice for all. While the “paradox of tolerance”, as Popper called it, is widely acknowledged, the irony is somehow usually lost.

The real tragedy in the irony is not just that the liberal myth becomes a reflection of the exclusive force that it hates, but that it excludes the very coherence and connections that produce healthy heterogeneity—its supposed ideal. The latter is characterized not necessarily or essentially by differences of mere form or appearance but by a flexible harmony that produces new patterns and qualities of life.

Unique and creative qualities thrive when communities of beings are tightly knit together by mutual understanding and fearless communication, rather than a standardized stratification of ostensibly equalized but ultimately just quantitatively managed differences.

However, it is indeed true that many cultural communities, especially populist or “mass” political movements, whether left or right, tend to have a homogenizing slant. However, like cancer in an organic body, the blind force and frenzied desires of populist and fascistic movements merely reflect the problems of the social body to which they are a reaction.

They do this with a kind of inversion of the larger body’s rigid control of change. The “mutating” mass of crudely energized reactions in both organic and social bodies serves to reflect and challenge their rigid ordering of repetitively connected parts with what amounts to an aggressive and unsustainable aggregation of impulses towards vital change, novel connection, and growth.

While in reality there is always some amount of creative force involved even in the most primal and destructive rage, even in the unreal case of a pure and blind libidinal reaction, this would still be a kind of liberated expression of the incoherence and chaos—though, ultimately also the monotony—that underlies all discretely segmented and controlled systems of differences. This is true, regardless of how diverse, dynamic, and eccentric (or seemingly well-ordered) their surface may appear.

Both the concepts of chaos (or extreme change) and order (or extreme stasis) are artificial sides of the same confused coin of incoherent change—that is, change abstracted out of its meaningful environment and into the generic oppositions inherent to rigid boundaries—as well as to any mode based on mere information and overly codified communication.

Ordering change or difference based on restrictive, rule-based regimes is a desperate strategy employed by personal and social systems struggling with what should be the dynamic interface of healthy boundaries.

The “fractal-like” coherence of healthy systems—intricately connected yet creatively differentiating, overlapping, and communicating—is deformed into a dominant rhythm, standard, or code which turns its very “openness” into a sign of its desperate instability and an insatiable dependency, and its order into a mere muffling or averaging of the inherent chaos of a stifled evolution.

Such a deformation makes any sign of that system's natural, spontaneous vitality a random or chaotic danger that is only chaotic because it cannot help but reflect the system's incapacity to respond fluidly and coherently to vital signs of necessary change.

Chaos is just as monotonous as the stasis it threatens because it is stasis projected onto change; it reflects an order's inability to form a productive gradient with difference or tease out coherent meaning from the information.

It takes a rhythmically-tuned system to form meaningful change—one coherently constituting its pattern continuously through time but responsively "open" to the flux of the environment. Such a system creatively relays relations, transforming chaos from merely exciting or unsettling information into a dynamic feedback of co-evolution—into what, ironically, could be called "closed" loops, or more accurately, *the more immediately reciprocal relations of sustainably situated systems*.

At the highest end of this ideal, what results is mutual growth at all scales and in all directions, since such systems no longer need others to feed them; they only need to be situated in a meaningful exchange, ideally allowing for mutual adaptation without loss of momentum. There is therefore no need to disrupt or restrictively regulate the natural and eternal circulation of motion as it is ridden or tapped as an energizing motive force upon which other circulations can be built.

This makes things coherently connected, yet *also independent*, since no force is needed to express (or even improvise through) coherent combinations. And since everything is more or less in tune with everyone else, there are sympathetic adjustments, not only fluidly ready and solidly poised for any possibility, but thriving on them—just so long as everyone keeps listening to one another.

While this rather lofty ideal is difficult even to approach (especially in our current environment of systems), there are always opportunities to further its qualities. Even within the desperate reach of chaotic forces, there is the possibility of a more dynamically coherent regime arising to incorporate and harmonize the algorithmically unpredictable nature of vitality. However, there is also always the risk of the collapse of all sustainable order in the struggling system.

Nonetheless, the vital will of life, when blocked by overly regimented and devitalized divisions, will take this risk for the chance to reestablish any connective coherence, dedifferentiating down to a common denominator, whether it be old, generic cell types, as in cancer, or past cultural forms.

However, this is not a disease of infiltration; it is merely a sign, not the source of the danger. Even if such cancerous expressions become dominant in a system, for the system not to quickly collapse, they must catalyze some kind of system-wide change.

Indeed, this happens all the time, as cancer triggers healing changes in people, and social chaos triggers some kind of shift in power, or at least forces enough change for the person or society to live in a more tolerable arrangement. The Nazis, likewise, were themselves a kind of extreme and precarious compromise between a populist fervor and capitalist elites. It did not last long, naturally.

However, it did help trigger another compromise: a change in the capitalist system that paved the way for the post-war boom, and eventually a more sustainable global order under neoliberalism, which, in turn, created the problems and opportunities of today's techno-feudal networks.

Some have argued that though the Nazi's cultural program was abandoned, and the German nation seemed to—at least on the surface—lose the war, the intelligence apparatus and visionary technocrats on both sides more or less soon converged and continued on crucial aspects of esoteric Nazi research and technology, just no longer centered in Germany.[23]

Freed from the strain of taking on the rest of the world, and now with much of the Earth and its resources coming under the control of the liberal empire, the fascist fantasy of unified power could proceed, shorn of what was becoming more obviously an outmoded paradigm of symbolic centrality.

Without the need to cultivate a shared vitality, the road to unified power was becoming smoothly paved through a technologically integrated field of modulation. The flexible power of liberalism indeed has proven that the ritually sustained sovereignty of territorial coherence is much more cumbersome than the recursively trained compliance of network legibility.

Before even the end of the war, it was becoming clear to many in the Nazi regime that anchored authority was bound to give way to a fluid infrastructure of influence, formational rule to informational rule. Indeed, the whole idea of having an "axis" of power was becoming increasingly apparent as a liability.

The unity of a whole is much more vulnerable than a grid. In the former, disease, disorder, and dissent are continually threatening and require some mythic justification for the inevitable sacrifice that comes in the name of order. Now, such things can be preemptively coded and operationalized—every node evaluated for risk and even dissent funneled into profitable channels for the system.

Marketed as the antithesis of centralized power, in the new regime, centralization is just no longer geographic or theatrical. Indeed, its center is everywhere, and its periphery a space no longer visible to those caught in its materializing matrix. Marketed as progressively less hierarchical, or at least more fairly distributed, this apparent leveling of power is merely the geographical and institutional diffusion of its enforcement, not its dilution.

All flows horizontally, yet is governed by vertically abstracted protocols that can refactor identity into infrastructure and meaning into categorical imperatives of predictably differentiable niches. Power no longer needs monuments or martyrs. Myth survives. It just no longer spiritually animates; it just virtually entertains.

Consequently, cultural and geographic conflicts are increasingly just surface-level distractions of abstract oppositions taken out of the context of an inorganic system and intelligence network that is converging on parasitical stability with the natural flux of organic vitality.

This system can seemingly avoid any serious challenge. It can even instigate and use predictable conflicts centered on generic and manageable identities to corral instability when it needs some kind of transformation.

It can channel the chaos of cultural conflict into a form of control that is no longer vulnerable to the instability generated by crude centers of power, or even a decentralized bureaucracy. Such control is so well integrated into everything that its seemingly all-powerful protocols of data distribution are becoming the new gods.

Today, one increasingly sees the fruit of this shift from cultural conquest and deep state disciplinary tactics to ubiquitous AI control, with an escalating technification and tokenization of the flow of genes and all life, not towards the old delirious fascist vision of biological perfection, but rather towards a transcendence of all biology.

The future challenges humanity with the worst of both extremes combining and compromising as power competes for control, incorporating the vital desire for transcendence through its data science and biotechnology, while also employing these tools in a paranoid manner to stabilize their incoherent products, thereby foreclosing a more coherent evolution.[24]

For instance, global health and agriculture initiatives have been oriented towards engineering a techno-dependent biosphere of mono-cultured, factory-farmed beings, including a human population reduced to a chronically sick melting pot of drug-dependent techno-serfs.

Such a society may seem less dangerous or at least less genocidal than historical fascism; on the surface, this is true. Indeed, the liberal side of the technocracy is often characterized by its seeming opposition to death and uncontrolled change, marketed as protecting us all from the “dangerous” viral vectors of life and evil humans.

However, the negative aspects of nature and people are exacerbated by the tendency to compartmentalize and scapegoat their problems. This tendency is especially dangerous when the scapegoat becomes any naturally evolving human and all genuinely open systems.

Yet again, “open systems” doesn’t mean “open societies”—a euphemism for a kind of surface-level multiculturalism that makes repressing populist movements easier for the liberal bureaucracy. However, it also doesn’t mean the tech-libertarian dream of a network society

freed from explicit state repression yet inevitably tethered to the codes and protocols of the dominant network power.

“Open systems” should mean, rather, minds and bodies coherently communicating through the infinite. It should mean beings and relations adapting without dependence on any one system, especially one converging into an inhuman cybernetic network beyond normal scientific understanding or control.

4. Purity and Presence: Revisiting Deconstruction and AIDS

“[P]art of what it means to think about the force and efficacy of scientific knowledge is to think about the force and efficacy of language.”
-Evelyn Fox Keller[25]

Coherent, connected openness to the infinite is what characterizes all life and social organization when their problems are viewed in the right light—that is, not as more or less working mechanisms with set functions in need of management, but as evolving and irreducibly unbound relational relays, improved and enriched by an intelligence that can midwife creative coherence.

The attempt to purify life of death and uncoded change is a road to an even more lasting repression and a more frightening kind of living death than the Nazis and their unsustainably destructive vitalism could have ever achieved, not without dropping their Romanticism and any wild vital drive for sovereign expression and unchecked evolution, not without fully siding with their technocratic tendencies and embracing a thoroughly rationalized mode of conquest, as in a sense they ultimately did within the postwar merger.

While the two extremes of chaotic change and narrowly centralized control are not ideal, the momentum of one side seldom progresses unchecked by the other for long, since they are a polarity inherent to a system out of communication with others that could modify this artificial alloy of abstractions.

Nonetheless, liberalism’s aversion to explicit extremes and its attachment to the appearance of moderation have become a kind of semi-stable mask that covers over the problem and has fractured any deep challenge to its current trajectory, instead turning it into the polarized scapegoats of party politics.

Meanwhile, its transformation from a nominally democratic bureaucracy into a facade of neutral algorithmic control continues, regardless of which side of the political aisle—and which narrative and institutions—are used to expand its power further.

Whatever the challenge, the vital need for change as well as the equally emotional desire for stability—and their sometimes overlapping rationalizations and deployments of social regimentation—are always there in various and sometimes complicated ways, making the path to a healthier evolution difficult to discern and certainly to script in advance.

This complexity is why the boundaries of beings and societies need continual reevaluation, not necessarily in the sense of a destabilizing “deconstruction” of their principles, but rather an honest examination of whether these principles truly reflect their intended nature, to see if they have been somehow deformed or even inverted. Inevitably, there will be some of both because there is no pure principle. That is, there is no unalloyed context, no single original meaning.

Deformation is present from the start because there are no definitive boundaries of context. Additionally, every abstract principle involves its opposition—what it is ostensibly set up against or in contrast to—because in a way that is its meaningful context (like, for instance, the potential and actual binds that give freedom its positive meaning beyond an abstract platitude). Nonetheless, there is still a spirit in every real principle to which one can be true through every change in context.

When it comes to Popper’s “open society”, the principle is ripe with paradoxes and contradictions, but there is a way to achieve its spirit. It just isn’t through the solution our society has opted for: admitting the paradox as justification for imposing a set limit that contradicts the principle. Such set limits do not helpfully guide the polarity of the principle through the inevitable ambiguity of the real “open” contexts of life. Quite “the opposite”.

By making the abstract opposition of the principle its defining boundary and foe, it ensures it is dominated by this contradiction—by this oppositional dynamic. While the spirit of preventing genocide is easy to get behind, the problem is, in preventing one kind of totalitarianism too blindly, do we create its opposite and therefore mirror-image, potentially caught indefinitely within the orbit of this imposed struggle with an artificial limit?

Instead of defining a principle like freedom against its opposite, we can better achieve its spirit by carefully negotiating its contrasting conditions that define its meaning in practice. While principles will always require negotiation and interpretation, especially as contexts change radically, this can be challenging to do without conflict and contradiction.

However, it is much more likely to be accomplished when all polarity is understood as an evolving dynamic of negotiation, rather than a battle of pure principles discretely embodied, such as good and evil, or freedom and tyranny.

And contrary to the popular caricature of postmodern deconstruction, this can be done without destabilizing conflict and relativistic doubt. It just demands an orientation attuned, not to the polarity and mere choice of life as it is simply given, but to the horizon of interrelated possibilities. It requires digging deep enough to find the mutual conditions that can forge a cooperative evolution.

The true spirit of deconstruction should be an awareness of the need to listen to the voice of difference within things, so that the best possibilities can emerge and converge—not so one can become paralyzed with indecision, or become prey to the systems that corral the chaos of disconnected difference.

What the ideology of technocratic liberalism *has* retained from postmodern deconstructive-style discourse is, as discussed, a posturing of concern for the supposedly marginal. But if this concern goes no more than skin-deep, if it gets used to merely reverse hierarchies—or scapegoat whatever is a threat to power—then there should be no surprise as the hierarchies inevitably reverse again, and power merely pivots to its other pole to temporarily appease or co-opt the resentment that is bound to result.

If this oscillatory pattern of power is to be transformed into something better, there first must be a deconstruction of the legacy of deconstruction as it is understood, used, and abused. However, it must also be reconstructed once again to make it less easy for power to portray challenges to the system as a threat to all or the most vulnerable. Even when this is the case, the oppositions and scapegoating reversals don't change the game.

The irony is that the scapegoating process is deconstruction's most "essential" object of scrutiny.[26] Most importantly, it isn't that myths or the value hierarchies they justify and explain are essentially bad or wrong, for indeed, there is no way around them. Instead, it is that even when they are good, their meaning can change with context, so their meaning and application should be open to continual examination and revision, not taken as something set or manageable by our machines and impersonal networks of power.

Even when questioned and debated, as obvious myths have been throughout modernity, they can merely mutate into new iterations with similar forms and problems. This is particularly true if the questioning and negotiation don't consider the irreducible entanglement of all things as interconnected complex systems, and become, as they often do in so-called democracy, a mere competition between short-sighted interests.

This interpretation of postmodern knowledge as being essentially about the discovery of complexity and all real systems as open and variously determinate helps mitigate narrative tendencies to frame the postmodern as a narrow, culturally-driven phenomenon instead of what it more accurately is: an era of culture brought on by the complexification of society, science, and knowledge.[27]

There is a constructive side to this discovery of complexity, but the critical connotations are also significant. Both the philosophically postmodern and scientifically "post-classical" lines of revolution in theory point to the same deconstructive logic: scapegoating something as the one essential cause of something else is a problematic reduction of both truth and meaning.[28]

The culture of science, however, has largely continued much as before its post-classical crises in physical causality and foundational logic, not only continuing to shore up its founding myths but also becoming increasingly organized around the focus of convenient scapegoats.

This includes not only the more obvious scapegoats of medicine, but the various forces, laws, and ad hoc explanations that throughout the edifice of scientific theory ascribe agency to abstractions. This tendency is especially egregious in physics and cosmology since all other fields are supposed to be downstream from the “hardest” of sciences. When deconstructed, much of the hard ground of physical theory gives way to badly analyzed composites of historical trends in knowledge layered on top of what starts to look a lot like myth.

Indeed, myths are not so easy to eliminate. They not only survive and change outward form as new circumstances arise, but frequently grow stronger as their spirit and function are forced into the shadows of the subconscious, compelled to possess the would-be conqueror, shallowly attempting to realign a culture with new gods or rational ideas.

The wise ruler knows he must appease the conquered gods, lest they get their revenge; yet the unwise may live out their days of apparent sovereignty blithely unaware of their own servitude. No traditional ruler has had a more notable version of this kind of surface success than modern science and its acolytes.

Modern liberal society has suffered greatly from the value and function of ideas in the cultures it has replaced being misunderstood and underestimated. The result has been that its attempts to replace or supersede tradition often distort—and further entrench—traumatic biases that could otherwise have evolved into more ideal forms.

Nowhere has this pattern taken on a darker and more tragic form than in the story of modern medicine’s rise into the new global religion—transforming, yet in many ways only further inscribing into the mind old fears about sex, sin, and purity. While religious institutions have often been legally repressive of certain kinds of sex, their power to know and control our most intimate spaces has been limited compared to what has arisen with the modern medical security state.[29]

Indeed, nowhere do the contradictions and ironies that are so central to modernity and its claims to greater freedom come together in such a fascinating and underappreciated way than in the emergence of medicine as the new religion, especially in the sociological phenomenon that resulted in the concepts of HIV and AIDS.

For the true story of AIDS shockingly demonstrates how those aspects of religious myth most beneficial to power were transformed by science and liberal ideology into one of the most effective protocols of social control ever conceived.

The story is particularly shocking in the context of the fact that, out of all the accomplishments attributed to modern science, from organized knowledge to new technologies, its supposedly

high degree of success in dispelling repressive religious ideas is perhaps the most unequivocally lauded in the contemporary mind.

Scientific paradigms and inventions come and go, and can be taken up by various irrational human impulses; nonetheless, as the story goes, science and its concepts are driven by reality and reason, however flawed they might turn out to be in light of future science.

Even if this story is no longer believed quite so broadly, the specific stories and myths that invest our contemporary paradigm with most of its sense are seldom deconstructed, and even more rarely, reconstructed in a more helpful light. This is true even with academic deconstruction, whose penetrating but often impenetrable critiques of the structure of Western thought greatly contributed to the postmodern era's reputation for relativism.

Although ostensibly an influential discourse especially on critical thinkers in the postmodern age, even in its heyday in the late 20th century, "deconstruction" never quite made its way into the subjects and fields where it could have overcome its seeming opacity and equivocation and made a notable concrete "difference" in the momentum of Western culture—that is, where it could have nudged us away from our most deleterious structures and myths. Somehow, the opposite has happened.

Indeed, it was around that time that one of the most conceivably foreboding convergences of premodern myth, modern medicine, and postmodern politics first crystallized some of the West's most irrational fears and rationalized scripts into a bizarre new sexual repression, a fittingly religious capstone for a bureaucracy moving to control the flow of life on earth.

Power has often used religion in an attempt to control the procreative flow of its subjects, but its success has always been limited until this time. It was in the early 1980s that power for the first time at least began to achieve the natural end of its unchecked advance: the usurpation of spontaneous reproduction by the bureaucracy's narrowly conscious control.

At this time, the world was told that a highly deadly disease had arrived that could strike and most likely kill anyone who just happened to be close with the wrong person. And this could be any person since all that mattered was the mere presence of a virus detectable only by a medical test, a presence that could be lurking beneath even the most seemingly healthy person.

It was with the phenomenon called AIDS that science through medicine finally succeeded in inserting itself into our most intimate spaces. Suddenly, sex without science or some kind of mediating medical product was considered dangerous and dirty in a frightening way that sex without the approval of religious authority could never have acquired.

People have long believed, not without good reason, that they could catch a fatal illness from a sick person. However, there was also a general sense that this did not happen without good reason. Even for most of modernity, a sense of proportion mitigated man's natural fear of contagion, preventing it from closing down society and overriding all sense of community.

Contagious diseases and even deadly epidemics there obviously are, but one naturally does not greatly fear contamination where the people and environments are, by all common measures, more or less happy and healthy. Even when it is said that the presence of European diseases decimated a native population in the colonial period, it is difficult to imagine a happy population dying *en masse* from the simple fact of friendly contact.

Although even friendly novelty, such as the arrival of a traveler into an insecure domestic situation, can be disruptive or be the catalyst that brings out hidden tension, revealing that things were more precarious than one thought. New people and energies are not always easy to metabolize.

Even when epidemics *did* seem to start from mere contact with foreigners, it is never that simple. Before any of the more obvious factors of war, enslavement, or the explicit social chaos of colonialism made illness likely—or with the intermittent epidemics that have plagued societies throughout history—these mass-events also had complex social, environmental, and psychological factors at work.

All this makes the seemingly straightforward biological process of contagious disease one of life's most important tragic dramas of multi-layered metaphysical significance. While it is true that the genetic novelty we call "new diseases" can be a kind of illness-inducing stressor in itself, its mere presence, especially the presence of some molecule only detectable by science—but even the presence of a sincerely sick and potentially contagious person—does not naturally trigger the kind of personal concern that one has when the ill person before us is one of many dying all around one's own community.

This is quite logically because one understands that in the latter, the causes may be in a shared environment, not because there is necessarily any more of the contagion immediately present. While contact with sick people and environments could indeed "make" us ill, one naturally intuits that this is not out of all proportion to our propensity, or our degree of shared circumstances—that even the most contagious disease is not just about the presence or absence of some all-powerful factor, but about many.

There are, obviously, certain toxins or extreme conditions that can kill even a strong, healthy person without any other contributing factor, given enough "presence". Yet when they do become a factor, if one simply eliminates them without scrutinizing the system of reasons for their presence, one risks replacing one toxin with another.

There are also times when the level of presence required for such things to be considered an obvious and singular threat to anyone or everyone is not always there. In these cases, they first make the strong and healthy not so strong and healthy, in which time other contributing and potentially mitigating factors come into play and complicate the issue, making these kinds of subtly toxic situations the scale-spanning and multidisciplinary dramas they are.

All this is obvious before the concept of an “immune system” is introduced, reducing the complexity of maintaining a healthy equilibrium to the now standard trope of mere biological defense. The compassionately courageous have long been precisely those who braved the challenges of a sick world with the hope of doing it some good, and not because they simply had or believed they had good defenses, naturally acquired or otherwise, but often because there was faith that there were other factors at work than random vectors of death.

20th-century medicine gradually eroded this kind of ethics and faith, much as dogma and institutional power had maligned the original Christian spirit of the compassionate listener and healer into that of the missionary zealot. For like the zealot’s blind faith in his superior way, the pharmaceutical doctor, by the power of his potions, need only deliver the prefabricated salvation, and need not listen nor fear, for he was on a mission and immune to being contaminated by the biological poisons of the poor.

The 20th-century drug-doctor, like the ambitious missionary, needed no wisdom to look past the symptoms of things, no resonant compassion or power of co-adaptation and mutual transformation. They came only to conquer.

Even so, with a bit of thought, it should have been obvious that new disease vectors can arise at any time, so biological immunity is never assured. Yet, because modern medicine was able to take credit for the rapid change in disease rates that are rightly attributed to improvements in the environments of the urban poor, faith in medicine had been capable of mitigating fears of deadly contamination long enough to secure even greater faith in its powers.[30]

Before that peak in medical faith, one might have thought oneself capable of catching one’s death, but in the heyday of modern medicine, many indeed believed that this only happened now in places where medicine had not reached or to people who refused it. If some new threat did arise, the saving potion would be engineered with a speed and focus we can never seem to muster for other social problems.

As the 20th century progressed, medical monopoly was so firmly established on this public confidence that by the century’s end, when the burgeoning medical bureaucracy started a regular schedule of diverting blame for the escalating health effects of their failures and the toxicity of the whole industrial system onto ever-new viral scapegoats, there was little ground for widespread resistance.

However, the extreme panic around new brands of influenza and even AIDS paranoia quickly faded as each and every time the news cycle shifted when the hyperbolic claims of health officials quietly failed to materialize. AIDS itself gradually faded into the background, becoming just another one of the endlessly proliferating categories of illness. Yet, the tragic drama surrounding AIDS in particular should not be allowed to fade into obscurity, for its repercussions continue on in the psyche and society of humanity.

Over the years, many journalists, scientists, doctors, and authors have risked their careers telling the story. And in the wake of the events of 2020, the sociological event of AIDS got some renewed attention.[31] But too few still appreciate the level of tragic irony that was expressed in the AIDS drama. As with covid, philosophers barely commented on AIDS at all,[32] even though it was the perfect storm of the most important themes of the philosophical culture of the day.

As suggested earlier, the ideas of “deconstruction”, especially those of its founder Jacques Derrida, could have shed some critical light on the puritanical dimensions behind the rise of virology into a major force within 20th-century biopolitics. Deconstruction was particularly poised to tackle the themes playing out with the AIDS crisis—and within the important though very marginalized scientific debate over its “origin”, that is, before this debate became relegated to “denialism".

Most relevantly, deconstruction explicitly critiques absolute origins, emphasizing how important the marginal, the seemingly inessential, and even the parasitical are (especially to their seeming opposites, which projectively construct them that way). This all could have been quite helpful to the “core” debate.

It could have illuminated how myths of purity and contaminating causes play out in the obfuscation of vital polarities and generative relations. Derrida’s critique of the very notion of a simply present identity—or origin separate from its variable constitutive contexts—could have lent tremendous support to what has proved to be a turning point in the ability of corrupt corporate science to punish and silence dissenting scientists and journalists.[33]

The marginalized and maligned figures in the dissident position often came from a relatively nuanced understanding of the role of disease processes—even communicable or parasitical processes—as struggling adaptations to unhealthy environments.[34] They even sometimes made deconstruction-like remarks, though in a more popular language.

Kerry Mullis, who won the Nobel Prize for inventing the PCR technology used in both AIDS and covid tests, was one of these dissident scientists and was often given to more metaphysical speculation.

In one interview he remarked about the critical implications his invention had not only for the AIDS hypothesis and the industry built up around using PCR for diagnosis—which being quite the renegade, he was fond of doing—but also for the very idea of any disease being equated with a virus when the PCR test seemed to imply that there are “traces” of just about everything in everyone. He said:

> With PCR if you do it well you can find almost anything in anybody. It starts making you believe in the sort of Buddhist notion that everything is contained in everything else…I mean because if you can amplify one single molecule up to, to something that you can really measure, which PCR can do, then there's just very few molecules that you don't have at least one single one of them in your body.[35]

Admittedly, the notion that some amount of various and potentially problematic viruses are already in most people at some level is increasingly accepted and not altogether damning to mainstream positions.

The importance of the amount and concentration of supposed pathogens, rather than mere presence, should be common sense, even if this sense is often lost in the hysterical media. It has even become a more standard framing in medicine in recent years, especially compared to the days of HIV contamination paranoia, which itself was mitigated as the connotation of an assured death sentence by its mere presence faded.

Viral concentration even formed part of the scientific debate over masks during covid. More attention is indeed placed on co-factors than what has often been the media frame on contagious disease. But is contact with a large amount of the putative virus material a major factor?

Mullis once speculated on how simple exposure to a large number of people and their biological excretions can be a stressor, for obvious reasons.[36] A healthy system needs exposure to difference, but being exposed to more difference than one can healthily process can be overwhelming.

This is true whether one or others are sick or not. However, if either or both are sick, in whatever way, then most people intuitively deduce that this can be even more taxing, for the simple reason that even immoderate exposure to healthy difference is naturally easier to metabolize than the exposure (especially intimate exposure) of systems already struggling with their own internal conflicts.

Mullis's comment was directed at the original AIDS phenomenon, which occurred among a unique subculture of people engaged in not only a specifically damaging array of drugs but also had an exceptionally high number of sexual partners.[37]

The implications of this fact were politicized in an unfortunate way, for the lesson need not be that they were ill because of their sexuality, but because of a convergence of several important factors. These factors could have led to a deeper analysis of our collective myths: our narratives about sin and punishment, disease and blame, medicine and drugs, sex and love.

However, the political and mythic need to find impurity led to the politics polarizing around either religiously prejudiced or scientifically biased scapegoats. This state of affairs obscured thoughtful debate and allowed the technocratic paradigm to establish a new foothold in the collective psyche.

The lifestyle of the original AIDS patients was, in the early days, understandably a subject of legitimate debate. And for the brief time that this was allowed in serious discourse, it was

naturally centered on a deadly combination of specific drugs. These drugs were being ritually abused by many of the patients. Certain drugs and other related lifestyle factors were, to clear-thinking doctors and scientists of the time, the central medical issue.

But even concern over the number of their sexual partners need not reduce to some conservative disdain for gay or libertine lifestyles, but a genuine gesture towards a more rational medicine, one which takes the social and emotional life of the person into account, as any good traditional medicine does. Having healthy sexual relations with large numbers of partners is no easy feat from an emotional and social perspective.

To any logical medicine, this cannot help but be reflected in physical health. However, this does not imply that it is essentially impossible or wrong, or that someone deserves the consequences of their struggles, which are always tied to larger collective issues and social relations.

There need be no ridiculous moral insinuation that those who do drugs or have multiple sexual partners deserve to die. The culture of gay men at the time was dealing with a lot of social conflict and conservative prejudice, so if they were drawn to excess as they found some small space of freedom, this is understandable.

People of all styles of life were eventually drawn into the AIDS tragedy due to numerous scientific, sociological, and economic factors. However, cultural politics played a significant role in this. The conservative tendency to reduce any discussion of the consequences of lifestyle factors into narrow moralistic judgments indeed made taking an honest look at the problem difficult. This just helped push attention to more profitable and politically safe scapegoats.

Yet, even when the proper proximate causes are teased out, reducing a complex sociological and biological phenomenon to just a medical issue can obfuscate its larger significance, especially once it becomes, as it did in the case of AIDS, no longer about just the stressors, pressures, and behaviors surrounding a particular niche community.

AIDS was not about a random vector of death. Still, neither was it merely about life choices or an unfortunate convergence of circumstances—for instance, an unforeseeably deadly combination of drugs and sexual practices. For the scapegoat drama that it became was bound to happen in some form—with some combination of factors or another—to trigger a social evaluation of marginal and potentially unhealthy lifestyles, a drama that has continued in various forms ever since.

For obvious reasons, the repressed margins do often become unhealthy or behave unhealthily. Yet as the margin grows and center fails to hold, this leads to starkly opposed attempts to, on one hand, merely justify or normalize the problem, or on the other hand, use the most extreme examples to justify further repression in defense of the norm.

Cultural politics often polarizes too generically around these kinds of dichotomies. Conservatives, for instance, frequently cite the belief that gay men are usually drawn to, while

perhaps not the levels of excess that drew the initial subset into the tragedy of AIDS, excessive or unhealthy lifestyles nonetheless.

Or they point out the mental health challenges of fringe identities as proof that it is all some kind of illness to be cured. To the extent that reductive stereotypes are true, they should evoke a compassion that transcends the binaries of helpless victim and blameworthy behavior.

However, liberal technocrats will go to great lengths to instrumentalize or normalize the problem as they did with AIDS or covid, not only turning these problems into abstrusely technical issues but also blindly (or often against obvious evidence) insisting that these diseases were a plague on all of society to which they alone had the cure. Meanwhile, the problems of marginalized people get buried—and even exacerbated, as when “AIDS” was tragically used to exploit them across the world, especially in Africa.

Something like autism, on the other hand, having fewer opportunities for exploitation, was mostly just normalized, at least until enough people and scientists pushed back. Normalizing is easier to do than teasing out to what extent marginal expressions are an unavoidable, necessary, or even vital form of difference, and how much of their eccentricity is a sign of deeper problems than mere issues of acceptance or tolerance.

Either way, they have something to teach us. And whatever the case, all problems, whether they are social, environmental, or personal, are not some core cause, but another link in the chain of suffering and desire that few, no matter what their level of normality or style of sexuality, ever completely escape.

Sex and gender issues, however, do tend to bring things back to the fundamental problem of productive polarities, of a creative tension between differences that makes mere acceptance of disconnected difference a limited proposition.

While acceptance and, especially, compassion are good, if the drift of difference tends towards a breakdown in communities and families—in functionality or reproductive viability—and none of this can be harnessed to lead a new, greater harmony of novel forms, then more is needed.

The answer, however, cannot be simply fortifying the decaying norm, but instead finding a more productive polarity between the norm and the margin. What must be found and amplified is the reciprocal connections between opposing ideals in society, the creative tension that, when embraced, can transform cultural conflict and the dissociation of vitally linked identities from a pointless cycle of oscillating biases into a new gradient of evolution.

Yet this is not just a matter of cultural politics, but of the polar dynamics of every relation. This means not only each person’s generic surface relations with others, but the energies set loose from the core of one’s trauma and desire.

For whether we are drawn excessively into one sexual pole of trauma or the other—whether it is the insatiable fire, hungry for external difference and the domination of desirable diversity, or the soothing water of attachment and fear of the challenges of change—we all suffer.

However, it should be said that while cultivating a reciprocal relation between the opposing sexual expressions of these archetypal polar principles might make for a beneficial pressure—and it might even push sexuality beyond the suffering of fear, attachment, and desire—such ideals are generally just as elusive to the traditional relationship as they are to everyone else in our times.

Most people struggle just to find and sustain a satisfying sexual polarity, let alone some alchemical unity of opposites within themselves, both of which aren't essentially about the "natural" tension between traditional gender expressions or opposite sexes, but a harmony of contrasting energies.

The individuated yet selfless love required to sustain a potent polarity of communicating contrasts can be tough to maintain. Everything in postmodern life is set up to collapse the polarity of evolving reciprocation into promiscuously opposing personality fragments—or into relationships of compromise and deindividuated inertia.

One could argue that the greater difficulty of finding a stable or satisfying polarity in unconventional relationships could be an impetus to delve deeper and discover the ultimate freedom and alchemical dynamism of differences within. In any case, having difficult desires is never easy, even when society tries to normalize them.

Things were especially challenging for the gay men of the 1980s, dealing with a new freedom they were perhaps not prepared for. Being drawn into a drama where they were the sympathetic victims in a political climate shifting in their favor was understandable, especially given what they had been through.

The tragedy is that the political polarization perhaps made them double down on embracing an emerging liberally-styled establishment of technocrats hungry for not only a new paradigm of commercially viable biological scapegoats and politically fetishized victims but also drug-devoted patients.

Had the polarization been a little less stark, perhaps there could have been more skepticism towards the poppers and antibiotics that were being abused at the time, and especially what deserves to be lambasted more than any other iatrogenic factor in the history of modern medicine, the primary drug first used to treat them, AZT.

Perhaps contemporary skepticism towards pharmaceuticals, especially in the wake of the failures of the covid era, could lead to more comprehensive changes in medicine if the political climate were not still so hostile. Perhaps there would even be an awareness that there is a

consciousness of sorts at work through the technocratic system that is dehumanizing and devitalizing us all, whatever our politics.

This system benefits not just from repressing our sexuality but also channeling it into its fetishizing obsessions with trauma and victimhood, power, and domination, all sanitized into a grid of hybridizable masks and surface personas.

These fragmented identities are incapable of achieving the higher ends of intimacy, where reciprocal exchange is recursively embedded enough to embody the evolving archetypes of power. This power sublimates any personal or localized exchange, relaying the poles of any relation into infinitely shared registers and modes of being.

Such an alchemical convergence layers and pairs large swaths of systems along archetypally polarized gradients of energy. And when conscious beings can intensely conjugate these poles—for instance, by combining a kind of multi-personal fire of creative curiosity with a sensually saturated water of fearless devotion—limited relations are condensed and catalyzed, creating a cauldron that can brew new values and energies.[38]

However, this is how all new life and energy emerge—as a convergence of endless influence. Consequently, while it is good to make this cosmic process more localized and explicit, no one is defined or constituted by any one system or relationship, nor dependent on the forms through which life dances.

The poles and limits of beings and existence, while appearing to define things and oppose them to each other, simply more or less reflect—depending on the intensity of extended relations—the currents and voltage-like potentials that stretch across ever-increasing layers of the larger cosmos.

It is just that the greater the intensity of differences harmonized, the greater the energetic pressure is raised on the stilted systems of surrounding relations, ideally helping all find a sustainable coherence of productive pressure and tension.

The technocratic system, of course, doesn't "like" this boundary-redefining pressure; it thrives on our stasis, on fearful attachment to traditional gender stereotypes as well as on obsessions with racial, sexual, and politicized identity, since both block the emergent with static representations. It benefits from the medicalization of sex and gender as well as the dehumanization of the different.

Both sides need to be thoroughly and continually deconstructed if there is any hope of opening up the endlessly looping war of absolute oppositions, any hope of escaping our capture by the abstract representations of the mind and the desperate passion this creates.

Some critical context needs to be continually applied to the very idea that what is named—whether it be a named disease or sexual persuasion, the actual presence of some

quality in a person, or even the person themselves—can ever be adequately recognized by generic representations, no matter how radical or inclusive.

It is all well and good to want to escape traditional labels, or even all labels, but the real challenge is to see how even in their negation, concepts trap us in exhausting oppositions and contradictions. If we can instead see the net of their limits and potentials, we can overcome their dominance over us—and over the relations each concept more or less helpfully channels and deploys.

For without concepts, we are, at least collectively speaking, even more confused. They just need to be applied with an awareness that relations are what make ideas what they are and us who we are. This means not turning these relations into more or less opposed appendages of our conceptual identity, since this ensures that we will lose the living value of both ourselves and every association.

Nowhere is this more difficult than in the realms of illness, sex, and violence, where identity becomes challenged, and discerning the meaning of this challenge becomes potentially a source of further trauma. Thinking in terms of passive victims and autonomous aggressors, however, obscures the recognition of the most relevant factors in the contextual environment.

In other words, it takes the actual situation, its reasons, potential for transformation, and its implications for all, and makes them ready for the ritual cleansing of the chosen scapegoat (basically whatever can be most easily or profitably associated with the most obvious cause or symptom).

By turning the signs of the singular situation and environment into mere symptoms of the standard scapegoats dictated by the system, the truth and meaning of things get buried beneath the ritual war on the monsters the system itself continually engenders, while the truth of things lies in their unique patterns of connection.

This pattern between things is often determined in no minor, incidental, or isolated way by the event of something or someone's challenging—and even traumatic encounters—with others and the environment.

Yet the vitally emergent (and even spiritual) significance of one's relationship and health challenges can be disruptive to not only the larger system designed to profit from illness, but also the comforting identity it provides one as a victim of a "properly" named aggressor, something that can make healing developments subconsciously rejected.

Emergent meaning and healing can also be blocked when attachment to identities—especially marginal and frequently pathologized identities—goes beyond a mere defiance of victimhood and becomes too defined by its opposition to brute attempts at "curing" the supposed pathology. While this is understandable, it can go as far as attacking attempts at addressing the environmental factors of illnesses like autism, supposedly in defense of diversity.

The motivation here is often a belief that even sincerely helpful attempts at understanding are merely disguised desires to repress the different, assumedly akin to conservative claims to be able to “cure” non-normative sexuality. Whatever the kind of non-normative factors involved, making society more tolerant and compassionate toward diverse expressions could go a long way towards making them less likely to cause suffering.

However, even more effective is creating the conditions where the polarity between the normative and marginal is not so trenchantly polarized. Yet since the ideal, as discussed, is a creative and cooperative tension, that doesn’t mean collapsing or eroding the ideal standards of the culture, nor does it mean the opposite: forcing the marginal more towards the norm. It should not imply a reduction of difference at all.

Done correctly, it would mean a release of experimentally diverse forms—forms not fetishized in their difference or reified in opposition, but in their ability to uniquely relate to each and all. Pursuing an ideal should never mean a purifying elimination of its contrasts, but this is especially true and clear when that ideal is an enactment of the harmony of contrasts.

To get anywhere close to the ideal, society must first learn to read the signs brewing at its margins and determine what they symbolize about its collective struggles. It needs to be capable of determining in what ways suffering is an adaptation to a sick society, and this is impossible when everything is either pathologized as a personal issue or a meaningless illness, or it is normalized as a mere style of individual being.

We don’t simply suffer from some illness, shameful or not; we are ill because we suffer. This process takes many forms, but it boils down to a lack of adaptable harmony in our world; some are more sensitive to it and may show more obvious signs of it, but that doesn’t necessarily make the margin more ill than the norm.

All are more or less afflicted to the extent we impede or are somehow involved in the impediment of the flow of life, which is always moving to challenge our boundaries and labels, spurring them to grow and harmonize their oppositions, even in the act of death.

However, the point in bringing attention to the constructed and limited nature of labels and identities, whether they be diseases or people, marginal or not, is not to dismiss them as illusions, or to force them all into equal relevance.

The point is to see past the clunky conceptual picture painted by a literal interpretation of our causal myths, to see how every process is not a bluntly factual or random event of colliding or contaminating things, but an open-ended process of mutual determination and meaning creation.

It is to see how every disease, for instance, is not caused by the contact of a solid but vulnerable self with a viral vector of unwanted change. Like all things, disease is a pattern of

adaptation to an environment of relations—a pattern with infinite connections and possible causal accounts—but which may be selectively characterized in better ways when this unique relational environment is appreciated in the generation of the apparent—and perhaps deceptively common—identifiable pattern.

5. The Ironic Legacy of Postmodernism: A Tragic Inversion of Nietzsche

"There are two Ideals for our existence: a state of the highest simplicity, where our needs are in reciprocal accord with themselves, with our powers, and with all those in relation to us, through the mere organisation of nature, and without our assistance; and a state of the highest culture, where the same condition is attained through infinitely more multiple and strengthened needs and powers, by means of the organisation that we are in a position to bestow ourselves."
-Freidrich Hölderlin[39]

Admittedly, all this deconstruction of presence and identity is a bit more challenging to wrap one's mind around than what has become the popular interpretation and legacy of academic deconstruction: the simple concern for the repression of the marginal and unfairly termed inessential. But properly understood, both the widespread concern for justice and the deconstruction of identity and presence are part of the "same" point and go wrong without each other.

Or to put it in a way commensurate with the true meaning of the discoveries of our time—from post-structural philosophy and quantum physics to fractals and complexity theory—these points are, as all things are, not necessarily part of one objectifiable self-same whole, but part of (and implied in) each other in mutual determining contexts of infinite transformation and reiteration.

However, this idea of infinite contexts and connections between things has been obscured by the overriding theme of their discrete and fragmented nature, most notably by the shift from definitive, objective knowledge to the unknowable and abstract entities of quantum physics. Yet, there indeed is a knowable continuity in the quantum. God does not play dice.

Einstein was correct in some ways; he just died before the fractal was understood.[40] Perhaps it still has not been understood. If we cannot harmoniously integrate our knowledge and technological apparatus into what we are studying, then fragmentation is indeed what we will find.

Without a genuine metaphysics, without even a meaningfully unified field theory to tie those pesky quantum clouds and quantized people together in some meaningful fabric or even conception of reality, Einstein's physical relativity has merely fed into the metaphysical relativism of the popular postmodern mind.

So things have gone wrong, very wrong. With fragmented identities fetishized and abstruse abstractions reified, they tend to poorly stand in for real dynamic connection and transformation. And yet, things are still unconsciously conceived as part of some self-same universality. The

horizon of justice has been reduced from any concern in addressing the complex causes of suffering to the mere melodrama of seeking out and punishing aggressor identities while solidifying the trauma of victims.

This reduction not only makes inevitable a chaotic culture of victimization or a militant politics of incorporating a misleading abundance of comforting identities into the generic whole, but it also creates an equally melodramatic reaction, making any transformation of suffering impossible.

For as Buddhists have long known, a crucial component of suffering is one's rigid identification with the fleeting forms of the world and the cycles of karma that result from acting upon that ignorance. This is not to say that one should idolize a fluidity of personal identity or give up all attempts at justice. Instead, one should strive to compassionately understand all characters and qualities as mutually arising and dependent on the context they form for each other.

So no matter what side of the victim divide one is on, any change from the cycle of victims and aggressors cannot be accomplished without shedding the assumed coordinates of bluntly factual representations, no matter how inclusive or equalized.

Yet, within contemporary society, the mirage of inclusive representation epitomized by the standard model of liberal politics—and even the standard model of physics—is so blinding that it marginalizes any vital ideas that challenge it, or channels them into the political spectacle of an elite-managed opposition.

The incoherent abundance of entities populating liberal models across the sciences and humanities may seem very open considering all its proliferating terms and identities. However, this openness only includes that which does not radically realign the libidinal economy of abstract and reified fragments, and these only increase people's suffering, giving no deep satisfaction or feeling of connection.

They may give power over a domain, but this is not the kind of visceral understanding that can open into insight with every new or growing connection. It instead demands conformity to a given theoretical language or regime of politically correct speech.

The consequently segmented economy of minds breeds impatient ambition and a psycho-sexual fetish over power and the reversal of its roles, endlessly reiterating the cycle of trauma and competitive friction. This partitioned economy of energy needs and feeds on suffering—on rigid mental representations and obsession with no real healing in sight.

Somehow, the revolution of 20th-century science and theory, which should have been about the relativity of motion and meaning to context, but also the connectivity and continuous codetermination of contexts, has instead become more of a universalized relativism; in other words, all values and subjectivity have been reduced to atomized virtual constructions relative to one seemingly fluid but really all determining network of power whose face is the mere profile of inclusive or empowering identity.[41]

To reiterate, the point should be that identifiable things arise out of and are framed within their pattern of relations with everything else, so there is a “trace” of each thing in everything, not just as a peripheral implication in a flattened frame of mere presence, incidental appearance, or representation, but as, depending on the frame, more or less essential to its being.

If this basic point of postmodern thought was the actual character of postmodern culture, there could be an open-minded politics of knowledge concerned with what relations are deemed most important. This ideal is in contrast with the ostensible demand to neuter all difference and value hierarchies other than what can pass as valueless fact—or the supposedly “factual” values of the conservative.

For the liberal, the approach equates to the reduction of all real ideas and values to what best fits with the model forged to most closely resemble the neutrality and inclusivity of facts and appearances—“we have waves and particles, we have white folks and people of color”! The conservative might balk at the incoherence of contrasting truths, but seldom has any solution but a rejection of complexity and a return to simpler truths and models.

These failures to understand and model difference might seem academic, but they have had quite an effect on the world. To better see how, one needs only look again at the AIDS crisis. During that time, the shallow form of postmodernism—which characterizes the postmodern shift in society more than the movement of theoretical thought—was making liberally educated people more sensitive to marginalized groups and the ideological function of the most obvious and bigoted kinds of scapegoating.

This is all well and good if surface-level inclusivity does not become a tool of elite repression itself as conservatives are fond of pointing out. But with AIDS, it added to the social dynamics of what happened in a profoundly ironic way.

As discussed, AIDS initially presented as a disease restricted to heavy drug users in the gay community, but since pharmaceutical companies made the most relevant drugs to the crisis, and since blaming the gay lifestyle was no longer an option in the increasingly liberal cultural climate, this only added to the political pressure to find a scapegoat more suitable to both government and industry.

The story of how the so-called HIV virus became that scapegoat has been told many times before, even if most people never hear it or want to hear about an issue whose advocates tend to become scapegoats themselves. Suffice it to say that the phenomena of AIDS, just like that of covid, can be a kind of magnifying glass of all the issues in our society. Both crises reveal much about how society and knowledge reinforce each other.

The story of AIDS, in particular, has many layers of complexity and consequence that are still being teased out and unveiled today. To survey just a few that have been studied elsewhere: AIDS, like covid, is a story about drugs and their recurring historical role in political repression

as well as commercial and cultural conquest.[42] It is about the way power constructs causality in science according to the flow of commercial interests,[43] about the way failures in scientific knowledge and well-funded research get rebranded, adapting to new opportunities to move projects with heavy investment forward.[44]

However, it is also about how the ancient practice of scapegoating marginalized people and malevolent spirits has been reversed in its modern form into a system organized around producing and profiting from them.

What had been in premodern times the sick and wretched became the virtuous victim, and the new scapegoat became no longer an invisible spirit carried by the different or down-trodden, but an even more elusive contagion that could be anywhere, but was supposedly made more dangerous by a tangible and convenient enemy: nonconformists to the paradigm of biological safety. With covid this trend became even worse, with vital life itself becoming the perceived contaminating presence to the more easily manageable specter of sickness and death.

While this kind of reversal of values has echoes of Nietzsche's critique of Christian slave morality, and admittedly, the paradigm of safetyism did not begin with AIDS (and covid certainly brought these themes into more stark relief decades later), the AIDS years started a level of insanity and blatant social engineering that was at the time unprecedented.

The covid era built on a century or more of capitalism's conquest of medicine,[45] but also on the emergence of the health bureaucracy and medical industry during the AIDS era as a leading power nexus of society-wide control.[46]

In this vein, the AIDS era also saw the emergence of virology from no longer being just an instrumental branch of medical ideology for generating profit and support for the medical industry, or diverting attention away from the externalities of the larger industrial system, but as a premiere tool for technocratic power and the acceleration of its tentacles throughout society, converging on biospheric control.

There are plenty of absurd and egregious examples of these themes throughout the history of virology, especially during covid, but they are seldom as tragic as what happened during AIDS. Few know or understand that healthy children were torn from their foster homes and subjected to what was known to be—and often were—fatal AIDS drug experiments because they were considered to be doomed anyway by a ridiculous reliance on the aforementioned PCR test, which as its inventor pointed out in the quote above, can find anything in anybody (when its characteristic amplification strategy is allowed to go high enough).[47]

Few have probably heard that certain politicized lesbians petitioned to get cervical cancer added to the list of diseases that were classified as indicating AIDS when they concurred with a positive HIV test, presumably out of solidarity with gay men.[48]

This all might seem insane, but people have their reasons. Ideology is always there to reinforce what might otherwise seem inhuman, corrupt—or even just absurd—as the rational course of action that only coincidentally happens to benefit those in power. This benefit to power often goes unnoticed or unacknowledged when health and medicine are involved. The tangle of social repercussions is just too much to unwind safely.

Even Michel Foucault, the philosopher of the time most qualified to recognize the social forces at work in the AIDS crisis, was perhaps too close to the issue to see it clearly or give a critique—and died before he got the chance. Seeing the ideology of the past is always easier than recognizing the blind spots of present problems, especially when one is professionally and emotionally entangled in the politics surrounding them.

Hindsight is 20/20, or at least it should be. By the time the various threads Foucault was onto converged into a more explicit and integrated system—in, well, 2020—the vision of scholars was anything but perfect. But how did the vast domain of scholarship influenced by continental philosophy, a culture of intellectuals that devote themselves to mining the detailed implications of theorists, become a part of the reversal of everything their most revered figures stood for?

As suggested, the lack of a well-developed alternative, especially when it comes to detailed science, has polarized most professionals towards the side of the scientific establishment in the politics of knowledge, even when they are generally poised as critics.

Creating a serious alternative, however, must first work back from the biopolitical landscape and into the ambiguities of the postmodern knowledge structure. For the structure has vital contradictions that have forced philosophers to hedge on key issues and led to their replacement by anyone who can simplify the narrative for the everyday person, as all sit comfortably within the silos of their media expectations. These contradictions must be addressed before the chasm at the heart of contemporary civilization widens further.

6. The Challenge of Alternative Science Today

“The breaking of a wave cannot explain the whole sea.”
-Vladimir Nabokov[49]

To restate the question at the root of our knowledge-culture’s most indicative ironic tragedy, one could perhaps ask: since a political will to fight repression and a general attitude of openness to alternative ideas has been the dominant theme in academic theory for quite some time, why do the supposedly radical or even “postmodern” thinkers seem to fail when it comes to questioning actually repressive uses of science?

Specifically, why did those with the sharpest critical tools for—and deepest theoretical investments in—deconstructing the burgeoning ideology of the bureaucracy and its religion of corrupt science and predatory medicine seem to do the opposite? Why didn’t they defend and support prestigious scientists and journalists when they were demonized for asking natural

questions about AIDS (and there was no “vaccine” issue, at least in this case, to complicate things)?

Perhaps AIDS seemed like just some niche medical issue at the time, sure. But why haven’t more philosophers and social critics, with so many obsessed with Heidegger or Foucault, actually applied their insights—especially the latter’s work on the origin of modern medicine—to the much more obvious and increasingly illiberal use of medicine as ideology that started in 2020?

It can’t just be the use of the vaccine label, which is quite a stretch to cover academics either ignoring or justifying their heroes’ worst nightmares of techno-manipulation coming true, or at least escalating immensely under the cover of the “medical gaze” during covid.

Not to mention that, according to all-cause mortality research that looks past the game of rebranding and scapegoating even small shifts in disease patterns, *tens of millions* of people died *not* from any new disease “itself”, which did not seem to affect trends in overall death rates significantly, but from the public response, in other words, from the very idea or concept of covid, which became a self-fulfilling prophecy.[50]

Imagine if the dissenting scientists permeating the internet media landscape were not continually framed as necessarily incorrect without any discussion, but rather debated with an understanding that perhaps their context for evaluating factual evidence differed from the mainstream. Philosophers could be educating the public on the sociological dimension of scientific truth, steering debate away from trenchantly opposed facts towards contextual mediation and evaluation of contrasting “facts”.

They could even lend some credence to amateur intuitions and countercultural critiques of biopolitical propaganda, which in turn could help mediate the bitter cultural war and extreme distrust that an increasing number of people have for all experts and academics. Why has the task of courageous social critique fallen to the often melodramatic personalities of the internet, or scientists willing to handle the embarrassment of becoming one and no longer being considered a legitimate authority?

Though embarrassment and illegitimacy don’t exactly cover the political pressure, do they? One is never just taking sides against what usually amounts to a majority of “experts”, but siding in a culture war with what is considered the antiscience and antisocial position, or even adjacent to fascism.

For instance, were those who refused the covid shot attempting to maintain some kind of conservative myth of purity? Were they following a misguided or even dangerously nazi-like notion of their spiritually superior or more natural evolution, uncorrupted by the degenerate paradigm of globalist elites and their evil science?

With that kind of framing, there would appear to be little hope of breaking through the clash of cultures—not if any politicized naturalism or spirituality gets pushed into extreme opposition with all forms of liberalism and into the caricatures of fascist or New Age “conspirituality”.

Yet, this only points to a larger project of challenging the narrow liberal consensus in science and knowledge, history, and meaning. It involves making the case that cultural coherence and its cooperative maintenance are not opposed to cultural or even scientific freedom and openness; indeed, they depend on each other.

Since any meaningful freedom requires coherent connections and communication, in culture, this means, as discussed earlier, having at least an overlap of mutual concern or purpose, if not some kind of shared metaphysics to shape the structure of things.

The current myths and metaphysics of our civilization revolve around the naive belief that competitive self-assertion is freedom and that this leads to truth, and even creates its own kind of collective self-interest superior to scaled cooperation. The latter is considered a compromise of freedom and a stifling of the truth which depends on it.

What results is a leveling of all metaphysical truth and higher collective striving down to an internal struggle for *and* against power, that is, *for* the power of already-established values, yet *against* either its too obvious expression, or a power that upsets one’s stake in whatever the current hierarchy of values may be. This contradiction divides so much effort and neutralizes so many wills that could have otherwise felt drawn to bring something new into the world.

“Deconstruction”, on the other hand, subjects all metaphysics and value hierarchies to critical pressure and destabilizing changes in context, which *can* make “space” for the new. Although, on its own, it can become a kind of metaphysics or selective value system in its own right—one primarily about vigilance and critical scrutiny, with no naive faith that mere competition will lead to truth and justice, since these must be decided within the context of other selections and evaluations.

Yet this is not so radical a departure as much as it is a radical extension of modern liberal values, albeit a kind of sophisticated skepticism applied more honestly to its own structure than the average atheist or scientistic polemic.

In other words, as a kind of postmodern metaphysics of difference, deconstruction was never about simply valorizing individual difference for its own sake, or tearing down every potentially dominant idea regardless of its truth or value. For obviously, this would be not only another kind of hierarchy, as all thought systems are, but a blatantly hypocritical one. Continual deconstruction does not imply foundational opposition to power or hierarchy, just their denaturalization and conscious determination.

Entrenched opposition to power is, however, the recurring hypocrisy of liberal dogma, so it was natural that deconstructive ideas became easily perverted by such a ubiquitous trend.

Unfortunately, this all creates a very contradictory and pathological power based on a constant struggle against itself, with liberalism in the postmodern era becoming even more plagued by inherent contradictions.

The greatest danger in this is that, in a universe of infinite opportunity, there is always another power somewhere that can take advantage and grow through the atomization of constant conflict—as well as through the apparent division of power's more visible expressions, since this can obfuscate its more subtle and sophisticated sources.

Not that this is unique to liberalism. Indeed, a culture of competitive power struggles that distorts truth and exploits values has long been the way of the world. It is just that it has escalated and received new justification in the modern and especially postmodern eras. It is therefore not surprising that this is what postmodernism and deconstruction have come to mean to many people.

The relativism, however—the tearing down of all truth but the contingent theories of consensus and the stalemates of power struggles—has mostly to do with how liberal devotion to scientism came of age in the postmodern era, not with the influence of inscrutable philosophical theories taking over society, as conservatives tend to think.

Philosophy has merely been forcing us to reckon with this, that is, with the inevitability of power, but not necessarily of coercive power, *not necessarily of power struggles*. They may be unavoidable for quite some time, but this does not make them the arbitrary foundation of things. Philosophical thought can, on the contrary, deliver people into a kind of cooperation that is composed not of blindly collective power blocs, but of consciously selected hierarchies of power and value.

Moreover, it is the belief in a science free from philosophy that has driven liberals on the left and right to embrace one or another form of the myth that if one can purify science and democracy of power, then the natural competition of capitalism or sparring ideas in science will inevitably lead to neutral justice and truth.

It is therefore inevitable that both sides of the liberal civic religion of the "free" or "open" society will see injustice lurking in every vital metaphysical or social trend, for these cannot help but threaten other trends and values, or at least ones too devitalized to play with the spirit of the times.

Perhaps for these reasons, a postmodern attitude of mere incredulity towards the power and bias at work in all things was never the best option for challenging our most dominant myth, as it suggests that the ideal should be a sufficiently scrutinized or "least bad" kind of power.

Deconstruction is just too much in the shadow of modernity's negative reaction to premodern power. Exposing modern power as just another value system and myth is all well and good, but

what it needs is a better myth, or ideally, a better metaphysical understanding in which to situate our narratives.

Thankfully, another philosopher of the postmodern era has become increasingly influential in the decades since Derrida and deconstruction gained prominence. Throughout his work, Gilles Deleuze attempted not just to deconstruct or problematize the modern West's most essential myths and ideas, but recontextualize them. And in the process, he wove a more hopeful and productive thread through the history of ideas.

He especially championed ideas in various fields and disciplines that could break free from the dominant apparatus of power, and so recognized the importance of alternative science, calling it "nomad" or "minor" science as opposed to "state" or "major" science.[51]

He even explicitly worked out a detailed metaphysics to help frame interdisciplinary efforts across the sciences and humanities. This was still a kind of metaphysics of "difference" but one more focused on the conditions of its production and varying value than its problematic presence.

Yet, while his work has had a positive impact on certain aspects of academia, it is unlikely to alter the entrenched biases of institutional culture. Unfortunately, this is especially the case in physics, the discipline whose biases are at least *considered* foundational for all science, making them most important in shaping the structure and polarity of all other cultural meanings and their trajectory in our scientistic society.

New paradigms in physics can have a profound impact on society, but since the quantum revolution, this has no longer been the case. Since the discoveries were never properly understood—at least outside of secret military physics—it has stalled any transformation from happening in the culture at large.

Transformation has happened, of course. Yet postmodern fragmentation owes more to the *failures* of modern physics than its successes—certainly more than any influence from the marginalized field of philosophy, to be sure.

However, because this transformation was more of a breakdown in the coherence of modernity than any emergent understanding, global society was forged out of mere pragmatic and economic utility. What might have been some incipient semblence of a shared global vision or metaphysics for the age of science became controlled chaos—a mere network of coded fragments managed from more coherent levels of knowledge beyond our view (if even a small fraction of conspiracy theory is true).

Whatever those levels are, the lynchpin for their coherence and power is certainly a wholly different physics. Is there a way of discerning what this physics is all about? Many have tried, but too few have taken a broad philosophical approach.

Even when this does happen, physicists are particularly averse to challenges from other theoretical disciplines, especially from philosophers who like to indulge in what physicists see as merely speculative theory. They have enough problems dealing with the surplus of theories from their own ranks to listen to anyone else.

This attitude is especially prevalent when it comes to anyone outside the academy, where some of the best alternative science is being conducted. The most major of sciences is not likely to welcome a challenge from a culture of “nomadic” theorists.

There *are* promising mainstream theory developments.[52] Still, they cannot help but get bogged down in mathematical niches and so lack the conceptual power that is possible when physics and metaphysics are allowed to inform each other.

However, even in alternative science, the ruthless slant of our society leads to a fragmented scene of antagonistic theoretical subcultures, each speaking their own language with their specific philosophical assumptions. While these can satisfy particular niche interests, culture is already overwhelmed with a glut of cult-theories competing for attention.

Specialized theories and terms can be helpful at times. However, when they don’t make sense beyond a certain point in their specialized niche within the ecology of ideas, it is clear that the terms have obfuscated something. This is true even when that niche is a specific way of seeing everything in the case of niche theories of everything (since no theory of everything is *really* a theory of everything).

Every explicit concept obscures other conceptual structures of ideas to some extent, so some contradiction and complication are inevitable. Specialism and complexity have their place, but if a theory can’t be variably connected to simple things, something is off. Good ideas have an intuitive resonance because, even when very complex or specialized, they can be made to speak to us all—they can say something about everything.

If a theory’s terms can’t be translated into or connected critically to others—if it is just an abstract model of particular things and not a metaphor of relations with implications to everything—then it needs a critical supplement.

This need is especially acute in the case of physics, since if it were actually modeling fundamental patterns as claimed, these patterns would ramify broadly and intuitively, illuminating important relations at work in all processes. Modern physics builds its more or less insignificantly varied unified theories, yet they frequently fail to resonate with or signify much at all.

The answer to this problem, however, should not be that physics needs to be more practical or concrete, such as a technologically unified system that determines or subsumes everything else with its objective or instrumental power. It is not even that it is simply “too mathematical”.

Physics has indeed allowed mathematics to obliterate flexible, intuitive thinking, becoming, at the extreme, reduced to a simple matching game between the autistic algorithms of an abstract or even artificial intellect and supposedly empirical phenomena that are far removed from anything intelligible without the edifice of theory.

Yet this is not a problem of too much abstraction; it is a misunderstanding of its “presence” even in the most concrete observation, a presence that does not necessarily tear down the objectivity of science. It does, however, situate both theories and things *together* within a different kind of objective space than what can be definitively identified as abstract or concrete.

Such a space includes all conceivable phenomena in various structures of differential tension and activity. The structure of all structures is therefore never completely determinable since every possible thing is always already in the process of reciprocally determining every other within the boundless play of relational contexts. There are not then simply theoretical, computational, and experiential *possibilities*, but endless *realities* always enacting every possible relation and idea with various degrees of relative coherence, intensity, or effectivity of organization.

Consequently, any discrete, seemingly concrete thing is an “abstraction” from a more objectively concrete continuum of interrelated processes negotiating the intensity of their relation to each other without a definitive center, margin, or frame of accounting. Still, any particular selection or abstraction, whether it is mathematical, observational, or conceptual, can more or less reveal dependable values and relations surrounding it in its environment of connected selections and abstractions of processes.

Even when mathematical physics meanders around in abstract environments, it can still stumble upon significant consequences and relations to initial assumptions. Yet so much more is revealed when what is sought is not, like in the dominant model of liberal politics and science, mere representations of diverse and contingently segmented phenomena, but beneficial points of transformation between them.

These vital linkages between things are missed when the quantitative and representational aspects of our models and minds are allowed to obscure the qualities they can otherwise invoke as *reciprocally determined ratios* or poles of relation.

Indeed, there is a reason why alternative physics is so popular. It tends to highlight qualitative transformations that are illuminated by abstract and mathematical concepts such as ratios and figures—particularly geometric figures and the golden ratio. In contrast to the dry pronouncements of mainstream physics, fringe theorists are often driven by a grand desire to link the so-called fundamentals of physical reality to everything else.

To the extent that a mind is fortunate enough to be unclouded by an attachment to the limited power that certain terms and dependable functions exert over controllable niches of nature, it

will refuse to settle with a hard division between physics and metaphysics (or, for that matter, between the function of a physician and that of a metaphysician).

Such a fortunate mind will sense that what appears most discrete, materially concrete, and empirically tractable is, for that very reason, the most “empty”, as the Buddhists say. It will sense that what science tends to think of as *the most concrete*—that is, not just discrete things or appearances, which science often dismisses, but the repeatable facts of reality—are actually *quite abstract* in the sterile sense of being restrictively framed only within a preferred context, separated from all but the most basic and controllable conditions of measurement.

The mirage of repeatability arises by stripping away or obscuring the very values that animate events and would otherwise extend them meaningfully into others. This supposedly uncovers the core concrete reality and a general truth. Yet these are really just signs of the power our specific life and tacit knowledge structure has to recreate conditions, even if these signs are often mistaken for foundational laws.

That very power, however, is what is truly abstract or transcendent—not in the sense of being a general form beyond particulars, but as a relational becoming beyond any group of things that nonetheless expresses itself through things and their many patterns of relations.

Discrete denotations and generalizations can appear like factual truths, but they are only tools: extensions of an appearance that can be made to extend to or work on certain portions of nature. Yet this power comes from the relations every discrete concept contracts—a power which only grows effectively as it is made a more relevant condition rather than a static law judging the measure of truth.

While this growth can be accomplished through conquest or cooperative extrapolation, any success is still due to the strength of these now expanded relations, not a privileged universality. Everything is universal in the sense that it can enter into relation with anything else, but that does not make something the natural ground of any relations it can effect or pull together.

In contrast to the discrete generalization, what exists most singularly is ironically then the most continuous—being the most metaphysically coherent, spiritually resonant, and conceptually consistent across different registers, not just domains it has imposed itself on.

Because both beings and real-ideas increase the intensity of their universality to the extent that they can be articulated in otherwise diverging contexts, physics—in the common sense of a study of fundamental material phenomenon—cannot then be truly fundamental, not on its own.

To the extent that it is wed to a metaphysics that can make it ramify through other disciplines as a vital condition, it can however, become quite essential and crucial to knowledge. Otherwise, it is little more than an theoretical edifice for engineering, providing a technology of discrete—or, at most, mathematically stitched-together—abstractions. It cannot then help but form the world into an image of its discrete matrix of incommensurable models and entities.

Diverting from this path of unilateral power through technological conditioning, and creating a society based on a reciprocal growth of knowledge in all directions is possible only to the extent that empirical findings are allowed to illuminate and be illuminated by their metaphysical ground, where fact and ground continually refine one another.

With such a metaphysics in mind, the instinct is to have science and the technology it makes possible serve the health and growth of life, not life serve a system of science hobbled by the more or less arbitrary meanings laid down by cultural history, especially as long as the latter is captured by the will to micro-manage everything.

More minds must accept that metaphysically guided science is not just a New Age trifle, nor need it be a top-down totalitarian nightmare. Indeed, the path we are on now—a path without any purpose but the low bar of proof determined by the machinations of material power—is headed towards such a nightmare.

This path is laid down even in mathematical terms step by step as each idea is subjected to the pressure and politics of formalization, the narrow game that requires not shared or even applicable understanding, but programmable functions of control, not extrapolatable sense, but an impenetrable logic of distinction and sterile segmentation.

The irony is that this disregard for metaphysical sense and an exclusive focus on control has produced a structure of science so founded upon the most vacuous of concepts, substances, and forces—and fundamentally mystifying explanations—that it has become a religion of dogma.

While, on the other hand, it is the metaphysically-influenced theorists of physics that have been busy producing visualizable and even *mechanical explanations* for everything. It is just that the true *meta-mechanics* of the universe must dig deeper than the language and concepts of the object-oriented mind.

7. The Entropic Force of our Information Society

“The rhyme of the poet
Modulates the king's affairs;
Balance-loving Nature
Made all things in pairs….
Perfect paired as eagles’ wings, Justice is the rhyme of things.”
-Ralph Waldo Emerson[53]

The key to overcoming the obfuscating logic of our matrix-society is challenging the modern mind’s tendency to become mesmerized by language. Life speaks to us through intuition, yet this need not be anything particularly magical.

Indeed, intuition can be seen as the opposite: the ability to see through the magical spell of words, to resist their appeal to our past conditioning enough to notice the signs of the moment, not just the past. For it is then more possible to recognize the subtlety—*and flexibility*—of language and context, to see what things *can* mean beyond just what they are *supposed* to mean.

In the age of modern science and mass-politics, the tendency towards closed contexts of meaning creates an either/or logic that sorts everything into antagonistic poles, not just in culture and party politics but in the very fabric of language, thought, and perception. Seeing the rhythm and rhyme of meaning pulsing through life becomes nearly impossible.

Instead, this intuitive music is stilted, arrested—turned into a mere emotion, which lacks the impersonal rhyme of reason and only gets played as a vital or subjective indulgence. To the consciousness entranced by words and concepts, everything is pulled into a binary block of opposed abstractions that are easily manipulated by others.

Indeed, the average person is saturated with words and concepts they don't understand. In our increasingly expert-mediated world, they are told they don't have "the" context to understand them anyway, inevitably seeing more and more things in terms of labels they cannot meaningfully relate to.

Even where they do feel they have penetrated to the inside of the knot of verified knowledge, they mistake initiation into its misleadingly complicated tangle of labels for sincere understanding, something impossible without meaningful metaphysical context.

The "educated" expert cannot help but see the intuitive remark uninitiated into the proper jargon as just so much silliness, especially upon hearing words they have already decided against or that are used in a way deemed incorrect or out of "proper" context. This attitude only further contributes to the binary of the cultural war, adding further barriers to establishing coherent communities and knowledge.

For like coherent communities, coherent knowledge is about connecting the structure of contrasting meanings. Closed contextual and disciplinary boundaries often mistake denotative consistency for coherence, substituting a kind of rhythmic entrainment for the music of meaning. Potent metaphors and comprehensive ideas are dismissed because they lack the cold precision and strict denotation of formal science.

However, as poststructural philosophy has often argued, that precision can never be much more than a refined but (in the end) overly-truncated metaphor. What this means—but which is not often said—is that superior understanding is inevitably *an art* deeply reliant on an extrapolatable system of connections between things and therefore on the flexibility of metaphor. And if only the most reductive and literal language is given the status of real knowledge, society is in danger of fooling itself in ever-more sophisticated ways.

People become conditioned to conflate a tone-deaf literalism with some kind of sober wisdom, and so fall for the feeling that a concept or theoretical language explains something when it has merely formalized a shallow and more or less complicated—yet in the end clueless—description of appearances.

Think of the common experience of going to a doctor for a diagnosis and getting your symptoms reiterated back to you, just now adorned with a fancy Latin term as if this is an explanation. Endless categorizing and modeling of phenomena has not delivered any real cures in medicine, and no real understanding of reality in physics, just abstracted models of mechanisms that can at most be used to replace, substitute, or manipulate local conditions, but never guide them into new fields of working harmony or understanding.

Even the supposed success of technology has been primarily limited to producing the most life-denying replicas of our systems, especially our formal informatic systems. Chemistry, for instance, could be the alchemical science studying and technologically supporting the very roots of life and all physical transformation; yet it is mainly reduced to making toxic combinations of its superficially organized elements.[54]

The result is an autistically analytic mainstream knowledge culture, full of compartmentalized geniuses sheltered from the demands of making broader sense and therefore from understanding the transformations at the root of our reality.

In trying to make comprehensive sense, balanced brilliance gets relegated to the chaotic side of that overly-regimented disharmonic divide of our cancerous culture. Increasingly, this also means being pushed into the ambiguous margins where it is difficult not to become (or at least appear) less-than-balanced, if not insane.

This state of affairs pushes every passionate mind into either the autistic focus of specialization or the schizophrenic scattering of focus across a field of contradictions, trying desperately to heal what cannot be healed—not without a consciousness blessed with an uncommon degree of stability when moving within contradictory forms.

Such a mind must have little attachment to the self-important literalism of modern expertise; it must also be at home within the necessary play of metaphors and selections that gets buried under the terminology of niche fields, feeling no need to impose its own literalism.

The oppositional divide of the current culture and consciousness, however, makes this attitude quite rare. Whether this divide is framed as between *the* subject and object, or among various subjects or objects, the tendency towards literalism is the result of an inherent intellectual predisposition that mistakes the disparate limits of our incoherent interference in things as a definitive structure of truth to represent.

It grants arbitrary causal action to abstract names for consequences and confers upon them the status of independent agents or a universal force. Yet, any kind of “field” based on the

necessarily closed duality of abstract laws and concrete things—and often linked by arbitrarily fundamental forces—is doomed to this incoherence. The tactic of explaining the movement of things by a force or law that can compel or control them explains nothing.

It also reverses and obscures the nature of what needs to be explained. It assumes the natural state of things is at rest in the abstract emptiness of a pre-existing space or a zero-point prior to even space, and it is movement from stasis or nothingness that needs to be understood as fundamental.

This assumption leads to explaining everything in terms of a brute intervention from above, or from a force with the leverage of some stable root to push everything else into activity. However, such leverage must come from somewhere; there may be immortal gods and laws, but even they are no substitute for understanding; the source of power must also be explained.

For science and physics to find coherence in a metaphysics of flexible knowledge, all change, including the idea of change itself, must be understood and explained in conjunction with its contrasting pole and their mutual dynamics.

Since everything has its precursors, and even subjects and objects at rest or at the ground of being must have their reasons and history, explanations that stop at what merely controls, interferes, or initiates change can *describe* how things happen but, by themselves, will chase causal chains forever without touching the deeper ground of understanding.

Furthermore, abstracting this regress into supposedly absolute potentialities or sovereign forces—no matter how many names they take—merely turns the infinity of influence into a dogmatic limit, giving the infinite no room for new content or context. Logic demands that everything have a reason. Physics states that objects remain in motion *or* stay at rest unless a force or interference is present, and yet the distinction between motion and rest is relative.

The appearance of sudden movement or force does not emerge from, and is certainly not explained by, some absolute ability to change or make change; it is simply a sign of novel change from a particular perspective.

Because change or movement assumes and defines itself against its opposite, this simply means it is constituted by contrast. Even when this explictly realized, the mind can still confuse the necessity of motion's contrast with some kind of sovereign leverage or unchanging motivating force through unconscious extrapolation.

One must keep in mind that rest or unchanging conditions can also be thought of in terms of their opposite, as a relatively stable, grounding confluence or coordination of continuous movements.

What is seen as rest is a kind of equilibrium, a stalemate, or an averaged-out interference between stable or even unstable processes of change that have settled into the background,

given a particular perspective. In contrast, the non-equilibrium conditions we usually recognize as significant change are simply where the process of change is itself singnificantly changing from our perspective in contrast to more stable or statistically-balanced changes.

And since things changing or not, moving or not, is all a matter of perspective, but perspectives themselves arise within regimes of mutual rest and motion, one cannot definitively explain the others. It is the mutual relation *between these three* that matters.

If logic is to adjust its demand for explanation to the infinity and relativity of reasons for things, it must bend its search towards the distribution of motion, rest, and perspectives, since they mutually determine each other.

In other words, whether one speaks of rest or movement, being or becoming, if these concepts are not to degenerate into an unexplained collection of the supposed brute facts of events and existence, they must have their reasons or origin—not only in the distribution of other beings and becomings but in the perspectives which frame them and the forces that arise when these meet.

If force is just a marker for the uneven distribution that can result from colliding movements, using it as an explanatory ground of motion or action is to entrench a disequilibrium or particular structure of power. This tends to naturalize the perspective of a dominant motion as some kind of magical law in no need of further explanation.

If, however, one sees things not as mere objects and forces locked in essential struggle, opposition, and contradiction, but as patterns of movements—or more accurately, as relations of change within contexts of other such relations—then the deconstruction of the myths of science or society need not lead to their impotence or a stale equilibrium. Relativity need not mean relativism.

Meaning and motion can be seen as vitally real and necessary—as more than either subjective constructions or contextual distortions covering some empty and timeless form or lawful structure of quiescent symmetry. Indeed, meaning and motion are the essential *distribution* of the universe's symmetry, an endless creation of relatively new dynamic structure, at least within the endless web of perspectival relations.

In such a light, meaningful change does not come about from a spontaneous individual movement or novel force from nowhere. Or one could say that any relative novelty or spontaneity emerges from a greater cauldron of causes.

Whatever the case, whatever the degree of seeming causality or spontaneity, all change emerges from gradients of difference between infinite equilibrating movements, between the compensatory motions inherently connected to the dis-equilibrating differences of finite perspectives.

An explicit force or cause is just a clashing of contrasts along meaningful momentum's endless journey of discovering and forming its path of redistribution. The relative paths of these mobile symmetries are essential to the unique arrangement of difference and recurring change that is every perspective in space and time—the special slant on existence that is every thing and position.[55]

Accordingly, every line of force or wave of change is both a disturbance and an equalization of disturbance, with no universal center or periphery, no beginning or end, no initial force, and no final consummation. All change is just a perspectival redistribution of the relative intensity of connections between things, between what is, at their impossible horizon (yet implicit essence), so well and equally connected that the symmetry and asymmetry, changing and unchanging, blend into each other.

Force in such a light can then never be a *primordial* push or clash, but a more or less localized loss, or a relative release of the power of coherent meaning and continuous motion. This power of coherence is not only logically prior to, but also accounts for and plays upon every discrete force and action, making force the god of the merely alienated mind striving for control.[56]

Such a mind has lost a sense of how every discretely framed or motivated action is already a reaction, every force or disturbance, already a compensation (and in the human realm often an "overcompensation"). Viewing force as a source obscures how it is always part of a structured web of infinitely concatenated relations, where apparent oppositions emerge from a more profound continuity rather than isolated interactions.

While within local contexts, force appears to act as a mechanism of balancing over time—like the oscillations of a wave—this captures only the outward form of a deeper coherence. In a broader sense, motion is never truly "out of balance" at all, but is simply locally unfolding the universe's ultimately symmetrical tension across the relational fabric of space, time, and infinite possibility.

Furthermore, any perceived discrete force is not only the local serialized signature of a deeper simultaneous symmetry, but in a way it is this harmony's inverted reflection. For in the restrictive frames of linear space and time, force often appears to be not some fragmented temporal slice of what is ultimately a rich relational symmetry destined to be realized, but rather a more or less gradual leveling of all meaningful distinctions into the so-called "entropy" of fragmentary and dissonant equalization.

Consequently, if one merely categorizes forces as expressions of laws—laws that can at most represent or organize a collection of phenomena under their rule and asymmetrical power—then even their unification is destined to further the dissonance while feeding society's turn towards the dissipating order of control. That is, even the most well-intentioned physics can feed the social slide toward the inevitably losing battle that ensues when force tries to reverse its inherent tendency towards collapse.

Force, law, and their consequently concretized collections, are always more of a matter of constraint, collapse, or collision than they are a peerless application of power, so this means no force or law is ever sovereign or capable of sustainable harmony.

In truth, every seemingly sovereign law or equation is just a form of the vital dynamics of mediation. It is relational coherence that is the essence of power, and it is *symmetrical all the way through*. This is true even if it is overshadowed within local spaces and times, which distribute it unevenly and give the appearance of inequality or segmented regimes of limited equalities ruled over by laws.

Consequently, all control and designated causes premised on the merely local consistency of interference are merely instrumental and therefore precarious. This point does not mean, however, that laws are really just habits formed by the "free" evolution of the universe or the variations chosen by one particular universe.

Instead, they are signs dispersed by the "entropy" of our out-of-tune trajectory, even if they are also inevitably more or less opaque signs of the greater harmony. Both mainstream science and the New Age tend to miss the significance of this point.

The physics of the nineteenth century did stumble upon the loss of coherent power inherent to force, as well as the possibility of a more open economy and interconvertibility of all forces.[57] However, the possibilities were obscured by the invention of this concept of entropy, and a belief in its inevitable sovereignty—a natural consequence of the dominant model of a closed universe of force destined to exhaust itself.

Entropy is a strange beast, a complex and insufficiently analyzed placeholder for philosophical problems that were never cleared up, and are difficult to unearth and untangle. It can be explained as just a measure of the disorder and loss of power or leverage in a system, but given how dependent the boundaries of a system are on scale and context, entropy is anything but simple or capable of being simply separated from the ambiguities of meaning.

Admittedly, the emergence of thermodynamic physics and its concept of entropy helped inscribe the irreversibility and asymmetry of time into the otherwise naive classical view of a fundamentally predictable and controllable cosmos based on the generalization of the symmetry of local space and the belief in the sovereignty of force.

However, the entropy concept seemed to lead to an even more depressing kind of determinism and symmetry than the closed harmony of reversible physics, only a statistically predictable symmetry perhaps, but one destined to eventually end the universe in the impotent whimper of ever-declining heat and diluted difference.

So when it was later discovered that entropy had profound mathematical similarities to information (at least as it applies in communication technology), the apparent paradox of information being equated to *disorder* and linked to uncertainty gave some reprieve from the

cold and limited views of mere thermodynamics. It also shed some light, not only on the ambiguity and meaning of the mysteries of physics, but meaning itself.

Perhaps, for instance, the meaning of entropy and *the eventual entropy of meaning* is relative. Perhaps things are not so much fundamentally uncertain, asymmetrically random, or ambiguously free as they are reciprocally determined within the open systems of life and time, never fully graspable by the closed contexts of discrete logic, and therefore never doomed to a final or fatal determination.

Logical puzzles and paradoxes, for instance, illustrate this not merely by showing the absence of fixed meaning, or how meaning itself depends on difference, but also by showing how this process reciprocates through infinity. To signify is always to draw a link, but this inevitably can become a boundary which echoes what lies beyond it. For without contrast, no link or reference has any sense.

Yet pure contrast, just link a pure link, by itself is equally barren. While a sentence like “This sentence is true” collapses into tautology, “This sentence is false” traps us in a sterile loop of affirmation and negation. In the first case there is no difference; in the second there is nothing but difference, sealed inside its own oscillation.

What allows meaning to emerge is not this static identity or that closed vibration, but an infinite mediating third—the open field in which distinctions can overlap, transform, and generate new contexts. Every utterance lives in this triadic space: sign, counter-sign, and the unfolding horizon that lets their relation breathe with a life no simple logic of opposition or predetermined reconciliation can contain.

The so-called liar’s paradox only dramatizes what every sentence quietly enacts. Each attempt to fix a meaning depends on what it excludes. And while the excluded does inevitably return through time, it brings with it an open field, weaving new layers of relation that do not merely orbit around any foundational center or opposition.

Some statements may seem to offer plain, factual certainty. Yet even the simplest “fact” gains its sense only by standing against what it is not—against other times, places, and possibilities that it quietly presupposes. When we treat a fact as a core or sealed object, it cannot help but flatten this wider field into a mere spatial opposition of opposed facts destined to clash.

Because meaning is forged through time and through the continual spacing of its infinite contrasts, no factual claim is a closed system of final *or foundational* references. Indeed, any kind of distinction is by nature an opening, *an active layering or nesting of poles of relative contrasts*—a resheathing or resituating of relations ad infinitum.

And like the paradox of openness, freedom, and tolerance discussed earlier, the paradox that is all truth and meaningful sense becomes confusion and contradiction when one tries to fix rather than just focus the meaning of things.

All attempts to fix meaning to some primary ground are akin to unconscious psychological projection, a kind of oblivious self-reference to a non-existent self, for one never really steps into the same river twice; indeed, every step is into an infinite river, brimming with vortices and oscillations between every unique step or focus of meaning and its endless web of reverberating relations.

And while an explicit paradox might more obviously undermine its own coherent ground, an oscillation is always set up at the core of every fixed foundation. Every time one takes what is inevitably a modifying metaphor for a fundamental identity, one turns a recurring link in the infinity of chains of connection into a loop around the opposed poles of overly-determined meaning.

For this polarity of contrasts that imbues things with specific meaning is just a selection from a tapestry of overlapping and evolving connotations. Absolute duality or essential opposition does not really exist. They are more or less illusory artifacts of conflating the incommensurable directions of space with the always mediating processes of time, in a sense, fragmenting time's simultaneously diverging and converging component series into externally segmented, spatialized, or literalized contexts.

Things are only essentially opposed or incompatible when they are roughly cut from patterned processes and turned into either truncated developments or completely dead presences. Opposition implies inevitably or finally formed abstractions, with time and relation frozen into static identities and their predetermined destinies.

Even then, this is just an imposition from confused beings. Even in physical space itself and its logic of mutual externality, space always appears with time, and therefore as part of a process of infinite mediation, with matter being a kind of blurred vibration between the apparent distinction of spatialized things and the indistinction of continuous processes and contextual openness.[58]

Reality is only determinable between things and along some way to other things. What can be fixed is only so through a relation with and reliance on truths that are, in some sense, metaphysically absolute, yet always enmeshed with others, making truth contextually infinite and empirically incomplete, so impossible to grasp in totality.

Coherent meaning and motion, then, just like genuine openness or tolerance, become incoherent when fastened to a rule or absolute reference, not because they are essentially opposed or that all principles and things have their limits, but because all principles and things mean and move through their relations, not away from or against them.

If meaning were reduced to a difference that is measured against something fixed, then every act of meaning or movement would only undo itself the further it proceeds. It would spiral away from its grounding origin or be forced to fall back around, condemned to orbit the very thing its meaning was implicitly defined against. Meaning would cancel itself out in the attempt to

express, as motion would collapse into stasis. What calls itself openness would become merely the radiance of a negating limit, and thus, a conquest.

The true spirit of something is found in exactly how it turns differences into gradients of relation; this is exemplified in how something handles opposition—how, for instance, tolerance handles intolerance. If it merely becomes its opposite at its limit, it fails to rise above the trap of closed contexts that haunt every fixed self with doubt.

The comedy and tragedy of actual existence is that any truth, when isolated, turns against itself—not because it fails, but because it forgets that its sense arises only in the weaving of differences across a continuous field.

Reality and time are not governed by discrete rules, but by the resonance of interference—repeating rhythms suspended between polar flows that only appear cyclical because the deeper field of transformation is too vast to totalize. What seems reliable is always the byproduct of nested asymmetries temporarily braided into coherence.

This truth reverses the priority of our creaturely frame on the terms of all processes: it is not subjects or objects that exist or act, not discrete truths that are expressed or embodied; it is connections and relations that subsist and extrapolate. Indeed, all meaningful activity and freedom not only depend on connections; they more accurately *are* these growing connections themselves rather than some kind of sovereign event thrusting out into or acting upon a pre-existing space.

Indeed, the more intensely and intrinsically connected something is, the freer it is because the more paths that are “open”—or perhaps, more accurately, “active”. While the less intensely and essentially connected—or as suggested earlier, the more empirically exact and materially unambiguous—something is, then the more it is dependent on and determined by inessential connections from beyond its frame.

By “inessential” connections, it is just meant that these relations are not harmonized and extended uniquely within it, but instead struggle over it, pushing it into the contested vibrations that must play themselves out in disparate regimes and exclusive possibilities.

The idea of entropy as information helps illuminate how this fractal-like complexity bears out in physical terms, and in what way the most seemingly foundational categories of physics: energy, matter, and information, are science’s somewhat clunky conceptual representations of something more fundamental—of what could be called the *three mutually dependent aspects of relation*.

Energy, matter, and information have emerged from the mess of material theory to more or less adequately label the dimensional distribution of every discretely localized break in the larger continuity of reality. Despite some problems with these terms—especially taken individually—as a triadic scheme they can perhaps help circumvent the impoverished oppositions of generic

thinking, as in mere “mind and matter”. More to the point, as a vital triadic model of relation they suggest a kind of economy of interconnections that breaks open the closed circle of material representations.

Such a closed circle is embodied in principles concerning the conservation of energy; yet in the open field beyond every dualism, the closed circle becomes an infinity of interpenetrating circles and cycles, thus consolidating a conservation of every kind of connection, and every imaginable meaning.

There are superior terms than this trinity of conventional scientific concepts that will be explored later, but matter, energy, and information can be made into a helpful metaphorical bridge to the three key dimensions of every process. These dimensions *triangulate a specific space* and foreground some fraction of the universe’s ultimately proportional symmetry.

One could think of matter, for instance, as a locally stored pattern of relative convergences and divergences within the larger, scale-straddling structure and flow called energy. This would make “information” a kind of inverted ratio of these relations—a shadow reflection created by every entropic division or collision that nonetheless can become a compensatory process of meaning, a reflection pointing beyond the mask of matter.

While each material thing is actually a convergence of infinite influences which discrete information can only more or less opaquely signify, that signification is also unavoidably a thread or trace of each material system’s history and meaningful momentum. It is a sign of the rhythm that forms each thing’s “perspective” of everything else and mediates its relation with the larger structure of energy.

Numerous consequences derive from such a view; for one, it relativizes the apparent discreteness, locality, and finality of everything, as matter, energy, and information become mediating processes of transformation, not finite substances.

Another consequence of thinking of these supposedly fundamental entities of physical reality as modes of mediation is that any linear notion of definitive evolution, whether progressive or nihilistic, becomes untenable. The contrasts and contradictions between definitively quantized and quantified spaces are not just wearing down the universe into eventual temporal reconciliation, but coexist in infinite layers of relative distinction.

And if the surprising emergence of new information is only meaningful or effective when in a specific context, one could then say that, with the right resheathing, the entropic chaos or nonsense of any context can be transformed into the harmony of meaningful continuity.

One could say that time’s breaking and burning down of dynamic symmetry—matter’s cascade into the increasingly static or spatial symmetry of fragmentation and entropic disconnection—is, in another context, the very process of charging up a new sea of potential, potentized by its resheathing within a different dynamic gradient of meaningful contrasts.

This resheathing may require time and transformation—it is just not necessarily the same line or layer of time as the degrading downward spiral each line becomes when it is cut off from others. It also need not necessarily happen through the exact entropy-producing mechanisms that physics associates with processes like organic life, which seem to reverse entropy and potentize new polarities only to—on the whole—increase entropy and further "the" so-called arrow of time, as all slides towards the abyss.

In other words, the foundational symmetry of things is not spatial—not a mere balance of forces or oppositions that can be eternally determined from a single and static point of view—but neither is it temporal in the narrow sense of a single line of time destined for resolution. Such lines only resolve into another kind of "static" that reflects the implicit stasis of all stubbornly segmented things: the meaningless and seemingly random symmetry of statistical noise.

Once again, order creates disorder—and information is entropy—only in the sense that information without evolving meaning or a layering of contexts and connotations is chaos. However, in the context of coherent life and the *variously layered* continuity of time, a relatively meaningful change to one becomes a source of dynamic order for all.

In this sense, "information" becomes less a mere copy of something and more like a connecting difference in perspective within the heterogeneous flow of energy between regimes of its storage, such as matter. With the correct meaningful information, even novel changes can be anticipated and arrive already linked to other changes, ideally approaching, if not finally achieving, continuous, frictionless, and therefore "forceless" processes.

Within a sufficiently smooth or rapid flexibility of context, the time of transformation can be minimized, which means the possibility of no longer needing to "force" the separation of order (usable energy and dependable or focused motion) from chaos (energy lost) through intervention and extraction.

However, it does seem that in order to live, life as we know it must violently extract and consume this inverted entropy, or "negative entropy," as a readily available flow of energy is often called. Even though energy itself cannot be used up or destroyed, this violent tapping of a flow of energy, like in the act of eating another organism, cannot help but segment energy into particularized and incompatible patterns, thus generating entropy (a reduction in total available flows).

Indeed, entropy and its inverse are two sides of the same coin: to make something more usable in one context makes it less available for certain others. To exist is to punch a hole in the status quo in some way. Even the most unobtrusive plant or humble plant eater leaves a mark or crinkle in the smooth flow or symmetry of existence.

While life often seems to increase order, creating new gradients and flows within its domain of space and time, even the most stable cycles of its creation never seem to definitively escape

their need to tap some flow from the outside and return it only after it has been rendered quite diffuse.

Anyone might sensibly assume that eventually the flow of life and time will burn through all usable energy, meaning all that depends on it—all that has been stored in quasi-stable cycles—must eventually be lost or dissipated. For no consuming fire can last forever, and even dynamically ordered flows must consume since no discrete thing's evolution can ever be perfectly efficient.

Is then the slide down the slope from the dynamic harmony of life towards the static equilibrium of death and entropy indeed necessary? Even if the universe is infinite, does that mean we are doomed to at most endlessly hunt for other sources of usable energy?

Only if we cling too hard to who "we" are—that is, *only with concepts of the finite and infinite bound up in the oppositions of spatial existence.* Any real thing is not a closed determination, just as the actual infinite is not about boundless extension—again, not about absolute openness, just as perfect harmony is not a closed circle of concrete circulation.

The truly perfect circle of positively paired and harmoniously layered contrasts wraps a continually connected sense through an infinity of differences, open to all in variable ways but balanced on the whole.

As suggested earlier, developments in information theory have revealed why what we perceive as random is simply that which cannot be compressed into a finite formula or abstract algorithm. The apparently random is just a trace of an infinite "equation", or rather, a boundless equality. It is what requires an open connection to the variability of limits and the overlapping processes of time to be tempered or understood.

And it is through those variations and processes that life finds a way to compress and store the random sequences of time in an open universe into an ever-more inclusive circle or ever-denser overlay. This condensation allows for the possibility of lossless circulation—not within an abstract algorithm, however, which can lead to the sterile repetitions and entropic applications of a static code—but rather, within the fluid tapestry of interpenetrating cycles of *shared energy*.

The order of life is a structure that exists in and through variation and relation. It is therefore dependent on a structure of change or "energy flow", with life's vessels quickly collapsing into the background of their environment when isolated from this flow, becoming mere food for other life on their way down the slope of degradation towards the supposed inevitability of inert matter.

Yet, unlike discrete representations or the static structures of lifeless matter that exist within these representational contexts, life itself is a continuity that does not fall back into mere potential, it carries on in ever-new systems, even as its matter, energy, and information seem to fall away and disperse before eventually being variously resheathed as part of new coherent flows in life's streams.

While the streams of life seem to be ensconced within death and responsible for much dispersive entropy, the change of life depends on the determinacy of death only in so far as it has not found a way to create or insert itself into what is always already the immortal flow found in *the spirit* of life—in its ultimately balanced state of reciprocal exchange.

For any particular line of life, this means a vibration and exchange fast or slow enough not to disturb the equilibrium.[59] Certain plants and simple organisms, for instance, can maintain their structure for quite some time due to their relatively slow and static stability, but this has its limits. The infinite ideal is only in the ever-more efficient and therefore seemingly rapid adjustment to ever-more dimensions of the inevitable flux of life, something that both requires and creates increasing cooperation.

For it is only a limit of energy that makes the impenetrable gaps between successive lives and simultaneous beings necessary. Yet this limit is not inherent but rather a consequence of life's wear and tear. It is a result of a disturbance in what is at heart *a circulation*, not a mere linear segment or limited flow.

The inability to interject without disturbing the coherence of circulation is not a necessity of all life. Everything coherent in culture and knowledge points to the possibility of bending the lines of life and energy into harmonious spirals of circulation without always spurring the hunger which is death.

Entranced by the doomed niche of definitive things and actions, however, we build our systems upon the creaturely view that, when intellectualized, only further freezes the flow, contributing to the seemingly inevitable character of random flux at the base of our reality now enshrined in physics, and celebrated by the New Age as a base of "freedom".

While this chaos and faux-freedom may seem natural and inevitable, a different way of seeing can be cultivated. Much of the above, for instance, is gleaned from certain corners of interdisciplinary theory, where philosophy, social science, physics, and biology are allowed to inform each other in all directions.

However, to see what even the best general-systems and complexity theories have been missing, it is vital to delve more deeply into physics, especially where it is allowed to reveal and become an effective metaphysics for our times.

8. The Contemporary Crucible Alchemizing Coherence

"Whence it is that every place of this world contains the rays of all things existing in actuality, and just as one thing differs from another, so the rays of each thing differ from all other things in their effects and nature, from which it happens that the operation of the rays in all diverse things is diverse." -Al-Kindi [60]

While it can certainly seem sometimes that alternative ideas (and even what should be obvious truths in science) have been routinely demonized, sidelined, and underdeveloped—and for all the cliched reasons concerning money, status, and power—this is not the whole story. The whole story concerns the fork in the road our society is on and the conditions that are necessary for it to progress in either direction.

The AIDS or covid phenomena, for instance, certainly had their share of greed and vested interests driving them to become such perfect examples of sociological forces obfuscating truth. Yet, sociological forces and the politics of science are just relatively surface signs of a cosmic-level crisis in the structure and evolution of consciousness, with humanity approaching a crucial choice in the manner that life on Earth is integrated in this era.

Uncovering the real and often oversimplified proximate causes of health crises is certainly important on its own, but these crises increasingly also concern the future of the planet's evolution, and show how desperately the system is pushing to get to its next stage.

Like every major area of human life and knowledge, medicine is creating and chasing symptoms because this is a path that promises a kind of technological control over life and death, the only other option for sustainable progress being, like real health and vitality, very much dependent on a radical transformation and cooperation of all interrelated systems.

Problems are always interrelated with other problems and systems, like what gets called something's "environment". Yet with the environments of the world becoming even more inextricably connected, the only path from here becomes either real cooperation or technocratic control.

Hence "the system" itself has been pressing to use problems like people's failing health as opportunities to escalate the transition to biospheric conquest. To the statistically driven managerial mind, this can't help but seem like a more realistic task compared to true global cooperation, especially given current technology and consciousness.

One implication of this trajectory is that as long as the conditions for the posthuman stage of civilization were still being prepared, science in general often had nowhere else to go besides amassing data for the inevitable rise of AI systems.

And in niches where this wasn't possible, science has tended to drift or divert into ponderous obfuscation and peripheral obsession—an especially apparent pattern whenever science in the postmodern age has been faced with foundational problems.

Thus the revolutionary potential of many scientific fields was stalled as the AI revolution was being prepared and launched, forcing foundational questions into the fringe for a time. "Alternative" or "fringe" science didn't seem to make much progress either, it is true, even as its popularity exploded in the early 21st century.

While it often strongly appeals to intuition, its technological claims, and even many of its concepts often appear quite nebulous. To most people the very idea of alternative science brings to mind hopelessly variable results or vague theories, especially when compared to the mainstream's often problematic but inarguably powerful interventions.

However, this is because, at its best, alternative science represents the more holistic and relational path towards coherence. One could call this the path of reciprocal coherence because it promotes each and every system's dynamic individuation and coevolution.

Its results are not as predictable because it depends on each system's pattern of connection to everything else. Traditional approaches to life and medicine, for instance, especially in the East, can be very effective and complex, but their emphasis on working with nature's open systems to achieve gradual and sustainable growth, development, and healing, makes them highly dependent on complex co-adaptations, and uniform results more difficult to produce or standardize.

This also makes them unlikely to replace the mainstream—even without any repression—at least as long as most people are seduced by the fear of death and the promises of quick and easy solutions to our biological and ecological problems, which they usually are.

The real problems at the core of science are problems of coherence and they can only be sustainably "solved" in two ways: through the open-ended adjustments and harmonizations of systems evolving to bring all into ever-more coherent reciprocation, or through subjection of all to the distributed control of one techno-mediated field.

The latter requires massive data to keep up with the endless need for system-patches and boundary enforcement. This is required by stagnant systems to fight the entropy inherent to their brittle approach to coherence, an approach aimed at linear progress and discrete longevity but dependent on the static ground of a vigilantly maintained *carrier-wave* to cohere and embed each and all into its *fixed form of energy.*

This fixed energy does not preclude all scientific and technological progress—especially the endless technological or biological augmentations necessary to sustain its insular form of order. However, as will be discussed below, by becoming dependent on this carrier wave, evolution can only proceed externally, becoming trapped in a materially reductive model of the "open field" as an extended prefigured space, a space which, as will be shown later, merely extends one's creaturely bias in insular cycles if its base is not made more receptive.

To be fair, this path can indeed produce impressive results, but its dependency on a closed system of control means it can only get so far without this control becoming near absolute. Thus the digital science and technologies that support this become inevitably prioritized to expedite the transition.

This is why so much science has been spinning its wheels for decades—not necessarily out of any conscious conspiracy of repression, but from structural momentum that is incompatible with truly “open” systems in the sense of reciprocally evolving relations of matter, energy, and information beyond any single space or context.

Admittedly, there is also almost certainly some concerted effort to keep certain technologies under wraps until the time is right. For even now, what would happen if suddenly all of humanity had access to vast energy and radically extended lifespans? Such a thing could be a disaster without a system in place.

Such knowledge and means *could* evolve more gradually and collectively and the danger would not be such an issue. But the technology seems already close at hand—even if more or less protected—with the path of tight control seemingly already decided.

One could characterize this fork in the road between cooperation and control as a polarity inherent to the structure of sustainable coherence. This has been described in esoteric thought, particularly by the ancient Chinese as a polarity between external and internal alchemy.

Mainstream science, for instance, has descended directly from the West’s own external alchemical tradition. External alchemy builds power, coherence, and longevity into systems by using strongly resonating substances, beings, and energies to shore them up.

Rather than harmonizing and embedding differences into evolving fields, or achieving sustainability through fluid continuity and reciprocity, it builds and fortifies a core structure and resonance. Whether this is achieved in the individual body through certain substances like a traditional alchemist, or through vast technological systems as modern science does, the spirit is the same.

There is nothing inherently wrong with this; life starts along these lines of needing to piggy-back asymmetrically on the energy of other beings and feed on external substances and systems. Internal alchemy, however, aims to break this cycle of addiction and static resonance—not into abstract autonomy, but into flexible bodies and paths characterized by relational individuation within the reciprocally evolving harmony of the whole.

While the classical esoteric distinction between internal and external alchemy is a helpful starting point to understand what is currently at stake, it is important now to understand how these contrasting patterns of coherence play out and ramify into our contemporary scientific frameworks and concepts.

Perhaps if the alchemical secrets of life could be turned into a new holistic science of space and time, the system would be forced to change its momentum. Indeed, if enough people felt the intuitive implications of “real” physics—a physics that logically extrapolates out into the heart of all true metaphysics—this could reorganize human knowledge and our sense of who we are,

and through the extrapolation of this knowledge, help humanity intuitively and generally (but dependably) foresee what else is out there.

Whatever the result, both the external and internal—both the technologically assisted and internally-instigated paths towards increasing coherence—are important to understand and are not always easily separated. The technological aspect, especially when it comes to new energy-technology, while perhaps being a force of destabilization if introduced too quickly, could also drastically deliver us from the sick security of our current matrix, if used correctly.

One way or another, a new world does seem to be inevitably unrolling; such secrets can't be held forever. However, because their emergence so far seems to be one of heavily-controlled and distorted disclosure, a framework is needed to parse the truth from the "spin".

A slow-and-steady-as-possible (but ever-more rapid) transformation into a new economic, technological, and cosmological orientation is underway, but for this disclosure to be more than an increasing subjugation, more people need the conceptual tools to discern the truth for themselves.

A metaphysical intuition integrated into physical concepts is key to that discernment, especially going forward as new revelations and claims emerge with implications for our whole sense of history and reality. Having a sense of how things work in a way that carries through even into the most far-out realms of existence mitigates the chances that people will overwhelmed as society changes ever-more rapidly, perhaps even empowering them to counter the drive of existing power structures towards what conspiracists claim is already a cosmically oriented, "deep state" technocracy.

While the Nazis undoubtedly had some success in developing a metaphysically potentized understanding of physics, and the U.S. and Russians soon after them, the technologies and encounters that emerged from those developments after they were shunted into secret programs has had to be pieced together over the years by alternative researchers.

Admittedly, revolutions in technology based on fringe physics may be near impossible without attracting negative and possibly understandable repression. Indeed, with so many lines of development converging on technologies so revolutionary and disruptive to the social and cultural worlds of the planet, one must see the expedited and unprecedented level of control with some sympathy.

Unproductive class tensions and culture war will escalate even further than they need to without some understanding of the security and stability concerns that will persist for some time without an unrealistically harmonious alignment of consciousness. Either way, class alliances and a broad compassion are called for as a post-liberal world order emerges beyond the coordinates and constraints of modern liberal democracy.

For the “open society” has now become a landscape of competing and AI-amalgamated wills, leading to a technologically enforced collective consciousness. However, the opportunities for that more harmonious alignment of consciousness will always endure, especially to the extent that there is a *variably modeled* metaphysical understanding and harnessing of the rhythms and flows of energy between us.

This can begin along various lines of thought and culture, but in the end, no single theory or structure will do. Various fringe theories are too often dogmatic when they need not be, not only posturing intolerance of other fringe theories, but especially with the frameworks and philosophies less laden with counter-cultural connotations. These are what most people take for granted as the ground of contemporary knowledge, so they need to be illuminated as well.

Metaphorical flexibility and permeability are vital in establishing a cultural coherence that doesn’t collapse the dynamic and shifting polarity of differences. They keep culture from drifting into uniformity or being wholly manufactured by its cybernetic systems.

In alternative knowledge-subcultures there is understandably a lot of fascination with sacred geometry, various subtle energies, and special kinds of waves. Yet pondering such things along the lines discussed above—lines concerning incoherent vs. coherent energy, or entropy vs. negative entropy—can help wed disparate theories to common philosophical considerations.

Countercultural thinkers in the 21st century tend to decry “postmodern philosophy” and try to counter its centrifugal tendencies with their own overarching theories of everything. Yet it is precisely the philosophy of our era that, whatever one wants to call it now, emerged to deal with the fragmentation of our times.

Its notorious openness to difference, despite its misunderstandings and misapplications, needs to be critically built upon in order for humanity’s outward growth to maintain any breadth or sustainable vitality, even if the holistic impulse to sew various threads back to some central theory is vital as well.

With so much difference in the world, fragmentation and confusion will persist without a flexibly coherent spirit. Without such a critical but inclusive spirit and knowledge culture, all will continue to be amalgamated into the smooth flows of digital space, with everyone, even conservative critics, becoming fodder for the algorithm—at least everyone without a sense of continuity beyond the politics of identity and the supposed facts of one’s media sculpted worldview.

As the frameworks and culture of alternative science and spirituality increasingly become the only contemporary worldview challenging emerging control and its scientific justifications with actual alternatives, they desperately need to be better guided by open questions than any belief in fundamental forces, energies, or substances.

At the most abstract metaphysical level this critical openness means a focus on the mutable structure and order of relations, not a simple blend of favored concepts and selective

skepticism. Without a sensitivity to the trappings of all language—to the dangers of reified and fetishized ideas, and to the consequences of believing in them too naively, a sensitivity so prominent in “poststructural” discourse—alternative science and spirituality can become little more than competing charlatans who, despite their legitimate value, often come off as simply hawking their commodified concepts and brand of “energy”.

Producing the antidote, therefore, may productively begin by reinscribing this increasingly muddled concept of energy into the activity that connects everything rather than something possessed and deployed restrictively. Energy is what connects each individual along variable paths of relational transformation that determine both motion and meaning.

While intuitively the word energy has rightly come to be generally used in a similar way, as that which flows from, through, and between these gradients and gradations defining every context and space, the concept must be clarified not only as the nature of all activity, but as fundamentally contextual and hence liberated from the possession of any particular subject or agent.

This needs to be done, however, not just in speculative philosophy but at the level of physics, the discipline from which the contemporary energy concept has launched off into all its wooly-headed (but somehow still “substantially” domesticated) glory.

While the concept of energy has evolved through many formulations before arriving at its modern technical form in physics, such an exclusive specialization of meaning not only fragments and obscures its significance, it can excessively and subtly limit its creative unfolding.

This is especially problematic for a term this important, which needs to be properly metaphysically grounded to secure the potential for innovative lines of flight—that is, to make room for truly new energies. A helpful tool along these lines comes from Daoism, where the related concept of *qi* has retained its metaphysical nuance over time.

Daoist metaphysics, perhaps due to its strong naturalism, places great emphasis on a threefold scheme of more or less substantive terms reminiscent of the modern physics constellation of matter, energy, and information discussed earlier.

While “qi” is obviously close to “energy”, *jing* as matter, or *shen* as light or information are perhaps a stretch, the latter two being more often translated as “essence” and “spirit” respectively. Indeed, compared to modern terms, all three Daoist concepts have quite different connotations given the context of their development and use.

Yet despite these different trajectories, both sets of foundational triads could be seen as articulating the relational essence of all activity. While matter, energy, and information, like jing, qi, and shen, are often seen as different even if mutually convertible substances, this convertibility is much more emphasized in Daoism, especially in their alchemy.

And while the alchemical process is most essentially discussed within the specific context of a human body, one could see alchemy as generally referring to a *conscious catalyzation* of the evolutionary process *inherent to all things*, a process reflected not only in the transformation of physical forms, but in the structure of language and the building of coherent contexts of meaning.

Modern science may have distanced itself from its alchemical roots, but as it increasingly reckons with the interconvertibility of its core categories—and with the relativity of all structure to context—a kind of alchemical view is resurfacing. In its light, even physical terms and labels refer more to stages or modalities of differential tension and coherence than they do any fundamental subjects, objects, and qualities—or even fundamental processes free from some contextual structure of relation.

The difference between a thing or substance, a meaningful relation or property of something, and a process or activity, is not fundamental; distinctions are nonetheless important as the terms of specific relational transformations, with no categories or beings given absolute priority as the "real" agents or realities.

For instance, just how in language verbs or adjectives can become the subject of a sentence—that is, a process or property can be treated as a being or agent—so too can all matter be understood not as a fundamental substance, but as an especially substantial phase in the structured transformation of meaning and relation.

One could say that, alchemically speaking, matter is meant to be the seed of a body for a meaningful being. Yet "being" and "body" should be understood as aspects of the recurring coherence of any structure, not necessarily the kind we recognize as life. This inclusivity means that not only are stars and planets—and even the most basic elements of matter—made of beings constituting larger beings, so is any coherent meaning or abstract structure.

External alchemists, for instance, through a combination of chemistry and consciousness, "evolve" and individuate not only certain plant and animal substances, but mineral ones as well, a process meant to attain a certain resonating coherence. Western alchemists associate different parts of substances rendered through their methods with different levels of its being, with a tripartite scheme being common once again (i.e. salt, sulphur, and spirit).

But whatever the substance, process, or level of being, the alchemical process in some sense transforms matter to make it more coherent and therefore more resonant with the beings or structures evolving through the material form.

One could say that alchemy expedites the process where some structure coheres into matter, and matter coheres or condenses into an essence (jing), which can becomes a seed of not only great energy (qi), but a spirit (shen) that can impart some of its resonant power to those who connect with it—or in some cases appear to consume its material vehicle.

Matter is ideally like the Daoist jing: the seed-like essence from which a new individuation process unfolds, an enfolded trace or refined essence of the qualities, processes, and relations that formed it. That trace or selective essence becomes ramified and unfolded through energy or qi: the dynamic tension and pressures of relational motion through which this essence is expressed, individuated, and continually reintegrated.

And as this unfolding proceeds, more of the “spirits” behind it becomes increasingly manifest and integrated into a new light. This coherent light of growing intelligence and “in-formed” awareness emerges, then, not as a merely present perspective or bit of discrete information attached to matter, but a sustained slant of the spirit’s relationally individuated or “embodied” becoming.

Jing or material essence is then like the subject of a sentence of becoming—matter made as or into the seed of meaning, life, and agency through the alchemizing context and crucible of coherent combinations. Qi or energy is the verb—the arc of negotiation between regimes, the process, the tension, the breath of transformation that catalyzes matter into life and life into information and consciousness.

Shen is then the spirit and object of all being and activity. Even when something seems pointless or passive, spirit is the secret meaning made of matter and energy: the coherence that becomes embodied when the relational tensions of any activity are harmonized enough for it to seep through.

All this implies that energy is not a passive fuel, but the tension held between multiple scales and registers of motion and meaning and the flow that arises from this. So in the same way that a word only gains meaning within a sentence, energy is never isolated—it is always a part of some patterned phrase in the grammar of becoming.

While grammatical forms vary across languages—some placing the verb first, others the object—this deeper triadic logic remains. Every language, in its own way, encodes a tension and transformation between different regimes of intensity in the pattern of relations between things.

Even when subject, verb, and object blur or invert, what remains is the fundamental structure of relation: some relatively stable coherence as ground, some transformation, and a meaningful trace at the horizon, an infinite spirit reflecting all other meanings and motions.

Consequently, one could summarize a critique of the common view that energy is merely the capacity to do something—or what something has—by saying instead: it is what something is doing across infinite relational contexts.

Even if physics now technically defines energy more mathematically along the lines of the conserved quantity of time symmetry—such definitions already presuppose time as given. From a relational view, energy is not only what endures in time but what brings temporal order itself into being through the circulation of relative coherence.

Energy is the expression of how coherently a system is woven into the tensions that surround, permeate, and distribute it, making all energy a unity mediating multiplicity. This ecological view reframes *all activity* as inherently braided through overlapping cyclical phases of relative coherence and reciprocal individuation.

The resulting grammar of relational movement can be envisioned simply through the classic “yin-yang” diagram of Daoism, where the dynamic interplay of yin and yang signifies this cyclical interaction and differentiation going on between all things.

If energy or qi can be considered the mediation between the ground of matter or jing, and the horizon of shen or spirit, then *yin and yang qi* are the directional tendencies towards these two poles—towards consolidation (yin) and transformation (yang).

If in closed systems this seems to imply divergent tendencies—like toward a conglomeration of matter and an outward dispersion of light—within the right crucible of conditions, the horizon of continual transformation can become an inward journey, making the divergences of individuation converge.

Alchemically speaking, one could say that jing, qi, and shen are then the stages moving towards this horizon of convergence through progressive refinement. While yin and yang qi could be considered the dynamic relationship that powers the process, and ideally, brings the ground and horizon ever-closer together in creative coherence. Like the primordial verb and noun of a relational universe, they are inseparable and mutually generative.

This alchemical dynamic finds a powerful analogue in the electromagnetic structure of light in physics. The body's essence (jing) can be likened to an electric potential—a charge or “original” source of qi stored as both structures and flows (and structured flows), but is more functionally associated with the yin of the body—its physical integrity and chemical potentials (yin), due to the incoherence in the flows in still developing beings making them largely dissipative and derivative of this chemical energy.

Generally speaking, this makes yin qi a more or less static electrical potential, as well as the magnetic field that more or less preserves the structure of that potential as it is tapped. While in more developed beings, yin qi can connote a dynamic field of electrical potential and magnetic structure.

Yang qi, on the other hand, is the more or less stable but dissipative current powering activity. But to the extent there is conscious coherence, it is the dynamic circulation of electromagnetism or light—where flow and field become a single, self-sustaining phenomenon.

The alchemical work is to transform the body from a network of dissipative circuits and currents into a resonant cavity where these potentials and flows amplify each other—where stagnant yin

becomes a dynamic container and wasteful yang becomes a luminosity that feeds its own source, making the system a self-fueling coherence.

In physics, the most coherent energy is a self-sustaining wave, but its common form—the propagating electromagnetic wave—must radiate outward to exist. The alchemical achievement is to create its functional equivalent as a standing wave: a self-sustaining resonance where yin (field potential) is continuously transformed into yang (changing flux) and back again, entirely within the bodily crucible. Over cosmic time, the stored energy of matter is indeed released as radiant propagations, a dissipation through entropy.

On the scale of ordinary life, this is a constant, largely incoherent version of the same process: a conversion of material essence (jing) into vitality (qi), and that energy into scattered awareness (shen) that is taken up by other forms in a vast, evolutionary exchange.

The alchemical process simply concentrates this cosmic cycle into the scale of an individual, refining its inherent dissipation into an internal, coherent circulation—and at the highest levels, achieving the ultimate mastery: not merely the slow entropy of matter into light, but its instantaneous, conscious transfiguration into a sovereign body of spirit

It aims to incorporate the body's yin qi—the passively structured pools of potential or insular circulations of energy—into the dynamically coherent, luminous, and continuously transforming yang qi of shen. Such a spirit can convert matter into light and light into matter as modes of the same fluid integration of all movement.

Before anything approaching this lofty goal can be accomplished, however, one must first build a coherent container by cultivating a strong yin qi field. Such a stable, resonant structure is necessary to build energy and minimize loss. Once this receptive base is established, the activating power of yang qi can be circulated no longer as just wasteful consumption or release, but as a refining fire.

If one can drive this refinement to a critical point of resonance, the formerly problematic poles of freedom and collective coherence, creative expansion and critical control, become a positive feedback loop. The structured potential (yin) and the dynamic expression (yang) fuse into a self-sustaining wave of resonant, energized consciousness

Thus, the Daoist framework elevates energy from a mere capacity to a measure of relational integrity—the coherence with which one participates in the infinite context of relations. This can manifest at a more basic level as a radical shift in one's experience of force and action.

Consider any master of qi in a combat situation. An opponent's strike is a highly concentrated, localized expression—a yang-like, forceful, dissipative flow. The untrained body perceives this as an external "force" to be met with an opposing force, creating entropy.

The master, however, does not oppose. Their cultivated, coherent system—where structure and flow have been, to some degree, alchemically fused—transforms the incoming yang force into a new context. They receive it not as a solid wall, but through their own fluid, circular structure (their yin qi).

This reception instantly redirects and integrates the aggressive flow into their own larger, more harmonious pattern of universal transformation (their yang qi). The opponent's yang is absorbed into the master's yin and re-expressed as part of the master's yang.

Force, in the sense of violent opposition, only exists within the opponent—that is, within an unharmonized system. The master demonstrates the spiritual ideal: a state where all phenomena, even attack, are met as aspects of a single, seamless, transforming field of activity. The master feels no force because force is only a reality within the fragmented systems the master synthesizes.

As the New Age has often vaguely understood, mystical ideas like these—especially concepts from the rich energetic science of Daoism—have much to offer the philosophical problems of modern physics.

Indeed, a deeper economy of preserved and distributed symmetries moving through all the apparent clash has become a more common theme in both countercultural and even some mainstream speculations. This is true despite the dispersive momentum of the postmodern era and all the obfuscating concepts of physics and cosmology that have been promoted over the years.

Such an energetic economy can imply a hidden commerce of connected patterns and pressures that underlie the familiar categories of force, motion, and mass. And despite the metaphysical and even occult implications, the truth has become particularly difficult to ignore, even in mainstream physics, especially considering phenomena like the spontaneous transfer of spin alignment.

These issues have been troubling scientists since the days of Einstein. Such seemingly instantaneous or nonlocal rhythmic harmonizations, even across vast distances, seem to defy normal causal explanations, and have made many even hard core materialists sound like mystics.

While mainstream physics has been forced to deal with the importance of this thing called spin, nonetheless, it has struggled with the fact that, at the fundamental level, spin is only an analogy because it cannot really be described as a quality or action of any spatial objects.

Spin is rather what constitutes things, making it impossible to understand in a model which relies on foundational substances or objects. Consequently, the nature of spin and the patterns of energy it expresses gets lost in the weeds of mathematical complexity, obfuscating the importance of its patterns.

While various philosophies of physics have pondered with fascination the nonlocality of the pattern's "transfer", it is usually rendered as some kind of mysterious anomaly, often giving anything associated with quantum effects some special significance as an unknowable transcendent potential.

In the process, however, it is usually missed that these patterns are not just some abstract curiosity, or some special realm underlying or bubbling at the base of space and time, but rather that space and time are these patterns—that time is relative spin and the spaces of the physical universe arise out of interference in the interconnections of what is (or what can at least be envisioned as) a formative dynamic of interlocking spins or vortices.

Saying "interlocking", however, can make one think of a great deterministic machine, like the gears of the clocklike vision of the universe science left behind with the advent of modern physics. But this is not the type of coherence meant here; true lasting coherence is not a totalitarian uniformity; it is not a rigid synchronization along any line or spin axis, as in a classical mechanism.

It is an open and inclusive infinity that ensures there is coherence and equality in every relation *at the ideal or abstract level*—that is, given the combination of all possible contexts—while within any context, or along any one actual line of space, scale, or collection of spins, things are quite different.

They are only "interlocked" then in the abstract—meaning that every change in one ultimately turns through all, even if that universality is distributed and modified differently within every space or perspective. This differential structure, as well as the specific frames that determine which pattern manifests, exist not only within segmented spaces like ours, but *even within the variable symmetries of the ideal*.

For as many thinkers and mystics have well-argued, this ideal continuum *does* allow for individuation within its coherent reciprocal connections. Any point within it—or in systems approaching the infinite horizon of the ideal—can serve as a site of individuation, as each relays or eccentrically modifies any change.

It is just that in order to approach the impossible ideal, this individuation must become ever-more perfectly in tune with the rest. All must be poised ready to harmonize every line or axis of circulation in a kind of alchemical fusion of directions and energies—or "elements" as internal alchemists call these archetypal patterns of movement (though with various levels of meaning and perfection).

It should also be said that the ideal level of coherence is *not* what is called superconductivity, the physics term associated with the limited coherence that can result from an over-reliance on external alchemy. One could think of a superconductor as an exemplar of external alchemy's

admittedly dynamic but *exclusive* coherence, where an axis of internal circulations can be adjusted to exclude competing variations that might introduce decoherence.

Ultimately, coherence must conform to and emerge out of the very interplay of multiplicity if it is to approach the ideal in any sense. Instead of forcing a single spin orientation and repelling opposition, *inclusive* coherence reconciles all possible orientations into variable and flexible higher-order structures, where interference does not have to be excluded or muffled into fragmentation, for all is interwoven in dynamic unity.

This unity then is not the rigid march of a machine but the fluid harmony of vortices that, through their very interaction, generate the morphing yet enduring structures of our physical universe, even if, again, that harmony gets distributed more or less opaquely by and within particular points of view.

But why is spin so fundamental? There may be endless mysteries to explore around this question, but the basic answer is easy to understand: a circular movement is the archetypal figure for symmetry through change, or unity in difference. While a moving or growing line may also qualify as such a symmetry, the circular movement implies that line of symmetry is itself a pattern of relation or change, not just some core thing growing or moving.

So at its essence, spin is not a circular movement in any particular thing or number of dimensions in space. It is a cyclical modulation of *some continuity of relations*. In other words, while a circle might represent this cycle, it is not some foundational pattern or shape in a fundamental medium but a relational recurrence that arises between and gives rise to other relational invariants and recurrences, thereby forming every medium and their modifications.

If a point is an abstract dimensionless representation of the idea of pure identity, symmetry, or timeless sameness, yet becomes circular or curved forms depending on spatial dimensions, spin at its deepest level is such a point concept forced into the reality of temporality. All real symmetry or identity is never just endurance in space, but a cycle in time.

Spin, in this sense, is not primarily rotation, but the temporal becoming inherent to coherence, and therefore to all structures and identities—like a tone whose reiteration in shifting contexts gives rise to the manifold melodies of matter and meaning.

Yet much as real things, outside abstract representations, are never point-like identities, they are also never simple spins—they curve, circulate, and resonate to establish and maintain coherence in space and time. This happens because no real cycle exists in isolation. It exists in relation to other cycles—other tensions, other flows.

For even a simple identity or self-relation to exist—or certainly to persist—it cannot help but do so through relation to another. And as this leaves the abstract realm of static spatial concepts or identities, and enters real processes, this means an encounter with a difference in flow. This diverts its return to itself through some kind of arc and its coherence becomes spatialized and

temporalized as a cycle intersecting and overlapping others. It is in this sense that spin becomes all things in space and time—and even space and time themselves—through the dynamics of its resonant relations.

More simply put, space and time are what happens when coherence mediates contradiction, making spin the cycle of change defining a thing and its self-similar space through the rhythm of other things. Consequently, by extension, the spin of a three dimensional vortex can take all impinging change—and in the most coherent collective toroidal dance, take all change from any direction—and make it part of its pattern.

Yet no collection of vortices can ever be complete or immune to modifications that are beyond its evolved threshold; there are always differences that manifest beyond a system's specialized scales and relative magnitudes. Each instance of space-time coherence is at most a compromise or partial resolution within a larger network of infinitely unresolved tensions within tensions that cannot be instantaneously harmonized.

Even so—even if the exact nature of the universe's dynamic symmetry might be infinitely complex—understanding how this symmetry is formed is not only more or less possible, it is vital. While alchemical and spiritual approaches are helpful for forming individual coherence, additional concepts are needed to help reframe the formative institutions of society.

To that end, sophisticated scientific models could clear up many of their foundational problems by simply addressing, as the alchemists have for millenia, how the reciprocity of motion is distributed. From there, the catylzation of its coherent condensation and concentration could be the practical alchemy of future science.

9. **Dimensional Dilemmas**

"...life begins less by reaching upward, than by turning upon itself. But what a marvelously insidious, subtle image of life a coiling vital principle would be! And how many dreams the leftward oriented shell, or one that did not conform to the rotation of its species, would inspire!" - Gaston Bachelard[61]

Interdisciplinary sciences investigating complex systems have increasingly brushed up against some of the more or less metaphysical principles discussed above. This is an inevitable consequence of tracking how order and structure emerge across layers of difference and interdependence. As the complexity of both society and scientific knowledge deepens, modern inquiry has been steadily pushed beyond the narrow confines of purely material representation and into properly metaphysical terrain.

Patterns of relation, when extended far enough, begin to reveal a subtle architecture of scale-crossing coherence and recursive temporality—one that resembles religious symbols and spiritual archetypes more than the physical phenomena scientific abstractions were originally devised to generalize.

Where traditional metaphysics often expressed such terrains symbolically, contemporary thought and technology has figured out ways to conceptually and mathematicaly model the recursive networks that emerge through the varying connections between everything—in other words, the differential structures underlying all patterned behavior.

Whether intuited and symbolized in spiritual traditions or modeled with mathematical formalisms, these abstract relational spaces are easily mistaken as unreal or merely instrumental. Yet esoteric traditions have long connected to them quite vitally and pragmatically as the key rhythmic links binding the nested cycles of all systems across scales.

Some quantum biologists have even surmised that organisms can store immense amounts of energy in such nonlocal resonant networks—essentially harnessing a medium of reciprocal exchange where space, time, and entropy emerge only as local and even organism-specific disturbances of a deeper coherence.[62]

By allowing resonant energy sharing across the system, the distributed coherence of these networks reduces reliance on the dispersive processes of direct fuel consumption, mitigating the usual metabolic wear and tear.

In other words, if energy is not essentially a fuel but just a momentum that can be made a source for further movement, coherent cycles need not ever run out, and even new flows need no force or intervention, only a well-timed coupling of flows to initiate novel movement or structure.

Even at relatively common levels of organismic synchrony, a feedback loop can be tapped into, where coherence reduces external energy demands, diminishing dependence on inefficient chemical processes, which in turn reduces the entropy that results from them, further staving off decay.

Yet, it is seldom acknowledged outside of esoteric traditions that as an organism gets more dynamically coherent, its rhythmic but responsive oscillations form concentrated channels and vortices, not only within organisms but coupling them to specific *layered networks of various densities* that span and connect all systems.

This makes resonant energy sharing more than just an abstract ideal of individual organisms, for it is also the structure of their world and evolution. It suggests organic life always has some access to this variable medium of connection between everything, making possible a continuity that defies life's mortality and spatial locality with potentially infinite paths and precursors.

In the wake of materialism, however, even spiritual thought too often frames the nonlocal or "energy" itself in the terms of either simply present substances or transcendent potentials. Thought can easily miss the polarities of relative difference and coherence—the more or less compatible oscillations—that make anything more or less "present" to begin with.

For if the essence of energy is in the polarized tension and pressure of differential relations, the infinity of this difference is what keeps cycles stable in space and time, since otherwise tensions would quickly equalize before much stability or complexity ever arose.

The significance of this becomes impossible to understand as long as energy is thought of as some substance or force traveling through or dissipating within space, when it is, more accurately, its very structure, a structure defined by the relative coherence and difference between beings, between whatever objects and subjects, observations and observers are involved.

Indeed, energy need not travel at all to have far-reaching effects since its tensions and resonances can negate or increase the space between things—not through any mystical or material force, but by a simple and visualizable mechanism.

To picture it, visualize two clockwise vortices side by side like identical twisting funnels spiraling to your right but tunneling away from you (like into the page). As the spin of their flows approach each other on their adjacent sides, they are actually opposing: the vortex on your right has an ascending flow next to the one on the left's descending flow.

It is easy to see how this opposition could neutralize the spin that keeps them separate—with the clockwise momentum on these adjacent sides becoming slowed and consequently diverted into or pulled down the funnel, while the spin on the outside of the now merging vortices is reinforced since it is becoming one combined clockwise motion.[63]

If the vortices were instead counter-rotating, with one clockwise and the other counterclockwise, the flow into their adjacent sides approach and then both ascend or both descend, reinforcing each other's separate spin rather than opposing or canceling.

This reinforcement amplifies the lateral angular momentum between them, making it harder for the vortices to merge. Instead of folding inward into a shared directional flow, the space between them can increase—or if the opposing spin orientations still funnel down a merging direction or drain, their separate orientations can just be reinforced, locking them in spatial distinction, their opposing spirals creating a tension ridge between them—a shear zone that resists full unification.

This contrast reveals a relational geometry of coherence: when two things are going in the same direction and with the same orientation, the cycles that define their distinction can be negated, merging them into a greater development.

To the extent that orientations oppose, this can feed and build upon the cycles that sustain the stasis of an established spatial existence, but at the expense of a more intense collective journey into the depths of the vortex's play amongst greater differential tensions. These, of course, are simple abstract extremes. In reality, all things are both merging and differentiating in different contexts.

The basic polarity of spin relations, however, is important to understand. It is a kind of scaffolding for the relational geometry of actual systems, since spin relations are prior to any purely spatial geometry or to an observable effect in an already-constituted space.

An everyday example of this polarity can be seen in the simple behavior of electrical wires, which seem to be “attracted” when the current goes in the same direction, potentially merging their magnetic vortices, while opposing wire currents “repel”.

It is seldom understood, however, that these effects are not due to mysteriously converging forces and laws acting on the stage of space and time, but rather, space and time are made and unmade all the time through these interference patterns.

Even this is easy to see once thought is liberated from assumptions of merely localized events or absolute sizes and scales. One must simply *eschew the habit of viewing magnitudes as growing or shrinking against a fixed measure like space,* or space itself expanding or contracting as a single container for all, for this would just imply a larger containing space.

Instead, picture how all things may be *actively and in this moment creating or negating the space and time between them,* and in a way that has no limit, akin to endlessly zooming out or in on a fractal, since, again, things are not limited objects in a container but structures of relations to all. Each is a specifically patterned portal into the infinite.

It is the reciprocal recursions inherent to every relation’s varying relations with others—that is, both its tension and overlap with other relations, as well as the rhythm of compatibility this creates—that creates the appearance of static spatial frames and the inextricably linked processes of time. These frames and processes are continuously shaped by the underlying resonant and dissonant interactions that are then observed as the universe’s forms and rhythms.

While dissonant and divergent change can at least *from the point of view at the impossible limit* become ever-more reduced, *even the most seemingly dissonant change* is always driven by at least *some* relation becoming more interconnected. Like two people becoming closer and their worlds growing more interknit. However, like how two friends becoming lovers can also be a divergence from the possibilities of their friendship, every “inward” or “centripetal” motion, is simultaneously an “outward” or “centrifugal” motion in another frame.

The relation between these converging and diverging frames is the story of the universe, a story that becomes more complex as contrasting frames interfere and pressure grows for a wider convergence.

What we call “movement through space”, then, is just a modification of a medium made of many of these *relatively* more fundamental polarized relations. In the last analysis, all relations are growing closer, so all poles are negating the distance between their extended relations. It is just

that, in a complex universe of diverse combinations, the appearance of increasing distance in some frames is necessary so that other relations can grow closer by contrast. All this happens *through wave-like interference*.

For instance, you may have to grow apart from some people to grow closer to others, but if the growth is followed far enough, the wave-like patterns of interpersonal conflict come back around and potentially resolve, illuminating the relative distance created as only a way to make space for a greater convergence on the endless horizon.

All this should not imply, however, that the larger-scale space and structures of the cosmos emerge simply from smaller, individual, or atomized relations. Indeed, there are no fundamental things or movements because all emerge in reciprocity.

Yet this poses a problem. Even though all lines of reason and inner vision *followed far enough* eventually point to a vast structure of coherent vortices and channels extending and entangling everything in varying distributions across space and time (as well as generating them), their energy-structure and information-patterns are dependent on the coherence of the relations involved.

They are thus difficult to map in stable detail, except as they impinge on more stable shared structures, like the backwater niches of relatively isolated material existence like our own seemingly stable and present space and time.

A psychic may be capable of “remote viewing” distant events, even distant in time, but this is not a neutral observation of a single space or time, but a plunge into a vast relational network. This precludes the idea of sending a measurable message free of the subjective distortions of the “entangled” systems.

As long as coherence is maintained, vast amounts of energy and “information” can be stored and accessed by coherent systems. However, this store of energy and network of information transcends the discrete forms that are more easily measured. It also doesn’t have the same structure or meaning across the diverse spaces or systems that access or contextualize it.

When attempting to use the energy incoherently, for example, by breaking the coherent cycle to measure it, or tapping into it without the right reciprocal resonance, the connection breaks and the energy dissipates, making the New Age dream of “energy from the vacuum” a bit more complicated.

This energy is only usable along the coherent lines that form the scaffolding or framework connecting any particular structure to the rest of the universe, so taking significant amounts of energy out of this network would require significant and reciprocal coherence to maintain the structure and flow.

For when coherence is lost, the scaffolding shifts, or perhaps one could say that there is a fall into its incoherent interstices, with the energy becoming disordered and unusable in any directed or meaningful way, as it often seems to be in the “vacuum” of space.

When this happens, when there is an attempt to draw energy out incoherently, or whenever there is a change in energy that is not immediately compensated, the organization and entropy of a local space or system also shifts.

Consequently, any relevant energy that was moving around coherently and imperceptibly within the distributed network of channels not only becomes inaccessible, but there is also a release of the dynamic tension a system had with its environment—in other words, the tension between overlapping or merging vortices and those differing enough to sustain a distinct presence and structure of circulation in space.

The individuated polarity that had maintained the system in its more coherent and distinct state can collapse since this was held together by its unique connections within a larger network of vortices. Without that tension between local and nonlocal coherence, a system cannot individuate from either, with the entropy of the local environment quickly overcoming it.

Local environments have their own order, but this is also grounded in the coherence of nonlocal connections, which without an evolving and individuating structure, can only last so long. Without the individuation process of life and eventually intelligence—especially collective intelligence and growing nonlocal connections—the gaps or drops in system interconnection we attribute with the incoherent vacuum flux of space (and its relatively inert status of high entropy) sooner or later break down all individuation into uniformity.

This collapse creates not only *more* entropy, but *more space and time*, respectively represented by the vector and the oscillating force of light or electromagnetism (EM). It is as if the network of vortices—whose *partial* patterns give birth to asymmetrical interference and the appearance of the physical universe—is being forced by incoherence to redistribute the way these patterns relate. This is happening whenever there is a seemingly isolated wave of radiation, signaling a change or loss of coherence from some perspective and material “source”.

It is the same with light’s terminal, or material “sink”, which will naturally follow suit if the wave “forces” the system that eventually absorbs it to also shed radiation through increased entropy. One could picture this as causing runaway entropy, or the appearance of “space-time expansion”.

For the formerly dense conglomerate of overlapping whirlpools at some “source” of mass sheds its energy as light with every loss in coherence, and this causes a chain of such reactions and dispersions if not neutralized by coherently maintained assimilation.

Traditional physics just sees the universe's clusters of overlapping and structured vortices as forces like gravity and substances like matter, or when there is a structural change moving between systems, the shedding of a "particle" of electromagnetic radiation called the "photon".

But one can see this forceful divide between light and matter as just the perspective seen from our point of view, a perspective reflecting our more or less incoherent interference in the light and radiation we absorb, with our unharmonized rhythms and perceptions subjecting us to the incoherent interstices of the larger pattern.

Perhaps, for instance, the sun only appears to be burning down and shedding its light as we struggle to make more coherent use of its energy, but given another perspective it is part of a divine network in such dynamic equilibrium that all it gives is given back in sustainable reciprocity.

As suggested before, the trenchant divide between particle and wave is a conceptual byproduct of liberal society's tendency to amalgamate incoherent differences rather than forge a more coherent connection between the poles and processes of their relation. This is not just a question of integrating subjective perspectives or separate contexts, but a question of seeing the relational, scale, and resolution factors that differentiate what is *variably* connected and continuous.

Not only does the conflict of forces in space and matter—and the creation and absorption of "photons" that mediates it—sometimes increase coherence, but in some contexts (especially coherent layerings of spaces and lines of time), it is always doing so.

And if coherence is context-dependent, it is better to talk about how every wave, whether it appears as matter or light, both preserves symmetry and transmits its dynamic structure through change—how it contributes to a greater creative coherence.

This further illustrates how matter and light are not different substances or foundational forms. One could even say that (at least at a certain level of interpretation) they are *subjectively segmented stages* in the transformational process happening between all things.

Accordingly, even though the space of material systems seem to be full of incoherence and mere spatial symmetry—full of frictions and forces that intrinsically "disturb the light" and scatter it into the entropy of space—the imperfect assimilation and shedding of waves, which *seems* to mostly increase overall entropy from any one point of view, is, from another perspective, vital to the overall regime of a deathless dynamic symmetry.

Spatial existence has its material islands of more or less stable dynamic symmetry, but the dynamic order of matter without life is still relatively rigid, and any rigid or segmented order is, like a rock in a stream, doomed to eventually erode away. Mere material symmetry is by nature a kind of stalemate built upon an essential clash of forces that left to itself or to a passive perspective eventually leads to the stale statistical symmetry of incoherent space.

There is some truth in thinking of matter and its complex structures as akin to whirlpools in an ocean of currents that is continually generated by them. However, if matter cannot become vital and intelligent enough to change with its flows, it will be left out to dry when conditions change. The flow may be eternal but its path through other flows is always changing.

Nonetheless, the forces of unpredictable change and the states of dissipation they seem to cause are in principle balanced elsewhere or in another context. Even if the mainstream idea of a photon particle brings to mind the asymmetry and entropy created and imparted by discrete force—even when its collision with matter seems to, by all accounts, increase entropy—still, the motion its force causes is part of a transfer of vital information. There is, therefore, always the potential of joining what always already is in some context a coherent flow of energy or negative entropy.

Certain Russian research supports the idea that when there *is* an apparent increase in coherence, there is an implied vortex tunnel or spin-wave that connects the coordinated spins of any emerging dynamic coherence to the system that sheds the spin and to a greater economy or ecology of coherence.[64]

It is as if when the system becomes more coherent, the increased resonance and spin alignments of its matter form (from its perspective) a strong left-handed or counterclockwise vortex that pulls the whole thing up taut to resonate with a greater system that feeds it.

Another vortex twists in the opposite way when it loses coherence, dropping it back down into a lower-energy state less dynamically individuated from its immediate spatial environment. This concept sheds light on why a purely spatial perspective on life and coherence leads to everything eventually coming into the passive equilibrium of death.

For the coherent structure of vortices that is all structure *in space* is—in a sense—time, and when time is reduced to space, both are doomed to a dissipation of their structure. The overall sense should instead be that of pockets of centripetal and centrifugal spirals everywhere as things rise and fall out of *relative* coherence.

We are drawn into the centripetal organizing processes of life, but we feed on the centrifugal process of death. Even the simple shedding of organization emanating from a nice fire, not only warms and energizes our bodies, but also gives off infrared light that can easily increase the order in our cells, performing a kind of transfer of the life and negative entropy of the tree that was burned.

Indeed there is a palpable difference between standing beside a living fire and being surrounded by ambient heat—between drinking from a spiraling mountain stream and sipping the same water long settled. These aren't examples of some special vital energy; they are felt encounters with the coherence embedded in motion.

A fire, alive and rhythmic, radiates not merely heat but a patterned flow—twisting tension unwinding in real time. Similarly, water that has flowed and spun through rock and root carries a memory of movement—its molecules braided for a time with gradients, eddies, and mirrored exchanges.

When such patterned energy enters the body, it does not need as much reorganization. Its existing coherence can be smoothly incorporated, its spin and rhythm matched. In contrast, disorganized heat or stagnated water may require the body to expend additional energy just to cancel out noise, to restructure apparent randomness into something usable.

Thus, life is not just a filter-feeder but a resonator. It prefers to align with what is already spiraling. It is not primarily a consumer, but a participant in the choreography of already-ordered motion—and the difference can be felt in every breath of wild air and every flicker of firelight that "feeds" the form without friction.

Nonetheless, any time rhythms mismatch, or a system collapses or dies, the gaps and gulfs of space and time are created; or conversely, every time a new complex system "emerges" or becomes more coherent, space and time are negated, all as part of a synchronized yet often syncopated cycle in the breath of exchanging energy throughout the universe.

This makes the so-called "emergence" of the new more than either a random event or a mere actualization of abstract possibility. It is, instead, a centripetal convergence and extrapolation of prior patterns.

While both mainstream and counter-cultural thinkers have picked up on some of this, too often they take our bluntly quantified or "metric" view of space for granted and this opens up all kinds of vague conjecture about "action at a distance" or special kinds of waves that are just assigned ad hoc the necessary properties, spurring yet another complication of fundamental physics.

Consequently, when the inevitable mysteries of psychic phenomena, UFOs, and advanced aerospace technology are brought into the conversation, they end up being relegated to "higher dimensions", further entrenching their ambiguity and holding back any revolution in mainstream science.

It is better to understand both dimensions and spaces—as well as the structure of what happens within them—as foundational filters and modifications, as ways of dividing up and distributing the changing patterns of a *relatively* abstract but continuous and infinite realm of relations, thereby making them perceivable.

So things primarily do not so much happen in space or in a certain number of dimensions because any dimensions, whether of space or otherwise, are merely used to interpret or represent a selection of variables in the dynamics of reality, whether this representation is conceptual or the very experience of life as it seems to present itself.

If one does not imagine change as primarily a motion of some isolated thing happening within some space, but essentially as a more or less innovative shift in pattern emphasis from one slant of connections to another, then one can easily see why the structure of three dimensions is special.

If one does not take a space or framework for granted when imagining the most basic pattern of a simple relation—and one has some idea that each thing is itself a relation—then one quickly sees that relations need two things to relate and another which specifically relates them (even if this third thing or relation is the seemingly empty space of the most simple and seemingly static spatial relation).

Yet, one must remember that the third thing, dimension, or quality—the more explicit medium or relation—is not the absolute mediator. It is a sign of relevant overlapping relations, a particular pattern of modification in mutual mediation between the two others. This is true whether that third be called time in the case of mediating two consecutive moments, or space itself (or the mental space of a perspective), or any other kind of third quality or thing that seems to determine exactly how two others will be related.

This is important to remember when there is a temptation to give any of the relations or dimensions the special status of fundamental space or transcendent time, or impart to them some other sovereign quality of absolute immanence or transcendence, or matter and spirit.

In all cases, there are two poles of processes mediating and being reciprocally mediated (in other words, co-determined) by a third that often appears as a process of some shared context or relations. The poles, however, are always mediating and determining more than their mutual relation to each other and their immediate relational environment.

For whether the overlap between two things be their relations of space and time, the relations of a loving relationship, or any other medium or environment, the process is never contained. This is because space, time, and all media or relations, are connected and reciprocally determined. They are both formed by and formative to what happens within them and that which uses them.

This implies a fourth “dimension” to every process that could be thought of not as “the” fourth dimension of absolute totality but simply as the greater universe of further processes beyond the obvious dimensions of self, other, and their shared world.

And while there are conceivably as many dimensions as one can relate, the relationships between the first three or four are special (symbolized in ancient science, for instance, by the Tetractys, where the proportions between the first four numbers are shown to have a unique harmonic relationship).[65]

While one can imagine a simple solitary thing, the fact remains that any particular one is never “the one,” never a single source of first force; it always implies another in relation. Likewise, although we can conceive a dyad of relation, in reality, every pair is already a process. Every

relation is a linking of changes, and this combination implies a new change or process—a third term through which the change is staged or transmitted.

A dyad can only imply contrast—a binary tension—not the continuity of true modulation which requires some stable frame. Even a continuous gradient of difference between two things necessitates a third that can condition or interpret it. Where two establishes polarity, three allows a turning: a shift, a fold, a curvature that gives the relation its structure rather than simply its edges.

In other words, relation is irreducibly triadic because it requires a beginning pole, a contrasting differential, and a mediating process that makes the difference between them intelligible. But even this familiar structure—of two things and a medium between—is too static and obfusctes the fact that all three terms are mediating each other.

What seems like a simple connection is already an interplay of nested changes and mediations. Every thing or moment emerges or stands out as a slice of change through or in contrast with other changes. Every other—every contrast—is already a kind of medium of mutual modulation for the first. Even what appears most static in a changing relation—what seems to anchor or stabilize it—is already just another layer of transformation, a contingent consolidation of difference that gives form to other differences.

One might then say that the third element is no *definitive* medium, but more meaningfully designated as the structural frame through which modulation becomes intelligible at all. Rather than connecting two fixed, discrete poles, the third term supplies the asymmetry by which one is *meaningfully* distinguished from another across a background of possible transformations.

What emerges, then, is not a chain of fixed roles but a recursive triad: a shifting interplay of change, interval, and orientation. These arise together—not as elements laid out in space, but as the coordinates of every process of relation. To speak of space or reality as *having* a certain number of dimensions is already to commit to a framework that mistakes its own representational affordances for a universal structure.

To speak of dimensions, especially in space and time, is already to refer to nested gradients and relational asymmetries that have stabilized into distinguishable paths, thresholds, and identities through repeated triangulation. Any apparent medium is already a particular organization of such triadic dynamics.

Because change does not simply happen within a medium, but is instead a manifestation of media interaction and distribution, the medium is not only part of the message, there is no end to its meaning and scope. There is never simply some event happening within a certain number of dimensions; there is an infinite unfolding of change that is always locally scaffolded by a trinity inherent to relation as the mediation process.

In other words, there are not a fixed number of axes along which change occurs, but an open-ended field of transformation structured by the very act of relating. Furthermore, the infinite array of mediating differences is not physically coordinated through space and time as some abstract categories of perception, *but through the space/time relation* as a potent sign of the nature of all change.

The space/time relation is especially useful in modeling the intensity of physical change as a numerical value—as in velocity expressed in an amount of space per time (s/t) like meters per second. However, every such ratio implicitly folds in the three aspects—for instance: a position or pole, a difference or interval, and a reference or orientation.

Motion is then not merely change over time, but the differential registration of change through a system of contrast and recurrence. Every physical pole and its medium is thus not a fixed point within a passive container, but an active relation of space to time (s/t), modulated through triadic tension.

Furthermore, this triadic structure encompasses not just motion itself, but the conditions under which motion is discernible: each pole, each medium, each interval standing in a relation of mutual transformation. What appears as a space-time continuum is a secondary abstraction—an averaging of infinitely folded relations with each seeming dimension being already a motion between relations, each with both spatial and temporal character.

Each aspect or dimension—whether pole, medium, or threshold—is thus not merely one axis among others, but a ratio of differential relations within a triadic logic, always embedded in and containing further transformations. The seeming stability of dimensions is just a local stasis within a mediating tension held between multiple potential pathways of development. Any pole is already folded with its medium of relations and a selective reference.

Consequently, the poles we assign as “objects” are only provisional anchors—moments of constraint that gather together the more basic flows of relation. The very act of isolating a particle as an object presupposes a relation to a field and to a differential frame of registration. So identity itself becomes a kind of recursive index: a placeholder for a more complex interplay of co-determining relations. A “thing” is then just a temporary knot—a patterned slowing-down or thickening of relations.

Even velocity is already a reduction of a threefold process into a binary abstraction. The moment we fix one term as a “unit” of comparison, the triadic relation collapses into a measurable effect that is never just a number. It is the process of mediated transformation between co-arising values.

In this way, the triadic structure of motion is not a map of a medium, its dimensions, or its things but of a mutating mediation with the infinity of relation. One aspect or “dimension” might play the role of a positional term, another as a rate of change, and a third as a stabilizing reference—but none are fixed.

Each element can rotate its role across layers of relation. It is this very pliability that makes stable-seeming forms emerge from ongoing transformation. The irreducible threefold folding of relations repeats itself across scales and contexts, for it is not a scaffolding beneath reality but the way reality weaves itself with every change in the symmetry of motion and every shift of relational becoming.

Now, if one perceives any change as a kind of breaking of a previous balance or symmetry, then the fact that there seem to also be three spatial dimensions begins to make sense. This is not because there just happens to be three axes of space, but because there are three basic ways—or more accurately, three aspects—of distributing, translating, and reframing symmetry itself.[66]

The first, at least in terms of simplicity, is the *translation*: like an experience or movement through (or repetition in) space or time, where the order of a relation, given some perspective, is preserved through extension along some line, with its medium or relations not yet taken into account.

Second is the turn, like a spatial reversal or temporal oscillation that builds perspective and memory, where the order of relations is interspersed, shifted, or changed through subjection to another order. One could think of this as where two differing lines, series, or directions fold into each other, turning around their mutual displacement to generate not just ongoing relation, but the rhythm of return—the recurrent spacing and pacing of difference that gives motion its memory and contour.

The third is the twist, where the full spiral of change and repetition that is every process and relation in its real but abstract and unbound motion through others is in some way and to some degree understood, where the transformation of two things through and in relation to each other relative to some third aspect or dimension is rendered more completely.

A simple form of this could be pictured in spatial terms as three levels of knowledge of the sun's motion. One can see it just move in a line through the sky, one can through observation and memory recognize it is an oscillation, and one can through contemplation deduce that we and the sun in some sense revolve around each other in the spiral through a greater space of relative motion within the galaxy.

This third level illuminates the truth that the universe is a play of *relational* differentiation and integration. Spirals are an effective visual model of this play as long as one keeps in mind that there are spirals within spirals overlapping in infinite ways, not some definitive spiral evolution.

Spirals coil energy into form and unwind form into energy, which is always part of a larger form. Spirals model, mirror, and form the deeper spinning and twisting logic of the space/time relation itself. At the biochemical level, this is no less true. The left-handed twist of most natural amino acids, the building blocks of life, is not arbitrary, as will be discussed below.

Counterclockwise spirals are the signature of inward coherence, of matter drawing energy into structure. These leftward twists, however, are often wrapped in right-handed structures that interface clockwise with the outside.

The combinations that result, like in proteins and DNA, both guide energy inwards into its core structure as well as express it outward. Most natural sugars also spiral outward or clockwise, which makes sense since sugars are often a catalyst for becoming.

In the metabolism of life, inward and outward are braided together: the inward spiral concentrates and enfolds coherence; the outward spiral projects and distributes it. Of course, even if this is the energetic geometry, the physical form reflects this in complex and potentially meaningful ways.

For instance, while the common right-handed spiral shell grows outward, reaching into space's general drift, there is also the rare left-handed shell, which, perhaps signifies that being who even in their outward expression turns inward.

Whatever the case, these patterns of handedness are not mere biological quirks. They are signatures of a deeper field logic—a cosmic asymmetry in which structure coheres by spiraling inward against the outward unraveling of increasing space, yet also by twisting back out again to reconnect, tracing a continuous braid between being and becoming.

Yet, even if a twist or spiral is a good model for the dimensions of change, since the three dimensions do not have any absolute correspondence with the dimensions of any given dimensions of space, time, or motion, what is linear motion in space or time to one might be an oscillatory motion to another. What is a stable particle of matter to you might be a wave of changing energy to someone else depending on the frame.

What they all are is an abstracted dimension of change, but a change of what? The idea of a fundamental particle is misleading, but so is a fundamental wave if one thinks of it as just moving in a space like a discrete object, for a wave is a motion *of* something. Yet it is not just a kind of motion, but an image of the continuity and reciprocity of *all motion*.

Waves are closely associated with energy because, like energy, they are not discrete entities at all, but rather what moves in and through them. They reflect the interplay of difference and resonance, polarization and equalization, processes that complexify and distribute symmetry, embodying the relativity and simultaneity of potential and activity. This dynamic tension is what underlies the formation of all distinct things and events. Consequently, understanding waves is the vital key to bringing things into harmony.

10. Waves Upon Waves

“The world is the infinite curve that touches at an infinity of points an infinity of curves, the curve with a unique variable, the convergent series of all series” -Gilles Deleuze[67]

The full polarizing and equalizing of all things swirling around each other in *infinite variations* is a bit hard to visualize, but that infinity is tamed and made meaningful by the fact that things are not discrete entities that need infinitely other arbitrary realities to play out each variation of every possible material relation. There need not be an entire alternative reality where you wore different color socks today.

While all meaningful differences have a reality, your sock color might not qualify. If it does, then your *supposed* choice still might not be as world-defining as you may think. It was inevitably linked to and conditioned by other factors, reducing the infinity of worlds with arbitrarily different details down to a less discretely defined infinity of meaningfully related, overlapping, and interacting structures.

This interactivity makes the day you actually wear those socks potentially more meaningful. Perhaps the sock color will resonate with some change in the color of your friend’s mood, perhaps incorporating in different forms all those life changing repercussions that were lost when you wore lamer socks. The so-called alternate reality then emerged in this one after all.

This is not to say there are no other realities; it is just to say that their infinity is structured by their interrelation. The fork in the road may have split realities, but the interrelations are preserved and are sure to come back around in some form.

This is the nature of light waves, not as probabilities collapsing into the definitive form of matter as modern physics has often interpreted them, but as waves upon waves interfering—and by interfering they create the distinct systems and realities that are, nonetheless, part of a larger array of waves forever circulating and redistributing symmetry.

The classical image of a wave often relegates them to the mere motion of particles or of some primary substantial medium, an image not really improved by modern ideas of a deeper medium of mere possibilities. Both concepts obfuscate the essential insight that every non-idealized wave is always already an interference of waves.

To understand why this is the case, think of a single continuous wave train extended forever in both directions. This is an abstraction: it lacks not only a beginning or end but also a distinct rhythm unless a reference framework of space and time establishes a standard. This framework defines the stage or “phase*”* of the wave at any given point, ensuring that the oscillations can be meaningfully located and related.

This concept of *phase*, however, functions on another level: locally it refers to the position within the wave's repeating cycle, but this depends on a globally uniform underlying standard that extends across the entire wave and in a sense extracts or “entrains” its distinct regularity.

This extended *phase-reference* can seem as if it moves along with the wave train, much like the moon appearing to follow a traveler on a highway. However, like the moon following you, this is an illusion. Phase, like the moon, is a reference precisely because its stability is nonlocal enough to persist through any local change.

It is a reference not in the sense that it tells you whether you are moving or not (the moon doesn't shift when you move or stop like a close object would), but in the sense that it can serve as a backdrop, against which the shifting positions and rhythms of nearer motions can be compared, coordinated, and brought into relation.

In this way, the phase reference is not simply another point in motion, but the stable counterpart in a reciprocal pairing: a coherence spread widely enough to traverse and organize a changing field without being undone by it. In terms of waves, it not only creates a coherent frequency across a wave's cycles, it allows multiple waves to find resonance across distance.

However, to truly be a truly ubiquitous or nonlocal standard, such a reference must act like some infinitely distant point, and this necessitates that any wave or rhythm it defines is also infinite in the sense of being a frequency without beginning or end.

For as soon as a wave has a definite length, it can be shown that its phase reference is no longer singular or continuous, but distributed across a superposition of component frequencies. Furthermore, the shorter the length or *more localized the wave* is made, the *more component frequencies* are required. In other words, something becomes *increasingly non-localized in the abstract space of definite rhythms* as it becomes more localized in space and time, as the waves and matter we know always are.

In this sense, localization introduces not just spectral spread but a kind of *referential ambiguity*: the wave's phase is no longer anchored to a single coherent standard but becomes a composite of interfering partial references, each nested in a broader structure.

While an abstract ideal of phase coherence and definite frequency can be assumed in practical cases, real waves begin and end—and with boundaries comes the infinite structure of relation. Phase, then, is never an absolute. It is always already a relation between changes. Every seemingly steady wave is carried by another, which in turn depends on another for its orientation, and so on, in an infinite cascade of embedded reference frames and *carrier waves*.

In this infinite regression of nested rhythms, no wave or reference frame is truly fundamental. Every oscillation borrows its coherence from a larger interference pattern. Particles and waves of motion traveling through them, like in water waves, are all secondary waves upon waves, with particles being like compound vortices resulting from the interference of waves upon a more primary ocean of waves—or at least of other changes. But what is this ocean of infinite change?

While physics dispensed with the idea of a material medium or aether, and has replaced it with various abstractions, what is not often clear is that the medium is not simply some

higher-dimensional, curved, or folded space, nor is it just some virtual vacuum or quasi-space of possibilities underlying our own. It is a continuum of more or less interpenetrating changes—in other words, *varying densities of change*—all structured relative to and nested within each other.

These changes, when abstracted out of their continuum and given spatial and temporal dimensions, will carry with them distinct proportional connections to other changes in their relational environment, all relative to other relations which abstract them.

While the continuum itself has no inherent measure, it does have distinct “neighborhoods” (as mathematicians sometimes characterize these “topological” spaces). A topological neighborhood is essentially a relatively ordered series or relational pattern. It can impose discrete divisions as it becomes abstracted out and inserted between—or rather folded into—others, as in the contexts of spatial directions, angles, and distances.

Consequently, what might be in the same neighborhood in a “space” less determined by simple quantitative distances, might be far away in the normal space we are familiar with. This means that standard concepts of “faster than light” used to describe non-local correlations, don’t usually explain anything or grasp the issue—hence Einstein’s “spooky action at a distance”.

He didn’t have the answer, nor has anyone else had a clue without first seeing that any wave of change is more than a simple object emitted from a source to a distant sink. No matter what the speed, medium, or proposed mechanism, all waves are waves upon waves, changes of change ad infinitum, with none fundamental except those taken as so to frame our reality.

The distinct domains we see as matter interferes with and is illuminated by light are a kind of local bubble of time-lags and heterogeneous spatial distributions in an otherwise simultaneous creation and distance-negating mediation of difference. But how or why is this simultaneous continuum always being translated into changing distances in space and time?

One can imagine why segmented domains of difference through distance are a necessity built into an infinite universe where all things exchange in instantaneous and ubiquitous reciprocity—for to paradoxically have both such universal symmetry as well as infinity implies finite modes that can express the differential structure within the infinite unity. The differential structure of finite form and its triadic mediation serves as the texture and engine of gradients that fuels the infinite’s rich relational intensity with explicit difference.

The infinite form arising from all these relations, however, cannot be grasped or represented, only implied through connections strewn across space and time, never being completely realized from any one spatialized point of view.

From within any perspectival space, it is the loss or gain of reciprocal coherence with one’s relational environment that necessitates the shifting distances of space and time, and this is inevitable for any particular reference or limited perspective.

While in the case of the ideal of perfect coherence, a reciprocal symmetry of exchange is distributed down and into an infinite level of resolution. It has no need for space or time because every possible distance is dense with the rhythms of return and the image of the all.

The *infinite inside reflects the infinite outside*, and all is one, which could still be said even within the variegated but ideally reciprocal structures of the infinite. Yet within space and time—or a mind attached to their categories and limitations—this perfect symmetry of difference in unity would be reduced to a featureless void.

The perfection of coherent reciprocal relation, however, can be approached through integrating the disparate threads and frequencies of space and time into a more balanced embodiment. This has long been the goal of advanced spiritual practice, one aiming beyond mere transcendence and into ever-higher integration and energetic density.

To better picture the ideal and its embodied relations, one could idealize it with the basic terms of space and time as a mirror-like symmetry and equality of relation—a balanced motion where two aspects, or something and its world, exist in perfect and instantaneous reciprocity. Like two things circling each other in an endless perfect circle: as “A” acts on or “pushes” into “B,” B is simultaneously circling back around and pushing into A, and so on.

At no “moment in time” is there any measurable difference between the two, so not only is the medium, frame, or reference pure unity, all elements are equal to this unity, so A=B=1. One could of course say that within this spatio-temporal analogy their mutual rotation establishes a 180-degree phase difference since the two elements are pictured from some perspective that differentiates definite, assumedly opposed positions within the space and time of the circle and cycle.

But this is just a by-product of using a spatial circle and temporal cycle to illustrate a relation where space and time are besides the point. The point is that any difference in the phase of the process is inconsequential because the mutual motion is continuously and internally balanced.

No separate propagating wave—no interference or phase lag—emerges because the only “wave” is a circular motion of instantaneous reciprocity. There is no context that would distinguish between who is influencing who, and all influence remains self-contained rather than radiating as an external disturbance.

At this level, both things, both aspects, even the representations here of space and time, are a quintessential picture of the same balanced and unified relation: they are all the same circle. Even if one labels the two differently, space and time have no separate meaning. The ratio between the aspects cannot help but be equal to one (A/B=B/A=1) because they are both the same one (A=B=1).

In this context, reciprocity takes the form of perfect uniform equality; there are no differences between things—or between space and time—that can impose limits on one another as they

would in any real world motion. In any real space or time there would arise a difference between the two brought about through a third factor—a reference that would make their now variable relation into a definite ratio, like what is often called speed or velocity (space/time).

In other words, as soon as ideal reciprocity is placed within a particular mediating context, locality and inequality can emerge. A, for instance, might appear greater than B from a particular reference or spatial perspective intervening on the basic reciprocal unity. To compensate, B must adjust within a heterogeneous structure of time to preserve overall unity.

The moment some perspective fixes itself in distinction, one aspect of the ratio is privileged, entangled, or in some sense dragged with the perspective through interference. This "normalizes" one aspect's circulation as a fixed background reference against which the other varies.

Unity becomes deferred and distributed as happens in our perceived world through the *relations of space to the constant of a uniformly ticking time*—in other words, *velocity relations* that now must form some kind of distribution of reciprocity through the structure of relative motion.

Basically, once a particular perspective or external reference emerges, distinguishing now between space (s) and time (s) as qualitatively different aspects, their unity is no longer within view so their reciprocity is no longer a uniform reflection symbolized by s=t=1.

It becomes now a structured relation—one in which it is this spatio-temporal relational structure that mediates and maintains unity. This means that from some point of view, even if still conceiving of space and time as a unified overall structure, this unity is now only so as a product of a relation, not as an essential identity (s=t=1), the options for their product relation to unity being either st=1 or s/t=1 (or t/s=1).

Each of these options has a truth and sense, but what is most important is that while time and space can vary locally, their overall product is unity (st=1). However, when they do vary locally, because space is only a specific magnitude in relation to time (s/t) and time to space (t/s), this means the balance within the structure of space and time is one where any specific velocity or ratio of space to time (s/t) is compensated by an inverse relation of time to space (t/s), so that (s/t)(t/s)=1.

Furthermore, this equation gives rise to the idea that the unity of space and time is not only a global product over all magnitudes (s/t)(t/s) = 1, but can also be expressed in moments where the relative ratio of space to time is equal to that of time to space (s/t = t/s = 1).

These moments of instantaneous reciprocal balance are not distinct from the overall product unity, but are local manifestations of it—points where the relational symmetry between space and time becomes exact and mutually self-reflective.

This, of course, leads to the question: if velocity is just a space to time ratio (s/t), is there some special speed in nature where this unity comes together (s/t=1)? There are many reasons to think that this is what is called the speed of light, which will be discussed below. But what would all this even mean?

For starters, if the preceding were indeed the case, it would mean that an increase in space is the same as a decrease in time, since in speeds other than light they are not equal, but inverses, making s=1/t, and t=1/s.

Yet what about the above indication that whenever the proportion of space to time is less than one, as in less than light speed, then the proportion of time to space linked to this speed will be equally greater than one, so that their product always maintains unity: (s/t)(t/s)=1. What does *this* mean?

One implication is that space and time as our species sees them are contextually defined aspects that manifest as inverses of each other, and this inverse proportionality preserves a greater unity by always acting as a mutual constraint between aspects.

They define each other in a way that ensures any deviation from balance in one aspect is offset by a complementary adjustment in the other. In other words, the change in one aspect (A) multiplied by the change in the other (B) always equals one (AB=1).

One could generalize this as a *model for all relations*, where the unique relation of and between two things and to the rest of existence is rendered as an inversely proportional relation to unity, where the infinite process of A times the infinity of B—which is an inverse of A—cancel out to the unity of one.

Multiplication is the essential operation of relations because all things are essentially processes. Even in finite terms multiplication implies a combination of not mere end-products, as in addition, but of the whole series: AB=C where C is the whole process of A cycled B times, or B cycled A times.

Yet the third element C remains simply the number one as long as it represents the whole context of possible reciprocity—that is, if A and B are not seen as discrete things with merely localized relations, but, like space and time themselves, as reciprocally-defined aspects within a larger continuum *spanning all existence*, or all space and time. But why would *every relation* fit this mold? Why is every relation necessarily a *reciprocal* in this infinite context?

Because in an all-encompassing continuum, every distinction arises as a unique but relative deviation from the unity which is light, so every relation is fundamentally a relation to the whole: each thing confronts its inverse reflection through the whole of existence. However, as things become or are seen as more finite and discrete, where the passage of time becomes fixed, and only spatial magnitudes become the concern, this reciprocity is obscured.

Still, with the right eyes, it can be found even in the static forms of geometry. In the Pythagorean theorem ($a^2+b^2=c^2$), for instance, the more metaphorical form of the reciprocal triad discussed so far is echoed, in this case, through the measurably distributed geometry of tri-angles.

This echo is especially illuminating when angle degrees are conceived as representing the proportions or phases of the all important circle and cycle of unity discussed above. This is pretty straightforward since a distribution of the 180-degree phase opposition (which already split the 360 degree circle) into the three angles of a right triangle is what underlies the theorem's coordination of spatial distances, and what forces them into a distinct proportional form.

Along these lines, the Pythagorean theorem could be seen as integrating discrete spatial magnitudes back into triadic multiplicative proportionality through the phase-structure of angular relations. And by turning up in various forms all over foundational science, the Pythagorean theorem reveals the supreme importance of the right angle to measurable reality.

It suggests how orthogonality mediates between, on the one hand, the abstract reciprocity of light—or the whole of space and time—and on the other, a particular context of discrete spatial relations.

Indeed, the right angle, the most basic angular relation after the opposition, takes this line that defines an essential distinction or oppositional symmetry, and turns it into both a diagonal ground and a product of specific orthogonal relations like that between so-called electric and magnetic fields. By doing so it triangulates a space upon which all measurable magnitudes and their linear combinations play.

While the opposition or inversion (a 180 degree difference in phase) is the most fundamental distribution of symmetry—marking the inherent opposites of spatiality (like in v.s. out) and spatially rendering the reflective symmetry of light's essential reciprocity, without another break or differentiation in the mirror, the symmetry remains quite abstract and sterile.

Like a generic distinction between foreground and background space—or a simple oscillation in time lacking modulation—a 180 degree difference just renders the abstract circle or cycle into one of immediately reciprocal relations, as discussed above: it merely illustrates the primary symmetry of the medium in terms of a unified space and time.

It does not, however, distinguish it from or with a particular reference frame. Consequently, duality cannot richly distribute symmetry or relay it through the variations of time, not without further differentiation and triadic relations.

To generate a structure and hence a world of waves, there must be more than a back-and-forth, or a background and foreground; there must be an interference of interferences mediating each other through others—a diagonal tension mediating between other vectors and proportions of change.

While the circle alone merely defines a continuous symmetry, and an opposition, its infinitely extendable inversions and reflections, the introduction of the right angle carves out an interior within that continuity. It establishes a relational frame where regimes of divergence and convergence can meaningfully interact and embed.

Rather than merely mirroring across an axis, orthogonality introduces a distinct asymmetry that allows tensions to relate and resolve into new configurations. In this way, the line of every relation or distinction is no longer an inevitable and featureless circle, and the circle is no longer a flat loop of repetition. They become the infinite spiralling curve of curves—a dynamic ground from which resonance, recurrence, and emergence can coherently unfold.

In this light, the importance of the Pythagorean theorem in science speaks to how an idealized background of angular connections distribute and mediate interacting reciprocities, a process that underlies discrete quantities prior to any mere additive relations.

The discrete is not a departure from multiplicative unity but its projection into a metric field: $a^2+b^2=c^2$ suggest how this is the case, with the squares implying that each discrete magnitude is not just a thing in space but a cycle in time, a kind of internal self-relation of temporal symmetry. Meanwhile, their sum manifests the structural balance of distinct aspects within a common whole taken as a triadic relation of interacting processes.

This prepares the way for a deeper notion of unity—one that, in the form of C^2, will be discussed below as it arises in Einstein's equation, not (like it is usually explained) as an arbitrary constant, but as a beautifully inevitable structuring principle behind energy, motion, and the varying ratio of space to time.

Such principles can illuminate how all varying speeds and angles can be seen as combinations and modulations of a fundamental reciprocity, where local conditions introduce variations that redistribute the structure of underlying balance in a way relative to the relations of each trajectory.

But no matter how these relations manifest, they remain bound by the same underlying idea: every distinction implies its complement, and every departure from unity carries within it the structure that restores it.

Once again, every relation implies three terms: where an other mediates one's relation with an all whose unity becomes a structured confrontation *through* each and all. Multiplication can express this triadic reciprocity as AB=C, and at the limit where the whole is self-balancing, C=1. Thus, things may not balance out between two discrete things within any limited space or time, but that balance is always implied within the greater whole.

Space and time—or any two things as they relate to each other as patterns *given the whole of space and time*—are inverse reflections of a greater unity structured through the orthogonality of

finite spaces and their relations through time. And without this finititude, they would be little more than a uniformly symmetrical opposition—in other words, meaningless inversions reflecting a selfsame unity.

Nonetheless, all relations are essentially a self relation—one that becomes a seeming duality of reciprocal constraint. This appearance is due to the polarity inherent to the nature of distinct relations and the process of their expression, extrapolation, and extension into each other. This polarity makes the other my reflection and the portal of my pattern into the greater universe.

Although relations can often seem to devolve to the level of isolated quantities and their linear accumulations, when properly understood, they never merely accumulate or diminish other relations spatially or arithmetically. Since they ultimately imply a reciprocity where all meaningful operations ultimately preserve unity, their true interaction is seen in their infinitely distributable combination and multiplication, since this will ultimately reflect their mutual reciprocity: $(A/B)(B/A)=1$.

Thus, the perfect circle of balanced motion becomes an infinite spiral of spiraling interactions, as shifting local spaces and temporal compensations structure the dynamics of reality. These shifting structures are where waves come in—not essentially as discrete carriers of disruption and equilibration, but as the very process by which an indestructible coherence sustains itself through change.

As the abstract circulation of unity is made to wind through the weft and warp of difference as space and time, waves emerge as the shape of its distribution. Every wave of change propagates not just as a passing force or disturbance, but as part of a self-adjusting interplay, where even centrifugal dispersion is just a shift between arcs in the continuous cycles of stable or centripetal coherence, cycles that are always working towards an ever-denser incorporation and interpenetration of other cycles.

Even as motion seems to scatter outward into disconnection, a deeper continuity persists: every shift away from or breakdown in some dynamic equilibrium is met with or being carried by a motion that is integrating the change into another as part of a larger rhythmic structure.

Incoherent collisions may seem to disperse energy—symbolized most essentially by our common conception of the light wave as an outwardly propagating ripple. However, even within a single slice of space and time, coherent motion is in the process of organizing and balancing light's seeming diffusion.

For instance, a relatively coherent system can attempt to balance any bombardment internally, if not through coherent combination then through structured oscillation. If these are not possible, it passes along or pressures the ripples of mediating tension into a broader arc or different system.

Either way, space and time are always balancing each other through their infinite domains of exchange, a balance that already exists as a simultaneous equality on higher levels of coherence. Without that balance in view, there is always some kind of pressure manifesting as the curvature of coherent mediation.

Circular movement is just an expression of (and mediation between) regimes of centripetal pressure. Even the most explosive and destructive dispersion is due to a coherent and consolidating unity rerouting but preserving every change. It is cycling every disturbance until they become better integrated into more *intensive*—and sometimes less spatially extensive—systems.

The ideal, however, is not the final elimination of space and time or any static consummation of reconciled oppositions, but rather in an ever-wider incorporation of systems into an ever-more intense overlay.

The infinity of extensive systems means that there is always a tension between what has been integrated and internalized and what has yet to be. Even seemingly simple and static materials are built of this tension and can never reconcile the essential incommensurability that fuels their whirl, dependent as matter is on some larger flow or differential gradient.

Matter bears an inherent incommensurability because it is born of a tension between inward and outward coherence—between the centripetal momentum each bit of matter has achieved to cohere its own structure and the arcs of the various scales of space that express that structure through its interference with others.

Even in the case of superconductive materials and fields, which can dynamically repel conflicting external influence and achieve a high degree of internal coherence, at their essence they are still a dependent interference so they cannot achieve perfect or final unity within their separate being.

All this reinforces that, because the stability of any self or substance exists only through its relations to others and to change, the medium for change *cannot be an unchanging being or inert substance*. Likewise, there can be no absolutely distinct or immobile medium for physical motion—wave motion or otherwise.

11. The Relational Geometry of Light

“Every electrically conditioned thing in Nature reflects the vibrations of every other thing...All matter is the motion of light. All motion is expressed in waves. All light waves are mirrors which reflect each other's condition unto the farthermost star.” -Walter Russell[68]

The true medium for motion, as for all things, is not an independent substance but the interplay of other things and their changing relations. In our physical world this means infinite space and time contracted into the dynamic field of relative contrasts that every motion

inhabits—a shifting balance of differences, where each part frames and is framed by every other.

Any particular reference frame, then, is never the whole medium. It is just its trace—a lingering sign of the diagonal cut that links discrete local things with the nonlocal across an orthogonal relation. A frame just gives a provisional balance of flows—a symmetry of asymmetries stable enough to compare motions and abstract a stable distribution of movements from the ocean of relations whose coherence never rests in one frame, but in their infinitely rapid and interpenetrating triangulation.

For the coherent distribution required for the appearance of local motions to even arise, the infinity of possible relations must be first narrowed down, and in terms of motion, this means that many waves of change must effectively cancel out or settle into a specific circulating structure to serve as a stable reference for other motion.

This isn't simply some top-down primordial descent from the abstract to the particular but an ongoing participatory process, a co-created reality where any local motion must form a stable symmetry by selecting or harmonizing with a certain background pattern of related changes in order to organize itself and its world of motion.

While this demand for symmetry imposes limits, determining what stays the same through what changes, because this is only a variable equality and not a transcendent law, its distribution, conditions, and interpretations can be arranged and extrapolated in endlessly creative ways and "fields".

One can talk about this process of establishing rhythmic or "phase" coherence in many ways that will be explored below. For now, it is enough to note that the diversity of its descriptions—and the frequent conflations of waves, frames, and mediums—arises because the more or less stable structure of "fields" or phase relations is never directly "seen" in itself.

What we experience are its signs, which stand in for a deeper and essentially ungraspable continuum of interfering waves, markers for both its steady rhythms, as well as its morphing structure. Any such signs or markers are only provisional handles on an infinite regress of nested circulations or reference frames, each using another as its background of assumed coherence.

One notable local sign of this is seen when an "electrical charge" is introduced into a "magnetic field". Here novel change forces a redistribution between the localized displacements of charge and the continuously circulating movements of the larger medium that frame its movement; together they unfold as the waves of light we call "electromagnetism".

It is easy to see how, just as in astrology, where a planetary position becomes a sign for an unseen web of cycles and resonances but is often mistaken for a universal or causal force, not only can background patterns be mistaken for *the* underlying medium, without a coherent frame on the medium of relations, its effects can be confused or reified as independent forces.

Too often, the changing signs of rhythmic relations can be taken as a product of some special field, as in the magnetic field, which is seldom understood as a specific local trace of circulating symmetries that make local motion possible, symmetries that only get attention as they adjust to the local trajectory with so-called magnetic effects.

More obvious phase points like the moon analogy, or the horizon line—or the looping circumference of spatial extension itself—being commonly and explicitly conceptualized as distant or abstract symmetries, are easily seen as relative or even relational effects of motion.

It is clear in these cases that having a high level of distance or abstraction doesn't make them a universal reference or medium. While the great distance of the moon in the sky when you are driving makes it appear to move with you—most notably, even when it is at a right angle to your motion—the moon is obviously not the whole medium of space but a persistent phase marker within it.

It is far enough removed from local turbulence to serve as a steady point of comparison, yet still only one stable pattern among countless others that together compose the true, endless medium.

In this way, space as it is experienced is also a reciprocally structured reference effect within the infinite medium. In this vein as an idealized reference horizon, it can be pictured as offering a contrast of orthogonal structure to any local motion.

Consequently, this right-angle relation to a larger reference structure is inherent to all linear motion, for all linear motion is a modification (or further differentiation) of the larger phase angles of the 180-degree opposition and the 360-degree circle and cycle of all time.

Picture the long front of a breaking ocean wave, parallel to the beach yet orthogonal to the direction in which the wave advances toward shore. The right angle of contrast here as in space itself defines not just some abstract model of an arbitrarily defined container of dimensions that frame motion, but the phase relation between every motion and the tension of existing contrasts from which it emerges.

When you make a wave in the water, the medium does more than pass along the lengthwise push of your hand. The water's own tensions create an orthogonal wavefront that extends beyond your motion, as if the medium insists on framing the disturbance in a larger pattern.

The hand supplies momentum, but the wavefront supplies coherence. Together they form two bound aspects of motion within the medium, which itself belongs to the infinite medium of nature. The persistence of the front traveling with the wave is a sign of deeper symmetries, interferences, and recursions that reach beyond what is visible.

What looks like a simple linear motion is never reducible to a forward trajectory or to its orthogonal pattern of reference. Picturing the diagonal that arises from their mutual alignment and tension helps represent the larger movement.

Yet this relation is not a mere isolated integration of idealized lines, since they are always, in a sense, infinitely embedded within and complicated by others, curving every directional line into mutual modulation. Their orthogonality bends, beats, and interferes, producing wake-like perturbations, as when vortices peel away from a hand moving in water. Light behaves in a similar fashion: its oscillations unfold at right angles to its propagation, and that propagation of energy itself stands at right angles to a larger phase front, each level nesting within another.

While real world interference further complicates this ideal order, making it less like a crystalline fractal and more like a living pattern that is always reforming, spilling over, and carrying coherence beyond itself. Mainstream physics simply reduces this complexity to a mathematical artifact. Because phase can be pictured as simply “riding along” with the oscillation of a wave, it is treated as secondary, almost imaginary, while the “photon” is elevated to the primary unit of light.

But the photon is only conceivable if one presumes a fixed phase, as if the diagonal of wave relations could be frozen into a straight particle-trajectory. In this way the photon covers over the infinite regress of phase, reducing a relational structure to an idol of mere statistical certainty. The result is endless contradiction: a “particle” that behaves like a wave, a “wave” that must be counted as a particle—an idol meant to anchor what is in fact only ever an ongoing alignment of relations.

And like any idol, it becomes a mere arbitrary constant as the provisional reasons for its structure fade. The constancy of light speed, for instance, would appear to naturally arise if phase was given its proper due. For it is both the local tick and a sign of the universal rhythm, the true anchor of all measures perhaps, but an anchor of reciprocal relations, not paradoxical units.

Even in its role as the “flow of energy” in an electromagnetic wave—that is, as the line orthogonal to both electric and magnetic oscillations—it is treated as if it is an unimportant by-product of the other two. This has led to a majority of even educated people thinking that energy “flows through the wires” of a circuit along with flowing charges, when it clearly is orthogonal, making it delivered through a larger field meditation.

The bigger picture is always one of nested modifications of relatively propagating—even if often interfering and cancelling—coherences. One can picture an idealized diagonal cutting through and connecting all nested spiraling wave modifications, but this ideal line is really a curve of curves.

One has to remove all conventional notions of light and its path as defined by a particle or particle-like trajectory of linear motion which assumes a fixed phase of rectilinear reference.

When light is no longer a “photon” shuttling through space but the continual alignment of phase relations, then it becomes curve of curves by which nonlocal coherence gives itself as local form. The analogy to the hypotenuse of a right triangle still holds in the sense that light binds every orthogonal pair into one integrated motion, channeling the coherence of the medium.

To get a better picture of how these orthogonal pairs show up as the electromagnetic aspects of a wave, picture some coherent circulation or flow is diverted by the structure of other flows, creating a pressure on both as the force of the interference is mediated and carried along by the greater pressure gradient attempting to equalize them.

Putting the photon concept aside, the light *wave* is often modeled as two orthogonal sine waves meant to represent a swing in the electric and magnetic fields that moves like a propagating oscillation. Modeled like this, each successive phase appears to reverse direction like a series of discrete modifications spurred by the interaction of the two ultimately united but apparently idiosyncratic fields.

However, what unfolds is more accurately thought of as a structured sequence of tension redistributions between spatially extended systems of equalizing pressure, where every oscillation represents a local mediation of larger structural adjustments in the geometry of pressure.

The electric component marks the release of tension from lost coherence—a radial descent of pressure shaped by the structure of intervening gradients—while the magnetic component reflects the dynamic flux of that structure as it works to redistribute and stabilize the imbalance.

What flips at each point in space is not a local reaction to a discrete emission, but a pre-adjusted realignment of tension vectors translating larger phase transformations into local structures. This was more or less locked into place by the phase rhythm established at emission. Each reversal is a necessary turn in the spiral propagation that preserves continuity across the wavefront. Each crest and trough is the expression of how surrounding motions have adjusted to preserve balance across a phase-defined frame.

As with any wave, the phase-wave of light seems to travel with the electric and magnetic fields as both their carrier and their consequence. Though light appears to move through space, what truly propagates is the ongoing recombination of phase relations across a network of motion.

Light waves are not merely a medium or a signal, but the active expression of a coherence that arises through the interference of asymmetrical flows. In this sense, light is not a thing moving, nor a field being disturbed.

It is the very resonance generated when one mode of relation is drawn into proportion with its counterpart—when two directions, each driven toward unity, but through interference determining a distinct infinity, become momentarily bound in a shared interval.

This alignment does not unify by erasing contrast, but by preserving the tension within it. The so-called motion of light, then, is the trace of its higher-order reciprocity—not a merger of opposites, but their coordinated dissonance, a projection of the unified space-time reciprocity into the structure of space and time.

Just as a musical interval preserves the difference between tones while revealing a harmony they together produce, light reveals the measure between relational poles—each differently defined yet bound within a shared frame of transformation.

What makes this relation appear “law-like” is not its static structure but its reproducibility: it is the reliable signature of differential systems attempting to equalize across incompatible gradients. In this way, light waves are the visible tip of an ongoing and deeper negotiation between matter’s tendency to localize and phase’s tendency to globalize, an electric release made through contrasting movements, pressures and tensions, and the magnetic preservation of those through the light of the electrical transformation.

The seemingly straight line of a beam is thus a slice through spirals of reciprocal constraint—an active path that marks the balance between divergence and entanglement, between the finite expression and the infinite continuum from which it springs.

Each point in space doesn't simply pass along the wave—it actively adjusts to the level of coherence forged between a “source” and “sink”. These sources and sinks of light, however, need not be recognizable matter since any scale of interference can create them. In every case, light waves advance as a chain of reconciliations, a recursive knitting of phase into form until tensions are resolved—absorbed, redirected, or harmonized—in a coherent interaction.

When coherence is achieved—whether abruptly in matter, or gradually through wider dispersal—the process seems to conclude. In this sense, the "sink" is not an endpoint but a condition: the structural sufficiency of space to assimilate, neutralize, or transform the tension into a new mode of order.

Again, physics talks about the photon or “energy flow” as the thread of this process: a transmission of coherence woven orthogonally through the electric and magnetic interplay, extending the new order into surrounding structures.

Students are told to orthogonally align their first three fingers to represent the three vectors. Yet the extended shape of mutual transformation is never set in motion through the mind, making any intuition of this triadic structure as the geometry of our reciprocal reality unlikely.

Admittedly, this phase, this energy flow, *this coherence of motion*, can seem quite derivative and passive compared to what is recognized as the actual waves of novel change. Yet it must be remembered that this reference motion is distributing the perfect circle of reciprocal rotation (embodied in the closed loop of an equal relation) into and through the variegated field of colliding things in space and time.

These movements are never passive carriers for the “real” waves; they are the coherence that is always actively forming them even as they are formed by them. It can be helpful to call them *longitudinal* waves because, like the common longitudinal wave in air we call sound, the change is directed along the same direction that the wave travels.

This is contrasted with the orthogonal or *transverse* wave or rather aspect of the wave—those familiar up-and-down or side-to-side oscillations moving perpendicular to the direction of propagation, as seen in water or the standard depiction of light.

This terminology does tend to make so-called longitudinal waves more mysterious or abstract. However, they are actually the abstract circle of balanced reciprocity that is differentiated through contrast; they are, therefore, not a particular kind of wave but the essence of all waves and motion.

While it is true that—depending on one’s point of view, if one acknowledges them as real at all—in effect they seem to have a distinct action of either pushing *or pulling* things through or into circulating and centripetal systems.

But because they express the continuity of motion, this is not a primary push of force in space but its attempted negation—a movement against all separation that only becomes a push in conflict with others or a circle in modulation.

It is the essentially reciprocal momentum of the universe diverted from instantaneity by the clash of force into the spiral mediation of all other waves. The longitudinal wave label is apt because it serves as a contrasting carrier wave upon which other waves ride. As the phase wave of other waves, they also, in some sense, carry the distribution of the structure of all waves along a line that is always, given enough space and time, an arc of or into some rotation or spiral connecting regimes of rhythms to an ever-denser reciprocal equality.

This is the more essential dimension of waves because it better represents the circular or reciprocal momentum of every change, even novel change, since the new is simply a convergence of momentum. Novel change, when not harmonized within coherent contexts, coincides with some clash of momentum producing force; so while it is still part of a larger continuity, it also creates a local oscillating disturbance more or less perpendicular to a larger arc through their mediation.

Such interference and changing entropy compounds and leads to other such encounters, creating infinitely nested and twisting adjustments. One might better see now how the common model of light as propagating flat orthogonal sine waves obscures the relational geometry at work.

The sine waves are meant to represent rising and falling magnitudes and their direction, but it is better to try to picture and even feel the oscillating pressure and tension moving and reaching

through a network of such pressures and tensions extending out in all directions, even if the initial direction of an oscillation can sometimes be simply polarized.

Everywhere, small cycles meet or are produced by the flow of larger ones—like whirlpools within a river, which is itself within the biosphere's circulating water cycle. These cycles create a twisting cascade that is always spiraling things around into the most stable systems.

And since every wave exists only in relation—since it is not a thing moving through a fixed medium, but a difference in motion between overlapping or interfering systems—wave propagation is more accurately depicted as the expression of reciprocity within a field of interactions. What looks like a direction of motion is only a relative contrast within a broader system of circulation.

If all motion were perfectly coherent—purely longitudinal, perfectly aligned along a shared arc—then all interaction would collapse into unity, or into phase-harmonized reciprocal in/out exchanges: dense vortical centers, perfectly interknit without—at the highest end of coherence—any need for dispersed spatial extension.

There would be no separating spirals, no divergence of planes—only a dance of nested reciprocities folding back into one another—no gaps, no apparent distance, no external diversity, only infinitely different gradients of relational intensity.

But as soon as one direction of coherence does not immediately align with another—when the arcs of rotation conflict or the systems they belong to diverge—then transverse distinctions emerge—not as fundamentally different waves, but as the orthogonal expression of that divergence: a side-step oscillation relative to an underlying longitudinal drive towards unity or expressing continuity.

In this way, both the transverse/longitudinal distinction and the electricity/magnetism distinction are relative in the sense that they are all the same slide down the slope of equalizing difference. Spiraling motion arises as these pressures conflict and mediate, giving rise to nested incommensurate arcs twisting around one another. Longitudinal coherence intersects with transverse adjustments, and each new imbalance generates a further compensation—a recursive, cascading geometry of relation.

In short: waves become rhythmic dissonances through vortices of coherence, and the spiraling structure of reality arises from the fact that no coherence exists in isolation—it is always held in difference, always curving through relation.

There thus arises a variegated hierarchy of winding and unwinding spirals of more or less linked vortices. Regimes and scales of oscillations, circulations, and spin resonances arise as all systems try to balance what they receive or pass along what they cannot to other systems and levels, much as lovers take on or share the burden of their partner's past when the polarity offers the right match in spin to steady the torrent.

As waves of consolidation or distribution, then, these longitudinal waves do not, at least individually, follow the classical "back-and-forth" longitudinal motion of sound waves resulting from colliding particles. Rather, each wavefront corresponds to either a more or less twisting compression movement, or an untwisting rarefaction movement, as coherently linked rotation is either being internalized into a local system, or it is being redistributed through a larger arc.

The "back-and-forth" motion does emerge, but from opposing directions coupled together, creating a dynamic interplay of push and pull, like springs loading, unloading, and exchanging their power.

As a system's global coherence vectors towards ever-more more intensive—or at least scale-spanning—symmetries of heterogeneous circulation, a change in one becomes increasingly and explicitly an immediate change in others. Yet unlike the timeless reciprocity of an abstract circle, there is *a difference* that returns to the first—*yet unlike the fragmented conception of isolated or additive difference*, there is no end, no center, and no origin to the continuity of true creative difference.

At the most coherent levels, there is both translation (influence) and rotation (return), but fused in such ways that there is no push or pull, no separation between the regimes of coherence like one gets in our universe of coupling and uncoupling spirals of interaction.

While within our still gestating universe, waves of coupling and uncoupling spin form the network upon which the conventionally known and detected light waves ride, and exist with or without explicit detection or interference. However, to reiterate, it should be clear that these "normal" light waves, or "transverse" waves as they are called, are not some radically different or independent phenomena.

Indeed, they emerge quite naturally where the diverse arcs and circuits of continuity must utilize—and in a sense create—a space lateral to their circulation in order to resolve their contrasting torque, or just mediate different scales and directions down a line defined by another arc.

In the context of incoherent motion, that is, from the perspectives of imperfect systems immersed in changing entropy, the rising and falling of fates has an analogue in the transverse light that arises as a required intermediary. Like a rough sea, rising and falling gradients sway perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of more stable circulations, or to the winding or unwinding spins and the vibration between them.

For instance, even as compressions and rarefactions coherently interact, imperfect "phase" matches can cause a ripple down the line of otherwise coherent connection. Even perfect coherence along one line can disrupt related systems and encounter resistance. If this happens, motion must resolve itself in another direction—hence the utility of in some cases thinking of transverse oscillations as a kind of wobble perpendicular to the direction of propagation.

Within a larger structure of coherent systems, however, transverse oscillations can phase-lock into standing wave patterns. They thus preserve a kind of coherence across space even if they can convey resistance and entropy in constrained contexts.

Indeed one can picture the rhythmic dives in a transverse wave as repeated attempts of some system attempting to find its way towards the complementary arc of another more stable circulating system—a recursive search for coherence between incommensurable motions.

Each oscillation of so-called electromagnetic waves reflects the unresolved tension between the relatively longitudinal and transverse components of interference, with magnetism reinforcing the coherence of the intervening spatial motion, forcing the longitudinal inward seeking to adjust as the phenomena we call electricity tries to complete its circuit.

In other words, the wave's persistence—its propagation—is simply the system's recursive attempt to resolve dissonance by reestablishing coherence between different phases of motion. Though again, every localized disturbance still feeds into a greater whole where energy circulates undisturbed in a self-sustaining equilibrium.

In very coherent systems, systems where relational motions are highly rhythmically aligned, "transverse waves" would emerge only as coherently embedded and curved orthogonal structures—paired waves balanced in near simultaneous reciprocity because there would be no resistance or unbalanced interference requiring external redistribution, only circles within and upon circles, or tightly knit spirals within spirals.

An ideally coherent system of life would have motion that propagates as perfectly reciprocal relations, where any long-range circuits only reflect the coherence across scales balanced within difference, thus sustaining overlapping patterns. Yet unlike mere electrical circuits, these require no extraction to sustain them. They don't need to take energy; they tune into it.

In the case of the relatively static but stable coherence of the plant, sunlight is received not through extraction but through growing and storing energy along the gradient of eschewed light. The delay in the gradient caused by its life cycle is a way of holding space for coherence to unfold in time.

Yet ideally this can be done in a more active and immediately distributive way, where a system wouldn't hoard in the sense of holding on more than it gives. Ideally, it is a node in a wider coherence that allows it to store not for itself but as a rhythmic necessity of relational flow—storage and release being part of a larger pulsation. It might still gather from the darkness of decay, but only to release in the light.

An ideally coherent system neither hoards nor consumes, but it can divert to better connect and cohere the chaos. It gathers where there is waste or excess, releases where there is lack, and

remains phase-aligned across the rise and fall of local disorder. Its coherence is not a barrier against chaos but a membrane through which the breath of life can grow.

Energy remains not only internally structured and balanced within the system, but immediately so on all scales, so much so that eventually spatial scale—even space and time itself—would become unnecessary, or rather, increasingly internalized, self-similar, and fractally embedded as it grows the light of life and coherence into the darkness of death and entropy.

Whatever the case, *whatever the extent of coherence*, it is always preserved across systems by structuring interference into phase-aligned adjustments that neutralize any externalized force propagations of electromagnetic waves.

Thus, transverse waves are not an absolute loss of coherence—they are the local expression of how energy resolves itself through a segmented system like our space, which not only has various relative bounds but is completely collapsed into coherence at other levels where the disconnect is already resolved.

The longitudinal component, on the other hand, encodes the deeper structuring of change, balancing motion exchange across a system. Incoherent change may seem to disrupt this balance, requiring a larger context of space and time to play out the necessary compensation, but at another level every change is coherent. Again, incoherence is just motion viewed in isolation, a localized break from a larger structuring framework.

Whether there is the “normal” EM radiation of transverse force detected or not, the waves of light everywhere impart a compression or rarefaction in the space between things as space and time somewhere are either created, negated, or both, even simultaneously—and at some level always so.

Yet, as suggested earlier, this is not so much a contraction or expansion of a substance as much as the creation or negation of relational resonances, or more essentially, *relational intensities,* being translated into the distances of space and time.

Entropy generation (a clockwise direction of twist or “torsion” as it is called) creates space and time, but this is theoretically always negated somewhere else (the counterclockwise direction of torsion in negentropic processes).[69] It is just the local time lag and spatial distribution created by taking an uneven perspective on this conveying of change and equalization that makes the drama of the “physical” universe possible.

To reiterate, with the movements that make up the fundamental medium of our diverse and dramatic reality, the three dimensions of their change are distributed into space and time itself, not as distinct dimensions of either, but as correlated transformations in symmetry across both.

These twisting threads and dimensions of growing and recurring relations are essential to the very possibility of change. That is because they make a vision of change possible that is *free of*

the inevitable conceptual contradictions of fixed substances, as well as from an arithmetical poverty that *reduces the numerical harmonies of mutual transformation into a mere shuffling around of atomistic identities.*

Such reductions and contradictions are inherent to the excessively literal or materially-bound mind, with mere objects in motion in a set container of space and time serving as the most fundamental assumption that blocks understanding the nature of motion and harmonizing the inevitable but relative entropy of unexpected change.

Indeed, the literal mind sabotages itself by assuming these apparent containers, frames, or mediums as *naturalized* background sets for the drama of the universe. For space and time not only expand and contract as mainstream physics has postulated, but, more accurately, one could say that they are being conjured and dispelled constantly in a cosmic economy of more or less shared realities, an economy whose balance sheet manifests as the seemingly stable relations of difference rendered as space, and the changing play between them that necessitate something like time.

The translations, rotations, and twists that reflect the process of every change and its equalization emerge as the waves of influence create patterns of asymmetry and symmetry that can be experienced. Change and the equalized distribution of change give rise to a myriad of centrifugal and centripetal poles, everywhere generating ever-new horizons of space and time *as well as their negation* by the recuperating bounds of every relation's rotation through others.

A never-ending battle (or dance) ensues, all strung between a polarity of ever-renewed inward and outward horizons, a dynamically polarized dance defined by the vortical dynamics that characterize the transformation and redistribution of symmetry.

12. Deconstructing Modern Physics

"When judging a physical theory, I ask myself whether I would have made the Universe in that way had I been God." -Albert Einstein[70]

In light of the preceding, it might become clear why no "thing" can simply travel through force faster than light, because no thing, especially light, is simply traveling through space or time. Indeed, all motion is more essentially a manifestation of space and time's dynamic interplay. However, that being the case, patterns can seem to move faster than light when the space between things itself is changed, or even nullified, allowing for the more fantastical possibilities of science fiction and ufology.

In Einstein's physics, if an object were to approach the speed of light, the energy required to accelerate it increases without bound. In ordinary motion, driven by the push of force, this means burning fuel against the inertia of the frame in which it is embedded—consuming the system itself in the attempt to escape it.

Forced acceleration does not simply overcome resistance; it generates entropy, creating more space and time to be resisted than it could ever hope to master. A rocket striving for light speed would, in principle, have to burn all the matter in the universe as fuel, and still the goal would recede.

However, the issue is not simply a lack of sufficient potential or actual energy to meet the demands of acceleration. For, as discussed, energy is not merely a potential or actual force, but more accurately the structure of something's relations.

Whether that structure is taken as the potential difference between things or this polarity's kinetic release, the energy inherent in a material object's motion reflects its dynamic tension and connection with everything in the universe. Forced acceleration does not effectively eliminate or align these tensions but instead pushes against them in a more or less incoherent way.

It is true that, in Einstein's relativity, the faster an object moves, the more energy it appears to accumulate in its exponentially increasing mass. But as in a rocket, this speed is gained not by harmonizing with its context but by burning fuel, tearing itself into heat, exhaust, and waste. The system consumes itself in order to press forward.

This accumulation is not a true gain of energy through alignments of structured flow, but the build-up of polarized tension. The rocket, for instance, strains against the very inertial frame that carries it. Forced acceleration fights phase itself, as if motion were only a line to be driven harder instead of a reciprocal coordination between movement and its reference.

The result is that the rocket does not escape its frame; it presses into it more violently, folding its effort back as resistance. The faster it forces, the more coherence is lost to entropy, until the demand for fuel would surpass all the matter in the universe.

For motion to become more than a redistribution of energy within a system, it must come not from an attempt to overcome resistance by force, but from joining or creating coherence across frames. Where phase is aligned, speed is no longer a contest against inertia but a harmony and exchange between systems. While coherent motion carries itself in phase, forced motion consumes itself in inertia.

As the object accelerates incoherently, it complicates the structured field of related motion, its entropy causing distortions and lags in space and time as the lines of tension in the region are forced to adjust. The mounting resistance and increasing incoherence only accelerates as speed accelerates. In this state, energy that is merely extracted and turned into linear force—like from burning a chemical fuel—becomes simply bound to the tensions of the object's forced motion.

This doesn't make force a bad thing or incapable of practical change, especialy when coupled to more coherent and intelligent uses. Just as animals need to burn fuel but couple that dissipating gradient to other processes that maintain and even increase coherently organized flows, even in

simple acceleration, coherence can arise if force meets the right counter force and achieves some kind of coherent flow.

While forced acceleration alone cannot escape its oppositional limit and transcend light speed, in most cases that's besides the point. Force can, for instance, propel one enough to find a way to other gradients of differential tension. And while if taken far enough, it may lead to destruction under the strain of force, there is no process of complete energy dissipation or fragmentation, so it is not inherently unproductive.

Forced acceleration can even store potential energy, much like a rubber band stretching, as it pushes against the structured resistance—such as a rocket building gravitational potential energy by ascending against Earth's pull.

In such cases, usable energy is retained even within the surrounding system and can be later recovered as kinetic motion, just as organisms can utilize the entropy of their dissipative and incoherent internal heat as a catalyst at other levels of their organization. Just as a broken clock tell the correct time when rhythms align, so does entropy and heat feed into coherent motion as the scattered motions align with various other gradients and flows.

Yet brute force and its accumulation of resistance, while capable of fueling the more coherent systems to which it is coupled, is severely limited as a means to motion. To avoid some of the contradictions of normal spatial thinking, it can help to think in terms of a kind of geometry called "projective," which describes how perspectives shift and structures transform across different frames of reference.

In this geometry, every trajectory is shaped by its relational context, with lines, limits, and reference frames shifting with perspective. Unlike conventional Euclidean geometry, where parallel lines never meet and motion is measured in absolute distances, projective geometry reveals how motion, scale, and relational structures are interdependent. This allows a view of the precise way trajectories are not isolated but emerge as part of a dynamic system where limits and infinities are context-dependent.

More to the point here, in a geometric view that views motion more as a transformation of relations than an isolated movement, then at a line of movement's contextual limit, it always curves back into a broader relational framework, making even parallel lines converge at some point relative to others.

Escape velocity is then not an escape from limits into an abstract space but a transfer from one regime of motion to another. Without another field to transfer into, there is nowhere for it to escape to. Motion would naturally curve back, as in orbital motion.

Furthermore, not only is it true that the closer the object gets to the speed of light through pushing against this arc, the more it strains the relations that constitute it, but it is also outrunning its ability to reorganize and sustain its internal coherence, since its internal structure

is just modulations of conditional relational arcs that prevent it from breaking free short of destroying itself completely.

The increased entropy, space, and time of this kind of motion mean that, like Achilles attempting to catch up with the tortoise in Zeno's famous paradox, there is no way to catch up with light through the incoherent motion of brute force.

Again one can see limits in the logic of fundamental identities and differences—and any attempt to sustain or expand them without considering their relational frames. Attempts to overcome opposition and constraint through force brings up cliched but valid warnings against defeating violence with violence. Oppositional structures will always remain unless their internal tensions are coherently relayed into another context. This is the true path to increasing speed or energy.

For example, esoteric spiritual practices designed to increase energy depend on this. The body and relations of most people are full of bound up energy, but not much of it available for use since this depends not only on "opening" up these knots, but integrating structure into flows that preserve a geometry of sustainable differential tension.

This is particularly important in spiritual health practices, where the structure of human fascia can help ground the storage and distribution of energy in the body. This is done through linked and fractally embedded cycles which arise when the frequently constrained network of our connective tissues is properly opened and connected.

The process is a microcosm of what happens everywhere. True individuation necessitates not spatial segmentation—since that leads to collapse into the uniformity of entropy—and not only an opening to other flows, but their coherent coordination and self-reflexive incorporation.

At the most basic physical level this means not fighting and even surrendering to inertial motion (think of the lack of force experienced by a body in free-fall acceleration), but also rhythmically aligning with and integrating other structures, scales, and cycles of motion—including surrounding motion—creating a constructive interference of converging dynamics.

To picture all this correctly, first consider the object accelerating through force to the limit: this is more aptly thought of as attempting to outrun the speed of light by becoming a discrete localized infinity—or rather the infinity of a zero-point since its mass supposedly grows in magnitude but also shrinks in size, thus cascading it into the contradiction of an infinite but discrete density.

This is an obvious impossibility and a twisted convolution of the impulse towards not just freedom but increasing energy. True energetic density is about overlapping relations and a convergence of intense connections as one relationally individuates and builds productive polarities with ever more things.

Brute force or motion, on the other hand, exemplifies the contradictory compulsion towards exclusive freedom and power. Meaningful freedom requires *a space of relations* in which to act

and that means the power of coherent cooperation. While coherence and power do not exactly rule out kinds of manipulation, the use of force creates incoherence that embroils one in conflict and must be rectified for there to be any true growth of power or freedom of action.

One could think of this as a kind of physics of karma, where what one ejects or rejects to achieve some speed just creates a circle of eventual return. Burning one's bridges or burning fuel to get ahead will only take you so far before the debt must be repaid.

The abstract line of forceful motion or development against its background context is a mere linear addition that implies a subtraction from somewhere else. It is an inherently dissipative process. Again, a decontextualized line of forceful movement is an abstraction away from its meaningful context into an unreal negative freedom that in reality is always in the process of curving back around.

And whether it is the force of social violence or the fuel-burning processes of life and technology, mere force and consumption are inherently more or less vicious cycles. The cycles of force and counterforce can be constructively arranged to fuel and leverage the power of a greater development, but on their own they cannot help but go in quite limited circles.

A line of force can, however, be used to move to the edge of its entropic environment or to the perimeter of its cyclic dependency. Yet this, in the larger scheme of things, is no pinnacle of power, only the border between regimes that must be cohered from any real—or in other words—multiplicative gain in capacity.

Confronting such a limit, however, may open up the possibility to catch the winds of a greater coherent system of movement. And while some force and incoherence is a necessary part of basic life and movement, understanding its limits is essential to using it correctly to achieve a more sustainable and coherent trajectory.

For instance, even if outrunning the light was possible, if something could actually escape its karma and entropy, its connection to the rest of the universe would disappear through the escalating incoherence that is produced yet not given the time to equalize or reestablish (since this is partially what light speed is about: the speed of this adjustment to the disruption of force).

One could also see this as an attempt to make something—and the nonlocal contexts and energy that defines it—fully local or "present", in the sense that Derrida's deconstruction sought to critique. The implication is that this would have to make the whole universe fully and finally present, negating all time into something's point of space (or at least its point of view on and control of space, another impossibility).

In more metaphysical terms, this attempt to outrun the light could be characterized as a conversion of the distributed power of something's energy and its many contextual dimensions of participation into a completely localized dominion of darkness, where the act of struggling into

the openness of freedom—attempting to break free from “karma” and localize the infinity of connections that make something or someone what they are—cannot help but become a prison.

On the other hand, the ties that bind something to the rest of the universe and prevent matter from reaching light speed, can also act like waveguides, directing the energy of resistance toward greater coherence. Just as the collisions of turbulence in a fluid can, under the right conditions, organize flows into structured vortex motion, resistance in physical systems can serve as a catalyst for organization rather than mere dissipation.

This is implicit in true spiritual practice, where by struggling for freedom and autonomy, one is pushed into conditions that *increase* the resistance they feel, but this ultimately guides them into a unique relational coherence with a greater expanse of the universe, the only true freedom and power.

Even if one can, for a time, increase “one’s” energy and power through force and resistance, long before reaching the impossible limit, the cost of the increasing need to feed off others tends to overwhelm, or else force one onto a more coherent path.

Ultimately, the increase of localized energy in the sense of a gain in the speed and intensity of matter or a body’s resistance to the larger universe just reflects the energy it needs to sustain its seemingly divergent motion. Without a larger cohering context, such divergent motion cannot help but increase the centrifugal motions around it as it consumes its fuel and exports its entropy, creating more space and time.

All this illustrates a misleading irony in the modern concept of energy: that the intense forces that diffuse usable energy into entropy are often seen as the “high energy” horizon of physics, when they are more accurately the least useful or meaningful, as the sterile grandiosity of our particle accelerators has confirmed.

Indeed, the most important dimensions of a force-strained bit of matter or body’s energy is actually *decreasing.* Its relation to the distributed structure or energy of the universe is not only locally fragmented and released from its sustainable flow, but even when tapped for a time and imparting impressive shows of strength, it is quickly scattered into a pit of relative inaccessibility. Is it any wonder such physics produces little more than fleeting forms with even the most gargantuan and “high energy” apparatus?

As an example of the ironic contradiction that results from pursuing ideals against their opposite discussed earlier, this illustrative relation concerning basic oppositional motions in physics brings to bear the most fundamental ramifications concerning the path our society is taking: the fascination with force is depleting our power. The localized energy required to stubbornly continue moving or growing to escape the pressures of death or decay is coupled to a reduction in nonlocal power and long term coherence.

In other words, fighting the negative without learning from it and transforming it puts one at odds with the circulating network of dynamic symmetry, and this leads into a more rigid and entropic structure.

The path of attempting to solidify and protect an isolated coherence of distinct identities tied to localized bodies or spaces ends up opposing and destroying what makes those identities what they actually are. Even if there is some success in acquiring the necessary energy to sustain life and stave off decay, an evolutionary dead end inevitably awaits.

However, it should be reiterated that this is all balanced at other levels. Not only are the barriers to achieving isolated sustainability important guides and a potentially formative influence on life and matter, they pressure things to align their energy and push them toward the coherence that exists within those topological layers of the universe where all is simultaneously harmonized.

This can't happen, however, if life forms extend their natural atomistic bias past the point where they should know better. Instead of applying life's death anxiety to technologies that ultimately cause more death and suffering, the atomistic base of our species' ideology and instruments must be thoroughly challenged.

The physics to do this is already there underneath the many misguided interpretations. Teasing it out can further reveal the energetic processes underlying the pressures in nature that can help life reach toward dynamic stability and cooperation. Especially in a society beholden to set systems of matter and data, rethinking its foundations is vital to overcoming its fear of contaminating otherness and to drive home the concrete reasons why ultimately each is preserved only by a transformation *through* all.

Furthermore, thinking clearly through patterns that physics has revealed shows that at the higher ends of mutual coherence, another way to sustain life exists, a way that is not the negation of death but a reduction of the spaces that make it a necessary rhythmic beat only for a life lived in relative isolation and disharmony.

For instance, as objects or bodies move and resonate more coherently together they can appear to slow down as they converge towards mutual motion, but from another point of view—one moving differently than the first—they may seem to achieve the highest of speeds and intensities.

They can seem to approach light speed, or even exceed it. With the right kind of convergence, things can even seem to disappear altogether—but again, not through force, not by pushing through and against space and time, though indeed by negating them in the specific sense of a negation of their fragmented linearity—a rectifying cancellation of imbalance.

The distinction between forced acceleration and coherent change can be further understood as structured projection from the balanced topological level down into the segmented or "metric" spaces we are familiar with.

Projection, in this sense, refers to how a higher-order relational structure is mapped into a framework where certain constraints and resistances emerge as artifacts of the projection process inherent to spatialized perspectives, hence the utility of “projective geometry”. The frictions of force are a distorted projection of a continuity constrained by a rigid segmentation of metric space that is then exaggerated by incoherent acceleration.

In contrast, because coherent acceleration preserves a deeper structuring of motion, it can not only avoid the accumulation of resistance and travel freely without force or fuel across frames, it can also reform frames in a way that allows it to reach unthinkable relative speeds.

Rather than compressing relations into the rigid framework of resistance-based metric projection and linear acceleration, and thus moving in a haphazard way through space, to the extent that something moves coherently, it maintains something of the fully extended relational—and hence rotational—structure of motion as a reciprocal transformation between things as they spiral towards an impossible infinite convergence.

While the stubborn spirit of forced motion is a path of divergence—at its impossible limit even seeming to speed away from all things through corrosive dispersion—*harmonizing systems are always converging*, but not in any final sense. They are always, in a sense, “ascending”, not falling forever together like in the relatively weak convergence of gravity, but, in effect, negating the space and time between things in all directions.

It is just that since there are always things creating more space and time through their changing and often incoherent and force-mediated relations, there is always more distance to negate. This is the case even between two converging things, since each has its own unique relations to everything else. No matter how extensive—or rather, *intensive*—the convergence, it is never complete.

It can, however, become ever-closer and more intense as more things are harmonized and their resonances intertwined. These convergences are how things can approach or even exceed the lightspeed barrier relative to other motion.

The reason has to do with the fact that light is what connects and standardizes the variable relations of space to time that manifest as the relative velocities of objects. Relative velocities can be distributed in ways that make converging things seem to shoot past light speed from the point of view of things not converging as quickly. For as always, everything must balance out.

This relation between relatively sub-lightspeed and superluminal groups is supremely important, for it is behind the most highly polarized and powerful structures of energy possible. Mathematically, this scenario is built right into the structure of modern science’s most famous equation, $E=MC^2$, provided one knows how to look.

Beneath the standard interpretations relating energy and mass, this equation can be made to show how the relative speed of the two poles of sub-light and superluminal group-relations are conjoined. While speeds, being direct ratios of space to time, are fundamental ways of perceiving and quantifying relations relative to the shared motions that define the relation, physics has usually missed the immense significance and applicability of this.

It buries its observable ratios of relative motion beneath abstract concepts—in this case, mass and energy—obfuscating a crucial layer of meaning to one of the essential discoveries of our times. One can, however, still use these rather abstract concepts to get a feel for the hidden layer, especially if one thinks a little bit about the equation.

For starters, if one simply rewrites the equation as $E/M=C^2$, this emphasizes the ratio between mass and energy and its equivalence to some kind of velocity relation (a multiplication of light speeds). With the right eyes, this illuminates not just a proportional relation between energy and mass, but also suggests how this relation preserves the symmetry, wholeness, and balanced nature of light.

For instance, when light in its role as energy gets divided by mass or matter (E/M)—that is, when light becomes seen or detected, or when it is trapped by or passes through interference, especially that of a material medium—that which has no direction, no inherent frequency or *even speed in itself*, becomes at least part of a distinct ratio.

Looking at the ratios in this form, one could say that energy (E) is to mass (M) as light speed times itself is to one ($E/M=C^2/1$). Energy (E) relates to mass (M) in the same way that C^2 relates to 1. One could think of this as saying that energy (E) in its relation to mass or matter (M) is like the balanced topological relation of light with itself (C^2) is to a discrete thing (1), which in energetic terms (E) means being divided by some mass (E/M).

Read inversely, the relation becomes $M/E=1/C^2$, where mass, as a fraction of energy, is seen as a discrete one measured against the infinite recursion of light's self-relation, making it even more explicit how mass is just a word for discreteness.

Mass measured against C^2, the relational plenitude of light, helps make it clear that it is not just "energy's equal" via an arbitrary constant, as $E=MC^2$ is usually explained, but more profoundly is energy's fraction—its narrowing into a unit.

In any case or form of equation, C^2 represents a self-multiplied, self-referential structuring of light's motion. Mass (M) is what anchors this structuring into a discrete form, making it observable. Thus, energy (E) is in these terms part of a structured ratio (E/M) that emerges when the self-relation of the most unified level of existence becomes two interacting waves of change we call light (C times C), and forms a stable interaction in discrete matter ($E/M=C^2$).

More basically, $E/M=C^2$ shows a particular energetic value to and for every *sub-light* group we call mass or matter (some amount of E per some amount of M). Does this mean the energy

value here is “the superluminal”? No, because Einstein’s equation is showing the concentration of energy in a seemingly isolated mass, or energy’s reduction to mass as it becomes more isolated as mass increases—or seems to increase with speed through force—as was discussed above.

So where does the superluminal come in? Indeed Einstein’s equation is often cited as why the superluminal more or less cannot exist (outside of certain quantum effects that just happen to obey “different laws”).

First, it might help to further tease out why the ratio between energy and mass here is formed by or equated to two conjoined (multiplied) light speeds ($E/M=C^2$). It can be helpful to think of these two light speeds as a kind of archetypal relation of symmetry structuring all difference (as it is what imparts a distinct value to energy or to matter given the other).

Again, a higher-level or “topological” balance is always preserved between two things in any changing relation, and this becomes represented as two equal waves of change or light (C times C). However, this abstract symmetry becomes a distinct ratio (E/M) due to the appearance of discrete matter as a kind of inversion of one of the waves (CC becomes E/M), perhaps since one of the waves will now be seen from a particular and inherently opposing point of view (in the sense of opposing directions as distinct matter confronts its world).

Imagine that from the balanced topological view, two waves are emerging from opposing poles of a relation, continuously overlapping and interfering, with neither pole inherently a source or sink. Each node is an interference point of infinitely many waves, including those emanating from its opposite. At this level, roles are fluid because the relation is continuous and symmetrical.

But when a structured spatial framework is imposed on this topology—one that slices continuity into measurable intervals—symmetry gives way to orientation. The same interplay that was once simultaneous now appears as a sequence, with one pole functioning as source and the other as sink.

The emergence of direction is therefore not because one pole initiates motion, but because continuity has been refracted through a spacetime gradient. What could not be resolved all at once in a segmented reference frame, is resolved step by step, giving rise to the light wave as the incremental correction of imbalance distributed across the field.

The oscillation orientation or “polarization” of the transverse part of the wave reflects the deeper character of that relational asymmetry. In linear polarization, the plane of oscillation remains constant, echoing a stable directional bias in how the source and sink are phase-offset. In circular or elliptical polarization, the torsion between the rotating phase structures of source and sink cannot resolve in a single plane, and instead spirals through space and time—each point along the wavefront marking a compromise between multiple twists in a rotational continuum of interference.

However, because the transverse flux is just a projection of deeper rotational tension—a lateral trace of a fundamentally longitudinal, torsional interference pattern between regimes of motion—it is never a simple one-way wave.

There are two “combined light speeds” in C^2 because clearly there is still a movement going in both directions, implying the deeper mediation of symmetry within the speed of individual light waves. In other words, the two instances of “C” represent not just speeds but the reciprocal structuring of motion—with one corresponding to the local adjustment of linear space to the cycles of time (s/t=1), the other defining the nonlocal adjustment of time to the local space (t/s=1).

This structured reciprocity of light’s motion reflects a general symmetry, where for *any change or motion* that is observed there is an inverse movement that must exist relationally to preserve overall coherence. When it comes to normal sub-lightspeed motion, this inverse is the “superluminal”, which is not just some mathematical artifact, or some fringe area of physics or science fiction, but a phenomena essential to the way light-wave and velocity relations sculpt energy and matter.[71]

To see how, it should first be acknowledged that, seen in isolation—as mainstream physics tends to view things—a light wave does appear to be, in some sense, discrete. It also appears to travel at a constant speed (when not interfered with), and with its specific frequency representing a fixed amount of energy. All this would seem to imply a local phenomena, with any nonlocality or superluminal action as something mysterious or illusory.

Yet from a relational perspective, all of light’s perceived qualities emerge out of its interaction with the *whole matrix* of matter’s relative motion. Without this matrix, nothing is ever “seen” in the first place. As implied with the earlier more general discussion of waves, any particular frequency is already an interference pattern, even if it *seems* to be just a continuous wave train traveling freely in the void of space.

For as soon as light is “detected”, or rather interacts with something, it becomes a mediation between that interaction as an absorbing sink, and some source. While, as implied above, that source of radiation is a product of wave interactions as well, interactions that include a connection to the motion or matter that ends up absorbing it.

To see this all more clearly, consider what happens when light waves travel through a material medium. In such cases, the progress of light’s localized packets—or “group waves”—can be slowed, while the underlying oscillations that interfere in order to make the shape of the packet—the “phase waves”—shoot on ahead.

In a sine-wave depiction, this can be pictured as a wave bunch traveling along at the same speed with waves of various wavelengths whose overlap composes the discretely-bunched packet, yet where upon further interference, the composite packet can begin to move more slowly than the others.

Strictly speaking, this, of course, is all relative to some observer—not only their different speeds but the their distinct identities. Indeed, they are both “groups” made of other waves, since all waves are. Physics just refers to the discrete packet as *the* group wave because it is the foreground composite made of interfering background waves.

Furthermore, because the oscillations that constitute the foreground aspect of a light wave are more or less canceled out outside the edges of the packet, they can be sensibly referred to in the singular as *the* phase wave that both holds the packet together and provides the reference against which its motion can be measured.

On its own, this whole “slowing down of light wave packets in a physical medium” phenomenon does not seem surprising or important, but it has implications that reveal the nature of matter and its associated energy as expressions of the interference patterns of light.

For instance, imagine if a wave-packet shape is seemingly “lost” to some bit of matter through complete absorption. One can view this absorbing object as just a more complex group wave. This could suggest that matter itself is akin to a compact or "high-energy" wave-packet of light, seemingly slowed by its entanglement with a complex system of many interfering waves.

If this line of thought is to hold, matter would have to be an extreme or densely-layered case of light’s group-wave speed being constrained within the context of others, implying a great amount of light or energy stored in every tiny bit of matter—which, of course, it is, as nuclear explosions have vividly shown us.

However, what’s particularly important here is that no matter what the level of complexity in the interference and consequent slowing down of light—either through matter or as matter itself—there is, as suggested, always a polarity of velocity relations that illustrates what matter and energy really are behind what is described by $E/M=C^2$. Now one might begin to see why—or see how the triad of terms in this equation might be reframed in terms of wave relations, speed, and light, putting them all on the same conceptual plane.

For if the slowing down of a light wave’s shape is not only about a splitting of the speed of the interfering carrier or phase waves from the speed of the packet itself, but also suggests a model for the formation of matter from energy via complex entanglements of light wave patterns, then this begins to put a whole new “spin” on the Einsteinian idea of equivalence (or convertibility) between mass and energy (or between gravity and inertia).

It suggests that this equivalence holds a truth more far-ranging in its significance for society and its potential application than the usual obsession with nuclear reactions. While the potential for a split in speeds between the group and phase waves of light has long been known, it has seldom been seen as integral to space and time, or matter and energy.

It should, however, quickly bring to mind an important connection to $E=MC^2$, perhaps even more coherently justifying this equation’s place as science’s most famous, especially once it is understood that the continuous waves and the discrete packets they form through interference

have a proportional relation to each other and to the overall speed of light, as energy and mass do in $E=MC^2$.

It is just that this wave velocity relation is one of *inverse* proportionality, dictating that when a light packet slows into matter, the phase wave that gave rise to it is released into the reciprocal role, necessitating that it carry on “faster than light.” If there is some direct analog to the relation between mass and energy in this inversely proportional relation, and the group wave corresponds to matter, then the superluminal phase wave seems to correspond to the inverse of energy *as it appears in* $E=MC^2$.

However, if instead all quantity is understood as a measure of the intensity of differential motion, one can see that the form of “energy” in Einstein’s proportionality and the form in the velocity relation describe the two essential inverses of space and time outlined earlier. In Einstein’s equation, energy grows with mass as the outward divergence of space against a background reference—the piling up of localized force toward the impossible horizon of light. It is space measured through the constant of light squared as a limit, a way of quantifying the energetic quantity of mass—in other words, separateness itself.

In the inverse relation, by contrast, when the localized intensity of a packet slows—when its group speed drops toward the observer’s frame—the coherence of time intensifies. The phase relation expands outward without bound. At the limit, this coherence appears infinite, for once divergence is fully absorbed, relation persists across all time. Instead of space diverging against a limit, it is time deepening through coherence, with light as the universal thread of relation.

Yet even here one must be careful. At the limit of convergence—where group motion collapses and phase tends to infinity—what is captured is only one differential. For every ratio belongs to others, and what seems like complete co-movement at one level may mask divergence at another.

No single metric, whether Einstein’s divergence or the infinity of phase relations, can stand as the single measure of coherence or energy. Coherence itself is never a fixed unity, but the continual interweaving of differences across scales.

The value of these two equations, then, is not that they provide a final definition of energy, but that they reveal the polarity: divergence measured as mass–energy, and convergence measured as phase coherence. Each points beyond itself to the other, showing how motion, whether outward or inward, is always part of a reciprocal whole.

The inverse velocity relation is particularly valuable, however, because it shows what Einstein’s form hides: that the slowing of group waves or the collapse of spatial difference is not a pure loss but a transformation.

Difference that once raced outward as a discrete packet is drawn inward and redistributed through the phase field. Energy becomes no longer bounded divergence but the implosive

gathering of relation, where difference is carried through an open web of connections rather than confined to discrete force.

In Einstein's proportionality, like the simple addition of mass, any increase in speed or material force only increases discrete localized energy. Even when centripetal, as in gathering matter, it remains a divergent effect: the sample grows in force but not in coherence, like a pile growing higher without becoming more integrative. Energy is reduced to a measure of divergence from a background, defined by the limit of light rather than building on it as a thread of connection.

Energy as mass is thus the image of intensity following modern atomistic conceptions such as light as runaway speed—energy appearing in the outward acceleration and dispersal of things away from one another, like an explosion. Without taking account of phase, gravitational convergence is reduced to mass accumulation: never more than a local acquisition at the expense of a larger divergence—as some mass converges, it falls away from everything else.

Any material acquisition is very different from the creation of matter or its complex organization, which arises not from adding more of what is already discrete, but from a deeply implosive convergence—where waves interfere constructively, coherence deepens, and negentropy appears.

Matter creation is not simply an entropic explosion that happens to produce more matter, as in mainstream accounts of fusion, but the transformation of motion into a higher order of coherence. Where divergence piles up quantity against a background, convergence reorganizes relation itself, opening space for stable form to emerge.

A musical analogy helps clarify this polarity. Imagine a melody played in sharp, rapid bursts against a steady drone. The separation is vivid, like Einstein's energy measured in divergence: each note is clearly defined, but it flashes past before its resonances can settle. The notes stand out, yet remain isolated.

Slow the melody down, however, and something different happens. Each tone lingers, its overtones interweaving more fully with the drone. The definition of sharp contrast softens, but the depth of resonance increases. The note is not dissolved into sameness, but bound more richly into relation. Its identity persists, but as part of a larger harmonic whole.

Here we can hear the reciprocity directly. Greater sharpness defines identities but reduces resonance; greater resonance binds but softens discrete existence. Physics has divided this reciprocity between relativity's concern with motion and divergence, and quantum theory's concern with limits of resolution. But in truth, both are perspectives on one balance: difference can be sharper or deeper, isolated or distributed, but *it is* always preserved.

Any apparent loss of localized tension is matched by a deepening of relational tension across the field. This balance appears in different guises.

When coherence collapses in one place, it is radiated outward as light or heat, binding other systems through waves that carry relation further than matter alone could. Radiation is not simply entropy lost, but connection redistributed.

When matter converges gravitationally, entropy does rise in one sense: heat builds, radiation escapes, complexity seems to collapse. Yet gravity also couples differences into new coherence: stars condense from diffuse clouds, galaxies emerge from scattered stars, heavier elements are forged in stellar cores. What appears as collapse at one level is at another the deepening of relational order.

When matter converges gravitationally, the process is always implosive: a centripetal binding that draws differences into coherence. Gravity in itself is negentropic, for it couples motion into deeper relation. Yet the outcomes depend on the level of order it engages.

If gravity acts on a system that has already developed a higher form of coherence—such as fusion in a star or metabolic balance in life—its implosion may appear as collapse. The richer process fails, and gravity takes over as the simpler binding force. Entropy seems to rise because complexity is lost, yet what has occurred is the replacement of a higher negentropy by a more basic one.

In other cases, gravity builds order from diffuse beginnings. Clouds of gas condense into stars, stars gather into galaxies, galaxies form cosmic webs. Here gravity's implosion does not destroy a higher order but generates a new one. Entropy is locally released as heat and radiation, but coherence deepens as matter is bound into durable structures.

In both faces, gravity is always negentropic in essence, always implosive, always drawing motion inward. It appears entropic only in comparison to the collapse of higher forms of organization. Properly seen, gravity is not disorder but the phase convergence that rebalances differences when other processes falter or when new structures are ready to form.

When waves interfere, their local cancellations are never nullities but redistributions. What disappears at one node resurfaces in another, difference carried invisibly across the phase field. Interference is the geometry by which apparent loss is balanced by hidden continuity.

And when motion slows into coherence with a frame, what seems like a loss of forward drive is a gain of temporal reach. The phase relation expands, binding motion into a wider order, carrying differences through time even as local divergence diminishes.

In each case, what looks like entropy gained locally is matched by coherence elsewhere. Phase does not signify a vacuum reservoir of infinite energy, but the ongoing circulation of differences, where energy and entropy are repurposed according to the geometry of relation.

Phase, therefore, does not imply a static reservoir of infinite energy hidden in the vacuum to which one can definitively converge, but a continual circulation of differences. It is not space

itself that provides boundless energy, but the way differential motion reorganizes through the geometry of phase relations. Energy and entropy are reused and repurposed depending on this geometry—sometimes appearing as divergent force, sometimes as convergent coherence, always as the reciprocal play of motion.

Just as a melody that slows may lose some sharpness of contrast but gains a richer coherence with its harmonic background. What seems like less energy in one register is in another a greater resonance, the polarity of divergence and convergence continuing to work across scales.

All this implies that the continuous carrier wave—the longitudinal or phase wave—when quantified, describes the rate at which coherent structure is maintained across space and time relative to its local disruptions. When group and phase velocities are equal, what we call “light speed” arises as the balance where background coherence and local transformation advance together. When they diverge, the packet no longer speeds away with its background but is folded into the observer’s frame, while phase appears superluminal because it reflects this redistribution of coherence into the wider field.

Seen in this way, it becomes possible to translate Einstein’s equation into its inverse image. With some simple substitutions drawn from quantum physics, one can re-express
E
=
m
c
2
E=mc
2
directly in terms of these velocity relations, revealing energy not as an abstraction tied to mass but as the play of speed, coherence, and relation itself.

This substitution dispenses with the abstractions of “mass” and “energy”—both dependent on our interference to measure—and instead deals only with observable speed, which is simply the ratio of space to time.

Building off of de Broglie’s revolutionary insight that matter is a kind of group of waves, a few simple substitutions from quantum physics turn $E=MC^2$ into a new equation where the velocity (V) of the matter (m) wave group (Vm) multiplied by the velocity of its phase (Vp) = the speed of light times itself (C)(C).[73] In this way, one might more easily see why there are two light speeds (CC) in Einstein’s equation, for there is a clear symmetry between the two sets of speeds on both sides of this version: VmVp=CC.

The equation reveals a kind of *creative coherence (CC)* connecting every sub-light speed or material phenomenon (Vm) with its inversion, with what appears to be a “superluminal” phase

wave or waves (Vp), since again, Vp, being inversely proportional to Vm, would have to be greater than the speed of light to balance the equation.

But what this suggests is that the two variable speeds (Vm and Vp) represent light's inherent self-referential unity (CC) structured into two complementary motion regimes—one material (matter-group velocity) and one relational (phase velocity). Their product preserves the underlying balance of light's structuring ratio (C^2), ensuring a reciprocal interplay between localized and nonlocal motion.

This is especially apparent if one thinks of light speed, as suggested earlier, not as some definitive amount of distance per some amount of time, but as a ratio, as 1/1, as *always the same amount of space per time*, and consequently rendered as just the number we associate with unity (1). In which case, one times one still just equals one.

One could also take this equation ($VpVm=C^2$) and divide both sides by C^2, yielding $VpVm/C^2=1$, more easily seeing why the two variable speeds: the material relation (Vm), and its way of relating—its entangled context of waves or phase (Vp)—multiplied or conjoined actually equal one or unity when divided—or rather distributed—by the conjoined light speeds, which of course they always are.

Similarly, using energy and matter again, and writing it as $E/C^2=M$, there is an implication that when energy is divided by these two multiplied lines of linear light speed (C^2), one gets matter. Whatever the form of this ubiquitous but little understood equation at the center of science, C^2 is relating energy to matter, "whole" to part, showing us how a division is made equal—or really is equal or unified—by an interplay of reciprocal dynamics.

At its most basic conceptual level, C^2 is just suggesting how at the most fundamental level the circle becomes reconstituted through a combination of lines. There is one line representing the disturbance or change resulting from the division of the whole—and so takes the form of a speed (s/t).

Yet the other is moving in the opposite direction, not only in space, but in time, not to restore, but rather maintain balance. This is because, being the inversion of a speed (s/t becomes t/s), it is a superluminal simultaneity that is not adjusting the discrete relative structures of space through the process of a seemingly universal or nonlocal time, as in normal motion (s/t), but rather adjusting the discrete structure of time relative to a space through the seeming nonlocal continuity of space itself.

Together they reflect the inherent symmetry within light's unity $(s/t)(t/s)=(Vm)(Vp)=CC=1$. This unity operates not only through space and time, using them to distribute light's symmetry through the infinite dimensions of the universe, but also is at the same time relatively negating them.

For difference is not continually being created and reconciled along some line of time, but rather the structure of time and space continually generates a picture of the eternal symmetry of equalized difference. It draws a pattern of contrasting unity through and relative to every line of relation, and ultimately between the polarity of pure principle and its picture composed in perspectives. One must only learn to see it.

13. Collapsing Quantum Confusion: Riding the Superluminal Phase-wave

“For all that meets the bodily sense I deem

Symbolical, one mighty alphabet for infant minds…”

-Samuel Taylor Coleridge[74]

The preceding has envisioned that light, as a dynamic relational whole, ensures that what appears as separation on one level is always balanced on another. In particular instances, such as localized emission and absorption, this unity becomes contextualized—manifesting as a line of apparent exchange between source and sink.

Yet, because this manifestation between poles of matter seems to invariably travel at the same speed, regardless of the energy involved, what we see as light, *even at the supposed origin of its radiation*, is more essentially an interference of light with matter, manifesting most essentially as a universal ratio governing the relations between space and time. It is not a simple radiative exchange with a definitive source and terminal.

Unfortunately, the modern concept of a photon undermines the truth, giving the impression of a discrete thing carved out by nothing but the frame of a conventional unit of time, since it is the frequency or number of cycles per second that frames this choice.

Thinking in terms of this rather arbitrary entity tends to obfuscate that the baseline energy *per wave* remains constant across the EM spectrum, with the various frequencies being less about a specific amount of energy per unit, and more about the concentration of, and therefore a density of, relational structure or information.

There is no “higher-energy photon”, but rather a greater degree of overlap or interference of constituent waves—hence, like matter, the potential difficulty of their colliding force. This implies that not only is matter akin to an extreme extension of this kind of complex interference, but also suggests some reason behind its tendency to endure and restlessly resist decay into a definitive equilibrium, in some cases even evolving life and intelligence to this end.

Matter—and consequently life—are the coming together and prolonged working-out of an immense array of relations whose very existence is owed to a capacity to tame the chaos of impinging motion and spin which would otherwise disperse complexity into the mere space of disconnected or monolithic circulations.

Whether one is speaking of light or matter, there is an increasing degree of energy density as waves converge, creating not only higher-frequency light but also more complex material structures, with the "light wave" again being not just a propagation in space but a tensioned relation of reciprocal imbalance resolving locally along a path of least resistance while overall balance is always maintained through nonlocal contexts.

However, to the extent that the complex relation of local and nonlocal that is every light wave can be made coherent and simplified down to a single frequency, it can be understood as a representation of a distinct ratio of motion communicating between regimes of matter or motion—as an expression of an interplay between specific source and sink relations and their respective mass-group and phase velocities.

Whenever a frequency is measured, it is done so from some sink that absorbs and detects a light wave, thereby forming a momentary phase-link with the source. This frequency reflects not only the relative velocities of the two systems but, more fundamentally, the underlying phase-wave dynamics upon which both systems ride.

These waves are bombarding every object, with some arcs pushing material systems outward in space and some getting absorbed, thus contributing to their inward motion. There is, then, a kind of push and pull happening between all things as their underlying influences interact, even if this can often be harmonized into mutual motion.

As the transverse light wave manifests, a wave of interference and oscillation is formed between regimes of other waves and larger longitudinal arcs. From the point of view of space, without this clash and eventual inward bending—or rather blending—of the disparate arcs of light, nothing would relate and only the entropy of disconnected circulations would reign.

Measured light carries not only a signature of the coherence created as the unity of light speed connecting source and sink, but also a record of the lingering displacement from unity in its frequency or wavelength.

It reflects the centrifugal and centripetal relations only relatively harmonized in the light-speed wave of a given frequency. While each wave interaction achieves a degree of coherence, it simultaneously leaves behind a “spinning record” or imprint of prior momentum and interference.

Every interference pattern carries echoes of resolution and disruption—a relational record of the tapestry of its topology. In this way, the light wave embodies both the unity and the entropy (or information) inherent in its creation, standing as a dynamic testament to the balance and imbalance of its formative forces.

In this sense, not only is matter an extreme form of very high-frequency or complex interference, but high-frequency waves themselves often arise from a more intricate interplay with the nodes and knots we call matter. Seen in this light, the mysteries of so-called “quantum” physics become more understandable and visualizable without simply reverting to the naive models of classical physics.

Take the so-called double-slit experiment, for example. Such experiments, even in light of increasing evidence of the importance of coherence, are often framed as some kind of observation “collapsing” wave patterns into particle patterns. This framing reinforces the entrenched divide between incompatible models, regimes, or worlds, with some special status imparted to both the “quantum world” and the world-making—or world-splitting action—of the “observer”.

There are routinely mind-blowing announcements of new fantastical sounding discoveries in quantum physics, but the double-slit experiment is the most notorious and enduring of these supposed mysteries, despite, like most of these anomalies, being downplayed as time goes on and hype diminishes.

It boils down to something like this: when supposedly discrete and tiny localized particles of electrons are fired, *even one at a time*, towards two slits, they produce an interference pattern on a screen on the other side—a result typically associated with waves which would naturally go through both slits and cause such an effect.

Yet, introducing a detector at the slits to observe "which slit" the electron passes through destroys the interference pattern, leaving two bands of particle-like heaps instead. This paradox has perplexed thinkers for decades, primarily because of the nonsensical way it is described.

For historical reasons, the dogma of quantum physics became that everything has both particle and wave-like properties, whether it is light or a supposed particle like the electron. Which is fine as far as that goes.

But because the nature of these wave-like properties and their connection to anything particle-like demanded a new conception of what the medium of these waves might be—and this would require a kind of “purely” conceptual theorizing that was already going out of fashion in the early 20th century—it was decided to be beyond the concern of “real” science, which didn’t need to understand what was going on in order to make accurate predictions with statistics.

While alternative interpretations have been frequent ever since this resignation to statistical modeling was decided, alternative theories have seldom challenged the fundamentally discrete or atomistic bias of materialistic physics.

Even when the New Age latched on to any talk of the centrality of “the observer”, this also took a rather vague and fragmented form. It followed the metaphysical leanings of many early quantum physicist who were more fascinated with “consciousness” and the discovery of a lack of purely objective ground than in teasing out the coherent connections driving what in hindsight is clearly a ground of variable relations.

Once one realizes that the real discovery of quantum physics was not an extension of atomicity from particles to waves and energy (and then more secondarily and mysteriously an extension of continuity from waves to particles), but rather the beginnings of a modern rediscovery of the

reciprocal determination that exists between all things, the confusion and paradoxes should disappear.

We need not be resigned to either old-fashioned and simplistically spatialized continuities, or when they prove inadequate, mere statistical prediction. Endless mysteries still await, but they unfold with the simple effort of teasing out the infinite implications and combinations of an understanding of basic reciprocal relations.

Something so simple as the double-slit experiment should not be so confusing. To understand it, one simply needs to realize that the electron, like light, is not a discrete entity moving through space. Instead, it is, like all matter, a localization of the distributed wave dynamics that arise within the relational structure that forms space and time to begin with.

These dynamics are inherently connected to everything else and already span the entire experimental setup. When an electron "passes through" the slits, it is not a particle choosing one slit or another, it is an occasionally constrained or “particularized” pattern of otherwise distributed waves that naturally interacts with both slits.

The slits shape these distributed dynamics, modifying the relations of the constituent waves, which then combine to produce an interference pattern visible at the screen terminal. The localized particle doesn’t paradoxically "travel through both slits" because until the intermediary detector interferes, the pattern we call an electron is a convergence of constituent waves that naturally span and interact with the slits, shaping the interference pattern that results.

Many physicists have interpreted the interference pattern as a result of a mysterious nonlocality, even implying that the electron “knows” about both slits at once. Much confusion arises from the mistaken assumption that the electron is both a discrete particle and a wave merely in probability, ignoring that this is a real wave effect, and as discussed, *all real waves must inherently be made up of other waves.*

Yet this infinite regress means that there is no fundamental space or time, only an infinite relay of relations. The electron’s wave nature is not merely probable or theoretical but a real expression of the changing relational structure that manifests as matter and motion.

The perceived "nonlocality" is simply a reflection of the fact that the electron’s wave dynamics are already distributed across the system. Introducing a detector to determine "which slit" the electron passes through simply intervenes in the previous wave-based dynamics, effectively hiding them beneath the knot of material complications.

The supposed “act of measurement” appears to destroy coherence, not only eliminating the interference pattern but making the electron go through one or the other slit, seemingly with only statistical determinacy. Yet this is not because of some inherently special quality of observation or some inherent randomness in nature, but because the so-called act of observation is just a relatively incoherent interference, and thus introduces entropy.

In its undisturbed state, the electron maintains a self-reinforcing cycle—an ongoing interplay of phase relationships that allows it to remain relationally extended across both slits. This cycle sustains the interference pattern by allowing constructive and destructive interference to guide the electron's distributed presence. When a detector is introduced, it disrupts this balance, replacing the natural relational feedback with a relatively incoherent interaction that limits the system's ability to maintain the previous pattern.

Thus, what is perceived as "collapse" is not the electron magically turning into a particle, but rather just a shift in the relational configuration. The detector redirects the electron's phase and group dynamics into a constrained state, suppressing the system's ability to sustain a self-reinforcing wave interplay that can resist collapse into the relative indeterminacy of disorganized particle motion.

Thus by viewing the electron as a manifestation of distributed wave dynamics, nonlocality can be approached and understood. The electron's behavior is locally connected to the wave dynamics it arises from—even if these dynamics traverse vast distances and seem to connect distant things. "Nonlocal" effects can arise simply because space and time arise between everything and therefore shift with each local phenomenon.

The nonlocal dynamics are, in the case of this experiment, shaped by the relational interplay of the source and the absorbing screen as well as the intermediary fields of the slits and detector. If one imagines a long link between distant objects, like a long wave front that they both ride, and one sends a sinusoidal (up-and-down oscillation) pulse down this line, it will naturally take a while to traverse.

But if one simply pushes or pulls this longitudinal link—or twists it like a rope, causing it to tighten or loosen, compress or elongate longitudinally, as phase dynamics do—the effect is simultaneous and "nonlocal" but entirely continuous and visualizable. This reframing shifts the central mystery of the double-slit experiment from "How does a particle behave as a wave?" to "How are distributed relational dynamics reciprocally determined by and with local phenomena?"

By transforming the dichotomy of particle and wave into yet another version of dynamic, continuous, and overlapping polarities, matter's behavior is easily tied to the fundamental relational structure of the universe. Matter is never a simple group of particles or waves, but is rather part of an extended system where space and time are continuously structured and shaped by the motion of things.

The slits themselves are not just passive holes through which the electron passes; they act as nodes or sources of relatively destructive and constructive interference within the network, even if what is destructive in one sense is constructive in another.

Like all processes in space and time, there is an interplay of spins spread across connected spaces, as well as longitudinal pulses pushing and pulling, or forming a balance that sustains their structure and boundaries, together shaping the patterns we observe.

The slits and the detector, like all specific material shapes, amplify and redirect waves in particular ways, creating a dynamic field where particles can emerge as focal points of countless background interactions whose significance and prominence depend on the filters of local rhythms.

All matter is an interference pattern of waves traversing upon a wave, upon a wave, ad infinitum, all on the long journey towards the impossible horizon of final equilibrium. But to be clear, these infinite waves upon waves are not a simple spatially scaled or embedded fractal. Each system emerges from shared waves of change that constitute the background phase wave of their space upon which traverse the developing waves of matter and time.

What appears simultaneous within one system is the result of phase coherence, where coherent cancellation of transverse disturbances creates constructive longitudinal interference, collapsing or reducing distinctions of space and time, bringing events into a unified relational structure. However, when viewed from another relational framework, the same events unfold in a sequential relation due to differing group wave velocities that alter the phase relations.

In this way, simultaneity and sequence are not simply imposed by an observer but emerge from the nested relational structure of waves, where coherence defines simultaneity, and decoherence reveals sequentiality. Thus, the most fundamental shared waves of simultaneity are also a kind of serial temporal process as experienced by other spaces, whose own stable ground is a changing process for another, and so on to infinity.

In the slit experiment, the detector does not collapse a special quantum probability wave or disrupt some inherent quality of the quantum system. Instead, it abstracts out, or spatially speaking, “boxes in” new relational dynamics of the system. By interfering with certain waves, it decouples them from the larger shared phase wave upon which they previously rode. This interference introduces new complications, altering the rhythm and extent of shared wavefronts.

However, this morass of delaying complications is the inevitable burden of intricate material vehicles. It is their nature to evolve new complex arrangements and this requires time. They do not merely “actualize” a specific possibility from a transcendent store of quantum potentials, such as forcing the electron to “choose” one slit. Instead, they add a new dimension to the relational field.

In the case of the detector, its interference concentrates waves onto narrower pathways, imposing a more localized configuration. Yet when elements like the detector intervene, introducing new entangled interactions into simultaneous multiplicities, this is not merely a matter of spatial localization but also of temporal differentiation. The relative decoherence doesn’t just create space—it creates time by breaking the simultaneity of the phase wave’s coherence into a sequence of entangled relations.

In other words, the so-called "paths" of the electron are not pre-existing alternatives where each possibility exists already as a distinct world. Instead, the phase wave’s multiplicity reflects a simultaneous, relational shape that is not reducible to discrete choices.

As suggested earlier, interventions and decisions do not split a singular reality into separate worlds via a special action from beyond them. Instead, changing local reconfigurations in the shape of broader relations can combine and modify its threads in more or less coherent ways, and this determines whether the path creates more incompatible complications or is able to maintain the broader pattern through local conditions.

Even the most coherent local intervention, however, may seem to embroil some wider symmetry in a novel realm of relative incoherence, but this is how symmetry must be experienced from any spatially embedded perspective: through serial temporal processes that are not so much a break or imposition of asymmetry as a spatial construction of symmetry's infinite form.

In this sense, there is no absolute loss of coherence in the individuation of particularity, but rather a shift from a simultaneous one into a coherent series via a creative process that does not foreclose potential but rather further determines it with new dimensions of interaction.

A frequent failure to understand this exemplifies how modern physics reflects and ideologically justifies the era's dominant cultural politics, hindering the creative process of individuation with obsessive focus on determining and preserving trenchant distinctions.

This short-circuits creative evolution by mistaking the imposition of rigid boundaries and the fixation on discrete outcomes for the actual "resolution" of problems. It prevents the construction of more fluid and an *ever-higher resolution* in the forms of interrelation that characterize the fractal-like unfolding of "potential".

The detector's role in "localizing" the electron, like the emergence of any form of matter, is not about "actualizing" potential in the sense of resolving indeterminacy; it's about individuating and embedding particular dynamics into a different and eventually richer relational matrix, where the emergence of localized behavior reflects a recalibration of space and time within the system.

The visible material universe itself, as an extreme form of complex interference, demonstrates this process on a larger scale, as light and matter continually reflect the evolving interplay of coherence, localization, and the broad simultaneous rhythms of phase relations that move across vast stretches of space and time.

Quantum physics does reveal something fundamental about our universe, but not the move from objective to subjective determinacy championed by mystical interpretations, nor the statistical determinacy of mathematical models that build power on aggregating isolated, incoherent fragments of information. Instead, it points to a deeper reciprocity that transcends these extremes, one where relations—not isolated outcomes or fixed certainties—define the fabric of reality.

So-called quantum indeterminacy is simply a reflection of our fragmented perspective, not an absence of deeper order. The determinacy of rigid frameworks and preformed possibilities imposes limits that obscure the relational dynamics at play. Neither isolated randomness nor closed causality captures the truth of quantum phenomena. Instead, quantum physics reveals a

mutual interplay—a relational unfolding where the apparent contradictions of chance and necessity dissolve into an open and unlimited coherence.

The interplay of reciprocal but infinitely relayed relations undermines all definitive trajectories as well as definitively chaotic disruptions, illuminating a universe that remains in motion, not as a sum of discrete, causal chains or probabilities, but as a continuous, dynamic balance of being and becoming.

It reveals that what matters most is the degree of coherence in any interaction, certainly more than any foundational subjects and objects, since there obviously is no such thing as a neutral subject or the passive observation of plainly present objects.

The crux, of course, is that the more complex the interaction, not only the greater the difficulty of creating coherence, but the more diverse, far-ranging, and potentially powerful that coherence can be when the simple continuity of complexity is forged out of the merely complicated. It is as if life uses material vehicles to develop new structures to tease out the one from the many, exposing an ever-greater infinite and evolving pattern of the universe.

If physics and the matter-wave/phase-wave division seem rather inconsequential beyond niche academic interest, one can think of the division as a richer form of the matter/mind distinction. One could say that this more modern form of the old distinction illuminates something new or essential, not only about matter but the concept of mind as well.

It suggests that the mind is just a specific transpersonal and relational medium, not a system of discrete beings. This should have became more obvious with the rise of artificial intelligence. Nonetheless, AI is still often misunderstood—as is “information” in general—as true or false, real or not representations of beings rather than a process and sign of all beings’ relations.

Whether the medium is a phase wave or an informational matrix, it is always just a specific form of the more general middle term of every relation: the perspective, mode, or system of rhythm and reference upon which any two things or systems relate.

So what could this imply for humanity about the reality of the transcendent or superluminal? Can life or society bring the two sides closer together and literally “approach the light” as the physics discussed here suggests? This would necessitate more than just a new physics, requiring a transformation of our entire realm of relations.

The appearance of entropy and the prevalence of so many disconnected spatial systems in relatively centrifugal motion such as we see in our reality are not a fixed confinement to a partial view and limited existence. Our plight is created by the many layers of our incoherence that will take a long time to change, but it will never happen without first understanding the situation.

Our science continually reinforces the localized view dominated by the breakdown of order, seldom the full extent or source of its seemingly spontaneous emergence, or their nonlocal

connection. Every life indeed then seems like little more than a limited line without the nonlocal or “topological” view.

Understanding and developing this “higher-resolution” view may be an infinite journey, but it is good to remember that it lives within every process or perspective as they relate to the whole, making it the dynamic heart to which every seeming-fragment yearns. It is not some far-away ideal or static formula to merely model in the mind, but a vision towards which all our systems can be nudged, since it is already their secret essence.

In essence, there is no fragmentation, only a localized destructive interference that makes space for a temporal process through which things can better approximate balanced reciprocity. And though this balance is achieved often at the expense of spatial and temporal distances, it is no destruction of difference except in the sense that there is an annihilation of separation as a means to and result of a better amplification of differentiation and change. This is just part of the process of deepening interpenetration and constructive interference.

Of course, having this vision of perfection doesn’t necessarily translate into humanity moving towards it correctly. A lot hinges on how we model and apply these principles to specific social systems, sciences, and the technologies that mediate them.

The most essential hinge concerns that recurring postmodern motif of “difference” and how humanity treats apparent disharmonies between its systems. If knowledge of the “energy” of physics and the metaphysical implications of how it produces real interconnected difference gets buried beneath the discrete form of difference manipulated by data science and recursively entrenched into the collective psyche through its AI expressions, it may be difficult to recover.

In contrast, the proper metaphysical implications should fall naturally out of an intuitively felt and constructed scientific understanding, one that points to a continuity and mutual determination of all difference. One can then easily see, for instance, what is spiritually implied by discussions of a realm of maximally interpenetrating change.

And descending from this lofty realm, one can then feel and imagine, even before any definite distances or even specific angular relations get invoked, how the discrete division between beings has something to do with, as discussed earlier, the centrifugal effects of spins no longer cancelling their proximate counter flows, but instead beginning to counter-rotate against each other. Hard distinctions between inward and outward vortices are in this manner formed by relative resonances defining what gets included in a given space.

It is this kind of motion or space of primordial magnitudes and rhythmic differentiation prior to and determining the vector motion of objects that could be thought of as a kind of relative origin of the separation and uneven developments defining our world.

It should be easy to see why physics and metaphysics sometimes confusedly blends together in the counterculture, especially when it is this “causal” realm of system-defining “scalar” motion

that has become the fascination of alternative spirituality and science, whether people think in these terms or not.[75]

The terms, however, can indeed be misleading. They are appealing because they imply some kind of realm of secret forces or causes, but too much emphasis on this intermediate realm also can lead to obsession with discrete divisions. Whether its an obsession with good and evil or with hunting down the supposed true “cause” behind things, this metaphysical trend towards trenchant transcendence doesn’t help countercultural ideas gain broader traction, especially when it becomes a kind of Gnostic paranoia.

To clarify, the reasons that determine the pattern of distributions and equalizations that play out in life are infinite and therefore beyond the proximate “causes” that determine which contingent contexts something takes place within.

There are no dark forces or technologies that can attack the true source of things, for this has no limited origin. While there may indeed be “scalar weapons”—a popular esoteric term that implies a manipulation of the trajectory of something’s coherence or incoherence relative to some system—acknowledging their existence should not drift into paranoid occultism. [76]

Admittedly, there are some rather dark implications that fall right out of the physics and make sense of long-standing esoteric claims. One can at least imagine how it could be possible to “engineer” a *relative* cause by manipulating through wave interference the whole pattern of vortices upon which some piece of material existence depends, either increasing or decreasing coherence, perhaps even collapsing this vortical foundation in certain systems.

As for “causal realms”, they are of course a subject of esoteric philosophy and occult magical traditions, and here too one can see how manipulating events could be accomplished, not only with machine technology but by the ability of consciousness to influence wave dynamics.[77] One may even understand how an occult economy of competition over energy could exist.

Indeed, in these traditions, it is implied that certain beings consciously choose to evolve along the lines of primordial separation and exploitation past the point that would normally require increasing constructive convergence with the wider universe to increase energy and coherence.[78]

In a kind of cosmically scaled version of animal predation, such beings must decrease the coherence of others and thereby create a wave of entropy, space, and time, that they can ride—or from their point of view, feed—into their own inward momentum, pushing others into a centrifugal chaos while outrunning any karmic equalization.

The stubborn spirit of solitary freedom discussed earlier could in this way actually achieve some measure of escalating energy, light, or speed through divergence. Though unlike the brute process where something merely tries, like the fire of a phallic rocket engine, to push through or

outrun the rest of the universe through incoherent force and exhaustive consumption, coherent intensity requires the kind of vortical manipulation one associates with the flying saucer.

However, unlike the kind of technology used by advanced crafts to temporarily achieve high speeds and system jumping, the advanced parasitical being does not merely decouple and couple between systems, but must maintain a deeply entrenched and sustained oppositional polarity with everything in order to sustain its intense inward motion.

This creates a conflict of interest with those whose increasing coherence depends on an increasing convergence with all. One may see here something of the physics behind many spiritual traditions' claims of a polarized struggle in the heavens. Those trying to polarize against all will still end up working together against those trying to harmonize all, with humanity mostly caught in the middle.

One can picture this as one side pushed into a precarious coherence as they compete with each other, pulled towards but attempting to dominate and cohere around themselves what would be, from their point of view, a centripetal momentum from the light and entropy sloughed off by some rich source of diminishing polarity, like struggling life and conflicts of consciousness. The other side would also be attached, yet devoted to the centripetal motion of all that has been scattered, working to bring everyone back into the balanced motion of undivided light.

One can imagine the selfish side's impulse as having something to do with a foundational fall from grace. Into the divine realms of distinct but distributed and interpenetrating beings and vortices, the distances of space and time are introduced in this kind of way as a negative inversion of the divine ratios of balanced constructive interference.

When the increasing coherence and convergence are kept for oneself and not distributed to others, there is increasing separation and a feeding off the entropy of what is no longer a constructive mutual differentiation and individuation, but for other beings, a destructive dispersion.

While this presence of predation no doubt serves a function in producing a richer potential for consciousness evolution, unlike the path to universal harmony, which has endless regimes of wayward matter to bring back into the fold, the other side's dependence on maintaining dependably low-speed matter-waves to fuel its superluminal phase-wave development, can only go so far.

It can achieve a version of the dream of independence, but its relatively nonlocal power is still tied to something comparatively local and limited. While organic life must pass through a phase of parasitical dependence, there is a higher path to unlimited development that is truly "open" on all sides to an ever-deeper and wider harmony.

14. Deconstructing the Disparate Forces of Physics, Mainstream and Alternative

“The whole is not a closed set, but on the contrary that by virtue of which the set is never absolutely closed, never completely sheltered, that which keeps it open somewhere as if by the finest thread which attaches it to the rest of the universe.” - Gilles Deleuze[79]

Whatever the story—whatever happens to distribute the momentum of causeless continuous motion into seemingly separate beings, into mind and matter, or the appearance of dispersive interference—still, what is dispersive in one system, giving rise to space and time there, flows out and eventually into another, becoming organized, transforming all incoming linear force and emergent space into the centripetal vortices that replace space and negate its entropy, or rather transform it into the interpenetrating energies of immediately reciprocal relations.

Some imagine space as empty, or perhaps full of “potential” or “virtual” energy. Yet it is not a container to be emptied or full. It is an expression of more or less contrasting or more or less converging spirals of space-time manifestation and elimination.

Space only appears as a more or less empty container for matter because entropic, centrifugal forces dominate from our perspective. There is not enough coherence and centripetal motion to organize the chaotically distributed vectors and spins of space—that is, its interference patterns are not densely and intricately organized enough to be recognized as matter, or coherently conjugated enough to converge into the truly continuous medium beyond the seeming voids of space and separation of death.

One could say that space is a rather unorganized crisscross of flows and spin orientations, with matter being considerably more organized. Organisms are even more so, with the most creatively coherent fields and densely diverse overlays of life’s lines of energy converging towards the immortal.

To many alternative physics thinkers, the ordered flow of matter that becomes more coherent in life is visualized as creating a kind of standing-wave pattern in the structure of the surrounding field. Life and other coherent systems (like the spin-coherence of a magnetic field) are just likened to whirlpools in a sea of energy, organizing the spiraling torsion or vortical motion.

However, once again, while the order one sees in dynamic systems may seem to emerge randomly from disorder, or from fortuitous spatial collisions, in principle, it must be drawn from somewhere else, and must, in turn, go somewhere when lost. It could not do so unless space was only relatively disordered, being more essentially a field of potentially resonant channels tuned to the system that is navigating it.

Consequently, the centripetal pools of matter and life are not islands in a dark sea of space and sporadic energy but rather are part of the ocean of structured power, that, as discussed, is *nothing but* coherently connected whirlpools of circulating harmony. They only appear dispersed in space and time while spurring this appearance ever towards the deeper reality.

The universe may seem to be only sporadically populated with islands of light and life consuming a diminishing store of dynamic coherence, with life especially tapping ordered flows of energy and leaving its mark in the form of increased disorder. But these exhaustible gradients and flows, just like every finite line of life, are just traces of a greater circulation.

The appearance of an increased crinkle in the fabric of flow (in other words entropy and discrete information) is a sign of an eternal *asymmetry* inherent to symmetry. This *asymmetry* is really just the infinite relationality of symmetry, its transcendence of mere presence or absence in that it manifests always through connection and experience, never as something as opposed to something else in a discretely spatial or representational sense.

Apparent asymmetry and disorder are just the potent motion in the ocean, the active side of infinity that ensures the creation of new differences—new gradients that not only produce space and time itself but are the very mechanisms undergirding everything. This includes any kind of spiritual fabric of harmonies beyond the separation of space and time.

All seemingly opposed poles are being converted endlessly into and through each other, with even the determined and indeterminate generating each other through and within the context of their relation. What is called entropy—what is the residue that is said to be shed or even created in “dissipative processes” like those at work in life—is not just our waste, not simply what is left behind as unusable, unstructured energy and degrading organization, but only what life temporarily fails to harmonize.

Like the subjective dispersion of energy that results at the limits of our naive attempts to definitively unify with each other in sexual consummation, the centrifugal residue inherent to the incompleteness of every event becomes part of what creates the spiraling circle of new life.

What cannot be made simultaneous—that is, harmonized along a relative gradient of presence within the “space” of the eternal moment—becomes worked out through time, just as the spin-seeds that emerge out of the vibrating shear between apparent opposites conceive and grow the next generation through the womb of life.

Indeed, just as the jarring rhythms of one system are the harmonious oscillations of another, polarity and compensation are already present at the moment of apparent loss. A simple example of this is found in the orientation of the corresponding spirals of communicating systems. The right-handed or clockwise twist of outward generation or loss is by nature already a left-handed twist of incoming nourishment and negentropy when seen from the receiving frame.[80]

Reality is made of coherent change, where both symmetry and asymmetry, being and becoming, are preserved and distributed, endlessly generating new combinations due to the open and infinite nature of everything, a nature that can mutate its constitutive structures without ever losing any of them to some definitive force or separation.

However, inherent to the implied asymmetries that are etched into the interstices of the highest symmetry are the segmented realms we experience. Here the symmetry is distributed—which means that the consequent asymmetries of fragmented frames and spaces necessitate the appearance of incoherent exchange or interference. This is expressed and signified by the separation of light and matter, vector and spin, producing reciprocal adjustments in the fabric of relative motion.

This fabric is often said to be created or dominated by “gravity” at the large scales of cosmic structure, despite gravity’s supposed “weakness”. However, in light of the above, it should be clear that gravity—and other so-called forces like magnetism and electricity—are all reified aspects or expressions of the same underlying tensions of motion.

What is called gravity appears more ubiquitous because, from the idealized perspective of flat or neutral (even if curveable) space—the assumed background of spatially-bound minds—gravity is the closest thing to a concept of primordial “scalar” motion.

If space is conceived as a fabric that simply undergoes “curvature”—or what could be better understood as a coherent bias in opposing field flows—all it takes to create an apparent net dominant motion is for local spins to align just enough to cancel their proximate counterflows, allowing them to fall inward together as a combined vortex.

The accompanying lateral spin of the vortex need not add up to much, nor does large-scale order need to form for this “primordial” convergence to frequently arise across space, especially in the neutral or “flat” foundational space conceived by such thinking.

Indeed it is true that, because inward coherence collapses and bends lateral spatial tensions and does not require the maintenance of an organized transverse structure in space in order to persist in some fashion, its simple “scalar tension” between divergent inward motions—or between these “counter-spatial” motions and the spatial structures and movements that result from their contrast—can exist and accumulate even in disordered or entropy-rich environments.

This does make gravity appear as a more resilient and omnipresent effect—despite its apparent weakness—for it is less dependent on specific material structure for its existence. Over large distances and across the diluted structures of interstellar space, it is gravity’s scalar convergences (and divergences between systems) that not only seem to persist throughout the cosmos, but appear to be what organizes its structure.

Yet this is because space itself would not exist without spins converging enough to both converge and oppose in some structured way. For in actuality, neutral space is not a primordial condition; it is an abstracted background, more akin to a statistical average than a logically or cosmically prior state.

Any organized manifestation of spin—even when seemingly poised in the atomistic opposition of supposed neutrality—is always embedded within, and expressive of, a close relational

connection and convergence. One can see the general principle of opposites being closely tied together manifested in these basic physical facts—such as in a magnetic field where opposing vortices stabilize a plain or space between them tied to the same inward motion.[81]

For mutual opposition and counter-rotation to not become dispersively entropic and centrifugal there must be a balance of *scalar tension* holding the *scale of spin* together. Where this is absent, it is only locally so, spurring regimes of inward motion to diverge radically and centrifugal expansion to appear dominant.

In other words, for distinct externally poised spins to even appear requires an already-structured geometry of mutual internality—shared gradients of centripetal and centrifugal coherence. What appears as neutral is only a temporary symmetry of competing flow regimes, not a passive container or backdrop.

Yet, the common conception of space as being—on its own—neutral or flat, and gravity as some kind of modification, is difficult to let go of. While gravity was at first assumed to be a quality of matter, once this theory failed, it only led to the idea of “dark matter” instead of a deep reassessment.

In reality it is gravity—or inward, “counter-spatial” motion—that makes not only matter but the lateral motions and volume of space possible, not the other way around. Yet even if spatial forms and gradients are mere modifications of underlying counter-spatial tensions, it is admittedly true that the accumulation of matter increases inward motion.

This is because despite matter being the most obvious sign of an increase in the spatial equilibriums that delay space’s negation in inward convergence, it also increases this inward motion. Indeed when the tension between motion directions becomes organized into an accumulating bit of recognizable matter, while some of the lateral or transverse spin that accompanies all inward motion becomes space and form, especially when spin differentials are reinforced, some space is also cancelled in the coalescing aggregate.

Matter often forms more “gravity” or inward motion because material complexity offers more opportunities for the coherent cancellation of spin differences, and the space and time that goes with them. By comparison, other “forces” can seem rather insignificant next to gravity’s seemingly frame-defining and space-molding action.

Indeed, while the “lateral” tensions and reconciliations of space and form associated with electric and magnetic gradients undeniably create much structure in space, if one merely sees them as a force of matter primordially distinct from gravity—a force that maybe shuffles things around and organizes them temporarily, but is not really responsible for forming their essence—then they can appear comparatively local, short-lived and shortly reconciled.

One would naturally assume such limited scale prevents broad or large-scale effects in these fields, especially when contrasted with the seeming ubiquity of the “vertical” gradients associated with gravity.

Yet even if it is true that interfering motions may often average out into large-scale inward or outward flows—deep and dark movements that indeed seem cosmic in scale compared to the light waves or electromagnetic forces that seem to bend to their will—explaining them requires mysterious-sounding patches on the failures of gravitational theory like “dark energy”.

In truth, the apparent ground and horizon of the cosmos is still just a relative frame on motions that cannot be definitively categorized as more fundamental. Indeed, it is heterogenously structured alignments and differentiated fields that largely shape not only local phenomena but also the very conditions through which scalar or longitudinal flows emerge and organize.

Structures are not modifications on an underlying medium, even a medium of more primary motion, because *every motion is a modification*, and every arrow of precedence is relative and *more fundamentally a reciprocal emergence.*

Mainstream models, constrained by force-based mechanics, are often forced to invent ad hoc explanations to account for the sheer magnitude or unexpected geometry of expansive and contractive movements. These theories mistake mathematical stitching for physical insight, and miss how crucial every alignment in the universe is in making the larger structure. Even if often circuitous, the flow is always reciprocal with the macro and micro in mutual determination.

Nowhere is this missing principle more of a roadblock to humanity’s self-understanding than in our picture of the planet we live on. Even though the coherence of planetary fields is so vital to the evolution of the Earth and its beings, our world’s “field” is usually relegated to merely an effect of some assumed magnetically molten core.

But such an assumption blinds us to the more profound reality: that planetary-scale fields are not the products of mere mineral machinery, but signatures of systemic alignments—patterns that stretch across the crust, oceans, atmosphere, solar wind, and even the geometry of the solar system itself. These fields are not the afterthoughts of mass, but structural agents of planetary formation and coherence.

When the assumption is a force behind every effect, one assumes that it must emanate from some arbitrary cause instead of learning the relations that converge to bring it about. This of course also means that, while electricity and magnetism are underestimated aspects of the bigger picture, they are not the “real” generative primary forces either.

They are, however, signs of the vital heterogeneity that makes the universe run. Longitudinal motion only exists relative to other contrasting scalar gradients that interfere and produce the transverse effects of electromagnetism.

Electromagnetism is, however, not a composite of separate forces or even separate motions, but a mode of relational orientation within the larger topological field of centrifugal and centripetal interference—a geometry of living gradients. These differentiated gradients are vital to making what would otherwise be a rather abstract opposition of longitudinal tensions into a tapestry with infinite topology.

They are no mere local differentiation, but rather the scaffolding of self-organization through which continuity moves and symmetry evolves from the macro to the micro, and then back again through matter and into life, where electric and electromagnetic tensions are used to store, transform, and distribute coherence across scale.

Wherever one wants to start the story, it is all a relational mediation. Where local spins converge and contrast, their combined lateral spins can not only form complex chemical structures but set up coherent directional flows across space and time. Some space is still negated, and an inward gradient is formed; but when these inward gradients are coherently organized in contrasting directions, the spin combinations can create large scale loops of spatial mediation.

In this manner, electricity and magnetism can create tensions and flows that align with and add to other regimes' inward gradients as well as negating them, adding to a perceived spatial "expansion" or "contraction". And in this way, the difference between forces is a matter of perspective, with the distinction between the longitudinal, magnetic, and electric effects being a more important *relative* distinction than any collection of fundamental forces.

This means that the fabric of space-time is not really curved at all, and certainly not by force, but rather shaped by the torsion of relational coherence. The observable phenomena we call gravity, electricity, and magnetism are just differentiated expressions of scalar motion—emerging where countervailing flows cancel, reinforce, or entrain each other into structured coherence across scale.

Such lines of thought are vitally necessary to reorient science and society toward a topological grammar of becoming, where to move is not to just to travel but a visible mode of meaning that shapes the field of relation itself, and all change is reciprocal or is doomed to confront reciprocity through history's vicious cycles.

Any force or motion, no matter what the medium or relative direction, is mediating pressure and pressing into what is ultimately the inward movement confusedly called gravity when it finally falls. The fall is not inevitable, however, nor the universe doomed to some final crunch since this distance-negating pressure can become balanced and its progression delayed indefinitely or harmonized through space and time.

For at the end of the day (or the end of the world) inward or unifying motion only exists in contrast so it can never completely overcome other directions. So the ground and horizon of being's seemingly "primordial" inward motion in a sense does pale in power and precedence

compared to the complex symmetries and more differentiated fields that give being and space some shape, birthing and folding it into vital becoming.

While inward motion can seem to overwhelm space in certain interstellar phenomena, like so-called “black holes”, this is more of a triumph of intense structural coherence than some simple gravitational collapse of outward manifestation. Such coherence may seem to have completely negated space, but this is only relatively so—and even relatively speaking, it does not overcome through opposition.

So-called gravity or mere mass alone cannot accomplish such things. Mass itself requires some harmonized spatial structure—and even then it doesn’t get far without the burgeoning seeds of life’s dynamic symmetry. Without it, the weak coherence of relatively inert matter—such as amorphous rock or inert dust—can only long for the spark that ignites an evolutionary ascent, and the concomitant descent of some higher spirit or idea.

It takes the structured regimes of intensely organized matter to transform ongoing pressure differentials and background motion into organized pathways of vital energy and living relations. While stars and planets, for instance, may not appear to be life as we know it, if one sees coherence itself as the true sign of its spirit and intelligence, then one may begin to glimpse the contours of a more lasting and ubiquitous evolution.

All forms are alive to some extent. It can never be reduced to a mechanical sum of simple gradients, such as spin, charge, or mass. It is not a heap of properties, but a persistent, phase-locked coherence: a torsional memory inscribed in the field, a symmetry of recurrence that allows certain topologies of relation to hold.

Spin is not an added motion, but a topological constraint—a rhythm in how the field twists and returns to itself. Even mainstream physics is forced to acknowledge that mass and spin seem to emerge less from discrete constituents than from the binding tensions and relational dynamics of energy held in form. All form is a self-sustained resonance, a knotted coherence, stabilized across scale through recursive alignments of phase

This means that the passive compromise of gradients found in simpler matter does not simply scale upward into the levels of intensity observed in stars and planets. Without more complex field architectures, such matter remains dynamically inert.

In a relatively incoherent substrate, gradients of motion—thermal, vibratory, or scalar—are typically averaged out in all directions. Their internal tensions cancel, leaving only a diffuse inward pull—a weak, directionally neutral tendency toward gravitational sinking. While any mass implies some coherence in both centripetal and transverse motion, this coherence remains minimally structured unless certain axes begin to dominate.

As pressure accumulates—through interference patterns and resonant field interactions within matter—and as the relationships between spin, oscillation, and structural constraint begin to

align, emergent axes of intensified inward and outward flow are diverted into differences that we observe as electric polarity or "charge."

Yet what arises here is not simply an accumulation of force, but a transformation within the scalar field—a differentiation of its inward-directed coherence. In the undisturbed state of an abstract ideal, this tension is, like an isolated charge or gravitating body, isotropic and undirected: a uniform pull toward structural simplicity. But when polarized by asymmetry, constrained by boundary, or entrained by resonant rhythm, this field resolves into organized lines of potential—manifesting as localized electrical structure.

From this condition, discharge can occur—a radial resolution from a point of concentrated difference toward a neutralizing horizon. Yet this release cannot remain purely radial within the resistance and geometry of real matter. The curved and constrained environment deflects it into spiral paths, giving rise to magnetism as a torsional field structure—a rotational form of continuity that emerges when scalar resolution meets spatial boundary.

Still, this is not a simple transformation of radial tension into spiral motion. What we observe as electromagnetism is not merely curved charge flow, but the emergence of a triadic field structure in which scalar potential, directional discharge, and torsional coherence co-arise.

Magnetism does not follow electricity as an effect, nor does charge simply convert into rotation. Instead, these field modes interlock as mutually dependent expressions of constrained motion. Electromagnetism, then, is not a compound of two forces, but a single field topology folding in three directions at once—scalar (inward), radial (electric), and rotational (magnetic)—each contouring the others through mutual orthogonality balancing the triadic tension of relation.

In this sense, electromagnetism arises from the interplay of resistive geometries and localized asymmetries in how inward and outward motions resolve. It is a structure of energy shaped by internal gradients and external boundaries.

These gradients, together with the dynamic interference of overlapping waveforms, give rise to the observable behaviors of electric currents, magnetic field lines, and electromagnetic radiation. What we call electromagnetism is thus the visible structure of constrained coherence—a medium folding in and out of itself across scale.

This interplay is not simply material—it is the flow of life in the universe, where electric and electromagnetic gradients serve to store, organize, and distribute coherence across scales, setting up the conditions for the spiritual descent into form that is life.

Crystals represent an early threshold of this descent. They exhibit structural coherence through fixed geometric symmetry—spatial order encoded into the lattice. This coherence marks a step beyond inert matter, locking internal motion into a form that resonates across scale. Yet it remains largely static: a resting structure that stabilizes gradients and reflects order without adapting to it.

Water, especially in its structured states, occupies a pivotal transitional role. It bridges the crystalline and the biological, maintaining both lattice-like coherence and fluid adaptability. It remembers phase relations, entrains rhythms, and mirrors ambient fields. Unlike the locked symmetry of the crystal, water responds and reorganizes—it doesn't merely balance tension laterally, it transduces it into evolving internal order. In water, symmetry begins to move.

Biological life builds upon the medium of water and internalizes its memory even further. No longer content to balance charge externally or passively, the organism draws difference inward—alchemizing tension into function, converting gradients into meaning.

Life metabolizes imbalance: it feeds on asymmetry, storing and releasing coherence through nested cycles of feedback, regulation, and transformation. As life becomes more coherent, it requires less and less space and time to do this. It embodies ever-higher harmonies of a simultaneous differential tension.

Like the loving exchange between any two beings in perfect dynamic equilibrium, when gradients, barriers, and asymmetries become balanced and transformed enough into boundless reciprocity, they can, again, seem to generate no lingering space and time. Or more accurately, *the space of one is the time of the other*, and both are canceled in the process. As one ray of influence expresses forward in space and time, the other backward from any one perspective.

While as long as interference happens and the exchange is not so immediately reciprocal—as long as space and time are created but not immediately negated through loving communion, the waves and wobbles of circuitous reconciliation proceed.

Again, all forces are the same dynamic of pressure mediation attempting to resolve back into the topological fold of interpenetrating change. They are perspectival expressions of the same underlying realignment—a world of nested vortices, of spins either canceling to fall inward or reinforcing to structure space, constantly seeking coherence and thereby producing new gradients.

Whether in copper wire or cosmic vacuum, the same basic field-logic persists and underlies even the most complex arrangement and modifications. Indeed, all fields are just modifications of the same flow, with contradictions or barriers giving rise to the mutually orthogonal aspects of electricity, magnetism, and the resulting energy flow.

Yet as discussed previously, as important as EM waves are, thinking of them in terms of radiated and absorbed “photons”—or even discrete light waves—obfuscates that while these force and field waves riding the lines of push and pull from interfering regimes may appear as the central struggle of the universe, these seemingly sovereign transverse waves are, much like the transverse waves on top of the ocean, on their own, just opaque signs of an infinite sea.

Meaning that, like the waves that mediate between air and ocean, there is an abysmal depth in the medium for which the waves are just an interface, a depth holding endless mysteries for

every manifestation. Yet, like a transversal line in geometry that cuts between two other lines, the transverse wave cuts across and through the otherwise symmetrical reciprocity of light's unity.

This makes it more than just a passive sign—for it helps generate the dynamic interplay of reflective opposites with something akin to a diagonal relation: not merely parallel or symmetrical, but continuously skewed, reflecting the tension inherent to the complicated distribution of matter and light, body and spirit—the triadic tension between beings and their mutual becoming.

To reiterate and now recontextualize the discussion and terminology on waves from earlier, the ripples of what appears to be a normal light-speed wave at a given frequency are actually always a packet or group of waves riding on, interfering, and mediating other waves of influence and interference. This means that every observed light wave is a product of the interaction between regimes of interfering waves, like the regime which ostensibly emitted it and the one that absorbed or detected it.

Even though this group and its constituent waves—a convergence in the substratum of carrier or phase waves—travel at light speed as EM radiation in the space between matter, as soon as radiation is absorbed, or as the group-wave of light interacts with or becomes part of matter, the phase-wave becomes relatively superluminal, adjusting the whole phase-rhythm or energetic structure of any matter in relation to the matter group-wave or absorption event.

Theorists conceptualize different sides of this process with various concepts. Whether one talks about torsion, scalar, longitudinal, and phase waves, as the counterculture does, or talks about the flow of energy orthogonal to both the electric and magnetic waves as the mainstream does, these all just highlight certain aspects of more or less the same phenomenon, even if the mainstream concept is especially diluted by standard physics models.

For, again, energy doesn't just flow in space, as if it were a stream of particles coursing through the wires or the space between them. It is not a substance traveling from point A to point B. Rather, energy is a continual reorganization of field tension across a structured medium—a phase event in which electric and magnetic polarizations co-arise along the constraints of geometry and material boundary.

The "flow" observed between circuit elements is a manifestation of this ongoing rebalancing of scalar tension, constrained by the form of the conductor and the surrounding field. The energy is not in the wire or even solely between the wires—but in the topological relation that emerges when scalar potential is polarized, discharged, and folded back into rotational continuity.

The circuit does not "carry" energy so much as it hosts a continuous negotiation between inward-directed tension and outward torsional propagation. The apparent movement is a surface expression of deep phase alignment—a choreography of resolving tension and

geometric feedback in which charge, field, and resistance form a coherent, self-maintaining rhythm.

Unlike the radiative divergence of free electromagnetic waves—which spread outward through space as a decoupling of torsional and scalar tensions—circuits maintain a closed-loop coherence, where energy is not so much emitted as perpetually redirected and reorganized. In an electromagnetic wave, the scalar potential is discharged into space, and its electric and magnetic components propagate orthogonally in a synchronized phase relation, forming a traveling field disturbance. This form of energy is structured by open boundary conditions, allowing the field to decouple and extend.

But in a circuit, these conditions are constrained. The system is bounded: energy is folded back into itself, forming a recursive path of tension modulation rather than an outward emission. The loop maintains its coherence not by pushing force forward, but by continually restructuring the field in phase—a rhythmic balancing of electric difference and magnetic torsion along the wire's geometry and surrounding space. The result is a standing negotiation of phase rather than just a propagating pulse.

This is why the energy in a circuit can appear to "flow" between components, even while no substantial mass or particulate flow is occurring. What we observe as current is the local terminal effect of a broader, nonlocal realignment of phase.

All this can be understood in different ways and with different terms. However, it is probably the concept of a phase wave that is most important and best bridges abstract models and ambiguous terms to fundamental principles.

Talking about the phase of a wave as not just a reference but an active sign of a greater medium can help highlight that any change in apparent motion or potential can produce vast changes in the structure of things through wave interference. The concept can even help connect nonlocal phenomena to the principles of phase conjugation in mainstream physics.

Phase conjugation is known to restore wavefront symmetry by producing a coherent wave that mirrors the distortions of the original in reverse phase, effectively canceling them out. Coherent EM absorption is a more general variation of this process, wherein the interplay of group and phase waves reorganizes to restore systemic symmetry within the nonlocal topology of space and time. Both processes manifest the same underlying principle of symmetry restoration, with coherent absorption acting as a deeper structural realignment rather than just a local correction.

The phase concept properly framed makes it clear that any nonlocality arising from longitudinal waves is not a matter of serial propagation through some primary substance, but a simultaneous restructuring through shared phase-rhythms—shared wavefronts and interlocking flows of (centrifugal) space and (centripetal) time.

At their extremes, these flows feed into each other, since all created distance must eventually be negated and all that has been negated becomes a new gradient of difference to something else. All inevitably comes back around, rhythmically cycling through everything.

Even the apparent separation of light into superluminal and sub-light-speed waves is not really a separation at all. So-called light speed is in some sense just the speed of centrifugal expansion relative to and made by the motion shared between source and sink, which then becomes modified when light is absorbed by matter's centripetal motion, adding to both its relatively sub-light motion and thus implying a superluminal adjustment of the larger phase-array.

More generally speaking, as discussed earlier, when a group wave (or transverse component) appears to separate from its previous phase alignment—for instance, when light from some source hits some new matter—what happens is that the light's group wave becomes tied up with the centripetal motion of the "absorbing" or dispersing material medium, and the waves that previously carried the group (the phase or carrier) become relatively superluminal because the whole front shifts instantaneously to align with the matter.

Space and time are either being negated in coherent alignment, pulling the whole structure—and possibly vast wavefront—a little closer, or space and time are being created in the case of entropic interference, adding to the centrifugal cascade and increasing the wave's outward speed relative to the matter.

In either case, the waves are not merely separated, absorbed, or reflected in a conventional sense. But neither is this just a single fabric stretching and contracting as mainstream physics tends to frame it. It is an open and infinite system of implosions and explosions, a storm of spin sucking space and time into its vortices and releasing them back into new spaces of relative difference.

Yet, this is all just the usual topological creation and communication of difference brought into specific contexts as created and negated space and time. The result is a continual reorganization of the space-time fabric, as matter bends or rather modulates the long arc of some regime of seemingly centrifugal phase waves into the tighter orbits of its own space, thus creating some amount of localization of the underlying continuous topology.

This contraction or localization adjusts the entire space-time system without being a separate force or magically superluminal effect, and consequently, is not difficult to visualize. Even if a longitudinal wave has unwound or spread its centrifugal spin considerably across space, a small instance of coherent material interference can reorient the entire wavefront by aligning that dispersed wave of spin toward a new centripetal center.

This process is analogous to pulling the drain on a tub of water: the spiraling surface waves, which may have been chaotically interacting and pushing against one another, are instantly reoriented as the drain introduces a coherent center. Similarly, the introduction of coherent

interference may act as a focal point, reorganizing the spin dynamics of the longitudinal wave and directing its energy inward.

It should be easy to see how even a seemingly minor interaction can influence the broader structure of the wave, and hence the structure of all physical things as interconnected wave phenomena. Quantum physics discovered that matter is also a wave, but it insufficiently appreciates the significance of matter constantly capturing and releasing waves to sustain its structure. Such a concept makes it easy to understand every so-called “force” in terms of wave interaction.

For instance, if in some system the only centripetal “force” is gravity, it has enough coherence to capture the waves needed to sustain its mass but not enough to overcome its expansive fall along with similarly gravitating matter. With simple magnetism, the centripetal momentum is greater, though rather basic and linear compared to the complex coherence of life, which harmonizes many longitudinal lines of waves. The greater the coherence of the matter or life, the more phase waves it coheres and draws inward and into the balanced light of instantaneous reciprocity.

Although life does not appear to have more gravity relative to the matter around it, the complexity of its fields and entanglement contribute to a greater centripetal momentum of all the matter it is bound to. One could, for instance, imagine a galaxy of abundant and highly evolved life (or other highly evolved coherence-patterns besides organic life), and compare to this one with less. In this case, the latter might appear to have less gravity.

Their mutual motion would depend on their shared phase waves with each other and other galaxies, possibly even flying apart faster than light if their directions of inward motion were sufficiently opposed. The interplay between the creation of space-time through outward radiation and the negation of space-time through inward harmonization can create large-scale regimes of contrasting motion, making any definitive cosmology of inevitable collapse or expansion impossible, but spiral and toroidal patterns abundant across overlapping hierarchies of scale.

The cumulative light and change that is not cohered or absorbed from all systems can create what appears from our view as an expansion of space-time at the cosmic scale. However, both inward and outward motions play a vital role in the dynamic relationship between light and matter, so there are endless opportunities for large-scale implosions and explosions.

They are all part of a cyclical system, where the light, space, and time that is lost or is seemingly racing out into the abyss—out past all matter and opportunity for inward capture—is actually cycling within a “larger” system, or through systems that seem to annihilate the space of others at their margins.

15. Transversal Harmonies: Heterodyning, Heteronyms, and The Golden Mean

“An asymmetrical division is needed in order to create the dynamics necessary for progression and extension from unity. The golden mean is the perfect division of unity.”
-Robert Lawlor[83]

Modern science and its ideology have mesmerized the world with concepts that have, especially in postmodern times, become increasingly difficult to pin down or understand. The anti-postmodern impulse to re-ground science and society in clear facts is an understandable reaction to the excessive abstraction, relativism, and exploitation of complexity by power. But the subtle selection of facts by power is even more insidious if the relational base of even the most basic physics is not understood.

Whether it's light and matter, space and time, or even information, these must be understood not as things in themselves existing within the confines of some definitive universe of however many dimensions, but rather as reflecting definite ratios in the way we divide or relate to an infinite number of possible dimensions and relations.

This means that matter is not a more or less inert substance simply absorbing or releasing quantized bits of light or radiation; its interaction with light is a sign of a system’s participation in the polarization and equalization of a greater universe of continuity and distributed symmetry.

As life and matter become more coherent, they harmonize the relationship between their local group of waves and the larger phase-array of rhythmic cycles, bending the long arc of wayward light inward into tighter and more densely overlapping cycles, eventually eliminating all accumulating space and time into larger systems—but “within” what is ultimately the never-ending journey of differentiating and harmonizing systems more or less reflected in the play of light and matter.

Any progressive incorporation of difference into harmony, however, is not a linear process. It cannot be achieved, for instance, through any matter’s simple accumulation of light but through an open harmonic inclusiveness of each thing’s phase relations, an embedding of its short wave oscillations within longer wave cycles.

This means that the local spin patterns and long-range longitudinal aspects of the waves are integrated into a greater structure, a process which, being embedded in infinitely other systems, necessitates the development of intelligence capable of the necessary adjustments to an infinitely changing horizon.

Of course, again, at an abstract-relational or “topological” level, light remains unaffected by all this, since all “metric” or dimensional distances of space and time are nullified just as they are created in perfect reciprocity. But at any local level, where space and time are unevenly distributed, the degree of dynamic coherence within the system determines the balance of inward and outward motion.

In contexts without external perturbations, these waves remain in a state of unchanging change, cycling through the topological structure without accumulation or loss. In these regions where waves cycle unperturbed—the waves may remain invisible without interference, but they can contribute to the apparent superluminal motion of some distant matter, as the speed between disparate matter regimes naturally can exceed light speed in their contrasting motion.

This dynamic illustrates how light speed functions as a measure of the change of change, revealing not just linear motion but the deeper phase adjustments between distant regimes. In the absence of a shared phase reference, apparent superluminal motion emerges as material systems diverge, their mutual relations unfolding across scales beyond immediate perception.

Yet, even in incoherent interactions and disparate regimes, the equation $VmVp=C^2$ (what can be called the “Great Velocity Equation”) shows that the balance remains preserved at the topological level and is communicated through the doubling of light speed (C^2). The outward-directed wave, though appearing as lost light or independent systems in the segmented space of metric distances, still retains its deeper relational role, carrying forward the imprint of the interactions and spaces it defines its motion against.

Over the infinite time of relayed and overlaid systems, the imbalance resolves as all lost and shed waves recycle and integrate back into the continuous topology of their relations. Through the bidirectional line in time represented by C^2, light heals the holes of life’s trauma, recuperating missed past-potentials and the broken symmetries that haunt all centripetal systems with their eventual dispersion.

In the meantime, however, the phase wave’s motion (Vp) is key to distributing that ultimately symmetrical reciprocity. In coherent interactions, its relatively inward reversal supports unity and balance, reinforcing light’s role as a bridge between source and sink.

In incoherent interactions, its outward propagation adds space and time, reflecting dissonance while still preserving an implied return to balance. The interplay between matter (Vm) and phase (Vp) velocity gives form to the reciprocal nature of light, where every interaction reflects a mutual determination between being and becoming, outward and inward motion, and the creative and dissipative forces at work in the universe.

And because the background phase-space tied to any group of matter constitutes the structure of possible interfering waves, this can be changed by anything that increases (or decreases) coherence. Any change in reference can change the distribution or organization of the universe, hence the power and importance of what we call “consciousness”. Coherent life—and the relatively advanced relational individuation called consciousness—by way of their unique relations, facilitate the harmonization of waves, effectively “bending” outward radiation inward.

Mainstream physics may stumble through similar kinds of ideas, but the implications are often too radical to acknowledge. Specifically, the fact that coherent systems of life and consciousness have shown the ability to change,[84] align, and harmonize the basic threads of the

world's structure, implies that they in some sense are not just formed by but help form the whole fabric upon which the ripples of sensibility ride.

However, the concept of consciousness as a kind of causal power or "presence" can be misleading without some kind of deconstruction and relational reconstruction. The same goes for associated concepts in the spiritual corners of alternative science, many of which gravitate towards thinking in terms of some master field, whether that be consciousness or some kind of "scalar" potential. The latter brings to mind a mere potential energy in the "vacuum" of space, or perturbations within the "zero-point field" that are merely tapped or released through the right intervention.

It is better to think of consciousness or any other relatively transcendent power as just a relatively advanced product or effect of coherent combinations. Coherence does not emerge from chaos, nor does it simply impose its order on it because, once again, there is no absolute disorder. Coherence emerges and procures the right links between eternally existing motion and regimes of evolving coherence.

Coherent interference does not merely stabilize or internalize motion into standing waves; it initiates cascades of combinatory momentum, "heterodyning" frequencies that rhythmically link across scale—aligning flows of energy from molecular vibration and electromagnetic fields to longitudinal wavefronts spanning long stretches of time and space.

When such coherence resonates with golden ratio harmonics, beat patterns emerge that can propagate indefinitely through and between registers, bridging the sensible, the structural, and the symbolic, giving rise to the tones and vibratory modes birthing matter and meaning, sound and self.

Just as heterodyning produces new tones from the interplay of existing ones, so too does meaning compound into various layers of indentity or "heteronyms"—multiple names and contexts emphasing different notes, tonal textures, and registers of the same underlying harmony that is each being and all, with infinitely ramifying routes towards other names and beings. Coherence, far from imposing a single order, reveals the polyphonic identity of things: every resonance a naming, every naming a shift in rhythm or phase.

It is in this proliferating rhythm of relaying relations and diferential structures that we enter a multiverse of meaning—not a chaos of contradiction, but a harmonic diffraction and overlapping convergence of sense. Hence, nominalism and realism both fall short: truth is neither the label nor the essence, but the patterned interference of relational being.

Reframing countercultural physics along these lines helps heal one of its most straining contradictions: its spiritual sense is unabashedly postmodern and multivalent, while its science tends towards the traditional and monolithic.

Rather than attempting to reinscribe the multitudinous lines of science and physics back into totalizing theories, fundamental substances, or transcendent waves, there needs to be a terminologicaly variable understanding of the relational medium. Key concepts like “scalar waves” can then be seen as referring to phase-aligned, nonlocal coherence effects rather than as independent causal entities.

The concept then becomes a metaphor for the holistic dynamics of synchronized symmetry and exchange. Using the word “scalar” for a wave is a bit awkward, however, since in mainstream physics it means a magnitude without a direction.

Admittedly, one can imagine how phase waves could be thought of primarily in terms of interfering waves that can seem to destructively annihilate each other but have really just transferred a lateral or vectorial movement into a wave described as “directionless” in a conventional electromagnetic sense.

This perhaps is helpful when talking about certain applications, like weapons based on wave-interferometry, but it should be made clear that at heart this phenomenon is no mere standing wave—nor a wave of localized or internally contained motion—but rather an interference coherent enough to *delocalize,* to bridge space and time on that higher plane of lossless circulation.

While standing waves and complex vibrations are of course a common result of certain kinds of coherence as seen in matter and especially life, with life and evolved consciousness in particular, again there is also some amount of nonlocal coherence being mediated by local patterns.

Accordingly, with the right ratio of combination, especially when dealing with harmonics of the golden ratio, the result is not just the tension of vibration but a cascade of inward motion and “phase discipline”,[85] a pressure on all motion to align its rhythmic phases into certain proportional relations with every other.

This could, however, still be thought of as transferring momentum from the normal space of transversal boundary negotiations into a deeper strata of the medium. However, as suggested before, this transfer of momentum would not translate into mere motion in some primary or transcendent medium, but is like a more direct route through the ever-present but more or less densely connected medium. It is a medium with no center or periphery, only relative densities making more or less circuitous—or more or less mediated—paths through its sequences.

In fact, the more primary—or rather densest part of—the medium is, paradoxically, a realm of “direct” relation. This is not because there is a faithful translation of meaning or motion free of distorting change, but because the most primary or abstract medium of change is that which does not change, or rather that which maintains its same sense through all change. It is the eternal and ubiquitous sense of every motion or meaning as continuous difference and meaningfully connected distinction.

It is therefore the same sense inherent to all meaning, as well as the infinite speed of simultaneous change shorn of the spatial mediations or temporal gaps one associates with causal and effective motion, subjective or objective meaning.

Consequently, the eternal medium is not a core layer or transcendent plane as much as the medium that is all mediums and relations. It is not a primordial cause so much as the eternally circulating effect of the mere possibility or idea of completely independent action—an idea giving rise to the whole universe of actual attempts to make it happen.

The effect is always to draw all distance towards its equalization and "negation", even if through the detours and delays of opposition and divergence. And whether this medium of mediums is fed by what is constructive or destructive in a frame like our space, any force or discrete inteference is always just a mutation in the fabric of reciprocal relation, so it is always constructive on its own plane of boundlessly dense interconnections.

The destructive and centrifugal always feeds into the constructive and centripetal at some point, if not in one world than in another, and that cascades at the limit not into a destruction of all difference, nor a divisively divergent creation on a new plane. For on that plane, in what could be called *the aether*, things grow more connected as they expand the intensity of their relations, increasing shared relations, not carving a "space" out for a separate self.

Calling this plane the aether, of course, should not be confused with any 19th-century concept of a static spatial frame. One should, after all that has been discussed here, hopefully not see the aether as some primary symmetrical medium but a symmetry forged from *or at least specifically determined by asymmetries.*

Indeed, this has been the trajectory of all postmodern philosophy and post-classical physics,[86] to embrace asymmetry and differential structure not for their own sake, but as the key to the connection between things. While "deconstruction" perhaps did not make this explicit, and the counterculture perhaps goes too far the other way—often embracing the classical aether, consciousness, or some other unified field or energy as a ground of substantial or spiritual being—the "transversal" thought of Gilles Deleuze, and developments along these lines point the way, not back to any static ground, but *formatively* toward the dynamic fabric of intercutting processes in which we are all immersed.[87]

The transversal cut connects and creates as it divides, forming the spiral of generation and return one sees in the golden section. Unlike the disconnection inherent to the geometry of our compartmentalized mind—where parallel lines never meet and lead us to think in terms of foundational forms external to each other and statically represented—we can instead understand all space and geometry as projecting from a "topological" aether of relation.

In projective geometry, which could be thought as a kind of mediation between these two—between the topological aether and the segmented spaces we project onto it—even parallel

lines can be said to meet at a transcendent point.[88] However, this transcendence is not absolute; it is simply the space of relative connection and “immanent” convergence.

In the dynamic topological aether, all lines and directions meet and form some kind of infinitely malleable tapestry of connection, where more discrete or metric spaces can be created and new differences played out, yet all the while preserving the transversal connections, the triadic and even *triangular* transformations defining *and connecting* the polarity of every relation to others through shared relations.

There is an important difference here from the symmetrical polarity that characterizes our usual discrete way of thinking—where entities are conceived as parallel and separate, and any link between them is treated as merely incidental: an external line of incidence, striking across a divide without participating in the constitution of the things it joins. Relation is then just an afterthought—linear, additive, and imposed atop already-separated forms.

In contrast, the transversal line of light is not an incidental crossing, but an internal rhythm—a diagonal through process itself. It relates not mere things, but relations; not discrete events, but the rates of change that synchronize them. It doesn’t simply bridge distance—it modulates coherence, defining and reshaping the very terms of connection as it moves.

And because change upon change gives rise to interference—and interference always unfolds in a wave structure—orthogonality becomes the underlying architecture of all space-time relation: the tension between simultaneity and sequence, between coherence and local motion, between the wavefront and the path it travels.

Just as a wave moves forward by an oscillating mediation, every act of becoming is both an unfolding sequence and a simultaneous relation. What we perceive as matter is the crest of this rhythm, structured not by position alone but by the ratio between phase coherence and group progression—between the reach of simultaneity and the pull of localized change.

One axis traces the direction of sequential progression—the group motion—while the other defines the wavefront of simultaneous relations, the phase array. In the case of a breaking water wave, one might think of the wave crest as stretching along the shore (a line of simultaneity), while the motion of the wave pushes toward the beach (a line of unfolding events).

Everything that happens at once occurs along this wavefront of simultaneity—this is the superluminal phase, the reference space that binds events together. What unfolds sequentially, along the direction of propagation, gives rise to matter—the structure of time as embodied in local change. No event happens in isolation; every act of becoming rides upon a larger wavefront, where time and space are not separate dimensions but orthogonal tensions within relation.

Consequently, every act of change contains the ratio of sides in a right triangle: the longer and more coherent the wavefront—more phase-connected the system—the further its influence

extends down the time-like axis. More simultaneity stretches the context of causation. Space and time, then, are not just reciprocally scaled relations, but also the two legs of any structured wave of becoming.

The so-called “golden rectangle” is an easy-to-visualize example of how turning $E=MC^2$ into $VmVp=C^2$ illuminates this triangular relation.[89] In geometry, a golden rectangle is a rectangle with side lengths in golden ratio, which creates many curious properties. For instance, it can be cut up into a square and a rectangle similar to the original one. The smaller rectangle is made from a square and an even smaller golden rectangle.

You can continue in this fashion making larger or smaller rectangles, and the pattern forms a “Phi Spiral”. In addition, diagonal lines drawn between the first two orders of embedded golden rectangles will define the intersection point of the diagonals of all the embedded golden rectangles, recently nicknamed “the Eye of God”.

The diagonals in these embedded spaces all form a straight shot to the eye of the vortex. The sides of consecutive rectangles have the ratio: (A / C) = (C / B). In other words (by multiplying both sides of this equation by BC), you get $AB=C^2$.

This form, $AB=C^2$, is the same as $VmVp=C^2$, showing that the neglected dimension of phase (Vp), this line of the wavefront of synchronous change that can *form* an overview of harmonized sequential change, is key to a kind of self-similar or “fractal” compression of the disparate regimes of material motion (Vm) into the creative coherence (CC) of light, in effect bending every local and linear flow into a greater economy of equilibrating circulation.

The conceptual implications of all this need to be appreciated. The golden ratio is nothing more than a curiosity if one cannot see it as a potent sign of the ideal transversal cut, the ideal diagonal connection cutting across every divide, and between scales of reality—not just seeing it as a beautiful pattern of nature, but *feeling* how all nature orients around these kinds of lines that form spiraling connections.

Light’s proportional connections can compress disparate information and energy into vast arrays of simultaneous structure and rhythmic form, cascading down matter’s slope of coherent vortices, reciprocating and distributing into a greater collective movement of creative coherence.

Additionally, the connections between light, energy, and matter suggest a further connection between compressible information and compressible energy. For, simply put, if fundamental waves can be coherently combined, or made a factor of each other,[90] then they can be nonlocally compressed, or perhaps more ideally, allowed to freely circulate in nonlocal harmony.

Either way, this reduces both space and time, storing more energy in matter’s nonlocal connections—in effect, turning matter increasingly into condensed light and coherent energy, with a decreasing need to feed on space, time, and entropy.

To the extent that matter is indeed just relatively high energy or compressed light, this is only compared to transverse traveling light, or rather centrifugal illumination. This is just what we see of light and EM radiation, just the communicable incommensurability of material systems. It is a sign of their temporary inability to further compress or store light as energy, which is in some sense its more primary reality, an aether of light of varying densities and pressures without limit.

Unfortunately, the dominant understanding of energy and entropy has mostly been a one-way loss, giving us a picture of an escalating disorder and eventual heat death of the universe. Even if some cyclical process is acknowledged, the relativity of information, usable energy—and therefore entropy—is mostly ignored in favor of discrete concepts and fundamental substances.

Even if the mutual convertibility of information, matter, and energy is admitted, once again the difference is pinned to an absolute backdrop or spatial frame that increasingly reduces to a single manageable system of information. This, of course, has led to the widespread burgeoning belief in a computational cosmos, or various simulation theories of existence.

Admittedly, the hope invested in the immortality of information sprung quite logically from the doomed descent into closed mechanical systems at the root of modern physics, now carried over into the trap of the very closed concept of meaning as mere information.

The result, however, is that physics, once considered the foundation of the scientific edifice, is inevitably becoming submerged by the success of the data sciences. This has ironically frozen the conceptual and cultural life of academic physics at the point that it became mere content for the post-war cybernetic state.

At the historical transition from the relative secrecy of the world wars to the complex compartmentalization of technical knowledge with the rise of the National Security State, information supplanted matter and energy as the new master metaphor for obvious reasons.

The consequent neglect of deep philosophical problems at the root of these transitions has ensured that science is foundationally confused and meaning gets increasingly lost as the structure of knowledge grows around the incoherence. Chaos and entropy, integral components of the concept of information as it was formalized by Claude Shannon, have become the very character of postmodern knowledge and the cultural logic of information society.[91]

While there is much evidence that a more coherent physics of matter and energy also continued to develop deep inside this state apparatus,[92] the mainstream has mostly lost the thread of meaningful understanding. If we are to ever emerge from this compartmentalized culture of information, from a culture still stuck in the war-time polarization of closed insular systems hungry for information, a new polarity must be found. Not only must the paradox of openness be confronted, and the lost physics reconstructed, but the metaphysical root of all paradox in polarity must be understood.

16. From Polarity and Power To Aetheric Pressure

“Thought demands ‘only’ movement that can be carried to infinity. What thought claims by right, what it selects, is infinite movement or the movement of the infinite.”
-Deleuze and Guattari[93]

To understand anything at all (without falling far into the gravity of one limited perspective) one must properly engage the polarity inherent to things as relationally constituted. This means appreciating that polarity and relationality are not just a matter of subjective bias or limitation, but a formative element to the structure of reality.

Language and meaning, matter, and energy, all arise through contrast and opposition. Yet this does not reduce reality to simple or overarching mediator. The ground is not discrete information or some infinitely divisible unity. It is neither a containable whole nor a structure of paired parts.

Rather, every apparent pole is a relational role. Self and other, true and false—these are mere metaphorical contrasts of context—gradations turned into oppositions through the gap of further context—with the gap obscuring the deeper continuity: an immanent multiplicity of overlapping gradients that create distinction through their dynamic intersections.

Polarity emerges not from intrinsic division but from relations nested more or less within other relations, structured by interference patterns of both contrasting and coinciding movements toward coherence.

It is precisely when two or more gradients of related value only partially overlap and fold into each other—each striving toward a state of unity and greater continuity—that differences become pronounced through a shared world, opening intervals in which distinct identities seem to form and new layers of relations more legitimately do.

Consequently, every being is one’s self and every idea is true—yet each is resonant with differential tensions and torsions that structure its gradients with all others relative to the seemingly present perspective, context, or idea.

Infinite potentials await yet are always already being curved into the contours of some selective structure, or otherwise conditioned by the seeming limits of a system, forcing a fuller actualization in a different register which beckons from the horizon.

Each apparent polarity thus reflects a particular curvature of relational space, an interference pattern where multiple waves of influence overlap and differentiate each other—all the while pulling each other through a greater space of differential convergence.

In this way, the elementary poles and particles of any relation or system—no matter how foundational they may seem—emerge from others. Any given pole is thus more accurately described as a node within a continuously evolving field, defined not by intrinsic essence or

static opposition, but by the changing and infinitely overlapping contexts that extend in various ways into everything..

In this participatory network of interactions and feedback loops, what we perceive as stable entities or fundamental forces are secondary phenomena arising from more primary relational structures of interference and coherence.

Consequently, a genuinely polarity-aware worldview recognizes that difference is not the oppositions of forms in a container of space, but a relational differentiation that implies each pattern extends equally across all others, through infinitely shared spaces and times. Polarity thus understood is the immanent expression of unity as infinity and relational multiplicity, a single continuum reciporcally arising from and with every differential mediation.

However, for spatially bound beings, some sense of a negating, othering externality is necessary to even approach or faintly echo the layered and relayed relations of ideas, qualities, and potentials that structure coextensive and simultaneous realities into distinguishable forms.

Meaning and motion both depend on difference, yet such beings must keep in mind that difference is never definitive. It must be continually reiterated that difference is always a relative polarity—*a tension and torque* mediating every thing and event.

The tension is an expression of the way two poles are the same or connected along one gradient—the pull to unify subject and object in the space of matter or meaning. Yet they are always being simultaneously differentiated within another gradient—giving rise to the torque or oscillation that reveals every medium, unity, or identity as a mediating relation already split open or curved at its core.

Whether this presence of time as a curve prior to any space or thing is conceived as the spin components of so-called particles, or the circular logic that plagues the foundation of mathematics and dictionary definitions with the continual deferral of definite meaning, in every case the oppositions of space and difference are getting simultaneously pressed toward negation and transversely torqued into further individuation.

This insight becomes especially crucial when attempting to coordinate disparate conceptual or social systems in a way that remains both coherent and open. For without recognizing how knowledge itself is shaped by these underlying polar constraints, we risk treating our frameworks as given rather than as participants in the very realities they describe.

Consequently, a polarity-aware worldview does not seek to define or fix difference for all time, but to trace and coherently support its generative role. For if difference is clearly understood not a static opposition, but an asymmetry reciprocally arising with dynamic symmetry, then it becomes easier to continually and cooperatively reshape the systems through which the universe’s specific patterns are reciprocally determined.

Within the kinds of topological frameworks explored throughout this work—and echoed in various historical and emerging currents of knowledge—polarity then does not imply a metaphysical dualism, nor a reality of foundational forces or entities.

On the contrary, true polarity necessitates a singular and continuous field of relation, one so deeply entangled that no part of reality can be isolated from its reciprocal tensions.

Unity and multiplicity not only require each other through contrast but imply each other in essence; because if they were opposed no gradations would exist, making somethings or even all things lack unity or reality, and unity a nihilistic abstraction. They are not, then, the poles of existence, but distributed and overlapping components of every thing and field, mediating the extent of shared reality arising between endless systems of relations.

Likewise, in physical systems, it is not mere tension between opposing forces that generates coherent structure, but the potency of specific interference patterns—the phase geometry that arranges forces, conflicts, and contrasts into stable or evolving form. This is the terrain of coherence, rhythm, and recursive order: not the cancellation of difference, but its integration into nested patterns of energy and relation.

This universe is a spiraling dance of more or less inclusive relationships and the dynamic mediation of all relational poles. The importance of this kind of dance of poles to the rhythm of a mediating third term recurs again and again throughout the history of thought.

Yet this forms another subtle pole between the poles and their mediator that has often troubled and undermined metaphysical thinkers, leading to many reductively monistic or dualistic schemes. This is especially the case when the concrete felt sense of the abstract as living relation is lost and its polarity is hardened into opposition. The abstract essence of things often becomes a discrete realm external to or divided by the concrete realm of things we experience.

This sets up a world divided from its essence, and its beings divided from each other, when the most universal and abstract esence is more truly and effectively rendered as that which cuts through all, making it the real concrete continuum of life as experienced, even if divisions can be rendered with partial abstractions and projected unto life.

While this projection can make it seem as if life is inherently divided and not just more or less clearly continuous and connected, a more concrete feel for the living reality of the most abstract essence has persisted as well throughout much of cultural history. Indeed, a sense of the relative polarity at work in all things seems to arise every time the intuitive mind attempts to synthesize a science of the world, and not merely build an abstract system.

Intuition wants unity but working with the world requires multiplicity. For the two to be genuinely connected and not just nominally equated or one collapsed into the other, there needs to be a continual subjection of every phenomenon to every other driven by the drive to a more fully interpenetrating field of relations, not just satisfying models.

This drive has been key to the esoteric traditions of both the East and West, especially as they looked at the nature of physical processes.[94] It was vitally important to the West's Romantic era, with its nearly forgotten alternative approach to science.[95]

Even outside the quasi-scientific theories of spiritualists and poets, dynamic polarity keeps reasserting itself within every deep study of nature, undermining even the most reductionist trends in physics with some form or another of its unsettling power.

Unfortunately, these emergences have to contend with the general drift of science away from its roots in what used to be called "natural philosophy", and even a hostility towards philosophical understanding. Consequently, any interest in the principles and reasons for polarity has been pushed aside or distorted into the supposedly factual features of this or that phenomenon, with any illuminating potential being obfuscated in the process.

This could also be said for other important principles in physics, most notably, the very related idea of a fundamental medium of motion. While physics retains some version of both of these ideas, without a grounding in intelligent metaphysical principles, their importance and coherent meaning are inaccessible.

The obscured meaning was precisely the reason the term "aether" was dropped for the fundamental medium, despite not-so-different concepts emerging to take its place. "The aether" just had too much baggage that no longer made sense, metaphysical or otherwise.

On the one hand, this was understandable. There are certainly bad versions of every idea; the concept of a material aether that 19th-century physics was using, in particular, had become problematic. What has replaced it, however, has been holding physics back and therefore holding culture back from any resonant understanding of itself and the universe.

Without at least a tacit sense in the culture of there being a continuous and polarizable medium between us—or in our technological society, an explicit understanding in science of how the medium relates to the fields and forces that are its modalities—the dualities and energies that show up not only in physics but in all aspects of contemporary life, from sexuality to spirituality, cannot help but tend toward fragmentation.

Tacit understanding can be present in anyone's intuition. Yet in a society like ours so laden with discordant conceptual schemas, even the best intuition can become dulled by the object-oriented obsessions of our ever-more obtrusive cultural media.

While our culture may sew together its disparate knowledge regimes, and people can find a kind of love and community by overlaying their compensatory desires onto each other, without at least some sense of the dynamics that formed their relation, unity is seldom more than a precarious composite of ultimately fragmented entities.

Disconnected from any direct feeling of the energetic pressure being mediated through the fabric of our relations, one can only experience the flow of vitality as if it were the sole state of a solid self, like the mere predilection or attribute of attraction assigned by the fiat of facts and the conjecture of physical laws to the disconnected particles of physics.

Like the electrons of atomistic physics, each of us is rendered into a mere currency of exchange between networks of power, a precarious placeholder for absent knowledge bouncing around one nucleus or another that it can never seem to reach, burdened with a generic pattern of energy endowed on it by its ascribed identity.

For there to be a general understanding of how identities are formed through the modification of their relational medium, society must eschew the atomism that dominates its concepts. It must have knowledge of existence and its medium not as a mere space or static substance, but an aether of connection, not just between apparent things, but to a mutable fabric of organizing centers and shareable horizons—a fluid geometry of pressure formed by the reciprocal equalization and polarization of every gradient of difference.

This means making clear that our problems cannot be solved through some monolithic force that contains, binds, or overcomes difficult differences. Because just as there is no particle of magnetic attraction or repulsion (as there is no innate south or north pole in a magnet except as they arise in coherently organized vortical fields), so are there no foundational particles of any kind, no fundamental forces or identities at the root of things, and no total field that could tie all our oppositions together in a consummation of desire, whether that desire be conceptual or merely libidinal.

However, if, in a sense, all things are just poles within a more or less infinite field of constitutive relations, what exactly is a field in particular? What determines or distinguishes one finite field from another? One could just say, as most people implicitly assume, that a field is a space of relations and so is just a synonym for an abstract space or space itself. One can then go on to give laws and forces that describe or predict what happens in various fields or spaces, but this is not an understanding.

If one just sees the world as a heap of more or less opposed things (or at best complementary forces), then perhaps an equation to predict or control them may satisfy one’s will to knowledge. But as this text has attempted to illustrate, such control is a dead end. Forces and things are what needs to be explained; by themselves, they explain nothing, not without understanding why they exist in the first place.

To understand any field one must instead seek its limits, not to set up shop there or make its edges the handles of a lifeless tool, but discover in what way any seemingly knowable finite field is merely a layer of equalizing perturbations to other such layers—how every boundary already trembles with disturbances and re-balancing cycles stretching to infinity.

What looks discrete is a provisional cross-section of ongoing adjustments—local samples of beginningless perturbations and circuits relaying imbalances and composing wider lattices of feedback. And what is seemingly law-like is the regular cadence that emerges when a field of nested gradients finds a provisional arrangement capable of recirculating its own tensions.

Each local configuration “locks in” a subset of potential differences—compressing some, releasing others—and the repetitive exchange between those bounded differences gives the appearance of fixed rules.

Yet the stability is never self-sufficient: it is a relay built from innumerable micro-equalisations that propagate through, and are themselves propagated by, the larger continuum. In this sense, every “law” is a patterned compromise—an inherited choreography of gradients constraining one another just enough to keep a recognisable rhythm, while still suspended in an open lattice of unresolved disparities that can, under new alignments, produce entirely different rule-sets.

It is these contingent but intelligible compromises—rather than timeless edicts—that physics records when it writes equations or charts field lines. Physical law is then a response and reflection of ignorant minds or limited structures grasping at a bottomless and seamless sea that it only further muddies with every grasp.

Yet while the sea may be seamless in its foundations, the karmic cogs of the pulsing machines of perturbation and circulation running every finite field or function can be made to plug into each other in diverse ways—channeling and reflecting the infinite to various levels of intensity and relational density.

Ultimately, then, all process originate from and lead to not to some cold neutral sea of dead space or final singularity, nor some recurring release of primordial heat or explosive expansion, but levels of various density in a nested “aetheric” continuum that resonates metaphysically and intuitively when understood in such a way.

This aetheric continuum is not a fusion of bit parts but of endless gradients of difference becoming relatively equalized—endless regimes of equilibrium and disequilibrium all tucked up into every ground and horizon, always already active in some ways, but always also waiting to be tapped or teased apart by new relations.

The aether is then not space, nor a special primordial substance, but the relational continuity of all substance. It is not only that which is polarized but relatively negated, cordoned off, or limited, to make space for discrete bodies and the space between them.

Accordingly, to help bridge mainstream and metaphysical science, it could be useful to revisit not only the aether concept, but other related physics concepts that are signs of (and more or less opaque synonyms for) the aether: concepts like inertia, equilibrium, or the continuity of time, but these, like the aether itself, need to be understood in specific and dynamic ways.

They should not be rendered as passive oppositions or reactions to the dynamic changes of accelerated motion, force, or the polarizations that create space, even though these latter could be characterized as an apparent loss or division of the aether.

The reason: there is no *actual* division, no real separation. The one does not become two, or the same the different, through external cause, subtraction, or addition, but through the change in scale or context provided by a universe of infinitely new relations.

New relations multiply a unity into a mesh of polarized ratios, projecting and amplifying its coherence across shifting gradients. What appears continuous at one scale is actively demarcated, redistributed, and re-tuned at the next.

However, since there is not only no grounding level or base scale but not even a universal axis for a hierarchy of scales that could solidify the priority of one world over others—even those building on or using some of the same "stuff"—one cannot say that any side or scale definitively contains the other.

This is why one cannot simply move to some fundamental scale or a higher level of abstraction to find the defining reason for or connections between things. One may have found or formed a reason, but this is only another context, not anything definitively concrete. There is always a potential or implied transversal line cutting through the edifice and opening it out into other contexts.

Perhaps then, if one is to speak of difference and discreteness introduced into continuity as a kind of relative division, it results more from a multiplication of an infinite continuity through its inverse. This apparent division is, however, not really negative. It does not so much cut up or into a "whole" or "one" in the spatial sense, for it creates the very texture of continuity that *is* each "one" through the process of every one's mutual subjection to each other.

The two infinite orders implied in any relation become a specific spin on each other's infinity through each other, and through this process dovetail with a now more precisely determined but "greater infinity" beyond them both.

The infinite depths or extent of an "other" may appear as an inversion that negates one's own infinity, everywhere limiting it to no end. Yet, this is not because the other is one's "opposite" in the sense of its inherent negation, but because they are one's self coming from the "opposite" direction of space—*and time* in the sense that, in any process, as one confronts another, they and their past are the medium for the unfolding of one's immediate future.

And just as any number times its inverse equals one, so might an indeterminate infinity multiplied through its inverse find its completeness in the specific rhythm of a more determinate but still infinite one.

This also implies that “the” one that is continuous through all arises out of the infinity of infinities which manifest through the inverse reflections each relation creates for its pair. This dovetailing of every relation into diverse but potentially more comprehensive unities gives content to the old metaphysical tendency to blend the singular spirit of each with the one spirit of all while retaining multiplicity for the soul.

Still, every spirit is unique, arising from the specific path through infinite multiplicity that is its soul(s) journey, contributing to and merging into the one of each and all in specific ways. By subjecting each thing to its inverse, thereby dividing the illusion of discrete self-identity, the one *or any one* may find some greater semblance of unity in the unfolding of its relational essence.

Yet because this process is distributed across unending time, the inversion is not a simple spatializable reversal. You cannot simply flip an infinite line or series around; there is no mirror opposition capable of finite reconciliation, no single center, or simple symmetry that would make every series or process reversible.

Everything confronts a world that reflects not its mere presence but its infinite journey, yet coming from “the” other direction of infinity. Much as in music, where the interval from C to G is a fifth, but G to C is a fourth, the reflection contains a difference which together makes a cycle like the octave, upon which the music of existence plays.[96] These, of course, are finite intervals, specifically the ratios (3:2) and (4:3) for the fifth and fourth, with (2:1) for the octave.

The fourth and fifth, like matter and phase, are inversions of each other—reciprocal reflections within the progression of harmony. The harmonic progression, like all movement, is not merely a sequence but the unfolding of relational tensions: one tone implies, resolves into, or reframes another.

These tensions and resolutions are encoded in the ratios between tones and the way they invert and refract across registers without any definitive center or end. And like the velocities of the matter and phase waves of the “Great Velocity Equation” (VmVp=CC), the finite fractions that denote the musical intervals of the fourth and fifth emerge from a transversal relation that cuts across, opens up, and distributes inverse infinities (like CC into VmVp).

Hence, inversion in a relational universe is more than a spatial or geometric flip; it implies a twisting transverse symmetry—a transformation that reveals the infinite reflections of an interval of music or “moment” in time by reversing its frame of reference.

A fifth (3:2) inverted becomes a fourth (4:3), just as a group velocity becomes a phase velocity when the observer’s relation is reversed. Their product is the octave (2:1), just as in physics the product of reciprocal velocities (VmVp) yields the multiplication or cycling of the speed of light (CC). In both cases, what appears as motion is governed by a deeper, reciprocal constraint.

Just as phase and group components of a wave define each other through reciprocal motion, harmonic inversion illustrates that every structure carries its own counter-structure, and every path forward implies a return from a different angle. The universe, like music, unfolds through

these asymmetrical yet resonant relations—a field of ratios refracting through time, where each inversion is both difference and echo, both resistance and resolution.

Whether it is matter and phase, or simultaneity and sequence—each pair arises not as simple opposites but as asymmetric reciprocals arising from and helping generate a larger field of relations. Similarly, the proportional tension between the fourth and fifth emerges from and creates the dynamic foundation of the spiral of fifths.

This spiral is often reduced to and represented as the circle of fifths, a tool musicians use to navigate key relationships, modulations, and harmonic progressions. While each is the inverse echo of the other's path through infinity, it is their very misalignment—the gap between fourth and fifth, or between the octave (2:1) and the spiral of fifths itself—that drives transformation, progression, and differentiation without end.

This latter gap—called the Pythagorean comma—is especially important to understanding primordial asymmetry. As each fifth extends along the 3:2 ratio, it generates a spiral that seems to stretch infinitely, never perfectly reconciling with the doubling of the octave (2:1), a mismatch that prevents the spiral from ever closing in on itself into a perfectly compressible template of musical notes. This infinite outward movement reveals the fundamental challenge of tempering harmony to fit within finite, cyclical structures like the octave.

When it is made to do so, when the asymmetry of time is turned into a reversible symmetrical space, unity is turned from an activity of harmonizing infinities into an assumption that traps them in a prefigured space. The open infinity implied in every finite thing as a relation is turned into a mere horizon of repetitive oscillation, a scaling and reiteration of identity opposed by every other identity through the endless scales and registers of being and tone.

Yet like a finite frequency haunted by infinite overtones and undertones, underneath all the opposed identities, every finite thing draws from and participates in its own constitutive infinities, achieving the resolution of tension it cannot achieve within the trap of representation through the ever-present sounding of infinite relational harmonies.

For even as one approaches the abstract domain of an exact and pure finite value of frequency, as suggested earlier, this is just another clearly relative infinity: on its own, the mythical pure frequency would have no beginning or end in time, like a pure eternal sine wave whose identity and phase—its background reference—is fixed forever.

Of course, in the reality of actual time, reference "points" do not exist because time is always a "duration",[97] always just another relative frequency. Yet even if one considers the reference a literal point without time, a reference for change only makes sense in contrast to change, and outside the frozen world of space without time, non-change or the negation of all magnitude is just a zero-limit of the change that makes form, and in terms of waves, this implies infinite frequencies.

This is because the number of frequencies needed to overlap and interfere in order to reduce the infinitely long pulse of a definitive frequency down into the shape of an eternal point grows to infinity as one shapes and shortens interference patterns—or in other words, compresses them into the timeless dimension of an abstract dimension of space as reference.

A pure frequency, then, needs unending time and assumes absolute space (a point as phase), which itself implies infinite frequencies. In reality, finitude and infinitude are abstractions that all real phenomena assume as reference. All real things emerge as more or less determinate patterns wrapping through the ascending and descending currents of their constitutive reference infinities.

There are always infinite spirals of contraction and expansion behind things, and these become focused into finite cycles to help determine them, like the tonal space of music. This can, however, become constraining when the infinity of time becomes hidden under the spell of closed spaces—as can happen in too rigidly formalized music.

Yet as long as the contrast-space of relations isn't turned into the rigid oppositions of a single center, the finitude of tonal and spatial systems helps whittle down the wilderness of infinite relations.

An infinity multiplying or conjugating with itself gives just more infinity; but multiplying it by its inverse gives an implied one between all infinities—one always between two poles going in different directions—the infinite outward horizon and the infinitely inward approach to the unreachable final negation, the illusion of zero.

The poles of the infinite then are not two separate infinities (because there are infinite infinities even if they all even out to one), but the necessary and relative inversions of every continuum given the catalyst of a specific perspective or relation.

Opposition is then just the inversion process by which something self-generates a medium of otherness out of its own inherent and infinite relational potential. The polarity of inversion does not negate or merely limit a form, nor does it determine it purely negatively or absolutely since the process expands the relational pattern with every determination.

Physically speaking, the continuity of the aether is flipped into the emptiness of space, like a bubble blown into the aetheric sea, whose infinitely overlapping and therefore indiscernible currents suddenly become selectively projected into the fleeting forces and effects that can take shape in the bubble.

Understanding this frames all the confusing contradictions of physics as modalities of each other, with all discreteness being the beat patterns formed by the interference of the two scalar streams defining every field, waves upon waves—sometimes seemingly trapped within mere opposition, but always relaying into the infinity of the aether's ubiquitous continuous motion. Despite the supposed mystery of physical forces, they more or less all boil down to the

intuitively discernible process of pressure mediation guiding unstable distributions back to some kind of relative equilibrium.

Yet since that equilibrium is dependent on scale and context, the forces that seem to push away from it—seem to reach towards the creation of the differences that drive the universe—are not compelled from above but by the incommensurable presence of difference within every seeming equality, compelled by a specific context of relation. They are in truth just moving towards another relative line of equilibrium.

Just as when one heats a pan of water, it may seem from a point of view in the water that the heat spurs the relatively tranquil fluid into turbulent activity from the capricious whim of force from beyond. One can understand this, however, even understand the seemingly magical phase transition that can happen as the turbulence gives way to cells of heat transfer, that really what is happening is just two systems with a difference in energy coming together, eventually creating one current of water that travels up and one down as the hot water rises and the cooler falls.

These currents together create a cycle that merely balances out the water into a new dynamic equilibrium that can persist as long as the difference is maintained. One equilibrium is attained, even the most powerful torrent becomes a mere background to all that rides and builds on it. Nonetheless, waves upon waves, changes upon change reveal every ground of being as merely a harmonious relation.

This image can serve as a simple symbol of our fractal universe, that within each domain of local equilibrium or continuity, there are potential worlds spinning through their own space and time, waiting for the right relation or resolution to come into view or join a larger gradient.

Within every seeming plane of inertia or relative rest there is an implied motion and potential acceleration; within the apparent equilibrium of the most empty space or random flux of the void, there are cycles and structures that resolve into symmetry in on context, but are full of the asymmetry of temporal and heterogenous process in another.

Every center of stability or node of coherence—where things seem to cross and come together, resolve or even transcend space altogether—is not an absolute pole of being or becoming, no simple presence or transcendent hole into somewhere else, but a site where space folds into memory, and time is held taut between infinities.

The more spins connect and contract, harmonizing the discords that spur space and time, the more space and time become a continuous aetheric “substance”, not in the sense of a soild impenetratable stuff, but a symmetrically stacked harmony relations in all convievable directions of implication and extrapolation—a spiraling reflection of infinite connections humming ever-more richly with every new explicit melody layered into its endless harmony.

17. The Postmodern Aether: The Real Tao of Physics

“God is pressure.”
-Dion Fortune[98]

Much of the preceding ideas on the aether are implied if not explicit across various niches of heterodox science. While the aether is a popular term again, the language used often obscures the radical implications of the nested fractal-like universe with what often sounds like a return to classical physics concepts, or uncritical beliefs in “free” energy from the vacuum.

There is a tendency to think one can merely draw from the infinite energy of the aether without being drawn into it in some way, without having to face the fact that our whole world is held up by its flow patterns, and these cannot be radically changed or incoherently tapped without consequence.

While the concept of fractals is often invoked, any meaningful fractal cosmology cannot be grounded in only spatial and geometric concepts, not without delving into the more difficult implications of the dependence of space on a tempering of time’s structure of infinite series, its emergence from pre-spatial relations of infinity.

The bias of mainstream physics and mathematics toward discrete spaces and things must be thoroughly replaced. Otherwise, fragmentation inevitably results in society as this logic takes over everything and is only further entrenched by postmodern concepts of difference and contingency—or the post-classical concepts of science like the fractal or quantum indeterminacy—which are inevitably misunderstood and misapplied.

Without a proper understanding of continuity, any attempt to address fragmentation or put a positive spin on the seeming chaos or randomness of infinity, whether these attempts be mainstream or alternative, liberal or conservative, they will no doubt be repressive.

For continuity without grounding in a concept of relative polarity becomes a totality that can be differentiated and controlled, unlike the fractal which cannot.[99] The continuity of the fractal is infinitely connected but not infinitely differentiable; one can zoom not into smaller bits of the whole, not merely expanding some static point of space into other identical bits of space, but rather, like the aether itself, falling or rising away from the bubble of any one limited space to an endless richness of connections “within”.

Unfortunately, the spatial bias of thought is difficult to get away from. The atomizing momentum of our incoherent existence and knowledge-structures is strong in its tendency to frame everything as disconnected substances or piecemeal phenomena.

This is still true even when some polarity gets introduced if it is rendered as a conjunction of mysteriously inherent opposites, completely missing the interference and mediation of systems that form the poles in the first place. Discrete archetypes and oppositional forces are a deeply cemented part of how the collective psyche frames polarity. So even when thought relationally, the poles are reduced to linked parts of some bland totality.

While physicists look for meaningful unification in the mathematical integration of their conflicting historical constructions, popular metaphysical thinking often recognizes there is some transcendent unrepresentable potential that gets divided. Yet this transcendence is usually rendered as some causal “source” or spatially abstract “whole”. Or it tends to get reduced down to subjective or intersubjective consciousness, a whole “being” or collection of beings in some single “field”.

The spiritualist’s poles of existence, as in so much Western metaphysical thinking, tend to come back to a mere dualism of consciousness and matter, subject and object, as things in themselves, or as a hierarchy of reality stemming from a first cause or overarching unity.

So the poles end up standing in for the ends of a spectrum, a spectrum that boils down to some continuous thing that is little more than a fusion of its parts, with one pole, “consciousness”, being identified with the whole and the cause of its divisions. Seldom is the yin-yang symbol understood as an explicit deconstruction of discrete opposition and a model of all motion and meaning.[100]

As this work has explored, all opposition—every line between things, or line of force that defines any kind of field—is, like the curving lines between yin and yang, really a circle defining a continuity of transformation, of everything becoming every other thing in various ways relative to other involved lines of transformation.

And because popular New Age mysticism tends to reduce this to a balance of opposites, it just spurs postmodern critics to reassert discontinuity and difference, too often as if these were not the very conditions and relational modes of a *variable* continuity.

Mainstream physics, on the other hand, has had a long struggle with continuity. With some kind of atomism dominating physical theory for most of its history, continuity indeed has been more of a code word for infinite divisibility into smaller and smaller cogs in its materialistic machine, so actually not continuity at all.[101]

This reflects the animal mind’s natural desire to fuse the discrete into a unified machine to take hold of and use by the implicitly transcendent subject—a desire that too often carries over even into the heights of mathematical abstraction and by extension biases our technology.

It treats all unity as merely the deterministic flow from the material past to the material future, with no gaps except when harnessing some stem of that flow and using it without a clue why the cycles that were severed inevitably return and defy that final victory of predictive science and its dream of total control.

Of course, in science, absolute control and infinite divisibility have become more obviously untenable. Consequently, physicists have given up strict causality and determinism, and with

them any way they seem to know to bridge the gaps between the discrete quantums of nature's material appearance.

They have seldom appreciated the obvious: that the fundamental objects of study are not discrete particles or even discrete events bluntly conceived or observed—not mere parts of a single whole, or complementary aspects of definite things—but signs dispersed by the colliding systems we are inevitably a part of, proportional relations of our ever-evolving involvement in the flow of space and time.

The New Age of course inserts a causal consciousness into the gaps, a mere subject to connect the discrete objects, but neither camp sufficiently appreciates the complexity that emerges out of simplicity. Neither has brought enough light to the mutable pattern inherent in every thing as a process of relating, a pattern not localized into any subject or object or delocalized into discrete abstractions, but distributed according to the rhythms between things.

Complicated theoretical niches and hypothetical forces tend to mesmerize the mind, pulling thought towards the extremes of ever-more abstract mechanisms of control over ever-more specialized concrete particulars—in a gradient stretched ever-more thinly by the incoherence of our interventions. Yet the world is always just a whirl within a whirl, always flowing to mediate and equalize the pressure-field of polarized differences.

Within the postmodern landscape of science and thought, however, especially with the discovery of the fractal, mental "space" *was* opened up to think of how things can be connected without being reducible to any containable scheme. Again, just as in some fractal animations, one can zoom in and not get smaller and smaller parts of the whole, but potentially infinite iterations of (and connections to) other similar patterns.

The fractal illustrates how the internal flux within is not the mere qualities of an identity—or the statistical subset of a larger whole—but the truly open system of changing relations of each thing to everything. As discussed earlier in relation to biology, the flux is neither random nor a pure product of some nonlocal space taken as the whole.

In a coherent body or even social body, the entropy, transverse waves, and the information decoded from them, cannot and need not be eliminated but rather ideally should be coherently conjugated. Outward fragmentation can be transformed by internal recursion into creative differentiation: each orthogonal tendency, curved back into the evolving whole through higher-order circulation.

This isn't a flattening of dimensionality, but a densification—orthogonality remains, not as resistance or escape, but as interwoven layers of volumetric motion. Sine wave becomes spiral iterations and interpenetrations; wave becomes weave.

Every directional line of embodiment can become clearly revealed as a unique horizon of relations, with the worlds they determine just waiting to be tapped by a new physics and

biology—a science not just of “consciousness” but of rhythmic coherence, of a greater economy of energy and forces that emerge precisely as energy becomes no longer dependent on force, and force, no longer on a limited extraction of energy.

When action is no longer based on a shear strain or karmic complication but on harmonic improvisations, it can nest within the momentum of that endless journey back from the infinite intervention that eternally polarizes the aether “in the first place” and creates every seemingly segmented space.

Such a science is no longer hemmed in by the study of local interactions, no longer limited by incoherent collisions. To the extent of the coherence of its actions and abstractions, it can construct continuity not by reaching to abstractly unify fragmented systems but by guiding them into tune with the greater horizon.

This infinite horizon from which we abstract our local space may seem like a source, or our abstraction from it a cause, but the poles of existence are just a way to frame our exploration of the infinite relations within, which nonetheless is always simultaneously an infinite journey without—whether we zoom into anything, more or less entangling with it, or zoom out into the implications of our mediations and interventions.

A misguided search will no doubt continue for some unified field in the sense of one deterministic equation, system, or series to which all must obey. It is therefore crucial that a strong and relatively coherent culture of alternative science is cultivated along with a broad popular sense that the technocratic approach is misguided, both metaphysically and morally.

To that end, revisiting and reworking basic and culturally scalable concepts like the aether and polarity can go a long way toward bringing coherence and popular support to the most metaphysically potent and structurally resonant thought.

For instance, it could be helpful to reframe the aether for the masses not as some unified field, not as space itself, but as its inverse, its reciprocal—or in the simplified sense that more people can easily grasp—its “opposite”. For it is the horizon of condensed light and space-time negation—or rather, convergence—against which all things are polarized in space, and through which time is working to harmonize them.

Of course, if possible, opposition needs to be qualified and reframed as a distorted spatial sign of a deeper reciprocity. With the growing popularity of astrology, perhaps some reference to its concept of planetary opposition could be helpful.

This is especially helpful when it is made clear that astrological aspects depends on one’s point of view, or rather, one’s position within a field of mediation, and that this field and position distributes a deep qualitative continuity and reciprocity into the complex overlapping cycles of time, cycles signified by planets in various phase relationships like the 180 degree relation of “opposition”.

Instead of inherent poles of existence, there is just the phase overlap, symbolized in astrology by the conjunction or in music by the unison, and its relative negation or distirbution into the distances of harmonic and material space.

One could say that the fullness and variously dense light of the aether is partially obscured through disharmonies between bodies like planets in mutual motion—in a way, casting a shadow that is the seeming darkness and emptiness of space, but also a relational complexity that gives rise to the music of material existence.

Or one could bypass the negativity of the concept of “space” altogether, and talk about the polarity of the local and the nonlocal. Either way, it should be made clear that there is no part and whole—only what is framed by the zero and infinite as relative abstractions—convergent limits formed by the foregrounding of our unique way of relating to and furthering the shape of the cosmos.

This shape, our relations, and their rhythms are always framed from within a selective transformation that makes some things more intensely polarized and pressurized than others, and which depends on the inertial motion formed by previous selections.

So much as was discussed earlier in regards to social and sexual relations, returning to the importance of polarity is not done to ground us in traditional dualities, like man and woman, or subject and object, but to help us navigate the tension of space’s inherent oppositions into greater evolving harmonies.

For any real harmony alludes the integration of static differences. No matter how creatively diversified, even diverse integration cannot amount to much more than a mere massing of marginal forces and locally confined states—that is unless it is also a coherent conjugation that extends the singularity of each pattern, transforming it through new domains and registers.

The aether is then indeed abstract, but not reductively so. It amplifies each thing through others; it doesn’t fuse or ground them for all time. As the medium for and of interrelation, the aether is our concrete but variable ground. All discrete motion moves from and towards it, but nonetheless is never outside it—for it has no inside or outside, making everything its more or less distorted sign.

This means that both the ground and horizon of existence are merely denser layers of the medium, not a trenchantly transcendent unity or infinity. Since the basic concept of space is a nothing, and the aether does relatively negate the distance between things, the concept of a spatial antithesis has merit as a vizualization aid.

However, this can ofuscate that space is actually the more negative concept. While often thought of as a dimensional structure or container, in which case the aether can seem like its mere collapse into a vaccuous unity, space is actually more a sign of relations pushed into the

background in order for life to get a foothold in the aether. The aether is in a way, the opposite of nothing, the negation of all negation, since it is in a sense, the all-inclusive “everything”.

Yet this game of negations and exclusive oppositions is a byproduct of discrete conceptual abstractions—of spatially bound metaphors for what is more properly understood in terms of relations within the aether as a plenum of continuous connection. In reality, even space is “full” of the aether—even when it is stretched thin by incoherent systems and the limited scales and perspectives of spatially bound beings.

What transforms the concept of space from an empty structure or negative abstraction into a vital idea is its reciprocal relation with time, and this leads naturally to *understanding the aether as time*. Time is then the essence of all substance, not as a fundamental stuff in or absolutely distinct from a space, or an essence that fills space, but rather that change that determines and *relatively* negates space and distance through spin-coherence, even as it opens up new spaces and lines and worlds of possibility.

Whether it is waves and particles, or energy and matter, these are not two kinds of things simply present in space. They are the same aetheric substance of time, which, depending on one’s point of view, is always radiating to the shared horizon of light where all lines meet, or falling down the drain of conglomerating matter, in both cases moving to nullify all space and separation.

Time as the aether and the essence of substance is then the essence of matter, but matter’s coherent aetheric essence, not its fragmented form. This makes it more like the pressure or tension between the material things of space—or perhaps the presence of spirit in and between matter *as energy*, as the gradient of difference capable of driving some process, making material form distinct not essentially distinct from energy, but its differential structure—the necessary spin separations and geometric balances that give energy a field through which to flow.

The metaphysical or even spiritual significance of the aether, then, is not in its status as some transcendent plane, but as the immanent energetic pressure mediating and forming all structure through its differential flow.

While the pressure is always oriented towards some transcendent horizon (even in the case of inward motion since all motion is headed towards the vanishing point of a spaceless structureless equilibrium, no matter what the relative direction), again, the transcendence and inertia of any plane of continuity, homogeneity, or equilibrium, is only relative.

Esoteric spiritual systems have often had other names for the most transcendent planes, whereas the aether has been useful as a term for the realm of energetic mediation. It is often paired with the term “astral”—signifying the realm of mind and meaning that arises from the rhythmic flow of aetheric energy (as in astrology); together they can be aptly termed the “intermediate zone” or realm(s) between matter and the divine.[102]

While all may flow from and toward the highest aetheric convergence and absorption into transcendent or divine planes, even in metaphysical systems that believe there is some ultimate realm of perfection and balance, in practice one can see that even the most quiescent symmetry hides a brimming potential that cannot be ultimately separate from its manifestations.

This potential is not just that which is in need of external instigation, but which is always already active, only requiring a change in perspective to experience it, like the simple change of scale that illuminates the fury of molecular activity hiding in a passive object. Likewise, as some sages have claimed, even the most divine equilibrium is not necessarily any primordial passivity awaiting the thrust of worldly expression, but rather the nonlocal balance riding on every local asymmetry.[103]

As discussed, the flow patterns that concern many esoteric spiritual systems are characterized by channels and vortices driven by pressure gradients and practices that aim to *increase* this differential pressure, not collapse it into uniformity. While there is much talk in popular metaphysics of “going with the flow”, in actual practice this amounts to a gradual transfer of tension from the exhaustible force of resistance to the taut membrane mediating life’s eternally renewed polarity.[104]

This means that at its higher levels, spiritual practice can make one no longer a local imbalance in an aetheric field that is balanced beyond them but an ever more comprehensive expression of its universal becoming. Whatever the case, the resistance or tension of and between things is not a barrier of difference to overcome in eternal peace, but rather the way the universe pressurizes things into the denser layers of aetheric communion.

It uses every conflict to discipline its scattered forces, to push them beyond the relative peace and inertia found in settled aetheric pools, and into the greater momentum of relations so dense with interconnections that they cannot be broken down, only made a plane or seed growing through and increasingly as all things.

And since the inertia of every aetheric pool is relative—even in the stable circulations of the most topologically consistent system—in the right context, everything is not only a store of energy and potential, but always already a concentration of meaningful and powerful activity.

Even the most seemingly divine unity of circulating symmetry is simultaneously fueling and fueled by differential mediations and deferred reconciliations, worlds and waves spiraling through infinity but condensed into various pools of seemingly foundational being.

Things *are always already part of a structure of difference*, or “differance”, as Derrida intentionally misspelled the word to underscore that this difference is not just the normal assumed meaning concerning the comparative capacity to differ, but a deferred presence incapable of complete localization.

And since this presence is distributed across an infinity, it implies not just a structure of unbounded space and substance, but the openness of time and meaningful context. This means that difference and context are crucial to the heart of being. Or as Derrida put it, "difference is older than being itself".[105]

The relational differences of "becoming", then, are not simply what being does, or even what makes being. They are being's very structure, meaning, and energy, implying the most substantial reality is held up by the stability of meaningful coherence and implicit cooperation that stretches across the poles of every relation.

While open and expansive development and the image of freedom this invokes is important, meaningful becoming is never just some linear outward flow. Indeed, this would merely dissipate potential if not for the fact that in other more coherent and cooperative contexts, every line is captured within a circuit of stored meaning and potential feeding into the greater ocean of harmony.

Concluding Condensation: "Healing" the Culture of Contradiction

"Is seeing itself not—seeing abysses?"-Friedrich Nietzsche[106]

The most important achievement of thought in the postmodern era consists in the realization that knowledge systems based on static representations of clearly identifiable and controllable objects—and societies that treat people like these objects—must be transformed into something more tolerant of the variation that arises from a world made of *relational being*. What needs to be better emphasized, however, is that while this relational variation may be infinite, it is still structured by the continuity inherent in every relation being part of a pattern of reciprocity.

Unfortunately, any burgeoning sense that superior knowledge depends on a fluid proficiency in connecting differences across the pattern of relational and reciprocal being is pushed aside by the standard model of science and liberal society. This model ostensibly promotes openness and freedom but has failed to properly understand the paradox inherent to its ideals, that the spaces of imagined freedom are the abysses inherent to the deluded mind fastened to the mere sight of established realities.

The aether of connection that can fill the abysses necessitates a collective coherence that has something more than the mere sight of set things; it requires true vision. True vision is not a set plan imposed on society, for by nature it works with what is by aligning things with an ever-renewed horizon made by an ever-more extensive creative coherence with all.

It is an illustrative irony that the "open society" has led to the closed values inherent to thinking in terms of compartmentalized sets of things over their relations. While there are movements in philosophy, logic, and mathematics to rectify this,[107] the veneer of an open society covering a

monolithic network of power is getting baked right into the solidifying global technocracy. This will be difficult to undo.

And while hopeful developments arise continually, they have a hard time breaking outside of the niche assigned to them by the system's deeply entrenched protocols, especially as these are consolidating ever further beyond the reach of scrutiny.[108] The myths and the algorithms that sort us into predetermined compartments are also making it difficult for anyone speaking outside their coordinates to be even understood.

The difficulties of cultural differences in postmodern society could potentially have led to a more context-sensitive approach to life and knowledge, one more attuned to the singularity of each event and the diverse ways of approaching them. Instead, a new myth was born out of the very impulse to deconstruct all myths.

Or rather, the modern myth of progress mutated by adapting to the escalating desire for performative inclusion and scientific salvation, and by adopting postmodern language to create the complicated myths of today's technocracy.

These myths have transformed and built on the primal desire for radical change as well as distrust of the kind of change modernity has been providing. The result has become a society divided in essence but united by subservience to an emerging technological "consciousness", since humanity has come to trust technology more than each other.

Unfortunately, the very ideas that could get people on track working together are the most demonized, for they undermine the importance of identity, the very thing so central to the game all are taught to play and which makes each individual visible to the algorithms, or rather *the algorithm*, since they have become like a single digital god, the sole endower of life, or at least personhood, in a society of amalgamated profiles.

Yet, we need not and cannot set aside our identity any more than we can put aside our materiality. Whatever the construction, what must be brought into the frame is the aether or fabric of connection pulsing between us, defining the polarity that gives each identity a relational meaning and power.

Whether it is gender or sexual polarity, or magnetic or gravitational attraction, being dependent on scale and context does not make any of these arbitrary constructs. Indeed, it makes them signs of an even greater identity that guides us into the light of wisdom.

1. Deleuze and Guatarri (1977 pg. 112)
2. "Bubbling spring" is a term used in Daoism to refer to the point on the soles of our feet that opens the channels of our body into the well of bubbling vitality we receive from the Earth. This suggests that the more we are cut off from the Earth, the more dependent we become on society. This dependency is deeper than any practical reliance on society, which is perfectly "natural" for most of us, but rather a dependency at the level of libidinal energy. When we cannot feed from the circulating energies of nature, then we tend to feed pathologically off of each other.
3. Ho (2008)
4. Ansell-Pearson (1999)

5 Ho (2008)
6. On a more nuanced notion of randomness, see Cilliers (1998). For the related concept of “chance” in a more poststructural light, this quote from Gangle (2016) on Deleuze sums up much of the perspective developed in this text: “What Deleuze calls chance in Difference and Repetition[...]must be understood as the necessary embedding of any actual system of local relations in an indefinite multitude of extensive(lateral) and intensive (higher-order) systems, such that the slightest perturbation of the local system has untold immediate ramifications across the entire coordinated (or at least connected) space (pg190).
7. Aurobindo (1939) gives a logical metaphysical argument about the place of immortality in the destiny of evolution, but one can see the idea throughout the theosophical era of esoteric thought, as well as in the work of contemporary metaphysically-inclined biologists like Mae Wan Ho (2008).
8. I consider the sexual mode (and model) of symbiosis to be roughly in the same position to the larger open system as Hegel’s dialectic is to Deleuze’s, that is as a kind of reduction of the rich tapestry of reciprocal becoming (Deleuze’s eternal return of differences) to a mere play of constrained oppositional identities (Hegel’s dialectic of opposition and contradiction), which nonetheless serves as a medium for the greater movement of relational becoming. See Somers-Hall (2012) for a thorough academic comparison.
9. Deleuze and Guattari (1987, pg. 110)
10. Agamben (2021). There were also less well-known academic thinkers that spoke up like Babette Babich. But from what she told me, there weren’t many others (https://twitter.com/babette_babich/status/1641474373369380864)
11. See my preceding work “Signs and Scapegoats: The Viral Vectors of Science and Society”.
12. For a good take on the “Sokal Hoax”, see Desilet (2002).
13. ibid.
14. Again, see my preceding work “Signs and Scapegoats: The Viral Vectors of Science and Society”.
15. Humphries and Bystrianyk (2013)
16. Latour (1988)
17. Various cultural threads using terms like “integral” or “Metamodern” come to mind, but tend to just step back from the radical implications of poststructural philosophy.
18. Baldwin (1955 pg. 18)
19. The now cliched phrase “the banality of evil” was used by Hannah Arendt in her coverage of the Eichman trial. Despite the phrase becoming a bit banal itself, to this day, one can still not point out the banality or historical contingencies of tragedies and their mythologized scapegoats without provoking hysteria, especially about the Holocaust. Thankfully, some courageous scholars still brave the backlash. Finkelstein (2003), for instance, does a good job reinstating the Holocaust into its historical context, and critiquing the hysteria that has only fueled further atrocities. He also lends credence to the idea expressed here that the centrality of the Holocaust arose with postmodernism, arguing that prior to 1967 it was rarely discussed as a discrete or properly named event.
20. Popper (2002). This book was getting much attention again in the wake of increasing fears of fascism, especially its discussion of the “limits of tolerance”, at least showing some awareness by liberals of the contradiction at the base of their beliefs.
21. Hudson (2018)
22. Harrington (1996)
23. Farrell (2009)
24. This dichotomy is explored in Deleuze and Guattari (1987).
25. Keller (1993)
26. Desilet (2002)
27. Cilliers (1998)
28. For an interesting study comparing postmodern philosophy and “post-classical” physics see Plotnitsky (1994).
29. While this is explored in depth by Foucault (1978), I think he would have been amazed by how sexual regulation through scientific discourse progressed through the phenomena of AIDS. Unfortunately, it was this very phenomenon that prevented him from living to see it progress or to analyze it for us.
30. There is debate about the role of vaccines and modern medicine in history, of course. Illich (1976) and Humphries and Bystrianyk (2013) are important evaluations. But even the academic sociologists Byrne and Callaghan (2002), admit that the labor movement deserves more credit for improved health statistics than medical science.
31. Kennedy (2021)

32. The only philosophy book that I have found that attempts to apply deconstruction to the AIDS debate, and in a pretty lackluster way, is Protevi (2001). Though to commit fully to such a deconstruction would have been impossible as an academic, I imagine, so he still should be praised for doing what he could do.
33. There were many involved and many that faced repercussions, but the most famous of them were probably the scientist Peter Duesberg and the journalist Celia Farber, (see Farber 2023).
34. In classical Chinese medicine, disease is indeed a kind of adaptation, one that is made more problematic not just by unhealthy environments, but any environmental change that cannot be properly harmonized. It therefore has external and internal "causes", that depend on the person. But this is still a question of unhealthy environments, even if what counts as unhealthy varies from person to person and includes (and is very much determined by) unhealthy internal environments (negative emotions). Many AIDS dissidents, however, had no radical ideas about disease before getting involved, but came to question many of their assumptions after discovering the corruption. For instance, journalist Janine Roberts (2008) artfully documents her transformation away from believing viruses cause disease at all. Germ theory skepticism can sometimes be too reductive in the other direction, but it at least trends in the right direction towards the environment (or terrain as they call it).
35. Mullis (2020)
36. Mullis (2021). Not to mention that the idea that health is all about getting the right amount of exposure to difference and change is just standard traditional medicine. In the classical Chinese system, external pathogenic influences are carried by "wind", which is not, to put in postmodern terms, some "essentialized" cause, not anything in itself, but merely a change too rapid for a body to adjust.
37. Duesberg (1996)
38. I am drawing here, of course, from alchemical symbolism. In Daoism, the metaphor of a cauldron is used to describe the more concentrated form of the processes that combine the contrasting energies of the body, like "fire" and "water", into sublimated forms. While ultimately this is done within the individual's body, harmonious sexual relations can help the process along, especially in the early stages when there is constitutional imbalance and desire. Even same-sex couples can attain a degree of this kind of conjugation of contrasting energies, for instance, by energetically polarizing lifestyle choices that emphasize a degree of sexual difference between the two people.
39. As quoted in Dastur (160)
40. Paraphrasing a line here repeated in almost every internet video and writing featuring the controversial engineer and inventor Dan Winter (2011).
41. For interesting work on profiles and "profilicity" see the YouTube channel of Hans-Georg Moeller: https://www.youtube.com/@carefreewandering/videos
42. Banks (2002)
43. Farber (2023)
44. Roberts (2008)
45. Kay (1993)
46 Banks (2002)
47. Scheff (2012)
48. Roberts (2008 pg.147)
49. Nabokov (1959, pg.60)
50. Rancourt et. al.(2024)
51. "Royal or major science refers to those practices that fall within the scientific norms and methodological conventions of the time, whereas nomad or minor science refers to those practices that fall outside of such disciplinary habits and resist attempts to be reduced to them." Duffy (2013, pg.14)
52. While I have not kept up on all the latest theoretical trends in mainstream physics, I have noticed a few similar ideas to the physics that will be discussed here while scanning the internet and talking extensively with Chat GPT. Relational Quantum Mechanics as well as Timescape Cosmology seem to have significant overlap, but even the mess of the standard model seems to be already getting pushed by necessity towards the kinds of topological and symmetry-theory considerations that I try to give a simple taste of later in this text. There are also many theorists that don't fit neatly into the fringe or mainstream category. While my take here draws mostly from rather fringe theorists, in the background are also the many academic physicists who have crossed over into the more philosophical or fringe arena of physics. I can't name all the thoughtful quantum physics books I have read over the years, but Vrobel et. al (2008), and Ho (2008) cover a good collection of scientists developing a fractal view of space-time that has been most helpful.
53. As quoted in Bunn (2014 pg.7)

54. While Larson (2022) made a good first effort at reorganizing the elements according to fundamental ratios, we have a long way to go to understand the transformative relations of elements opaquely modeled but powerfully used in operational or laboratory alchemy, which, believe it or not, still might have something to teach modern chemistry.
55. “Mobile symmetries” are discussed at length in Bunn (2014).60
56. I have Newton here in mind with all due respect to his genius despite his problems. For a discussion of his concept of sovereign force and how it shaped his mathematics, see Simpson (2012).
57. Hunt (2010)
58. “The syntax of deconstruction has been that of the interruption, the space, the rupture…This is a syntax that breaks into an interior but preserves a more definitive exterior even as that exterior lies within…The preceding discussion suggests that the intrinsic undecidability of distinction and indistinction constitutes relationship as such. This requires a syntax that trembles all the way down, a syntax of vibration, of the break that pulses so rapidly it blurs, a syntax of stretching and oscillation.” Weinstone (2004, pg. 150)
59. Ho (2008, chapters 3 and 4)
60. Al-Kindi (1993) pg.15
61. Bachelard (1958, pg. 106)
62. Ho (2008) surveys this field of holistic-minded biologists and systems-cosmologists.
63. Wheeler (2013)
64. There are many potential references for the Russian research on torsion and the fringe physics described in this section, but Swanson (2011) has a pretty exhaustive analysis of both experimental evidence and popular theories.
65. Pythagorean wisdom considers the “tetractys,” or “four-group,” one of the most sacred mysteries. The numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4, add up to 10 and are represented in a figure in the form of the “perfect triangle”. The Tetractys contains not only the basic intervals of the fourth, fifth, octave, and double octave, but also the point, line, plane, and solid.
66. This take on the transformations of symmetry was inspired by Bunn (2002), but it dovetails with the overall triadic logic of semiotics as it was formulated by C.S. Peirce (Gangle 2016).
67. Deleuze (1993, pg. 24)
68. Russell (1971, pg.87)
69. Swanson (2011)
70. Chandrasekhar (1987, pg. 68)
71. This idea of C^2 as representing two directions in space and time, and much of the discussion of $E=MC^2$ that follows, is inspired by the work of Douglass A. White, particularly this short piece (White, 2006) and a brief correspondence with him. I have extrapolated significantly from his ideas in this text and did not get a chance to discuss this with him before he died. But he recognized how important the “The Great Velocity Equation” (as he called it) was to the foundation of physics and reality. Philosophically, White tended to see things more in phenomenological terms, referring to his physical theory as “observer physics”. While trying to do justice to his insights here, I found that they had additional profound implications once plugged into my philosophical framework influenced by Deleuze’s rather “post-phenomenological” metaphysics and “transcendental” empiricism—which decenters the subject, but also incorporates it into an infinite “plane of immanence”.
72. Several thinkers have made the point that the concept of velocity is more fundamental than matter or energy. Most influential to me have been Rudolf Steiner and Dewey Larson (Vijaya 2023). However, Douglass A. White (2006) made the point in the context this text discusses and gives the derivation of his “Great Velocity Equation” ($VmVp=C^2$) from Einstein and de Broglie.
73. White (2003) used the duplication of light speed and its common symbol “c” to pun on its meaning as “cosmic consciousness”. I thought I would follow suit, but to fit more with my style of theory, “creative coherence” seemed more appropriate.
74. Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, as quoted in Cunningham, et al. (1990, pg. 299).
75. “Scalar” is a popular term in countercultural physics. Although taken from mainstream theory, it has different connotations in alternative circles that were popularized by Tom Bearden, where discussions of “causal engineering” and scalar weaponry have been frequent. See the many works of Joseph P. Farrell (i.e. 2007) for some imaginative readings of ancient texts with this physics in mind.
76. ibid. While ancient versions of this technology are a frequent source of speculation, there is, of course, no shortage of theories on its contemporary use, not only as weapons and weather manipulation, but also healing when constructive interference is selected rather than destructive.
77. Tiller (2001)

78. While the esoteric tradition has many descriptions and philosophies of black magic and demonic beings, I find Elkins et al. (1982) the most interesting due to its embrace of alternative physics.
79. Deleuze (1986, pgs 8-9)
80. The clockwise direction which corresponds to the loss of order at the source in Russian torsion physics (Swanson 2011), is considered the direction of "generation" in Daoism. The Qigong healer, for instance, must lose some energy as he treats a patient, releasing a clockwise spin towards them, but this stream is being fed by counterclockwise spins coming into the healer, who should attempt to balance this economy of flows so as not to become drained. Rhythm is another consideration here, as the harmonizing of oscillations is as at least as important as simply "sending energy". Indeed, the latter is pretty ineffective if not part of some harmonizing movement that brings coherence to the patient and allows them to tap into and more effectively use energy on their own without it being lost to the entropy of their disordered state (Tosi and Del Giudice 2013).
81. This is especially apparent when viewed through "ferrocell" images. This way of looking at a magnet has been made quite popular on the internet through Ken Wheeler. In addition to the other alternative physics theorists mentioned, I have drawn considerable inspiration from Wheeler (2014), who especially focuses on the role of magnetism in field mechanics. My terminology does sometimes differ from Wheeler given my ttempts here to integrate his insights with other theorists and philosophies. Wheeler, for instance, prefers to use the term magnetism specifically for the outward expression of force and motion resulting from incommensurable interference, reserving a term favored by classical electrical theorists, "the dielectric", for the more primary driving inertia of the underlying aether responsible for centripetal motion. I did not want to introduce yet another term.
82. Ho (2008)
83. As quoted in Kappraff (2002, pg. 443)
84. Tiller (2001)
85. Winter (2011)
86. The counterculture tends to hate postmodernism, and academics are mostly too proud to relate to the counterculture, so I am damning myself by trying to integrate them. But I cannot do otherwise. My descriptions of the aether are no doubt heavily influenced by Gilles Deleuze's "plane of immanence" referenced in much of his work. There is a sense in which Deleuze and alternative science theorists like Dewey Larson were all attempting to find the coherent sense hiding behind the culture's incomplete understanding of modern physics (Larson seems to have read Bergson, Deleuze's biggest influence in this regard).
87. Williams (2005)
88. Delanda (2002)
89. White (2006)
90. Quantum coherence was defined by Nobel Prize winner Roy Glauber in terms of "factorizability". Every element can be seen to be a factor of any other element. There are degrees of being quantum coherent just as there are degrees of being in phase. But the idea is that as something reaches a high degree of quantum coherence, its parts are not moving "as one" as in normal lock-step phase discipline, like a marching band, but are more like what Ms. Ho calls "quantum jazz", where every part can be taken as a creative center, while simultaneously, every part could be considered an instrument or medium of any other, depending on how one decides to begin. Ho (2008)
91. See Campbell (1982) for an entertaining take on the history of information theory. Also, I am here playing on the idea of postmodernism as the cultural logic of "late capitalism", so common to Marxist critiques of postmodernism, following Fredric Jameson. As much value as these critiques have, so-called postmodern philosophy is precisely what is needed to transform the cultural logic from the scientistic ideology of fragmented information, representations, and identity, and into one of coherent and continuous relations.
92. The ocean of alternative research on this would be impossible to adequately cite, but the work of Richard Dolan (2002), Paul Laviolette (2008), and Joseph P. Farrell's dozens of books; in this context Farrell (2008) is a good start.
93. Deleuze and Guattari (1997, pg.37)
94. Polarity is much more "central" to the esoteric thought of the Far East (i.e. yin and yang), which had a much better grasp of physical processes than some other esoteric traditions (classical Chinese medicine and Daoist Nei Gong are among the most highly developed symbolic sciences of the body). Indian and Western thought have often been seduced by the monolithic tendencies of discrete and transcendent thinking, but there have always also been more "immanent" threads that naturally value polarity and relation. Deleuze's work traces this through philosophy, but in Western esoteric thought, there are frequent turns from mere spiritual transcendence to the occult interest in the polarity of real processes. In Indian thought, Sri Aurobindo attempted a similar reconstruction to rescue what he felt was the original Vedic interest in the dynamic harmonization of the poles of existence (Aurobindo 1990).

95. Coleridge and Goethe were especially interested in polarity (Cunningham et al. 1990).
96. Hempel (2012) discusses this musical analogy much as I do in this text, relating it to incommensurability and revealing the importance of “phase” in physics.
97. “Duration” is an important concept for Henri Bergson, a major influence on Gilles Deleuze (Ansell-Pearson 2001)
98. Fortune (1935, pg.25)
99. Laurence Nottale makes this distinction about the undifferentiable continuity of the fractal part of his model of fractal space-time. See Vrobel et al. (2008).
100. The yin-yang symbol was so liked by Niels Bohr that he used it in his coat of arms. But I do not believe he really understood it. Plotnitsky (1994) makes a good case that Bohr and Derrida have very much overlapping epistemologies, yet this points to a problem with Derrida as well that has led to him being so misunderstood: they both overemphasize the negative—whether it be uncertainty, indeterminacy, or undecidability, what is often obfuscated is the reciprocal determination and continuity that link all differences through their variations. This was picked up by Bergson back in his day, but unfortunately his influence waned dramatically until Deleuze resurrected and strengthened his arguments (Ansell-Pearson 2001). To be fair, for sociological reasons, postmodernity was going to devolve into fragmentation no matter what happened in physics and philosophy. History, perhaps, was not ready. Hopefully now it is.
101. Capek (1961)
102. Aurobindo (1958, pgs.1039-1046)
103. This is a concern even for the engaged mystic, who, as Sri Aurobindo explains, will often miss the active side of the Divine because he has been led to believe all activity is beneath and secondary to the passive side. Deleuze had similar concerns about Western metaphysics, where “We are forced to conceive of existence as a brute eruption, a pure act or leap which always occurs behind our backs and is subject to a law of all or nothing” (as quoted in Somers-Hall, 2013, pg.164).
104. Whether one is talking about meditation or body-energy work, there is often a need to expand into the right connections, increasing space and connections in the body and mind to allow for the right centripetal movement to become part of an integrated circuit with the larger cosmos. Simply “relaxing with the flow” and “letting go” are often misleading metaphors for developing the requisite coherence and connectivity to make the detachment and surrender of spiritual practice safe and legitimate.
105. Derrida (1968, pg. 67)
106. Nietzsche in Thus Spoke Zarathustra, as quoted in Ansell-Pearson (2001, pg. 167)
107. Gangle (2016)
108. Galloway (2004)

Sources:

Agamben, Giorgio. *Where Are We Now?: The Epidemic as Politics*. Translated by V. Dani, Rowman & Littlefield, 2021.
Alexander, Samuel. *Space, Time, and Deity: The Gifford Lectures at Glasgow 1916-1918 Volume Two*. Macmillan, 1966.
Al-Kindi. *De Radiis (On the Stellar Rays)*. Translated by Robert Zoller, edited by Robert Hand, Project Hindsight Latin Track Volume I, The Golden Hind Press, 1993.
Ansell-Pearson, Keith. *Germinal Life: The Difference and Repetition of Deleuze*. Routledge, 1999.
Ansell-Pearson, Keith. *Philosophy and the Adventure of the Virtual: Bergson and the Time of Life.* Routledge. 2001.
Ansell-Pearson, Keith. *Viroid Life: Perspectives on Nietzsche and the Transhuman*. Routledge, 1997.
Aurobindo, Srt. *Letters on Yoga*, Lotus Press, 1958.
Aurobindo, Sri. *Life Divine*. Lotus Press, 1990.
Aurobindo, Sri. *Savitri*. American edition Lotus Press, 1950.
Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space.* Translated by Maria Jolas. Beacon Press, 1958.
Baldwin, James. *"Everybody's Protest Novel"* in *Notes of a Native Son*. Beacon Press, 1955.
Banks, Nancy Turner. *AIDS, Opium, Diamonds, and Empire*. iUniverse, 2010.
Byrne, David, and Patrick Callaghan. *Complexity and the Social Sciences*. Routledge, 2001
Bunn, James H. *The Natural Law of Cycles: Governing the Mobile Symmetries of Animals and Machines*. Routledge. 2014
Bunn, James H. *Wave forms: A natural syntax for rhythmic languages*. Stanford University Press, 2002.
Campbell, Jeremy. *Grammatical Man: Information, Entropy, Language, and Life*. Simon and Schuster, 1982.

Capek, Milic. *The Philosophical Impact of Contemporary Physics*. D. Van Nostrand, 1961.
Chandrasekhar, Subrahmanyan. *Truth and Beauty: Aesthetics and Motivations in Science*. University of Chicago Press, 1987.
Cilliers, Paul. *Complexity and Postmodernism*. Routledge, 1998.
Cunningham, et al. *Romanticism and the Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
Dastur, Françoise. "Hölderlin and the Orientalisation of Greece." Pli: The Warwick Journal of Philosophy, no. 10, 2000, pp. 156-173, plijournal.com/files/Pli_10_8_Dastur.pdf.
Delanda, Manuel. *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*. Continuum, 2002.
Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image.* University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*. Columbia University Press, 1968.
Deleuze, Gilles. *Pure Immanence: A Life* translated by Anne Boyman. Zone Books, 2001.
Deleuze, Gilles. *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane, Viking Press, 1977.
Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *What is Philosophy? Columbia University Press,* 1994.
de Jouvenal, Bertrand. *On Power: The Natural History of its Growth*. (1945) reprint 1976, Liberty Fund.
Derrida, Jacques. "Ousia and Grammē: Note on a Note from Being and Time". Originally published in 1967. Accessed at: https://grattoncourses.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/ousia-and-gramme.pdf
Desilet, Gregory E. *Cult of the Kill: Traditional Metaphysics of Rhetoric, Truth, and Violence in a Postmodern World: An Interdisciplinary Study*. Gregory Desilet, 2002.
Dolan, Richard. *UFOs and the National Security State: Chronology of a Coverup, 1941-1973*. Hampton Roads, 2002.
Duesberg, Peter. *Inventing the AIDS Virus.* Regnery, 1996.
Duffy, Simon. *Deleuze and the History of Mathematics: In Defense of the 'New'*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.
Elkins, James E., Richard F. Rueckert, and William C. McCarty. *The Law of One, Books One Through Five*. Schiffer, 1982-1998.
Farber, Celia. *Serious Adverse Events: An Uncensored History of AIDS.* Chelsea Green, 2023.
Farrell, Joseph P. *Cosmic War: Interplanetary Warfare, Modern Physics, and Ancient Texts*. Adventures Unlimited, 2007.
Farrell, Joseph P. *Nazi International: The Nazis' Postwar Plan to Control the Worlds of Science, Finance, Space, and Conflict*. Adventures Unlimited Press, 2009.
Farrell, Joseph P. *Secrets of the Unified Field: The Philadelphia Experiment, the Nazi Bell, and the Discarded Theory.* Adventures Unlimited, 2008.
Feyerabend, Paul. *Against Method*. Fourth Edition, Verso Books, 2010. (First published 1975)
Kinkelstein, Norman G. *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering.* Second Edition, Verso, 2003.
Firstenberg, Arthur. *The Invisible Rainbow: A History of Electricity and Life*. Chelsea Green Publishing, 2016.
Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction.* Translated by Robert Hurley, Pantheon Books, 1978.
Fortune, Dion. *The Mystical Qabalah*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1935.
Friedman, Norman. *Bridging Science and Spirit: Common Elements in David Bohm's Physics, The Perennial Philosophy and Seth*. Woodbridge, 1993.
Galloway, Alexander. *Laruelle: Against the Digital*. University of Minnesota Press, 2014.
Galloway, Alexander. *Protocol: How Control Exists After Decentralization*. MIT Press, 2004.
Gangle, Rocco. *Diagrammatic Immanence: Category Theory and Philosophy*. Edinburgh University Press, 2016.
Garfinkel, Alan. *Forms of Explanation: Rethinking the Questions in Social Theory*. Yale University Press, 1981.
Godwin, Joscelyn. *Cosmic Music: Musical Keys to the Interpretation of Reality.* Inner traditions, 1989.
Harrington, Anne. *Re-Enchanted Science: Holism in German Culture from Wilhelm II to Hitler*. Princeton University Press, 1996.
Hempel, Drew. *Alchemy of Rainbow Heart Music: How Paranormal Sonofusion Subverts the Matrix Conspiracy.* 2012. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/
Ho, Mae-Wan. *The Rainbow and the Worm: The Physics of Organisms* (3rd edition). World Scientific, 2008.

Hudson, Michael. *...and Forgive Them Their Debts: Lending, Foreclosure and Redemption from Bronze Age Finance to the Jubilee Year*, ISLET, 2018.
Humphries, Suzanne, and Roman Bystrianyk. *Dissolving Illusions: Disease, Vaccines, and the Forgotten History*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013.
Hunt, Bruce J. *Pursuing Power and Light: Technology and Physics from James Watt to Albert Einstein* (Hopkins Introductions to the History of Science, Technology, and Medicine). Hopkins University Press, 2010.
Illich, Ivan. *Limits to Medicine: Medical Nemesis, the Expropriation of Health*. Penguin Books, 1976.
Illich, Ivan. *Tools for Conviviality*. Harper & Row, 1973.
Kappraff, Jay. *Beyond measure: A guided tour through nature, myth, and number*. World Scientific. 2002.
Kay, Lily E. *The Molecular Vision of Life: Caltech, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Rise of the New Biology*. Oxford University Press, 1993
Kay, Lily E. *Who Wrote the Book of Life?: A History of the Genetic Code*. Stanford University Press, 2000.
Keller, Evelyn Fox. *Secrets of Life, Secrets of Death: Essays on Language, Gender and Science*. Routledge, 1993.
Kennedy, Robert F. Jr. *The Real Anthony Fauci: Bill Gates, Big Pharma, and the Global War on Democracy and Public Health.* Skyhorse, 2021.
Vijaya, G. K. “Goethean science and the Reciprocal System”. Reciprocal System of Theory. 2023. Retrieved from https://reciprocalsystem.org
Kruse, Jack. *"Brain Gut 2: Viral Marketing"*. June 22, 2012. Retrieved from jackkruse.com
Lane, Nick. *The Vital Question: Why is Life the Way It Is?* Profile Books, 2015.
Latour, Bruno. *The Pasteurization of France*. Translated by Alan Sheridan and John Law. Harvard University Press, 1988.
Larson, Dewey. *Basic Properties of Matter.* Independently published 2022.
Larson, Dewey B. *The Neglected Facts of Science*. North Pacific, 1982.
Laviolette, Paul. *Secrets of Antigravity Propulsion: Tesla, UFOs, and Classified Aerospace Technology.* Bear & Company, 2008.
Lewontin, Richard C. *Biology as Ideology: The Doctrine of DNA*. Harper Perennial, 1991.
Mathews, Robert. *"The Curious Life of a Polymath"*. *New Scientist*, 11 October 2006.
Montague, Luc, et al. *Electromagn Biol Med.* 34(2) (2015): 106-12.
Moore, A.W. *The Infinite* (3rd edition). Routledge, 2019.
Mullis, Kary. “What did Kary Mullis, the inventor [of] the PCR technique, think of PCR as a diagnostic test?”. Youtube. Uploaded by Demystifying money, October 17, 2020. https://youtu.be/scYudSweDAs
Mullis Kary. “Kary Mullis The full interview by Gary Null”. Youtube. Uploaded by Eresia Di Base. Feb 22, 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nuWH1zFfX5A
Nabokov, Vladimir. *The Real Life of Sebastian Knight.* New Directions Publishing Corporation, 1959.
Nitzan, Jonathan, and Shimshon Bichler. *Capital As Power: A Study of Order and Creorder*. Routledge, 2009.
Nuwer, Rachel. *"Why The World Needs Viruses to Function"*. BBC, 17 June 2020. Retrieved from: https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20200617-what-if-all-viruses-disappeared
Plotnitsky, Arkady. *Complementarity: Anti-Epistemology After Bohr and Derrida*. [1] Duke University Press, 1994.
Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Routledge, 2002.
Prigogine, Ilya. *From Being to Becoming: Time and Complexity in the Physical Sciences*. WH Freeman, 1980.
Protevi, John. *Life, War, Earth: Deleuze and the Sciences*. University of Minnesota Press, 2013.
Protevi, John. *Political physics: Deleuze, Derrida and the Body Politic*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2001.
Rancourt, D. G., et al. (2024). “Spatiotemporal variation of excess all-cause mortality in the world (125 countries) during the Covid period 2020-2023 regarding socio economic factors and public-health and medical interventions”. CORRELATION. Retrieved from https://correlation-canada.org/covid-excess-mortality-125-countries/
Roberts, Jane. *The Way Toward Health: A Seth Book*. Amber-Allen Publishing, 1984.
Roberts, Janine. *Fear of the Invisible.* Impact Investigative Media, 2008.
Russell, Walter. *The Secret of Light.* University of Science and Philosophy. 3rd edition, 1971.
Simpson, Thomas K. *Newton, Maxwell, Marx: Spirit, Freedom, and the Scientific Vision*. Green Lion Press, 2012.
Scofield, Bruce. *The Nature of Astrology: History, Philosophy, and the Science of Self-Organizing Systems*. Simon and Schuster, 2023.
Scheff, Liam. *Official Stories: Counter-Arguments for a Culture in Need*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2012.
Shiva, Vandana. *Oneness vs. the 1%: Shattering Illusions, Seeding Freedom*. Chelsea Green, 2020.

Somers-Hall, Henry. *Deleuze's Difference and Repetition: An Edinburgh Philosophical Guide*. Edinburgh University Press, 2013.
Somers-Hall, Henry. *Hegel, Deleuze, and the Critique of Representation: Dialectics of Negation and Difference*. State University of New York Press, 2012.
Spengler, Oswald. *Decline of the West*. 1922, reprint by Windham Press.
Steiner, Rudolf. *Truth-Wrought Words* translated by William Lindeman. Mercury Press, 1990.
Steiner, Rudolf. *The Elemental World and the Future of Mankind*. Lecture given May 28, 1922, Dornach.
Steiner, Rudolf. *"Manifestations of Karma: Lecture 10: Free Will and Karma in the Future of Human Evolution."* Lecture given May 27th, 1910 in Hamburg.
Swanson, Claude. *Life Force:the Scientific Basis: Volume 2 of the Synchronized Universe*. Poseidia Press, 2011.
Tauber, Alfred. *The Immune Self: Theory or Metaphor?* Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Tosi, Margherita and Del Giudice, Emilio. *The Principle of Minimal Stimulus in the Dynamics of the Living Organism*. Science and Society Archive, 2013. Retrieved from: https://www.i-sis.org.uk/principle_of_minimal_stimulus.php
Thalos, Miriam. *Without Hierarchy: The Scale Freedom of the Universe*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
Tiller, William, et al. *Conscious Act of Creation: The Emergence of a New Physics*. Pavior Publishing, 2001.
Varoufakis, Yanis. *Technofeudalism: What Killed Capitalism*. Melville House, 2024.
Vrobel, S., Marks-Tarlow, T., & Rössler, O. E. (Eds.). *Simultaneity: Temporal Structures and Observer Perspectives*. World Scientific Publishing, 2008.
Warzel, Charlie. *"Don't Go Down The Rabbit Hole"*. *The New York Times*, 18 February, 2021.
Weinstone, Ann. *Avatar Bodies: A Tantra For Posthumanism.* University of Minnesota, 2004.
Wheeler, Ken. *Uncovering the Missing Secrets of Magnetism.* Darkstar Publications, 2014.
White, Douglass, A. “The Great Einstein/de Broglie Velocity Equation: Derivation and Notes by. Douglass A. White, Ph.D.”. 2006. Retrieved from: https://static1.squarespace.com/static/61a582640df56b4c5c355804/t/61b78f7253f79037be9a15f8/1639419762694/VelocityEquation.pdf
Whitehead, Alfred North. *Science and the Modern World*. Lowell Lectures. The Macmillan Company, 1925.
Wilhelm, Richard. *The I Ching or Book of Changes* (C. F. Baynes, Trans.). Princeton University Press, 1967.
Williams, James. *A Process Philosophy of Signs*. Edinburgh University Press, 2016.
Williams, James. *The Transversal Thought of Gilles Deleuze: Encounters and Influences*. Clinamen, 2005.
Winter, Dan. *Implosion’s Grand Attractor.* Kindle, 2011.
Wolfram, Stephen. *A New Kind of Science*. Wolfram Media Inc., 2002.
Zajonc, Arthur. *Catching the Light: The Entwined History of Light and Mind*. Oxford University Press, 1993.