

# Being is desire

Vincenzo Peluso

Present address: Via don Bosco, 11 00045

Genzano di Roma, Rome Italy

fmsv.peluso@gmail.com

(Dated: December 13, 2024)

One of the main theses of this article is that the quantum, like the energy level or the magnetic moment or the spin, is the measurement not of a physical reality in act, but of the matter involved in a metaphysical relationship called intention. In other words, being is not an entity but a special relationship. Special because it does not bind two entities together, as these are not primitive but emergent, nor is it of a logical type, as logic extends into the plane of the act, but a metaphysical relationship in that it transcends not only the plane of the act, going through the period of potency, but transcends the very sphere of being to bind two "I's" external to being, which are the recipients and the clearing or openness in which entities and their temporal relationships are revealed-accepted in the form of a certain sense (receive a meaning).

The one that has no Being, is the "I" that does not exist. Being, in turn, is not entities, it is the matter of the relationship between two "I", the space that separates and unites them. Being is thus only the matter, the power, of a relationship between two "I", which we call Intention, which is free and whose strength is desire. The "I", through being, has a soul which mirrors the desired with which, at every act, he unites himself through the gift of a part of his being.

Thus everything is born from desire, each time new and free. Neither logic nor mathematics nor ideas are universal and self-subsisting realities. They do not have an independent existence but arise each time statistically from the structure of free intentions, guided by desire for the other.

## INTRODUCTION

### The Fracture and the Intention

The oldest and most original question of philosophy, the most fundamental question of being, is the relationship between one and many. Inaugurated by Parmenides, it marks, with Plato's dialogue "The Parmenides", the birth of metaphysics and the source of all Western metaphysics: every branch of the analysis of the One has given rise to a philosophy. Yet this question is poorly posed.

Indeed, it tries to relate, therefore, to place on the same level, two mutually transcendent moments of being:

- the inner moment of potency, which is the living time of the one, i.e., of the universal (existential, holistic, veiled);
- the outer moment of the act, where the universal, revealed, appears as an organized space, the place of its parts (the multiplicity of beings).

In other words, the search for a solution in the logic sphere is doomed to failure, because the relationship between one and many is not logical, but transcendent.

Being, in turn, is the bridge between two mutually transcendent "I's" who, in the relationship thus established, figure as a giver and a receiver.

The transcendent relationship between the one (the whole) and the many (the parts) within being is therefore only one component of the complete existential relationship that unites two "I".

This existential relationship, which is the building block of everything, is the Intention.

### The Problem of Plato's Parmenides

Space is not absolute but relative. It is the space of the one that has being, that is, of the whole that is composed of parts that are in turn whole (and so on). The being of the one is its matter (the potency that in act is energy). However, this involves difficulties. The difficulties arise from two metaphysical evidences, which the ancients had very clear, and which nevertheless were in contrast with each other.

1. Space is "res extensa", a full of matter (mass);
2. infinity in act is impossible. This

- (a) on the one hand, demands the existence of an element that puts an end to the recursive decomposition of the whole;
- (b) on the other hand, denies that this element can be, in turn, extension and mass, because it would be infinitely divisible, or that it can be extension without mass, because the void, that is, non-being, is not possible, or that it can be, finally, without extension, and therefore without mass and without being, that is, the point per se.

The problem encountered by ancient philosophy arises precisely from the consideration that in act, which is finite and discrete, there is no extension. If physical relation is contact, in physics, that is, in act, there are no lines, trajectories, surfaces, or boundaries, and consequently, no contact. In act, there is no fullness of being, there is no whole that decomposes into parts in contact with each other. Parts without boundaries and without contact were equivalent to unrelated, absolute ones, without being, unthinkable and inexpressible. Zenon's paradoxes demonstrated not only the impossibility of movement as such, that is, the impossibility of the trajectory, which will indeed prove to be unreal with the advent of quantum mechanics, but also the impossibility of movement as caused, since for the Greeks the cause could only be contact.

In other words, in the act there can be no "res extensa", nor trajectories. A whole, then, should be a configuration of points without extension, but these atoms would end up in a vacuum, which is impossible. Without spatial extension there can be no contact, and therefore no interaction, no action and passion, no cause and effect. Moreover, the points do not touch each other and therefore are not physically connected to each other, how do they form a whole? They cannot. Moreover, the "res cogitans" is associated with an entelechy, that is, a unity, but what is this unity if the whole vanishes, gradually reducing itself to a set of disconnected points? At last, a point like reality does not solve the problem of the impossibility of the trajectory in the act, and without trajectories there can be no movement.

It should be noted that, even if point 2 were to be reversed, that is, by admitting infinity in act, as Leibniz did, for example, the inventor of infinitesimal calculus, it would necessarily follow that the infinitesimal in act is the point, and the infinite in act is that of the points in the extension. In both cases, admitting or not the infinite in act, it follows that the element is the point, not physical and not real for the reasons explained above. For this reason, Plato and the Neoplatonists (Leibniz also professed to be a Neoplatonist) placed reality on a higher plane, that of immutable ideas, parallel and separate from the ontologically lower one of the changing phenomenal world, known through the senses. The two planes corresponded as well as the real entities and the shadows projected in the cave, or the images reflected in a mirror. To the ontological dualism of the Platonic school, which clearly separated two parallel spheres, one imperfect image of the other, Aristotle contrasted a dynamic power-act dualism, where one prepared and merged into the other.

### **The solution: the leap of the quantum**

In reality, the impossibility of the extension in act does not exclude the existence of the quantum, rather, it demands it.

In the context of being, the act, that is, the determined quantity, requires the one, the quantum, otherwise it would plunge into the indeterminate infinitesimal, that is, into its opposite.

However, upon closer examination, the quantum in act, which is the one, does not reveal itself in the act. It cannot be observed in act along its spatial extension or during its temporal period: the quantum represents precisely the extension that eludes the act, the extension that is veiled in the act.

The quantum is not a determined and clear monolith, as the act would demand.

The quantum is therefore only a determination of the spatial extension, or of the time interval, in itself obscure, indeterminate, outside the act. What appears in determined act, what comes to light, is only the point/instant of beginning and the point/instant of end that mark a path that takes place in the veiling.

The same goes for the whole as whole.

In other words, the determined act, unveiled, is not founded in itself but needs the indeterminate, the veiling.

The act, that is, the light, exists only in the instant, at the boundaries of the quantum's extension. The being in act, unveiled, which demands the quantum, thereby demands the possibility of veiling. It is veiled in the extension of the quantum, outside the Act, and then unveils itself determined in the instant at the boundary between one quantum and the next .

Similar speech for the movement.

The problem posed by Zeno concerns the continuum in action or, in other words, the infinite. It doesn't ask whether the sum of infinite terms can be equal to a finite one: simple observation of reality, and today also infinitesimal calculus, already demonstrates this. The problem arises instead from the consideration that infinity, by its very definition, has no end. In other words, the physical operation of adding infinite terms is a process that has no end, by the very definition of infinity.

Infinitesimal calculus makes a leap, it jumps directly to the conclusion when it finds that the result is a finite number, but it does not physically add each term one by one, otherwise it would never end. Similarly, motion, in advancing from the starting point to the endpoint, must advance by hopping, it cannot traverse in action the infinite points along the path, otherwise it would never end. The same applies to the passage of time because time is the quintessential movement, the movement of the soul.

Therefore, both in mathematics and in nature, as well as in existence, it is necessary to jump over infinity, to jump from one act to another by surpassing in flight the infinity in between.

This infinity that must be leaped over by moving from one act to the next is the infinity of potency.

In the historical reconstruction determined in the instant in act, the quantum is the leap, the determined period of potency which must be overcome between one act and the next.

### **The one the quantum and the intention: the same**

But space is, in the final analysis, the space that extends between two boundary points, a bounded space. The point per se does not have being, but only the point in relation to another point delimits an extension and therefore a space that has being. The point exists only as the pole of a relationship. The first whole, the first element, mass, is the space of the relationship between two poles: the distance between two points. The first element is therefore a relationship between two points that is not accidental, but decisive, essential. This element is, as mass, the quantum. The quantum exists in the reality in act, as a sample extension, a unit of measurement of a measured extension. In the act there is the quantum, the quantity, the number. The number is not a point, it has no meaning in itself except in reference to another, to an origin, and on the basis of a meter, of a quantum. Thus the number five acquires a meaning, which is the extension, only in reference to another, to an origin, which is zero, and on the basis of a meter which is the unit: five is the extension between the point of origin and the point of arrival equal to five units. The two poles, affected by the relationship, are the origin and the recipient.

The quantum cannot be physically present in the act, nevertheless it shapes it, forms it. It represents the leap, the positive point-like that stands out on the negative, on the extension that is the segment, marking it. The real point-like that emerges in the sea of the imaginary. But it is also the surfacing of the temporal dimension, of the past or the future, of the extension that cannot be contained by the present instant. It is the logical presupposition, the logic that becomes the foundation of memory. If the act is still, the form frozen in the instant, the quantum is instead precisely the extension in which the presupposition that founds the form of the act is hidden, the movement that founds the phenomenon and the form of thought. In other words, it is the extension in which life is hidden.

### **The mental**

Being in action is energy, but energy is not presence, it is movement, nature is in fact a movement of energy, between a before and after, between a here and a there. There is no extension or movement in action. In place, therefore, there are only points: the sooner or later, the here or the there. Between two points in action, however taken, an infinite extension opens up, both spatial and temporal. This infinite extension interposed is power. Energy therefore moves in power, jumps from one point to another, both along the temporal axis of identity and along the spatial axis of difference. But points can only form a physical whole if they are linked by a physical relationship.

*«What could connect the state of two successive instants, if the two instants are each closed in on itself and the abyss of infinity separates them?»*

Indeed, the movement presupposes a comparison of the position of an individual between an instant and a subsequent instant. But the comparison, i.e. the recognition of the identity of an individual and the difference of the state, is an operation of the mind. Moreover, two instants are never simultaneously present in action in physical reality, if not in a mind. On the other hand, in physical reality, what could connect the state of two successive instants, if the two instants are each closed in on itself and the abyss of infinity separates them?

Aristotle solved it by introducing the potentiality-actuality ontological dualism. The act takes place in the instant, the potency in the period. Potency, which is a period, which lasts, which connects the previous instant to the next instant, is the incubator of movement, it is the place of the possible. Potentiality-actuality, therefore, are not two sides of the same coin. They are, instead, two moments that alternate and follow each other giving rise to the movement, the actualization, from time to time, of one of the possibilities, which sets a point from which the new possibilities open up, and so on, making a path, since "the motion is the fulfilment of what is potential as potential". This so-called ontological dualism, which is rather complementarity, opens the door to consciousness, interiority, freedom, making it possible to see nature as a living being, a "anima mundi", ordered with its own ends as an organism. In fact potency is the opposite of determinism just as life is the opposite of death.

In the act, individuals are points united by the exchange of energy, what is their relationship in the period of power?

Since, in order to make a comparison, the mind must first reflect, the relation of potency must be mirroring. Mirroring, based on the continuous exchange of power, is, among other things, the necessary, though not sufficient, premise for the discrete exchange of energy taking place. Individuals, which in act are points between which energy flows, are therefore mirroring spaces in the period of potency. But the mirroring space is not sufficient to guarantee its own preservation. Not even an "I" alone could

guarantee its own preservation. The one who guarantees this preservation is the special "I", the absolute, that intentions the other, the created "I", giving him being. The "I" is not being, it is outside of being and does not exist without being. The soul, the body, the consciousness, the memory, the phenomenon, the logic, the history, the ideas, are being, but the "I" is other than being. The "I" is unknowable, whatever the "I" is, it is so thanks to the being that is given to it, which is its garment, in relation to another "I". The "I" is the one who is loved and who loves in the relationship with the Other. Intention thus replaces the dualism "res cogitans"-*"res extensa"*, both unified in being, with a pseudo-dualism I-Being. In fact, Being is not substance, it is relationship. How does the "I" interact with Being? The "I" acts on the Being by Nientifying it, that is, by not accepting it, by denying the relationship with the Other.

Which, among the many possibilities, will constitute the new act? Who/what will determine the choice?

Since the observations of quantum mechanics have ruled out the necessity as the foundation of the fundamental interactions of nature, only two alternatives remain: the blind chance or the free will of an individual who freely chooses in view of an end. Modern sciences has not even taken into consideration the latter, which is also the principle posed by a large part of philosophy since its origins and by Aristotle himself, to cite an example. Now, change is the worst choice since:

- it is incomprehensible, since it contradicts the Principle of Reason
- pure chaos would reign. Unless you bring up the infinite. Eg. the infinity of the universes or the Multiverse
- it makes matter primitive but, on the other hand, "being-there" and consciousness inexplicable

On the contrary, the Intention places "being-there" as primitive and as the foundation of the relationship. The MetaPhysics of Intention places the free will of an individual who freely chooses in view of an end as its foundation. Necessity and chance (i.e. "randomness") are not ontological constituents of being. Necessity emerges reflexively, that is statistically, from the myriad of individual underlying choices. Chance is due to ignorance of the concatenations of choices (or necessities).

The recursion of mirroring is a departure from the present, a reconstruction of both the past and the future starting from the present. Power, the space it reflects, is therefore soul, desire, knowledge, memory.

Being is not substance, it means that the past is not a dead and irrevocable reality, but lives and is shaped on the present, with every decision, as well as destiny: they accompany the present and transform themselves with it. Similarly, there is no Platonic world, ideas and logic are only contingent and more or less probable forms. Consciousness and brain, that is, qualia and quanta, are the two sides, the inside and the outside, of the same entelechy in act.

The intention is directed towards another member against the phenomenal background of the multiplicity of the remaining intentions with all the other members of the same universal. Direct, monadic intention is an existential relationship, involving the feelings of the soul, and its dynamic development must be represented with the linear geometry of intention. The phenomenal context, on the other hand, which arises from a global vision of multiplicity perceptible through the sensations of consciousness, gives rise to the logical relations and spatial images that must be represented with Euclidean geometry.

## TERMINOLOGY

The term Entelechy is used in Aristotle, in conjunction with the term energy (*Energeia*) but distinct from it, to indicate the Act, in antithesis to Power (*Dunamis*). Unlike energy, the Entelechy, as it designates a reality that has its own end in itself towards which it tends to evolve, implies a substance, a temporal subject that is therefore in potential even before manifesting itself in act, and which is endowed with an internal organization adequate to the realization of its essence. *Sinol* (*Σύνολον*), in Aristotle, was precisely the combination of *Dunamis* and Entelechy, matter and form.

In the following exposition, the soul (matter, power) is the source or foundation of consciousness (form, act), and the term entelechy often stands for the Aristotelian *Sinol* (power and act). Moreover, act and potency are moments of the relationship between two individuals. In it, a fundamental role is assigned to the terms "universal" and "mirroring", parallel, on the level of power, to "entelechy" and "reflection" on the level of the act.

Before entering into the discussion, it must always be borne in mind that universals, species, genera, ideas, mathematical operators, physical laws, do not exist in themselves, abstractly, but from time to time as contingent forms at the very moment in which they are realized in nature or, which is the same, in thought.

Contrary to the common meaning, by universal we mean not the set of individuals united by the same idea, but the set of possible realizations of a concrete individual emerging from an organization of member individuals who participate for the realization of the common goal which is the universal. Entelechy, as the actualization of a power, is in fact only a particular, a finite. By end, on the other hand, we mean something infinite, intimately present in the subject, in its power, in the infinite distancing from the act. The end, this infinity, is what the finite tries to achieve from time to time when it appears in action as entelechy. This infinity, the universal, is the profound reason for entelechy. Entelechy and Universal are therefore the two faces

of the subject, one in the act and the other in the potency. Behind the end hides an unknowable "I", an "other" towards which one tends and which shows itself in the guise of an idea, precisely of a universal, that is, a form of the senses, in act, or a form of feelings, in power. That is, an extended matter, an image, a figure, in action; a temporal matter, justice, beauty, brotherhood, freedom, etc., in the period of potency.

Similarly, mirroring, emerging from the continuous exchange of power, more concentrated in the places where baryonic matter is most present, is a premise for consummation, consisting in an exchange of energy, the result of a free decision, which is in turn the constitutive element of reflection, emerging from the multiplicity of energy exchanges. A distinction is therefore made between an elementary, free mirroring and premise of free decision, dual of the single exchange of energy in intention, and an emergent mirroring that is the dual of reflection, the result of an overall vision of the innumerable intentions. The assertion that, in a universal, each member mirrors every other by mirroring the universal to which he belongs, is therefore only in apparent contradiction to the assertion that its exercise by an individual, expressed in terms of intensity (desire) and object (the universal to which he has chosen to affiliate), is the very essence of his free will. In reality, the mirror and mirroring emerge statistically, they are the effect of multiplicity seen as a whole. The single elementary act, on the other hand, is free just as man is free in his decisions. The use of this terminology intends to privilege the Intention that has the human being as its subject. Man is, to a certain extent, free to choose the "Communities" to which he belongs and, through these choices, he chooses his goal. The particular Community chosen is therefore for man a concrete means towards the end itself. A man, moreover, can reflect values, universals, without necessarily belonging to a concrete community that personifies them. He is however a member of an ideal community, of a universal that he has freely chosen to mirror.

The term Intention is not new in philosophy. Intention in Neoplatonic and Renaissance philosophy can be seen as the desire or inner movement that guides the soul towards the divine, perfection and truth. It is a force that operates on a cosmic, spiritual, and personal level, integrating love, will, and knowledge. After the Renaissance, the idea of intention was revisited and developed in various ways, from Kant's moral theory to the modern theory of intentionality by Brentano, Husserl and their successors. These philosophers explored intention as a fundamental characteristic of the human mind, will, and consciousness, profoundly influencing contemporary philosophy. In contemporary philosophy, intentionality is the property of certain mental states (belief, desire) to be directed towards, or related to, individuals or states of affairs. In contradiction with Brentano's claim, however, it has been pointed out that not all mental states are intentional nor are all conscious. In fact, there are phenomenal states, for example, those that accompany physical pain, and beliefs of which one is not conscious.

The term intention is used, in this discussion, with a much general meaning and which will be specified in the following paragraphs. The structure of intention, in fact, in some ways similar to Aristotle's theory of the four causes, provides for an efficient cause at its beginning, and since it is argued here that everything that moves has an efficient cause, it therefore has an intention at its base. The difference between intentional and unintentional mental states, present in modern philosophy, is therefore analogous to the Aristotelian difference between cause and chance. Moreover, the thesis is maintained that intention is not limited to the mental sphere but embraces the physical one with equal rights, since they represent the outside and inside of the same (After all, according to Parmenides, thinking and being are the same). It is argued, to be clearer, that intention is the building block of everything.

## THE INTENTION

By abuse of language, we define universal (as *ἐντελέχεια*) a whole composed of parts which, as such, is an organized space. A universal is made up of a certain kind of energy (*ἐνέργεια*), i.e a quantum and a quale, of which it constitutes the totality, such that two individuals belong to this same universal if they possess this kind of currency and if they exchange this kind of currency.

The individual, who belongs to a Universal and is "a part of" its Universal, is completely determined by its own quantity of currency, and by its position in relation to the other within the common universal.

The exchange, that is, the giving-receiving of a quantum of this currency, is the relationship that binds two conjoined individuals and which we call "Intention".

Therefore, we can define the Universal Relationship, the universal and sole relationship, which is the Intention, as follows:

### 1 Intentional principle:

*Intention, within the space of a universal, is the relationship between an individual and his other, whose aim is the fulfillment of the desire to unite through the gift of energy (of one's own substance), against the background of the remaining intentions.*

*For each individual, it is composed of the alternation of two phases, that of giving and that of receiving, each of which is constituted by two moments: the instant of the Act along the horizontal, spatial axis, and the period of Potency along the vertical, temporal axis. More precisely:*

1. *ACT un-veiling: (PHYSICS)*

*at the moment of Consummation, as a result of a decision, the individual donates/receives a part of itself to/from its other, which belongs to its own universal. This act takes place in the instant, that is, out of time. Although instantaneous, it breaks down into three logically distinct moments:*

- (a) *Giver instantiation (particle - ἐντελέχεια -): the donor materializes quantitatively determined by its energy and position;*
- (b) *Radiation (radiant energy - ἐνέργεια -): the radiant energy, which binds the donor, from which it is subtracted, to the recipient, to which it is added, along the distance  $r^\diamond$*
- (c) *Receiver instantiation (particle - ἐντελέχεια -): the receiver materializes quantitatively determined by its energy and position;*

2. *POTENCY (power wave - δύναμις -) veiling: (METAPHYSICS)*

*at the Mirroring moment, which is the potency period between two Consummative acts, the individual mirrors in itself, and is mirrored by, each member of its universal.*

*During this period the individual sinks undetermined into its space of the potency unfolding from the dissolving of its amount of energy. This period takes place in the true time of life, that is, it is not measurable in itself. Nevertheless, it assumes a measure determined a posteriori, in the act, as the time of memory in the reflexive historical reconstruction. This interval of proper time, which has elapsed between the act of giving and the consecutive act of receiving, is equal to the path of energy towards and from the other, both mirror of one and the same path. Namely:*

$$\tau_{A \rightarrow A'} = r_{A \rightarrow B}^\diamond + r_{B \rightarrow A'}^\diamond \quad (1)$$

*If space and time are the same, both being mirror images of a single reality which is the path of energy, then energy has no speed.*

*From a geometric standpoint, the space of the historical reconstruction of intention is therefore linear, being composed of the same path of energy that is reflected both along each of the two real  $\tau$  time axes and along the common polygonal chain of radiant energy  $r^\diamond$ . That is, from the power segments that join the points in act, located in the origins of the pair of triads that face each other, the real sending triad and the opposite mirror receiving triad, having parallel time axis and the same give-receive axis, and the dual pair of triads with reversed parts rotated by an angle  $\pm\gamma$  around the origin of the point of arrival in the energy-time plane. The axes of each orthogonal triad correspond to: entelechy (time), radiant energy, and power.*

The intention, being always a part of a whole, is the existential relationship that is being lived in the context of the remaining intentions which, seen from the outside and as a whole, appear flattened in the background, the background that constitutes the phenomenal world-environment. This overview seen from the outside is represented by the geometry of the manifold (e.g. Euclidean). In the intention there is therefore a double geometry: the linear one, consummative, of the intention that is being experienced within the geometry of the manifold (e.g. Euclidean) which represents the phenomenal context of the world-environment.

The intention is characterized by quantum of energy in the act and by mirroring in the period of potency. However, being free, there is no rule and therefore no order—yet this does not imply chaos. Beneath the appearance of randomness lies a natural rhythm and a pattern that emerges statistically and phenomenally, revealing itself when one observes not the individual intention, but the whole, the universal. The existence of natural rhythms found in nature implies the emergence, statistically, of a quantization of the period of intentions. This quantization, which emerges statistically, reveals a preference, a NOT-indifference. In other words, intentions are free, but not indifferent, they reveal a higher-level organizing intention, a purpose. They constitute the indispensable reflective building block for the generation of reflective mechanisms (entelechies). As a result, the mirror and immediately after the clock are the primary mechanisms. With the mirror and the wristwatch, memory emerges, which is the foundation of knowledge. In essence, memory and knowledge are one and the same. By observing the whole, the quantum and the law of conservation emerge and stabilize, which together found mathematics and logic. Logic, in turn, allows historical reconstruction based on memory.

No intention is isolated, but each intention is part of a whole, it is at the same time the vertical intention of the part with its universal and the horizontal intention with the other parts of its universal. Vertical and horizontal are only two points of view of the same intention: the soul and the consciousness. For this reason, energy has no speed (there is no speed of light), because the path it takes along the horizontal radiant axis and along the vertical temporal axis of the entelechy are the double mirroring of a single and identical linear path. In other words, in the movement of energy (and only energy), space and time are the same and therefore there is no speed. Speed, instead, is that of the approach or separation between the entelechies.

An aggregate of individuals does not constitute a new universal (entelechy) in itself. Each entity is an entelechy or its remains, waiting to become part of a new, more specific entelechy and in any case already part of a more general entelechy. For example, entelechies are the universe, atoms, molecules, galaxies, star systems, planets, oceans, lakes, rivers, volcanoes, living beings, living organizations such as beehives, anthills, peoples, nations, teams, companies, etc.

The process by which a set of intentions nest and stratify and organize themselves into components that give rise to a universal, which in turn becomes part or organ of a higher-level universal, and so on, giving rise to organisms and superorganisms up to the maximum organism, which is the entire universe, is called Communion.

## 2 Teleological principle:

*The universal is the power wave that coordinates and depends on the power waves of its parts thanks to a relationship of mutual mirroring. The universal, being in turn part of a superior universal, is a link in the entire evolutionary chain that connects the two extremes constituted by the elementary and the universe, one mirroring the other.*

*Each universal thus represents a form of possible equilibrium with the universe of which it is a part. A link in the chain.*

*The universal, as the totality of parts, mirrors itself in each of the parts and determines their behavior and vice versa. The potency of the entire derives from the potency of the parts, but it is the whole that binds and guides the decisions of the parts in view of its ultimate goal, through a form of quantum entanglement.*

*Communion is a two-faced relationship. Indeed, in the period of power, on the one hand, it is the vertical (temporal) relationship of the universal, placed at the origin of time, with the part; on the other, the same relationship is the horizontal (spatial) relationship of the universal, represented by the remaining parts arranged on the plane of the present, with the part. In the Act, as the realization of one of the possibilities, the individual (the part) evolves (temporally) at the same time as it consummates (spatially) with its other (another part of the same universal). The individual is therefore two in one: it is the one and its parts, the soul and the consciousness.*

*When the wave of power of the whole comes to an end, its body, having its parts lost the unifying coordination, disintegrates.*

*From a geometric standpoint, each individual in act is a space identified by its own triad of axes, positioned and oriented with respect to its own universal, which departs from an origin placed at the center of the circumference of its present in act, with a radius equal to its electrical or gravitational Radius, and tangent internally to the circumference of its universal.*

If the single intention takes place in the linear space of intention, the configuration of the set of points in action, observable with an overall view, reveals the disposition of entities in the quadratic Euclidean space. We call reflexive and or Euclidean what emerges from an overall view. The Euclidean space has as its object not the unfolding of the path of the individual or of the energy, as it is for the space of Intention, but the configuration given by the co-presence of the multiple. From the whole of the spaces of individual intentions, Euclidean space emerge. Euclidean space, in turn, allows figures and images and phenomenon and ideas and entelechies.

The act of receiving and the subsequent act of giving mark the birth and death of the individual, in whose period of power the innumerable intentions that make his history follow one another, nesting and stratifying and organizing themselves. The potency of intention is all its present potency, within its reach, the totality of the worlds that can be realized by its decision. The potency of the individual is also suspended time, waiting for his decision, which however is not immobility because his world, and consequently his potency, in the meantime is transformed with the succession of the other intentions that constitute his universal. Potency is at all times the potency of the whole world, from birth to the present that mortgages the final act of death. The time of potency is therefore a living, suspended, present but mutant, comprehensive but indeterminate time.

In short, space is relative, it is the space of the One that has Being, that is, of the Whole that breaks down into parts and:

1. in potency it is the time interval of life. It is the soul and relationship is mirroring: each one mirrors and is mirrored in the other
2. In the act it is the space of vertical relations between the whole with each of the parts that is equivalent to the horizontal relations of each part with the set of the remaining parts. It is consciousness and relationship is reflection: each space reflects and is reflected in the other

The reflection between the parts is the elementary intention in the elementary space of intention, the reflection of the remaining parts in the part is the reflection of the world in Euclidean space (e.g. the reflection of the world space in the eye space).

The Intentional principle founds the whole physics and is described in the Intention Physics (see (Peluso, Intention Physics, 2019) (Peluso, Intention not Theory: the Vertigo of Love, 2021) (Peluso, The Geometry of the Discrete Act, 2021) (Peluso, Cosmology in the Linear PseudoPlane of the Act, 2023)

The individual does not exist without relation to his universal (which is always a concrete individual) and vice-versa. What is the beginning? What is the first intention? If being is relationship, who is the Absolute?

### 3 Theological principle:

*The One that is one (I), Absolute, without parts, the “Not other”, eludes being and knowledge and word.*

*The Absolute I, out of the desire to share its own happiness, out of the desire to love, must come out of itself, from its beatitude, and enter into existence.*

*The Absolute I enters into existence by becoming the original person who creates the other, the created I, intentioning it. The world is the intention between the original I and the created I, between two nothings that exist thanks to intention, and nature is necessarily movement because nature is being that cannot be held back by nothingness but only be reflected, received, and given, and this is the unfolding of life, the dialogue between two “I”s.*

*From a geometric standpoint, the Theological principle is represented by the cosmology. It is the intention between the point of origin, identified with the Big Bang, and each of the points placed on the circumference of the present in act, placed at a distance equal to the Radius  $R_\omega$  of the Universe.*

The recipient of the intention of the special “I” is an “I” that is given a body, that is, an entelechy. A galaxy, a solar system, a planet, an atom, a molecule, are entelechies but do not have an “I”. They are not the recipients of the intention of the special “I”, but rather they are the means. The entelechy endowed with an “I” is a person.

In the moment when from the component parts a new individual is constituted, its “I” enters at the same time in intention with the original “I”, and all the history is preparatory to this new birth.

The entelechies, which are the fruit of the evolution of vertical intentions between the special “I” and the other “I”s, constitute either the body of the universe, in whose form He manifests and makes himself present, or the bodies of the other “I”s with which He relates.

#### The explanation of everything

Everything is explained by the structure of intention, that is, by the geometry of intention, which accounts for the structure of space and the forces of nature, and by thermodynamics, which accounts for the energetic processes that take place in this structure. The prime matter is potency, which in action becomes three-dimensional mass, i.e. the Radius, a component of the Radius on each of the three axes of space. Starting from Radii, that is, from their position and orientation with respect to the universal, and from their mutual mirroring, the geometry of intention, alone, must explain QED and gravitation and all of physics in general.

Thermodynamics is the science that studies energy, its transformation, and the direction of natural processes. The laws of thermodynamics, in particular:

1. First law (conservation of energy): says that total energy is constant, but can transform from one form to another. It is the foundation of mirroring and logic and numbers
2. Second law: it states that the entropy of the universe tends to increase, describing a direction of time towards disorder. It is the intention, whose meaning is the charity: He who has plenty gives to the needy
3. Third law: it establishes that, at absolute zero temperature, the entropy of an ideal system reaches a constant minimum. All energy is zero-sum and it is released from an initial zero.

Consequently, all being, that is, logic, mathematics, physics, and the entire hierarchy of entelechies into which the universe is broken down, arise from zero thanks to the geometry of intention and the laws of thermodynamics.

#### The I and the entelechy

For Heidegger, in light of the ontological difference between *Being* and beings, *Being* is neither an entity nor an object, nor is it bound by time. Rather, *Being* is the fundamental way in which entities reveal themselves and become intelligible within time—the condition of possibility for their appearance and understanding. Within this framework, Heidegger underscores the unique relationship between *Being* and the distinctive entity called *Dasein*, the human being, whose existence is marked by its capacity to engage with and comprehend *Being*.

In the philosophy of intention, on the contrary, there is no ontological difference, in fact Being and being are both moments of an entelechy that are to each other like potency and act, but there is a more fundamental difference between Being and I, both constituents of the Intention relationship. What Heidegger attributes to Being, the philosophy of intention attributes to the structure of intention and to I. The I, in particular, is what can give meaning to being, accepting or rejecting it more or less partially and thus saving or betraying its original meaning in the most disparate ways.



***The entelechy:***

Every entelechy is a word of the special I and, as a whole compound, it is body (from the outside), soul and consciousness (from the inside). In other words, body, soul and consciousness are properties of entelechies that the receiving I accepts to some extent which constitutes its meaning.

The question is: is every entelechy the proper body of an I, or not necessarily? Saying whether and to what extent a planet or a galaxy or a sea or a river has an "I" is not easy. In any case, no "I" is more free than man to accept or reject the being that is given to him.

***The created I:***

The created "I" is not self-subsisting, it exists only by accepting the intention of a special "I" and by the being that receives in the intention.

**"I"logy vs Monadology**

A whole is composed of parts of which it is the universal and is in turn a part of a whole that is its own universal. Every whole reflects every other whole of its own universal or, in other words, its own universal, and vice versa. The whole is always a gift of the special "I" to the created "I" which in turn can give to another created "I". Natural wholes are entelechies, words of the special "I". Even the ideas that arise in the mind of a created "I" are entelechies, shadows. Conversely, an artifact, as well as a machine or an instrument or a painting or a statue or a book or music, etc., are not entelechies but aggregates of entities that represent ideas (entelechies, shadows), simulacra, reflections of possible entelechies, they are therefore human words, shadows of shadows. Even if a man were able to build not a machine, but a real person, just as when one generates a child, he would be simply generating a body, not his "I". Every entelechy is placed in front of the special "I" and is always either a word addressed to an "I" or the body of one of its interlocutors, that is, of an "I". Only the special "I" can make a simple entelechy the body of an "I". An "I" is capable of freely giving and receiving love. Thus an entelechy is the body of an "I" to the extent that its behavior is free and capable of loving, that is, free to accept or reject the intention of the special "I".

The Intention has some similarities with Leibniz's monadology, although it differs radically from it since it is of Aristotelian root, unlike monadology which is Neoplatonic. As in monadology, there is no absolute space but a space of relationships, and primitive units, the fundamental building blocks of reality, each reflect the rest of the universe from its own unique perspective. Unlike in monadology, however, the act is finite and not infinite; mirroring, which takes place in potency and is the premise of reflection in act, is a physical process and not a metaphysical one; the phenomenon is not a dark and confused spatial representation of an ideal reality, but is the interior of an exterior, the reflection in the consciousness of the external universe, as a result of its mirroring in the soul: in other words, there is no difference between the way of knowing of the special "I" and the created "I"; the primitive Leibnizian unity, that is, the monad, a simple entity phenomenally endowed with a body composed of monads over which it prevails by degree of perfection, is opposed to the whole, which is the physical, extended, material body, to which a metaphysical "I" belongs that does not survive the disintegration of the whole, that is, of its own body, and interacts physically and freely with the acceptance or rejection of the relationship with the special "I".

*Behind the indeterminacy of quantum mechanics lies the free will of the "I" that is the recipient of the intention of the special "I": the truth of quantum physics is the physics of Intention.*

**Entelechiology**

Being is the relationship between the special "I" and the created "I" and is organized in entelechies. Entelechy is a form of balance with the whole in view of a purpose which is to provide the basis for interaction with the created "I".

Each entelechy is part of the special entelechy that is the universe. It therefore mirrors the universe and obeys the will of the universe. Entelechies form a chain that goes from the special "I" (the universe) to the created "I" (the sensitive being). To the extent that entelechy is also the body of a created "I", it obeys the will of the latter.

Evolution is not so a blind mechanism. Its engine is the desire to love and to give the life that the special "I" has and that living beings in turn have. Without this desire, which is the force of intention, there would be no evolution. But evolution, insofar as it has as its purpose that of allowing a dialogue with the created "I", is not blind chance and necessity, but teleology. After all, it is only a matter of interpretation, and the distinction is not whether one goes straight or blind, but the existence of a desire. Even in Darwinism the real engine is the survival instinct, that is, the will to live of a living organism, without which natural selection would not even make sense, and in the anthropic principle it is life, in the final analysis the subterranean will to live, the engine that finally manifests itself in action in a living organism, which selects the real universes.

### The philosophical background of Plato's Parmenides

Being in act is the entity. It is the seat, that is, the space, of its matter which assumes a quantitative determination that expresses and reveals its form. The entity reveals its form through space, and there is no entity without form. To sum up:

1. space is memory frozen in the instant and, as such, it is space-time. It is the luminous conformation, revealed by the reflection in the Act, of the individual's parts. That is, the space is the set of quantitative relations that take place between the parts of the entity. The image, which as such is extension and therefore space, is knowledge and memory. It allows historical reconstruction through the principle of reason
2. Time is life. It is the metaphysical desire for the other, the feeling of separation from the other that translates into searching, distancing and approaching, in the expectation of union. Time is the dark conformation, shaped by the mirroring in Potency, of the individual's matter. That is, the Time is the amount of the matter of the individual, and it does not exist without its matter. Matter is desire.

Finally, matter is power. Now the question is: is this power (the "primary matter") active or passive? Is it matter that has the form within itself and produces it externally, or is it an external form that shapes the inert matter?

The answer of the Intention is that matter, that is, potency, has in itself all the forms that are possible at the moment, but it is an external "I" that, with the decision, chooses the one in act, thus forging the potency itself.

On the one hand, the individual intention of the special "I" with each created "I", the personal dialogue, on the other hand, the reflective intention, in the background, which emerges globally from the innumerable intentions of the special "I" as a whole, where the phenomenally emerging end is the anthropic principle and ultimately life, which can be confused with the Darwinism of nature. The order of nature, reflective, phenomenal, emerges from the chaos of free individual intentions.

### Universals (as Entelechies) and ideas

*"...is the same thinking and being"* [1] (On nature by Parmenides). In the philosophy of intention, both are waves of power.

Intentions are free. From a statistical point of view, the freedom of intention acts like a noise that superimposes itself on a signal. The elementary intention is characterized by quantum of energy, that is, by its natural rhythm, and by mirroring, but the principle of conservation is still hidden, is only a mode, an orientation. Mirrors and clocks have not yet emerged, there is no mathematics or logic, there is no knowledge.

As the number of intentions increases, the noise becomes irrelevant and the entelechy or mechanism assumes its own definite form. Consequently the first mechanisms are the mirror and the wristwatch. With the mirror and the wristwatch, memory arises, which is knowledge. Mirroring is the foundation of logic and the principle of reason, wristwatch of numbers.

Therefore, there is no absolute, abstract and real mathematics, absolute, abstract and real physic. Two plus two, in reality, that is, in the physical world, that is, in the calculation of a computer as in the calculation of a brain, does not necessarily make four even if, for all practical purposes, one can count on it. Mathematics is only the form of power at the moment in which it is thought, and this evolves and is the daughter of its epoch just as living species and stars and galaxies.

This is how order emerges from the chaos of an infinity of free intentions. The first to emerge is the mirror and the clock, then logic, mathematics, and the patterns from which the Darwinism of nature selects those suitable for life and therefore for the anthropic principle. In the same way, ideas are born and developed in the mind of a living being, either as a mirror of the forms of nature or as forms of power subject to the Darwinism of life. There is no absolute and real ideas, there are only entelechies, that is ways in which power in the physical world can function, can keep in balance with the evolving surrounding world.

### Thought and its forms

Perception is perhaps the primary source of forms, which are borrowed from the external world thanks to the ability to mirror that is proper to the soul, and that arises from the innumerable multitude of intentions that affect its parts. What is mirrored in the soul, in turn, is a multiplicity of possible pre-forms. Consequently, the mirroring already anticipates the form it will receive in act, it already has a pre-knowledge of it. How is this pre-understanding of being possible? The answer lies in the fact that the matter of the soul is the same as that of the world, the power is the same. The world can therefore be mirrored in each of its parts, as for example in the soul of a person.

Thinking is a primary intention against the background of the remaining intentions, it is a give and take that corresponds to a search and find. What we seek is the "other", the unknowable, in one of the forms in which we are given to know him. The place of research is the pre-phenomenal mirroring soul, among the multiplicity of possible forms that inhabit it, among the

innumerable mirrors that reflect what is sought. One cannot seek without desire, and the found corresponds to the sought to the extent that it satisfies one's desire. The path of thought advances step by step. Each step corresponds to a new choice, a new image, a new encounter with those who hides behind the guise of an idea, which involves a transformation of the soul. Someone who, every time you think you've finally grasped once and for all, you find yourself with only a few rags of clothing in your hands, because it's never completely yours, never completely given, because it's not something finished. The reason is that what is embraced in the infinity of the soul cannot be nailed down once and for all in the finiteness of consciousness. And so desire is never fulfilled, and the quest must start again each time, each time in search of a new encounter, because life can only be lived.

### **The Mind**

The mind is to the corresponding brain what the inside is to the outside, as qualia is to quanta, as thought is to the wave of power. Thought is a parallel between signs-symbols of consciousness that recall waves of power in the soul. Consciousness is associated with a soul of which it constitutes its surface, with which it forms a whole, a whole. The whole is the relationship between consciousness and soul, between signs and meaning, between configurations of quanta/qualia and corresponding power waves, between pattern matching and understanding. The person is involved in a load-bearing intention dropped into the context of the world. The world involves the cells of his sense organs and is reflected through them in the person reflexively, phenomenally, while the person is interested in the fundamental intertension with the absolute self in the guise of the universal that he has chosen, to which he has affiliated.

Intentions, however free, are so within a space of power that has its own form. Necessity is the reflective result, which emerges when the multitude of elementary intentions saturates the space of power and makes it appear, that is, it is the result of all possible decisions taken as a whole. In fact, power has a form that manifests itself in the act of reflection. If the single decision is free within the space of power, the multitude of decisions, saturating the space of power, invariably manifests its form, which then appears as a necessary consequence. A machine, or a computer that performs its functions, is not an entelechy, it is not a whole that behaves as a whole and that is free to mirror and therefore to decide. It is not an "I", it is not the recipient of an intention on the part of the special "I". It has no signs to which correspond waves of power waiting for the decision of an ego. The decisions have all been made a priori by a programmer, and the computer only has to execute the instructions reflexively, mechanically, necessarily.

### **Nature**

From the big bang to the man (or living being) present there is the space of an instant. The time of thirteen billion years is actually only a measure of the path taken by energy, in the present instant, to reach man starting from the Big Bang. Everything that has happened in this space, the whole path taken by the energy, is the background, it is preparation and a fundamental part of the intention in progress. It is the body of the universe that, in the fundamental intention in progress, appears reflexively, mirroring itself in the body of the created self.

### **Transcendence and Fracture**

Transcendence is immanent to Being and indicates the period of potency that, in the intention, opens between one instant in act and the next. Transcendence is the entire life of each "I", as its life is the time span from the act of birth (conception) to the next act which corresponds to its death. Transcendence is thus the wave of power of the individual in intention and his soul.

The fracture is instead the radical, infinite chasm that opens between one "I" and his other. All being is unifiable and must be unified, but every "I" is irreducibly other than being and other than every other "I".

Common Being is precisely the sign of the relationship between the "I"s that share a common origin. The common origin of all "I"s is the special "I", who personally called each of them giving them being.

### **The existence**

The "I" is the one without parts, which as such does not exist.

To exist it must place the other, where the other is another "I" and where this placing is an intention.

In the intention, the "I" is the not other.

The relationship between the “I” and the other, which opens to being, to existence, both the “I” and the other, is given by this NOT. The NOT unites them while it separates them.

However, the relationship is not symmetrical, one is the first, the origin, the one who places, the other is the one who has been placed.

NOT and BEING are two aspects of the same substance which is the relationship.

BEING is the veil that foretells the other, it is the hope in launching oneself towards the unknown other, it is the faith in waiting for the unknown other.

NOT is the space that separates while it is overcome by the energy that unites.

BEING is the period of potency, NOT is the instant of act.

In existing, the “I” becomes the whole made up of parts, the BEING and the NOT, the soul and the consciousness.

### **The “I” and Being**

The “I” precedes Being but does not exist without Being. The “I” comes into existence and exists within the existential relationship here called Intention. There is no Being without the “I”. Being is functional to Intention. Being is the power wave and the energy, namely the soul and consciousness, that the “I” receives within the intention that calls it into existence.

An entity has an identity if we can recognize it as the same in time and space, either because it moves following a continuous trajectory, or because it has properties that make it unique. Electrons, however, as well as quantum elementary particles, are indistinguishable, they do not have an identity. Electrons take on an identity only and when they are involved in the special relationship we call intention. In this case, they are the donor and the recipient present at the same time. The relation, in turn, is the relation between the whole and its parts which is equivalent to the relation of the part to the remaining parts. The relation, the quantum, is therefore the element of an entelechy, which is in turn made up of component entelechies, and only when an entelechy is sufficiently complex, then it assumes an identity and behaves like a classical mirror and a classic clock.

If space is not absolute, and if the elements of nature do not have an identity, and if identity itself, as well as logic, mathematics, physical laws, are statistically emergent realities, then being itself is constitutively relational. Being is the place of the body, of the soul, of consciousness, but not of the “I”. Being is the relationship between two “I’s”, what is in between and separates them by uniting them. Being, as power, is always the power of relationship. Power is mirroring. The Universal (the entelechy in potentiality) is therefore a mirror in potentiality, but an active, not passive, mirror. It reflects the other by virtue of his desire and more or less faithfully on the basis of his own openings and closures. Mirroring the other is a matter of love and an expression of freedom. Power, that is, mirroring or loving, is also living, it is therefore that terrain which is the true time of life, the struggle between the openings and closures of love.

### **The “I”**

The “I” exists with being. To exist means to be in relation with the other through being. Being is made for the “I”. The “I” inhabits being and imprints itself upon it, shaping it by accepting or rejecting it. Being belongs to the special “I”. Being is the gift of the special “I”. The “I” does not exist without being, and there is no being without relation to the Other. To exist is a relationship between two “I” through being. Thus, with existence, the “I”, being, and the Other are coexistent but not on the same plane. The relationship is asymmetrical; the special “I” is the origin, the one who possesses and bestows being by calling the other.

But the “I” is Not-Being. If being is all that is knowable, the “I” is the unknowable.

The freedom of the “I”, which consists in accepting or rejecting the gift of being offered by the Other, is expressed through decision. But decision involves thought, knowledge, and knowledge implies the mirroring of the Other. How can Not-Being mirror? How can the unknowable be known in order to be accepted or rejected?

In fact, it cannot. What mirrors, what knows, what is mirrored, what is known, is not the “I” but the being it wears.

That is, the entity that is the body of the “I”.

A body that is the whole and its parts and which constitutes the historical memory of the individual from its beginning to the present.

As a whole, it is the wave of transcendent, holistic power that endures in the potency of intention stretching between the act of birth and the act of death. Similarly, as composed of parts, in turn composed of ever smaller parts, each enduring the span of its own intention, the body, or rather the mind, is “a bundle of perceptions” and intentions that alternate and succeed each other with rhythms more or less frantic depending on their nature.

Every act, with which the intention of a part is concluded, is like a spark: a quantum and a quale.

The “I” inhabits the whole, which is its transcendent and holistic soul, facing the frantic sparkling of the acts of its parts that constitute its consciousness.

### **The Being**

If everything is one, if everything must have a common origin, then this common origin must be Being, and if everything must be traced back to a single cause, then Being is the Absolute.

But Being is not everything, is not absolute.

Being is relation, extension, space. Being is soul and consciousness. While it’s true that from the beginning of philosophy we find Parmenides’ sentence “thinking and being are the same”, it is equally true that thinking is a dialogue with oneself, and in this self-relationship, thought is not the subject. Being is not an “I”, nor is thinking. Rather, the “I” needs Being to think, to exist, because existence is to go out of oneself, and this going out of oneself is already a self-relationship. The “I” needs Being to establish a relationship, whether with itself or with another. The “I” is the “Not other”, the absolute principle of individuation.

In other words, if the one is not alone, then, beyond the “I” itself, there must be the absolutely other “I”. For these two “I”s to relate, a space must open between them, and this space must be filled by a means, by a third. This third, which cannot be another “I”, is Being, the space of relation that must be communication. For there to be communication, Being must become language, a message, so that each one may imprint it with oneself to give it as a reflective object to the transcendent subject.

If the entity is the present of the “I”, as close as possible, Being is as distant as possible, and between Being and entity there is continuity, as one passes into the other.

Being is not for itself, not presence, not substance, not an absolute. Being is communication, the means that unites two “I”s.

Being is the anything and nothing of potency that reveals itself in action as zero-sum energy. Zero that, in order to generate life, the original “I” breaks down into the positive and negative with which he recomposes the multiplicity of forms.

### **Space and Time of being**

Originally, for each individual in intention, there is only potency and act. The first, interior, of the soul; the second, external, phenomenal, of consciousness. At the same time, there is an internal space of potency, and an external, phenomenal space of act. These two spaces, as well as the power and the act, represent one the mirroring and the other the consequent reflection.

Power is matter and matter is space. Mass is the amount of power. The power increases with distance as it is proportional to the surface of the sphere distant from the center in which the donor individual is placed. As the distance from the here and now increases, the spherical surface affected by the power increases, the mass increases. In the original inner space of potency, the radiant axis and the axis of potency are orthogonal, because potency is the whole other of the act, the NOT of the radiating axis. In the representation of intention, the real is the path and the power is quantitatively determined by the radius.

In the inner space of power, the path of potency takes place within the Radius, that of the act, that is, of radiant energy, takes place in the outer open that joins the head of the Radius with the tail of the Radius of the other individual involved in the intention. Therefore, between the act of sending and the act of receiving, there is the power of the receiver. Thus, in the intention, although the receiving individual has already been involved, since the act of sending, his determinations at the moment of reception are still wrapped in potency.

In phenomenal outer space, the Radius does not appear explicitly as it is reflected in the outdoor path that gives rise to the metric time of the radiant individual and his reflection, which is the metric distance, and so on recursively, from reflection to reflection, giving rise to the phenomenal space-time of the historical reconstruction of memory. The individual evolves by interacting. Evolution is an inner self-relationship in time, while interaction is a relationship with the other in space. Time is therefore the synthesis of space. Space and time are the same. Spatial distance is in fact also temporal distance. The spatial plane of the phenomenal present corresponds to the cone of light of Minkowski’s spacetime. The plane of giving is different from that of having, the former being the upper part of the cone, the latter the lower one. Just like the cone of light, the plane of the phenomenal present is also proper to each individual and represents his world in hand. The plane of the present goes: in one direction, that of receiving, from the big bang to the here and now of the individual; in the other direction, that of giving, from the here and now to the anti-Big Bang. It is received and given in the present moment. The “future” of giving is only a distance, just as the “past” of receiving is only a distance. The originating big bang and the originating here and now are at the same instant. Thus the big bang of the act of giving is the same as that of the power of the receiver, but different from that of the act of receiving. The act is on the spherical surface of the universe within which the power is placed and at the center of which is the big bang.

In other words, the internal volume of the sphere is the seat of potency, whereas the surface is the place of the present in act where the temporal axis of each individual emerges radially dividing the surface of the black hole into its own receiving

hemisphere ( $0 \geq \gamma \leq \pi/2$ ), populated by all other individuals in the act of giving as matter, where the arrow of time is positive and entropy increases, and in its opposite giving hemisphere ( $\pi/2 \geq \gamma \leq \pi$ ), populated by individuals in the act of receiving as antimatter, where the arrow of time is negative and entropy decreases.

In other words, for each individual, the present, which comes from the continuous Big Bang (as source) as an approaching future (matter and increasing entropy), as soon as it surfaces, it submerges as past (antimatter and decreasing entropy) that move away to go towards the continuous Big Crunch (as well), and in this descent informs of itself the future that ascend in the opposite direction. The past that is moving away is also the future that is approaching, and it is the possibility of the present. The present is the realization of a possible history of the past, among the totality of physically possible histories in accordance with quantum mechanics.

### **Foundation of Mirroring**

Mirroring emerges from the continuous exchange of power, more concentrated in the places where baryonic matter is most present. It is the premise for consummation, consisting in an exchange of energy as the result of a free decision, which is in turn the constitutive element of reflection, emerging from the multiplicity of energy exchanges. On the physical plane, the foundation of mirroring is the “amorone”, the mirror of the universe, known as dark matter or Cold Dark Matter. It is in fact the foundation of gravitation which takes place in power and therefore in mirroring. (see [69] (Peluso, *Cosmology in the Linear PseudoPlane of the Act*, 2023))

The individual mirrors its universal out of love. Mirroring  $\equiv$  Loving. Mirroring structures the potency forming the body. But what is the relationship between mirroring and structuring? In intention, the individual sets a goal, aims to unite with the universal it already loves and mirrors. The goal, if transcended from the contingent appetitive one, is always the union with the universal chosen as its ultimate end. Once the goal is set, potentiality is no longer fullness, no longer indifferent. The goal, with its necessities and alternatives, structures the space of potency.

At last, Consciousness mirrors the soul, phenomenological (or momentum) space mirrors power space, electric radius mirrors gravitational radius; In general, the exterior mirrors the interior.

### **The entelechy and the person**

An entelechy is a wave of power that contains within itself the principle of its own realization, the final goal toward which it tends to evolve.

In a broader sense, everything that begins, evolves, and ends according to its own nature, such as a planet, a galaxy, a star, a river, is an entelechy. Artefacts, on the other hand, are simple aggregates of power waves.

Entelechies, such as natural bodies, are parts of the original entelechy which is the universe. To the extent that an entelechy is instead the recipient of the intention of the special I, as is the case with a living organism, it has an I and is therefore a person.

The person is the I that has being, that exists.

In other words, the entelechy is the result of elementary, basic intentions, while the person is the result of his own intentions. In the first, the parts guide; in the second, the whole. The first evolves passively according to a project already given, it is a mere instrument; the other, vice versa, makes its own history with its own choices for which it is responsible, it is an end.

The body is being. The wave of power of the whole is the soul, the sparkle of the actualizations of the parts is consciousness. The “I” is the recipient of being, upon which it has decision-making power.

Every time a sperm fertilizes an egg, the purpose of the universe is realized, which is the establishment of a relationship between the special I and an I. To mirror is to love, is the ontological pre comprehension, that is, the comprehension of the Being of the I that precedes every receptive act. It is in intention with the special “I” from which it was named. The “I”, therefore, arises because it has accepted to love. It has responded to a call. The “I”, in itself, is unknowable. But it, receiving the being, is free to mirror, that is, to love, and therefore to decide.

### **The internal and the external of the being**

The “I” could not live in a world devoid of meaning because the “I” lives by meaning.

But just as, in the act, everything is a path of energy, and the elements of the paths are the quanta, so everything is perception, and the elements of thought/perception are qualia. From a reductionist point of view, if being and thinking are the same substance, each being is composed of quanta and everything that the self thinks or perceives, are qualia and nothing else. The consciousness lives by qualia.

What is the difference and relationship between power wave, energy, signs, qualia, ideas?

They are the bridge between soul and consciousness.

Every whole is reflected in every part and vice versa, and so the universe is reflected in the eye which is reflected in the entelechy.

Being is not presence but movement, connection, as a wave of power or energy.

The soul is the wave of power, which in turn is composed of waves of power, and so on recursively, which continually form and transform themselves and which correspond to ideas or concepts. On the other hand, in parallel, we perceive energy as the qualia that ignite consciousness, as well as color, sound and all the other sensations that form the designs that trigger the waves of power. The waves of power that we inhabit in the soul are understanding ideas, concepts, meaning. Thinking is inhabiting a wave of power in the soul. In parallel, the qualia, which are the interior of energy, are the matter of the signs that appear in consciousness. Signs par excellence are words, images, harmonies in general. The signs, made of qualia, emerge from the harmonic relationships of the measures found in the manifold of intentions that populates consciousness. The sign respects logical rules and logic is the epistemological instrument of consciousness. The sign, in turn, is recognized when it triggers the waves of power of the intentions that correspond to it and that live in the soul and that correspond to the meaning. There is no sign without meaning and vice versa. There is no idea that inhabits the soul without its sign appearing in parallel in consciousness and vice versa. Sign and meaning are two concomitant aspects of the idea, of the concept, one in the soul and the other in consciousness.

Recognizing a sign, understanding a situation, is going back from the sign that appears in consciousness to the wave of power of the intention that corresponds to it in the soul.

It is possible to associate a sign, a name, a stimulus, to each wave of power that corresponds to one of our ideas, so that we, seeing the sign, or hearing the name, or perceiving the stimulus, recall the corresponding wave of power.

Vice versa, the waves of power that inhabit the soul rise up into consciousness, translating into the corresponding signs.

In consciousness, energy is the support of the sign, and the sign is born from harmony, from the numerical relationship in multiplicity. The sign is nothing but a harmony of qualia.

### **Ontological Pre-comprehension**

The ontological pre-understanding is the structure of intention, which is our very foundation, the ground of our existence.

*“Knowledge of the essent is possible only on the basis of a precursory, experience-free knowledge of the ontological structure [Seinsverfassung] of the essent. But finite knowledge (and it is the finitude of knowledge which is in question) is essentially a receptive and determinative intuition of the essent. If finite knowledge is to be possible, it must be based on a comprehension [Erkennen] of the Being of the essent that precedes every receptive act. Finite knowledge requires, therefore, a non-receptive (and apparently non-finite) mode of cognition, a kind of creative intuition”.* (Heidegger, Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics, 1965)

Before appearing as a phenomenon of consciousness, the entity presents itself in the soul. The mirroring that precedes reflection is the corresponding of the recipient to the intention of the giver. Reflection only occurs afterward. The knowledge of the entity occurs in consciousness, whose content is the reflection of the myriad of acts that forms the phenomenon.

It is useful to distinguish between two types of reflection. The first, reflection in itself, is the evolutionary one that emerges from vertical intentions that enact each individual particle and gives rise to the phenomenon itself, which determines the entity in itself and its movement, independently of an observer. The second, reflection in the other, instead emerges from horizontal intentions that connect the particles of the entity’s surface, through reflected light, with the observer’s visual organ. Before realizing in act, however, intentions are already in potency. The phenomenon of reflection, which occurs in consciousness, is therefore preceded by the corresponding idea (entelechy) that becomes present in the soul where it is in incubation throughout the period of potency.

Reflection is a cascade of intentions that connects the surface of the entity, through our visual organ, to our consciousness. Before realizing in act, however, intentions are already in potency. The idea therefore precedes in the soul the phenomenon that appears in consciousness. Now the “I” learns to know every entity when, in the intention that lives as “I”, the entity itself is offered as a gift. In this intention, the entity’s universal unifies the giver, the object of the gift, and the recipient. In receiving an apple, the giver, as a consumer of apples, offers me, as a consumer of apples, a part of his being, namely an apple. The receiving “I” must mirror the apple within itself, become an apple. This mirroring is part of the same structure of intention in which being manifests itself.

The “I” is not an entity, is not being, is not an object of knowledge. We can understand the choices of another “I” by putting ourselves in his shoes, but we cannot truly know him. We can understand them by analogy because we share the same origin, because both of us are held in intention by the same special “I”.

## The Knowable

Ontic being is memory and is everything that is knowable and is unifiable down to the zero from which it unfolded. The key to understanding being is the structure of intention: only based on it does being make sense and become knowable.

The wave of power of a person is the whole of a set of waves of power, each corresponding to an intention, to a self “as”. There is no understanding, knowing, without intention. For the “I”, understanding, knowing, is inhabiting the self which corresponds to the concrete concept, to the concrete universal.

### Universals and logic, feelings and existentials

Thinking/perceiving partly reflects the form of being, which manifests itself through ideas and concepts, partly the structure of intention, which manifests itself through emotions/feelings and existential.

Ideas and concepts are forms of power waves, entelechies, shadows. While an entelechy is an autopoietic organization, an idea is an artificial organization associated with a sign, guaranteed by an external agent on the basis of a formula, an essence. Ideas and concepts, i.e. the corresponding power waves, can represent universals or operators or logical relationships. On the other hand, emotions, feelings, love, faith, hope, generosity, audacity, patience, desire, are categories that are transversal to ideas and proper to intention. Similarly, existentials reflect the very structure of intention.

In other words, ideas are the universal of the intention, the guise under which the other appears from time to time, feelings and existentials are instead inherent in its structure and reveal it. The Intentional Principle, from the inside, is:

*Intentional principle (from the inside):*

1. *the desiring moment of separation that precedes the consummation, in which the father and the son are distant and desire each other. In this period:*

(a) *one yearns to give a part of oneself, one's body, to one's Universal. The donor does not see the other; he must have hope, moved by love he must go out of himself, he must jump in the dark towards the other he does not see to give himself;*

(b) *the other yearns to receive a part of himself, of the body of these, from his Universal. The recipient does not see the other, must have faith, moved by love must listen, must be seduced by the other, open up to the other; welcome him.*

2. *the moment of union in the spirit, of joy, illuminated by the light of qualia, where distances and times are cancelled, that occurs in the decision through the gift of oneself, of one's own body.*

Heidegger calls “existentials” the essential characteristics of being-there, distinguished from the “categorical” characteristics proper to other entities, things.

1. being-there does not have a stable substance and is not characterized by a static essence that establishes, once and for all, what it is: it is what it is only in the fact of existing, in its concrete existence in the world as it appears from time to time. It is not even the particular case of a universal genus because it is characterized by being-always-mine, indicating the human being in its singularity and concreteness;
2. “existing” derives from the Latin ex-sistere, “to stand out”: being-there is not exhausted in any given situation, it is always “outside” of every situation in the sense that it surpasses it towards other possibilities. It is constitutively being-able-to-be, it is not a stable essence but a having-to-be its own being: one must decide for one's own possibilities each time, and in every decision, one's being is involved;
3. standing-out also has another fundamental meaning: the existence of being-there is not that of a subject closed in on itself but that of an entity that ontologically is outside-of-itself because it is in relation to other entities and with the world. Being-there, that is, is constitutively being-in-the-world.

### Intuition and Reason

Intuition is the emergence of the idea present in the soul into consciousness; it is instantaneous, translating from the ontological plane of the soul to the gnoseological plane of consciousness.



Reasoning, on the other hand, is the application of logical operators to the data of consciousness, that is, it is the merging of power waves, since an operator, a concept, is a power wave. Therefore, phenomenology studies the translation from the soul to consciousness, the image of the other first mirrored in the soul and finally emerging in consciousness.

The act is like the electric arc that strikes between two bodies of opposite charge, like lightning between the cloud and the ground. First, the electric field grows as the two bodies polarize, then the arc strikes, modifying the state of the two bodies. The myriad of intentions between the cells of our sense organs and the atoms of the external world bring an image of the external world into our soul, which is realized in consciousness as a phenomenon, leaving an imprint on the soul, thereby modifying it.

Speculation is mirroring the other, the desired, in the soul. To speculate is to dive into the depths of the soul, into the immensity of infinite space, like a free diver. One must emerge into consciousness to take a breath, to bring to light a fragment of the desired with which one has struggled. It now appears as an idea, a concept. A concept that we have now grasped, that we can now inscribe into memory as a sign and keep under the vigilant eyes of reason. Speculative thought resides in distance, in depth, in vertical intention, where the other is mirrored. Its emergence into consciousness is intellectual intuition. It is the opposite of vigilant thought, sensible intuition, reason, which resides near the surface of consciousness, in horizontal intention. There, where signs appear, where the surface of entities of the external world is mirrored. Because consciousness is only the sign, the qualia, which need the depth of the soul to be filled with meaning. Meaning lies in distance, in depth.

Therefore, to speculate is to delve deep to grasp the other and capture a fragment with which to construct an image to be placed in front, under the eyes, as a sign in memory.

### **The Principle of Reason Reflects in the Teleological Principle**

Communion is based on the mutual mirroring between the universal and its members, and the mirroring, from a purely logical point of view, is symmetrical.

Communion is therefore the logical elevator that allows one to go from the bottom constituted by the elementary parts up to the entire universe and vice versa.

Given these two extremes, the real direction of travel therefore depends on the real starting point, that is, on the real cause.

If the real starting point is the elementary (foundation), the universal derives from this thanks to the principle of reason, if vice versa the real starting point is the universal (the end), the elementary derives from this thanks to the Teleological principle.

But mirroring is based on purpose, on a Teleological principle.

### **Order emerges from apparent chaos**

Knowledge, which is the revelation of an underlying harmony in the world, is not brought about by individual intentions, which seek only their immediate satisfaction, but emerges from the myriad choices made as a whole. It is therefore reflexive, and a content of the soul of a complex individual that is revealed in consciousness.

All contexts in which order emerges from apparent chaos, such as those studied by the Theories of Chaos, Self-organization, Thermodynamics, Complexity, Biological Evolution, reveal an orientation, a non-indifference, ultimately, a will, a purpose.

### **The I**

Ideas and entelechies are wave of power. Mathematics, like logic and every mechanism, is a wave of power. They are not subsistent, separate, a priori forms, but more or less probable forms that emerge from the texture of intentions. To understand is to put oneself in the shoes of the mechanism, to inhabit the wave of power. The content of consciousness, on the other hand, are qualia and the number of quanta. The "I" is free to decide and therefore is capable of loving. The "I" is therefore the ability to love, to love the other. There is a love in which there is no No, and this is the love for the special "I". Every other love is partial, it excludes the rest, it has a NO within it. In intention, all emotions are alteration of love.

### **The Incompatibility Among Universals**

Intentions nestle. In fact, among the intentions that lead to the same individual, there is a hierarchical order: one is consummative, and all the others are appetitive, subservient to this one.

Just as intentions are structured hierarchically, so too are universals and therefore purposes. Each intention, universal, or purpose establishes its own judgment on the world: two different universals cannot share the same judgment on the world; if

they did, they would be the same universal. Even if there is agreement on many things, there will always be differences on others, so what is good for one will be harmful for the other.

Each universal places itself at the center of the world and becomes its form in potency, the measure, the yardstick of judgment in actuality.

### **The not and the no**

The NOT operates on being, the NO on the Other.

The “NOT” manifests in action and is inherent in the finitude of being, and it is this very finitude that constitutes the foundation of charity. The “NO” lives in potentiality and is expressed through the negation of the Other, which is the negation of the ultimate purpose of charity.

The NOT operates on being and gives rise to diversity and difference.

The NO is spoken to the Other and gives rise to nullification, rejection, separation, opposition.

### **Ethics and Ontology**

Ontology deals with being, ethics with nothingness. Nothingness is the decider, the free one. Ontology deals with the NOT, ethics deals with the NO.

Ethics comes before ontology both because the “I” is the subject of being, and because the “I” is the pole of intention in which being is only instrumental.

### **The meaning of Intention**

The intentions are free, but their statistics betray a basic orientation that can be expressed through the principle of conservation of energy and the principle of increasing entropy. The first establishes mathematics and logic, the second reveals the meaning of intention: charity. The Intentional principle can be summarized as: The meaning of Intention is the Charity.

## **METAPHYSICS**

Metaphysics, in its etymological sense, represents knowledge oriented towards “that which is beyond sensible things”.

Kant insisted that the thing-in-itself is unknowable.

*[...] that our rational cognition applies only to appearances, and leaves the thing in itself uncognized by us, even though inherently actual.* (Kant, 2009)

since we can only say that it is the foundation of everything we experience, which is why it is impossible to rationally establish any metaphysics (understood as the science of what lies beyond sensible appearance).

In reality, being is all that can be known and there is no aspect of being that is unknown to us. The thing in itself does not escape this rule: the thing is a phenomenon from the outside, a soul in itself. Metaphysics is reflected in physics: they are the inside and the outside, the soul and the consciousness of the world of which we are part as beings.

The unknowable, the absolutely other, is only the I.

If sensible things are in the act, in consciousness, metaphysics is in the transcendence of potency.

The Absolute “I”, in order to intention the created “I”, must go beyond itself and exist: it must become the One that is, that has being, that is a person.

Matter, which is potency, is the spirit that unites the Creator “I” with the created “I” that materializes in the space of intention.

The quantization, which sets the building block with which our world begins, is of form, adhering to a teleological principle. This can’t be anything other than the Anthropic Principle.

### **The beginning**

Existence begins with intention, and intention begins with Nothingness and Being. Nothingness is not the negation of Being but is the otherwise than Being: the I that poses and the I that is posed, the I that gives and the I that receives.

Being, on the other hand, is the means of the relationship, the space that separates and the energy that unites, the positive and the negative.

The positive-negative dyad extracts the quantum from zero, and with this gives shape to the universe that hosts existence, that dresses and gives shape to intention. The quantum, produced in view of life, cannot have any other foundation than the anthropic principle, the creation of a world where the existence of living beings is possible.

### Space, Justification, and Method of Metaphysics

Metaphysics as a science is possible because it represents the inner aspect, the counterpart, of the external physical reality. Therefore, physics and metaphysics must correspond as the outside and inside of the individual's intention. Therefore, the method of metaphysics is to draw a parallel between physics and metaphysics and to found physics on metaphysics, on an inner level where we ourselves exist.

In more detail, seen from the outside, freedom, which is not indifference, implies an orientation superimposed on a noise. With large numbers, the noise is neutralized and the orientation is clear. But orientation starts from a beginning and tends to an end, it must make a path, it must realize its world. But it would not be possible to build, to progress along a path, if being were not memory. But memory cannot be something external, something further, beyond the same structure of intention and the same orientation. Structure of intention and orientation must therefore be the method and the goal achieved. Reason and memory. Structure and orientation that are, at the same time, a priori, the reason for every step along the path and, a posteriori, its historical reconstruction that places it as memory. Reason that springs from a method and an orientation and that presupposes it, otherwise it would be chaos. Reason is thus this same method and orientation.

The special "I" posits being, but being cannot be absolute nothingness, because being is presupposed by intention and is the very relationship tense between two "I's", it is the presupposition of existence. Being is therefore initially a relative nothingness, an absence of diversity, an absence of NOT, the identity of the indiscernibles.

This absence of diversity, in which being dissolves, is the nothingness that appears in the soul as an existential. For Heidegger it is anguish, for Levinas it is anonymous being, universal absence, for Sartre it is the basis of freedom and creativity. The relative nothingness of the soul manifests itself in consciousness as number, that is, as zero. Zero that conservation laws preserve in the complexity generated by intention. The zero that the laws of conservation preserve in the complexity generated by the intention that extracts the positive and the negative, the giver and the receiver, and reflects them in each other.

Orientation is the anthropic principle which determines the quantum/qualia; the method is the mirroring/reflection. Under the dominion of conservation laws, quanta/qualia and mirroring/reflection shape the universe.

Zero-energy space thus splits, spatially, into the quantum of gravitational matter that stands out on a negative energy gravitational field of equal quantity. Quantum of gravitational matter that in turn splits, reflecting itself on the temporal axis both in the positive direction -from the past to the present- and in the negative one -from the present to the past-, in a positive and a negative electric charge. Number has thus now appeared in the space of intention and has appeared as gravitation that stands out on a negative space and that is reflected on the axis of time electrically, as a positive pole facing a negative pole. A gravitational quantity  $R_{\bullet e}$  that must be reflected in the opposite pole as electrical  $R_e^{\circ} = R_{\bullet e}^{-1}$  and therefore return to itself, as a reflection of the reflection, finding itself as itself  $R_{\bullet e} = R_e^{\circ-1}$ . Mirroring is therefore the inverse function whose application on itself, i.e. on its result, returns the starting number.

With large numbers, when freedom is eliminated, the form of power is already defined even before the act forces it to manifest itself. This translates into the fact that the space of the power is reflected in the space of the act by means of a morphism that preserves the angles.

In other words, the potential is equal to the momentum (the soul is reflected in the consciousness):

$$V \equiv p = \sin \gamma \quad (2)$$

that is:

$$R : r = r : \tau \quad (3)$$

In physics we have, more explicitly, the coexistence of two spaces, that of potency and that of act, that of the Potential and that of the Momentum, that of essence and that of the phenomenon, the internal and the external, the Weak and the Coulomb, one reflecting the other, between which a morphism preserves the angles.

The quantum of matter, and more generally the distribution of the matter in the universe, depends on the ratio power=act when, as the distance  $r$  increases,  $\tau$  reaches its maximum limit  $R_{\omega}$  which is the Radius of the universe which coincides with the amount of matter in the universe.

In this limit case we have the general proportion that regulates cold dark matter and the part/whole relationship:

$$R_{CDM} : r = r : R_{\omega} \quad (4)$$

which establishes the quantum of gravitational matter  $R_{\bullet e}$  reflected in the electrical radius as  $R_e^{\circ} = R_{\bullet e}^{-1}$ :

$$R_{\bullet e} : R_e^{\circ} = R_e^{\circ} : R_{\omega} \quad (5)$$

The quantum of electrical radius  $R_e^{\circ}$ , in turn, divides space into an internal and an external space, one mirror of the other, one the seat of Weak intentions, the other of Coulomb intentions, while the area of Strong intention extends to the boundaries.

With the quantum of baryonic matter, the gravitational scale of the universe is set

$$R_{part} : R_{whole} = R_{whole} : R_{\omega} \quad (6)$$

and electrical interaction creates increasingly complex entities, where the interweaving of relationships becomes chemistry, configuration, information, and at last life.

Everything therefore depends on a single number  $R_{\omega}$ , which is the total of matter in the universe, and that finds its reason in the anthropic principle and in the method of nature.

### THE MYSTERY OF THE “I”

The problem of the “I” plays a decisive role in the understanding of Being and its rank.

At any moment, an individual can refer to himself as an I. What this “I” is and what its relationship to being is one of the fundamental problems of philosophy.

#### The problem of I in the history of philosophy

The relationship between the one and the many could not fail to leave its mark on the question of the self. Here, it is contextualized first of all in the relationship between God or nature and the individual, and secondly in the relationship between the individual and his multiple expressions, activities and personalities. Immediately after, the relationship between the I and matter, which is his body, arises.

Among those who believe that the self is a manifestation of a unique substance, God or nature, there are those who have proposed a multiplicity of different selves, each being a part (Leibniz, Bruno, ..) or a mode (Spinoza, ..) of the whole, and those who instead believe that all is in all, a single and same self in each self (open individualism).

Of these, apart from a few who considered the self as a moment in a dialectical process (German idealism), almost all considered the self as a substantial, enduring entity. Like these, those who have considered the selves as a creation of God or as participants of the Ideas (Plato).

Almost all of these argued for its immortality and often for metempsychosis. The idea is that if the self is an independent, immaterial substance, it is not subject to physical decay and can exist beyond bodily death.

Conversely, philosophers who deny the substantiality of the self typically reject its immortality. Without a core, enduring substance, there is no basis for the self’s existence beyond physical death, nor its continuation and preservation as an identity: the self of now is different from that of yesterday or years ago or that of tomorrow.

Among the various theories there are: Bundle theory of self (Hume), Self as a matter of psychological continuity (John Locke), Self as a narrative center of gravity (Aaron Sloman), Self as merely syntactic (Daniel Dennett), etc.

#### Preliminaries

How can one explain the meaningful order of the world and the existence of the person?

It doesn’t make sense to demonstrate that everything can be explained through reason to deny the existence of a design. Teleology and the principle of reason are one and the same.

The anthropic principle supports both the argument of underlying design, i.e., of an intention, and the neutral necessity of Darwinian selection among the infinity of possible universes.

If the “I” were also universal, if the mystery of the “I” as a person did not exist, then it could be used the neutral necessity of Darwinian selection or the Everett’s theory of parallel worlds and so on.

But all these theories are fundamentally incapable of explaining the mystery of the “I”, as this is placed on another level, a different level from that of being.

Being is the domain of knowledge and theories, but the “I” is outside of being.

If Intention were not the building block of being, or if Intention did not entail a free decision (neither random nor deterministic), it could undoubtedly be said that being is the absolute and the whole, and that consciousness and the “I”, whatever is meant by “I”, are merely epiphenomena of being, and useless at that.

The ability to decide freely and voluntarily, however, implies a decision-maker who has power over being, who has decision-making power over the wave of power. Who logically precedes being. We call this decision-maker “I”. Initially, two paths remain open: either the decision-maker is being itself, that is, the wave of power itself, or the decision-maker is a third party, external to being.

If the mystery of the “I”, of its origin, did not exist—this mystery which will be illustrated below—it could undoubtedly be concluded that the “I” is an aspect of the wave of power. That the “I” is an attribute of the entity or of a privileged entity such as man. That being itself, therefore, is capable of willing and deciding, or that there is no decision, according to the Everett’s many-worlds interpretation.

Primarily, if the self is part of being, then there is no true otherness, no true fracture between the self and the other. We are both beings, aspects of the same being.

However, the mystery of the “I”, as detailed in the following paragraphs, excludes this case.

### **The Transcendent Question**

According to Heidegger, philosophy, or rather metaphysics, begins with wonder in the face of the world, which gives rise to the question:

#### *1. Why are there beings at all instead of nothing?*

But Being is not absolute, it is founded on the “I”. Without relation, neither the “I” nor being would exist. Being is on a different plane from that of the “I”. The question about being, in the opposite direction from being to the “I”, becomes:

#### *2. Why do I exist?*

The word “I” can have multiple meanings. The I “in me”, the most intimate, the deepest, that inhabits the soul, unknowable, reflects itself by objectifying in its consciousness as I “for me” and in the consciousness of others as I “for others”. The question about the “I”, therefore, can be formulated according to an increasing backward movement towards the deepest “I”, as follows:

#### *3. Why am I “for me” precisely this I “for others”?*

#### *4. Why precisely am I “in me” this I “for me”?*

Of the last two questions, the first narrows it down to a particular ontic “I”, asking why I am precisely that one among the many; finally, the last looks at the transcendent “I”, that of the soul: it is the transcendent “I” that looks at itself, that questions its own origin. It is a latent, deep, primordial question that cannot be formulated or understood in consciousness. It springs from the soul, and when it surfaces in consciousness, it has already lost its charge. The question is not about the character I am in existence, the social identity I assume, but it is the question of a mysterious identity antecedent to existence, of a mysterious identity that did not exist and that now, with its immense wonder, exists as an “I”. Wonder arises from realizing that the “I” is a person. The “I” is not an entity like any other.

In the relationship that links two terms through the verb “to be”, for example, “A is B”, the first term of identity indicates a concrete entity, the one placed in front, while the second indicates a universal, a concept, an abstract idea. Thus, the identity “Rome is Rome” can be translated into “Rome does not belie itself, it is always up to its name, it is consistent with its fame, it is consistent with its idea”.

Likewise, in the identity “I am I”, the first term of identity indicates the concrete subject, the one immediately in front, namely, me, while the second indicates a concept, an abstract idea, the concept I have of myself. However, both terms, as they are in a logical relationship, are present in consciousness where there is no “I”. The relationship names the “I” but observes it from the outside. The “I”, in fact, is transcendent; it does not appear but lives remaining always outside consciousness in act.

The question “Why precisely am I this “I” ” is therefore understood, if one does not pay due attention, in the common way in which a logical relationship is understood, namely by placing both terms outside the true “I”. In this way, the true “I” hides once again. Even understanding identity as a co-belonging between being and thinking, between the entity and the concept, the transcendent “I” is not perceived.

The question, instead, intends to take a step back, interrogating the “I” outside of consciousness, where the true “I” resides. Wonder arises when the true “I”, the one that feels when we think, the one that observes when we see, can no longer hide by retreating but enters and places itself in the relationship which is now existential. The question then becomes transcendent, and it becomes the wonder in the face of the evidence of existing. The “I” of consciousness, my “I”, is nevertheless an “I” like any other; it has nothing special. It could very well have arisen from nothingness out of horror at anonymity, or because an impersonal being brought it into play. The transcendent “I”, on the other hand, is not. The transcendent “I” is a person; it rejects this explanation by asking, “*Why should I*” be the one brought up into play by an impersonal Being? “*Why should I*” be the one who arose from nothingness by himself? “*Precisely I as a person? Ridiculous*”. I am a person, who as such lives in transcendence, not an entity, not an abstract possibility. No one knows me because I am not a knowable thing. Yet I exist, because I am face-to-face, in dialogue, in intention with a special “I”.

The “I” is Other than Being and Prior to Being

The “I” is not a possibility. The “I”, therefore, is not Being. But the “I” is also not alien to Being; on the contrary, the “I” is immanent in Being.

The subject and the object are part of the content of consciousness. The “I” is outside of consciousness and in front of it.

The relationship between the “I” and Being is thus one of reciprocal transcendence.

Being is said to be the most general concept of all: indeed, anything can be said to be. But if it is the most general concept, it cannot be defined, since a definition requires the exhibition of the genus within which the object to be defined is distinguished by a specific difference; but being, being the most general concept, cannot be included in a broader genus.

Similarly, from the opposite side, anything can be said to be other than the “I”. The “I” is indefinable.

This all appears obvious if one considers that categories and concepts pertain to the entities present in consciousness, but Being and the “I” are outside of consciousness and prior to consciousness.

The “I” and Being, though different, coexist. The “I”, in fact, is not; the “I” has. But this having is not a physical relation between two entities, like a body having two arms or a tree having leaves, but a metaphysical relation, the relation that announces or presents a gift coming from elsewhere to an “I” that thus enters into existence. This gift is the dress that the recipient wears and makes his own with the history of his decisions.

Being is everything that is relatable and knowable. Being exhausts its space; there cannot be anything that does not fall within being.

Similarly, an “I” is what excludes the other from it.

If the “I” is not being, if the “I” does not fall within ontology, the “I” must be placed on a plane other than that of Being. Between the “I” and Being, the difference is not ontological, as it is between Being and entity, but not-existent, as the “I” and Being belong to inherently unrelated spheres. Similarly, the difference between one “I” and another “I” is inherently not-existent, untenable, unthinkable.

The “I” is indeed other than being, it is NOT being. This “NOT” does not distinguish and separate two realities present on the same plane and therefore relatable, but distinguishes between two planes, two realities, unrelated and unrelatable, but which are related by a third, by a special “I”. Being is the means, the spirit with which the special “I” calls and relates to the called “I”.

The called “I” can thus enter into relation with the special “I” and, through it, with other called “I”, through being. Being is the gift, the message, the knowable; the “I” is the Unknowable.

God creates the other by intentioning it, mirroring in it. This image that mirrors in the act of forming a wave of power is, immediately after, the dress of the “I” which is now other than the special “I”, existing, free.

For nothingness, with reference to the “I”, one must understand, therefore, not the nothingness of Parmenides, whose not-existence is a tautology, but the not-entity as otherwise than being.

Between the two planes, that of the “I” and that of Being, a metaphysical relation is established in which primacy belongs to the “I”. This existential relation, without which neither being nor “I” could exist, is intention.

### I and Time

1. *"How is it possible that this unity of knowledge, feeling, and choice which you call your own could have sprung into being from nothingness at a given moment not so long ago?"* [35]

The question expresses the astonishing coincidence that we exist at this particular moment in the infinite expanse of time.

The answer lies in the difference between the primitive time of power, of the soul, and the chronological time of the act, of consciousness. Chronological time is born from primitive time statistically, like an elementary rhythm that acts as a sample and on which all the remaining rhythms intertwine and harmonize, but who decides the primitive duration of this sample, of this quantum, if primitive time has no duration, it is not measurable? Primitive time is timeless, it has no duration, because duration can only be measured a posteriori, in the eternal instant of the act, after primitive time has given way to the eternal instant of the

act. And it is only in this eternal instant that the totality of chronological time appears as infinite, or as finite outside of time. But primitive time is not the instant, it is the persistence of the current moment in which the contingent instants that constitute the phenomenon of consciousness are intertwined. The quantum is the meter that measures, but it does not have a meter that measures it.

The now is all the time of the being that involves all the I's, and is transformed with the decisions of the I's. We are always facing our death, immersed in the power of life and in view of the final decision.

In the present, the intention of the special I takes place with every created I, whether it has existed or existed or will exist. Conversely, in the present of the created I there is only the history of the remaining I's. The past and the future are only a matter of perspective. The past is along the path of receiving and the future is along the path of giving, and the temporal distance is a spatial distance and a distance in power. Julius Caesar, now two thousand light years away, lives at this moment as much as we do. He can perhaps still decide not to attack Gaul, he can perhaps still spare Vercingetorix's life, because we make history with our decisions, at every moment. Each of our contingent decisions changes the entire history of the universe and forms our path towards the final decision that will decide our entire life. The now is the time of life.

Time is an essential part of the structure of Intention and only as such does it become, as asserted by Heidegger, the horizon for any understanding of Being. The question "*How is it possible that I am present in the current instant?*" is therefore badly posed both because time is a category of being only, and because only the present moment exists, which includes the totality of time that forms its historical backdrop.

The "I" is not an entity and therefore the category of time does not apply to it, but it exists in intention thanks to being, as it is embodied in being, and as such exists in time. It is not surprising, therefore, that the "I" exists right now. If it exists, insofar as it exists, it exists now, embodied in being. It makes no sense to ask what it was before birth and what it will be after death, because these temporal connotations belong only to its body, they do not apply to the "I", and because these questions only concern the history, the horizon in whose opening the present is placed. All that can be said about the "I" is that it exists in intention with the special "I", an intention that it is free to accept or reject.

The universe is new every moment, it does not mean that there is no continuity or causality between the state of one instant and the next. Power, in the context of which decisions mature, is in turn marked by them, guaranteeing the continuity of the universal history present in the instant. Universal history, which goes from the big bang to the end of time, transforms all together moment by moment, and we are all part of this history at the same time.

Universal history, which emerges new at every instant, far from being pre-established harmony, is the place where all the I's are present and living, and are its architects insofar as it is the fruit of the intention of the special I with the totality of the created I in view of its conclusion. The final act that will see the death of all living beings in unison. The sequel is a question of religion.

### The absolutely other

Among the challenges to the philosophy of Intention is the idea that what is mirrored in everything is the Self, and that therefore the Self is unique and the same in everyone. This is the view espoused by Erwin Schrodinger:

*It is not possible that this unity of knowledge, feeling and choice which you call your own should have sprung into being from nothingness at a given moment not so long ago; rather this knowledge, feeling, and choice are essentially eternal and unchangeable and numerically one in all men, nay in all sensitive beings. But not in this sense — that you are a part, a piece, of an eternal, infinite being, an aspect or modification of it, as in Spinoza's pantheism. For we should then have the same baffling question: which part, which aspect are you? What, objectively, differentiates it from the others? No, but, inconceivable as it seems to ordinary reason, you — and all other conscious beings as such — are all in all.*

*Hence this life of yours which you are living is not merely a piece of the entire existence, but in a certain sense the whole; only this whole is not so constituted that it can be surveyed in one single glance. [35]*

This conception could provide the simplest and most immediate explanation of the mystery of the "I".

However, it does not explain existence, which is based on metaphysical desire. Only the other, the absolutely foreign, provides a reason for the metaphysical desire expressed, for example, by Levinas.

Much more challenging, though much closer, is the Heidegger's Existential Ontology:

*«Man obviously is a being. As such he belongs to the totality of Being—just like the stone, the tree, or the eagle. To “belong” here still means to be in the order of Being. But man's distinctive feature lies in this, that he, as the being who thinks, is open to Being, face to face with Being; thus man remains referred to Being and so answers to it. Man is essentially this relationship of responding to Being, and he is only this. This “only” does not mean a limitation, but rather an excess. A belonging to Being prevails within man, a belonging which listens to Being because it is appropriated to Being.» (Heidegger, Identity and Difference, 1957, 6a ed. 1978).*

«*And Being? Let us think of Being according to its original meaning, as presence. Being is present to man neither incidentally nor only on rare occasions. Being is present and abides only as it concerns man through the claim it makes on him. For it is man, open toward Being, who alone lets Being arrive as presence. Such becoming present needs the openness of a clearing, and by this need remains appropriated to human being. This does not at all mean that Being is posited first and only by man. On the contrary, the following becomes clear: Man and Being are appropriated to each other. They belong to each other.*» (Heidegger, *Identity and Difference*, 1957, 6a ed. 1978)

For Levinas,

«*Being and Time, Heidegger's first and principal work, perhaps always maintained but one thesis: Being is inseparable from the comprehension of Being; Being already invokes subjectivity. But Being is not a being. It is a neuter which orders thought and beings....*» (Levinas, *En decouvrant l'existence avec Husserl et Heidegger*, 1967).

However, the existential condition of man proposed by Heidegger is incomplete, it only reflects the point of view of man in the Intention, it does not grasp its entire structure. The Other with whom man relates, seen from infinite distance, appears as something impersonal, like the world, even more, like Being. Charity, which is the sense of intention, and which presupposes the other, is transformed into the most impersonal Care towards the things of the world. The person, union of I and being, is reduced to a being since the I, which is the unknowable, not substance but otherwise than being, the pole of intention and its “*conditio sine qua non*”, is disowned precisely because it is not substance.

If Intention is the principle of everything, then Heidegger's correspondence of man with Being is the Intention's correspondence of man with the soul of an original I.

Only the other, the absolutely foreign, provides a reason for the metaphysical desire:

*The other metaphysically desired is not “other” like the bread I eat, the land in which I dwell, the landscape I contemplate, like, sometimes, myself for myself, this “I,” that “other.” I can “feed” on these realities and to a very great extent satisfy myself, as though I had simply been lacking them. Their alterity is thereby reabsorbed into my own identity as a thinker or a possessor. The metaphysical desire tends toward something else entirely, toward the absolutely other.*

... *The metaphysical desire does not long to return, for it is desire for a land not of our birth, for a land foreign to every nature, which has not been our fatherland and to which we shall never betake ourselves.*

... *Desire is absolute if the desiring being is mortal and the Desired invisible. Invisibility does not denote an absence of relation; it implies relations with what is not given, of which there is no idea. Vision is an adequation of the idea with the thing, a comprehension that encompasses. Non-adequation does not denote a simple negation or an obscurity of the idea, but—beyond the light and the night, beyond the knowledge measuring beings—the inordinateness of Desire. Desire is desire for the absolutely other.*

... *To die for the invisible—this is metaphysics.*

... *This absolute exteriority of the metaphysical term, the irreducibility of movement to an inward play, to a simple presence of self to self, is, if not demonstrated, claimed by the word transcendent. The metaphysical movement is transcendent, and transcendence, like desire and inadequation, is necessarily a transcendence.*

... *Thus the metaphysician and the other cannot be totalized. The metaphysician is absolutely separated.* (Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, 1969)

... *Intersubjectivity, is neither a cognitive relationship nor a relationship between two different freedoms standing side by side.*

- 
- [1] *Parmenides, On Nature (V century BD)*  
 [2] *Plato, Parmenides (IV century BD)*  
 [3] *Aristotle, Metaphysics (IV century BD)*  
 [4] *Aristotle, Physics (IV century BD)*  
 [5] *Aristotle, On the Soul (IV century BD)*  
 [6] *Euclid, Elements, (IV century BD)*  
 [7] *Plotinus: Enneads (250 AD)*  
 [8] *Proclus: Elements of Theology (V century AD)*  
 [9] *Giordano Bruno: La Cena de le Ceneri, 1584*  
 [10] *Giordano Bruno: De la causa, principio et uno, 1584*  
 [11] *Giordano Bruno: De l'infinito, universo e mondi, 1584*  
 [12] *G. Galilei, Dialogo sui due Massimi sistemi del mondo, 1632*  
 [13] *Isaac Newton, Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica, 1687*  
 [14] *Kant, I. (2009). Critique of Pure Reason. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.*  
 [15] *G.W.F. Hegel, Logic (1830)*  
 [16] *Sören Kierkegaard: The Sickness Unto Death (1848)*



- [17] Martin Heidegger: *The Principle of Reason*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- [18] Martin Heidegger, *Essere e tempo*, Longanesi & C., Milano, 1976
- [19] *Martin Heidegger: Conference of the Academy of Sciences at Heidelberg, July 26, 1958*
- [20] Martin Heidegger, *Kant e il problema della metafisica*, Laterza, Roma-Bari, 2015
- [21] Heidegger, M. (1965). *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [22] Heidegger, M. (1957, 6a ed. 1978). *Identity and Difference*. Pfullingen: Verlag Günther Neske.
- [23] *Jean-Paul Sartre: Existentialism Is a Humanism, Lecture given in 1946*
- [24] *Husserl: L'idea della fenomenologia, Mondatori 1995*
- [25] *Albert Einstein (1905) "Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper", Annalen der Physik 17: 891*
- [26] Einstein, Albert (1907), "Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogene Folgerungen", *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, 4: 411
- [27] Einstein, Albert (1915), "Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation", *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*: 844–847
- [28] Einstein, Albert (1916), "Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", *Annalen der Physik*, 49: 769–822
- [29] Einstein, Albert (1917), "Kosmologische Betrachtungen zur allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*: 142
- [30] Born, M.(1927). Physical aspects of quantum mechanics, *Nature* **119**: 354–357
- [31] Bohr, N.(1928). "The Quantum postulate and the recent development of atomic theory". *Nature*. **121**: 580–590
- [32] Heisenberg, W. (1930). *The Physical Principles of the Quantum Theory*, translated by C. Eckart and F.C. Hoyt, University of Chicago Press.
- [33] Heisenberg – Quantum Mechanics, 1925–1927: "The Uncertainty Relations".
- [34] Schrodinger, Erwin (1926). "Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem". *Annalen der Physik*. 384 4: 273–376.
- [35] Schrodinger, E. (1984). "The Mystic Vision" as translated in *Quantum Questions: Mystical Writings of the World's Great Physicists*. Ken Wilber.
- [36] Dirac P. A. M., *Proc. R. Soc. London A267*, 148 (1938).
- [37] Wheeler J. A. and Feynman R. P., *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **17**, 157 (1945); and *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **21**, 425 (1949).
- [38] *Feynman R. P., 1985, QED: The Strange Theory of Light and Matter*
- [39] Emmanuel Levinas: *Dall'esistenza all'esistente* (1947), a cura di F.SOSSI, con una premessa di P.A.ROVATTI, Marietti, Genova 1986.
- [40] Emmanuel Levinas: *Le Temps et l'Autre*(1947), Quadrige/Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1985.
- [41] Emmanuel Levinas: *La traccia dell'altro*. Scorciatoie [traduzione italiana degli ultimi quattro saggi di *En Découvrant l'existence avec Husserl et Heidegger* (1949)], a cura di F.CIARAMELLI, con una presentazione di H.KÜNKLER, Libreria Pironti, Napoli 1985.
- [42] Levinas, E. (1967). *En découvrant l'existence avec Husserl et Heidegger*. Paris: Vrin.
- [43] Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and Infinity*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- [44] Emmanuel Levinas: *Totalità e infinito*. Saggio sull'esteriorità(1961), a cura di A.DELL'ASTA, con introduzione di S.PETROSINO, Jaca Book, Milano 1980.
- [45] Emmanuel Levinas: *Difficile libertà*. Saggi sul giudaismo. Saggi scelti(1963), a cura di G.PENATI, La Scuola, Brescia 1986.
- [46] Emmanuel Levinas: *Quattro letture talmudiche*(1968), a cura di A.MOSCATO, Il Melangolo, Genova 1982.
- [47] Emmanuel Levinas: *Altrimenti che essere o al di là dell'essenza*(1974), a cura di S.PETROSINO e M.T.AIELLO, con introduzione di S.PETROSINO, Jaca Book, Milano 1983.
- [48] Emmanuel Levinas: *Nomi propri*(1976), a cura di F.P.CIGLIA, Marietti, Casale Monferrato 1984.
- [49] Emmanuel Levinas: *Di Dio che viene all'idea*(1982), a cura di S.PETROSINO, Jaca Book, Milano 1983.
- [50] Emmanuel Levinas: *Etica e Infinito*. Dialoghi con Philippe Nemo(1982), a cura di F.RIVA, Città Aperta, Troina 2008.
- [51] Emmanuel Levinas: *Fuori dal soggetto*. Buber, de Waelhens, Jankélévitch, Liris, Marcel, Merleau-Ponty, Rosenzweig, Wahl(1987), a cura di F.P.CIGLIA, Marietti, Genova 1992.
- [52] Emmanuel Levinas: *Tra noi*. Saggi sul pensare all'altro(1991), a cura di E.BACCARINI, Jaca Book, Milano 1998.
- [53] Emmanuel Levinas: *Alterità e trascendenza* (1995), a cura di P.HAYAT, Il Melangolo, Genova 2006.
- [54] Emmanuel Levinas: *Quaderni di prigionia e altri inediti* (2009), a cura di S.FACIONI, con prefazione di J.MARION, Bompiani, Milano 2011.
- [55] E. Levinas, *Libertà e comandamento*, Schibboleth, Roma 2014
- [56] H. Arendt, *Socrate*, Raffaello Cortina, Milano 2015.
- [57] Martin Buber: *Il problema dell'uomo*(1947), a cura di I.KAJON, traduzione di F.S.PIGNAGNOLI, Marietti, Genova 2004.
- [58] Martin Buber: *L'eclissi di Dio*. Considerazioni sul rapporto tra religione e filosofia(1953), traduzione di U.SCHNABEL, Comunità, Milano 1961.
- [59] Martin Buber: *Il principio dialogico e altri saggi*(1962), a cura di A.POMA, traduzione di A.M.PASTORE, San Paolo, Cinisello Balsamo 1993.
- [60] Martin Buber: *Incontro*. Frammenti autobiografici(1986), a cura di D.BIDUSSA, traduzione di A.FRANCESCHINI, Città Nuova, Roma 1998.
- [61] Vincenzo De Risi: *Geometry and Monadology*. Leibniz's Analysis Situs and Philosophy of Space, Basel/Boston, Birkhäuser 2007.
- [62] Vincenzo De Risi: *Plotino e la Rivoluzione Scientifica*. La presenza delle Enneadi nell'epistemologia leibniziana dello spazio fenomenico, in *Il Platonismo e le Scienze*, eds. R. Chiaradonna and M. De Caro, Roma, Carocci, 2012, pp. 143- 163.
- [63] *Peluso V. 13 jan 2019 Intention Physics viXra:1811.0391*
- [64] *Peluso V. 2021-02-12 Intention not Theory: the Vertigo of Love viXra:2003.0606*
- [65] *Peluso V. 2021-04-16 The Geometry of the Discrete Act viXra:2104.0097*
- [66] *Peluso V. 2022-04-30 The Cosmology of the Instant Reconstruction of the Path of Light viXra:2204.0175*

- [67] *Peluso V. (2022) The Promised Science viXra:2208.0071*
- [68] *Peluso V. (2022) Individual, Time and Space viXra:2209.0042*
- [69] *Peluso V. 08 Mar, 2023 Cosmology in the Linear PseudoPlane of the Act rs-2657670/v1*