Metaontology Specification

Version	1.1 prototype
Date	24.02.2024

Abstract

This document contains a description of a method or approach to knowledge modeling and representation that allows for the creation and functional implementation of dynamic ontologies.

It begins with a brief introduction to differential phenomenology – a philosophical direction proposing the definition of fundamental degrees of freedom in human experience and their key distinctions (meta-phenomena). These categories are applicable for the intentional analysis, synthesis, and reduction of phenomena from any field or sphere of human experience for its subsequent cognition in the form of a formal ontology.

In this context, a possible variant of formalization or specification of the results of applying the method is proposed in the form of a knowledge representation model, considering its applied significance and fundamental limitations. Finally, current problems and possible directions for further research are indicated.

1. Introduction to Differential Phenomenology

Definition of Intention and Responsibility.

Since the 19th century, positivism has gradually taken the place of monotheism, repeating the history of its predecessors in its intention to displace other aspects of human experience. The scientific method is one of the finest gifts of philosophy and has objective applied significance, but reality has not yet been objectively reduced to its material aspects by any discipline, just as philosophy itself is not simplified to formal and objective rigor. The author's intention **does not carry denial of knowledge or offense to the feelings of individuals, organizations, scientific paradigms, or atheism as such**, and is expressed in their acceptance, significance, and testing through personal experience. This material is compiled on the principles of strict verification and practical relevance.

Some idealistic, theological, and mystical teachings may carry a fundamental, even fundamentalist, distinction between the physical and metaphysical aspects of reality. The proposal to consider their common principles and initial unity may be prematurely perceived as profanation and de-sacralization. The author's intention or aspiration **does not carry denial of knowledge or offense to the feelings of personalities, societies, sects, or religions as such**, and is expressed in their acceptance, significance, and testing through personal experience. This material, in the author's opinion, does not contradict the basic principles of any world religions, mystical practices, or idealistic concepts known to him (including secluded nihilists and solipsists).

The text will never contain references either to sources or to the author's identity. This choice is conditioned by the intention towards objectification of an already subjective method. As well as towards freeing both the author and the reader from the dogma of authorities and the ubiquitous citation at the beginning of the 21st century, which, in the author's opinion, increasingly displaces the principles of individual thinking and subjective (independent) observation, suppressing the very spirit of realizing experience and depriving the freedom of reasonableness as such.

Like any teaching or formalism, **this text is false (incomplete or contradictory)**, partly due to the limitations of natural language, human experience, and formality as such. When working with the document, preliminary skepticism and criticality are strongly recommended, relying on one's own experience with consideration for the consequences of applying the method, just as attention and openness to new experience are suggested. Henceforth, **only the reader themselves, by free reason and without influence on their will**, can perform acts of choice, reflection, and motivation from the proposed experience and,

thus, **becomes aware of the intention or bears responsibility for the consequences of their own actions**.

1.1 Method

The method was reflected upon (comprehended) after its application from experience. In essence, it relies on known, albeit ambiguously defined, concepts of phenomenology, which may be used here in slightly different aspects. The reasons, nature, and manner of their application are indicated in a conceptual and relatively formal presentation for adaptation to the most prevailing scientific worldview at the beginning of the 21st century.

1.1.1. Phenomenological Reduction

Humans interact with reality in various ways, from physical, external, and objective to metaphysical, internal, and subjective. Any potential interaction with reality will henceforth be termed experience, and the manifestation of the act of such interaction or the concrete realization of experience – a phenomenon.

Thus, any potential interaction with this text potentiates (the term "is" is not applicable to a potential that has not yet manifested or been realized) as experience, and the specific act of reading it by the reader is a phenomenon from the reader's experience. This phenomenon testifies here and now to the reader's ability to realize the experience of reading, regardless of the reader's judgments about reality as such, about the reality of the reader themselves, this text, or the reader's judgments about the content of the text.

In this context, phenomena are inseparable from the one who experiences or realizes the experience, and the experiencer realizes it in phenomena. This two-way, mutually defining connection between the realization of experience and the experiencer will be called intentionality, and its aspect directed from the experiencer towards the phenomena of their experience will be called intention. The intention of the experiencer determines the experience they realize.

Thus, the intentionality between the reader and the text consists in the fact that the potential experience contained in the text does not manifest as a phenomenon without the reader. The reader manifests themselves as a reader and experiences this text only through the act of reading and the phenomena manifesting through it, depending on their intention – as a skeptic, critic, curious person, etc. Or they manifest themselves as a non-reader and realize the potential experience of refusing further reading with such an intention.

Phenomena possess the property of additivity. Thus, the entire aggregate of phenomena or interactions of the experiencer with reality can be called Being and represented as a single phenomenon of Being, and any aggregate phenomenon can be decomposed into its constituent phenomena. Such operations or relations of composition and decomposition of phenomena will here be called, respectively, synthesis and analysis.

Statistical methods are based on the analysis of initially unknown but realized-from-experience phenomena into sets of their homogeneous or similar manifestations. The scientific method can be experienced as a more general concept, striving towards or containing the intention, among other things, for the further synthesis of phenomena, but is not reducible to this.

Analytical and synthetic thoughts (hypotheses and judgments), however, follow not from the experience itself, but from its переживание (lived experience/undergoing) or realization in a phenomenon with the intention towards the experience of thinking (judging). The intention of positivists is directed towards objectivism and confirms in practice (again, in Being as a phenomenon from experience) the effectiveness of such an aspiration when working with material phenomena.

In its time, objectivism freed humanity from scholastic prejudices and led to a more direct and complete realization of material experience. It also opened up another fundamental degree of freedom or level of abstraction / reason / distinction through the rational cognition of reality, based on strict relations and correlations.

The correlation of a multitude of rational attributes of phenomena in their commonality or set, in the context of their distributions, correlations, and other formalisms, leads to the synthesis of more complex formal models. Synthesis in this context does not mean a transition to a meta-level; the result of the synthesis of phenomena is a new phenomenon, albeit with different quantitative or qualitative properties or aspects.

However, classification or systematization is also widely used as the distinction of certain essential, objective (from the materialist viewpoint) or a priori characteristics, immanent to the entire class of phenomena, both those already manifested from experience and those not yet manifested. This, in fact, allows the class of phenomena to be distinguished from the phenomena themselves at a meta-level as an abstract law or "essence," or, in idealistic terms, an "idea" or thing-in-itself, which will henceforth be denoted as an archetype or pattern. The distinction or understanding of an archetype or pattern from its phenomenon or phenomena, regardless of the nature of the phenomenon itself or the method of distinction, will henceforth be denoted as phenomenological reduction or simply reduction.

It is important to note here that the reduction of archetypes or patterns (laws) at the essential level and their further rational cognition at the ideal level as technologies, and formalization in the form of models, allows humans themselves to generate their material and non-material phenomena, manifestations, or instances. In the context of this chapter, carrying out the distinction of an archetype or pattern from experience through reduction will also be called its co-creation, and its realization in Being – creation. Thus, the distinction of human experience is carried out through co-creation, and its realization through creation, including through production or craft at the rational level.

The development of information technologies has led to an exponential growth in the quantity of knowledge (numerical data) and their computational power, and their public accessibility has led to redundancy, errors, and consequently, contradictions. Adherents of objective materialism reacted by intending to increase computational power. However, this approach reveals a contradiction or irony: it is objectively limited by the very material degree of freedom (or level of abstraction/distinction) that defines their perspective.

1.1.2. Epoché and Metaontology

Humanity continuously realizes experience, analyzes, synthesizes, and reduces phenomena at the essential level and cognizes them. Incomplete and mutually contradictory formal descriptions of knowledge about archetypes and patterns are co-created for their further creation and craft, which I will henceforth call ontologies. If the additivity of phenomena themselves is non-contradictory in essence (they are experienced as they are), then in their rational aspect or at the level of cognition, contradictions and incompleteness arise. How then to cognize the phenomenon of Being in its totality or unity?

The full potential of human experience cannot be statistically reduced and fully cognized within a single human lifetime, and this problem is equivalent to the lack of computational power when processing modern "volumes" of information. Phenomenal reduction includes supra-rational observation, which, in turn, is impossible without an observing consciousness and more. Therefore, here and henceforth, the author allows himself to break free from objectivity and turn to intentionality, intention, and first-person narration.

The intention towards realizing the experience of metaontology leads me to abstract away from any ontologies or conceptual frameworks with their formal and ideal projections of archetypes (laws and patterns) in the form of symbols and knowledge about them. Abstracting from preliminary judgments about reality allows one to experience phenomena directly from experience for subsequent reduction, which is denoted by the concept of

epoché in this context. Epoché allows correlating the cognition of the results of one's own reduction with knowledge about archetypes and patterns in known ontologies.

The reductions of phenomena I have experienced constitute subsets of various ontological sets. Their cardinality is so small that they can be neglected on the scale of the ontologies themselves or of universal human Being; I indicate some of them merely to illustrate the problem. Natural sciences. Somatic practices. Aesthetics. Psychology. Applied mathematics, computer and cognitive sciences. Business. Social studies. Law. Ethics. Magical practices. Religions. Philosophy.

Phenomenally reducing the phenomena accessible to me from experience at the "junctions" of these ontologies, I observe that the sets of their reductions intersect. Both the sets themselves and their intersections can contain different and even contradictory knowledge about the same archetypes, patterns, and their phenomena. For example, the body in physics, evidence-based medicine, art, and somatic practices. Emotions in neurophysiology, dramaturgy, and marketing. Classes in programming, archetypes in analytical psychology, arcana and symbols in mystical teachings. Choice in ethics, politics, logic, psychoanalysis, and behaviorism. Work in physics, labor in economics, act in law. Channeling in esotericism, revelation and possession in religion, personality disorders in psychiatry. Time in physics, processes in management, times in history and religions, etc.

One could try to isolate as powerful (containing the largest number of elements) a set of phenomena as possible, reduce and non-contradictorily cognize or project it into a new ontology, obtaining, at best, another mere interdisciplinary field, philosophical doctrine, or local sphere of social activity, but not a method for cognizing Being.

Given that the distinction through reduction is subjective, intentional, and thus cannot be delegated or automated, how can one interact with the vast array of phenomena yet to be realized? Furthermore, how does this approach address the potentially infinite set of phenomena yet to be distinguished and realized by humanity—a set whose potential reductions, as Being unfolds, will inevitably surpass any closed or static ontology?

1.1.3. Transcendental Reduction

The supra-rational method of reduction and the realization of phenomena without prior knowledge or prejudices from known ontologies allow for their independent reduction at the essential level. That is, things-in-themselves are accessible to me directly from experience as meta-phenomena at some other level of abstraction, in another "dimension" or degree of freedom, distinct from their concrete material or non-material phenomena or

manifestations.

The intention towards reaching the meta-level of all ontologies leads me to the necessity of reduction at this level of abstraction as well. But what can potentiate as the thing-in-itself of things-in-themselves, the law of all laws, or the archetype of archetypes? This degree of freedom is abstract from feeling and cognition. Without concrete material manifestations, archetypes and patterns cannot even be perceived, let alone rationally correlated (numerically measured) with standards and scales of measurement.

Laws and patterns are essence; they exist as they are, outside of time and space, as the essence of all material and non-material phenomena in other aspects or degrees of freedom, manifesting in them, including time and space. Natural laws, aggregate states or elements (*стихии*), properties of temperament, types and forms of life, major arcana exist in a multitude of sensory and cognizable phenomena, but are not felt or rationalized directly. Only phenomenal reduction is accessible to me "here", provided I can distinguish the archetype or pattern in itself or within myself as a phenomenon of another level of abstraction, that is, as a meta-phenomenon or distinction as such.

Whatever or however the level "above" or "beyond" essences potentiates (the concepts "was" and "is" are inapplicable outside of Being), it is not directly accessible from my experience, but it co-creates archetypes and patterns just as they, in turn, manifest or are created in phenomena. But also, as a result of human co-creation of a phenomenon or phenomena from experience at the essential level, new archetypes and patterns appear, subsequently created in phenomena.

That is, in essence, within the framework of human experience, reduction is a local or particular case of co-creation as such, since their unified result is the co-creation from experience of new meta-phenomena or distinctions, and then the creation of their phenomena. Closing this context of concepts, co-creation precedes creation, and in the local or particular case of human experience, reduction or the distinction of an archetype or pattern as a meta-phenomenon precedes the creation of its phenomena and further craft.

Directing the intention back towards rational cognition and formalization, I apply, in a limited way, the principle of falsifiability (a scientific criterion) and one aspect of agnosticism. In this context, I remove from further distinction the levels of abstraction, meta-phenomena, and phenomena inaccessible from human experience, leaving them at the level of absolute abstraction. Their potentiality (infinity) outside experience is equivalent to their inoperability or inaccessibility for humans, and should they potentiate

"into" human experience or should the potential of human experience change, the method will not change.

Within the potential of human experience, there remains no other way of co-creating or manifesting new essences besides reduction. I do not need to reduce all meta-phenomena of co-creation and phenomena of creation at the essential level; it is sufficient to reduce my own distinction or co-creation of archetypes and patterns (albeit particular, local, or limited) to encompass both distinguished and not yet reduced archetypes and patterns within my degrees of freedom or levels of abstraction / distinction / reason.

Such a reduction of reduction or distinction of distinction I will call transcendental reduction or transcendence. Its essence lies in a transition: moving from understanding archetypes or patterns to understanding the one who performs the understanding. This shift allows for a recursive focus on intention itself, which in turn enables the cognition of cognitive acts – the very definition of metaontology. How, then, is transcendental reduction, distinction, or understanding as such performed?

I have already briefly described one of the meta-phenomena of distinction – statistical or positive reduction, based on the rational degree of freedom and defined predominantly on material phenomena. Phenomenal reduction is based on a yet-to-be-revealed supra-rational degree of freedom. These reductions are distinguished by the specific degrees of freedom they employ.

If all the experience I realize is reduced through the same degrees of freedom or levels of abstraction, then they are immanent to me in my capacity as a human who distinguishes experience. Consequently, these degrees of freedom can be applied to the reduction and distinction of all co-creation and creation within the scope of my accessible human experience. (Here it also becomes accessible from experience that many meta-phenomena, not to mention their phenomena, are mediated or indirect in themselves. They are merely manifestations of the distinction of the distinguisher or the understanding of the understander, the intention of the intender or the observation of the observer, the thinking of the thinker and the cognition of the cognizer, the perception of the perceiver, the materialization of the materializer, etc., which goes beyond the scope of this context.)

Thus, a bitten apple is accessible from physical experience through mass, momentum, charge, radiation, etc. Metaphysically, the psyche can perceive it (color, shape, smell, taste, etc.), experience emotions, and remember it. The mind can correlate it with other fruits to measure ratios (numbers) and relationships with other phenomena. Consciousness observes it in time or process as part of a community or set (tree, dish, still

life, etc.). At the essential level, it can also be reduced as a fruit or the species *Malus domestica*, etc. Now, one needs to direct the intention inwards and perform the same reductions.

Interacting with physical bodies through my body and other bodies, I distinguish within myself the material and electrical degrees of freedom. Experiencing emotions, perceiving, remembering, and feeling physical bodies and immediate lives as myself, I distinguish within myself the imaginal degree of freedom. Correlating both material bodies and lives, as well as myself with them (Ego) and their correlations with each other, I distinguish within myself the ideational degree of freedom. Observing all this in time and processes within some commonality or systemicity, attending to attention or observing observation in other consciousnesses, I distinguish within myself the causal degree of freedom, and so on.

Having identified these inherent degrees of freedom through self-reflection (while acknowledging the subjective nature of this process), we can draw a brief conclusion. The distinction or differentiation of the fundamental degrees of freedom or levels of abstraction of the realization of human experience allows for the analysis, synthesis, and reduction of both real and potential phenomena, with further cognition and formalization in ontologies and their subsequent application. Furthermore, if the reduction is performed by a different individual (or an archetypal 'other person'), their unique experience may lead to the distinction of different degrees of freedom. This, in turn, allows for the distinguishing of a different Being and the co-creation of a distinct metaontology and its corresponding meta-phenomena, followed by their subsequent creation.

1.2. Meta-phenomena

Categories, terms, and concepts function primarily as knowledge and symbols (defined later). It's crucial to recognize, however, that these terms are distinct from the underlying essences they signify. They can be understood as projections of these essences into the realms of knowledge and symbolism, acting merely as pointers towards the essences themselves.

From this follows their "inessentiality" – not implying non-existence, but rather the absence of the essential aspect of distinction. Terms can be rationally correlated within cyclically closed systems, defining terms through other terms and thereby illustrating the relationships between the underlying essences. However, the essences themselves are not directly contained within these definitions. Instead, they are realized and distinguished (reduced) from experience and subsequently projected into knowledge and symbols, allowing them to be cognized and felt.

The phenomenon of the relativity of concepts is accessible from everyday experience. Even physical terms, defined quite strictly in the natural sciences (yet contradictorily in different disciplines), can be used in natural language with different meanings and senses (weight and mass, heat and temperature, energy, etc.). Consider metaphysical distinctions like feeling, emotion, thought, intellect, consciousness, spirit, experience, etc. The essences these terms denote vary so significantly, even among people sharing the same views, paradigms and cultures, that the very act of using them in communication strikes the author with surprise and a sense of contradiction or irony.

The categories detailed below were introduced earlier, prior to their formal definition. This was intentional: leveraging terms already present in natural language facilitates initial understanding of the method. Importantly, the method itself empowers users to define their own categories based on personal experience, aligning with a nominalist approach.

While presenting categories in reverse order might seem logically consistent, avoiding the use of concepts before definition, such an approach (common in idealistic teachings) often risks excessive abstraction and insufficient specificity. This order, however, corresponds to their empirical realization from experience and will also be more accessible to materialists.

While the detailed process of applying the method is omitted for brevity, these categories are presented as fundamental distinctions derived directly from reality through elementary reduction.

1.2.1. Matter

Each degree of freedom manifests through a dialectical pair of meta-phenomena. More abstract levels are free from the meta-phenomena of less abstract levels, but manifest within lower levels through specific, distinct qualities. In other words, the higher the degree of freedom, the fewer meta-phenomena it contains, and the more 'multidimensional' they are.

Consequently, the first three degrees of freedom (Matter, Electricity, Image/Form) encompass a greater number of meta-phenomena, though not all are distinguished here. While Matter and Electricity have been extensively studied and reduced via positive methods in natural science, the meta-phenomena within them are often understood inconsistently across different disciplines. The author acknowledges that the abstractions used here may differ from precise physical definitions; however, this discrepancy highlights the crucial distinction being made – moving from the strict cognition typical of

physics towards reducing phenomena to their underlying essence.

Matter – spatial level of abstraction or linear degree of freedom.

- Distance (space, zero, point) – distinction or potential difference in matter.
- Particle – unity of reality and the vector line, separated or distinguished by distance and realizing it at a point / in space.
- Vector (line) – capacity in matter, conducting/transmitting force.
- Force – flow in matter, catalyst for the realization of a particle by distance / a particle in space.
- Mass – inertia in matter, enabling motion.
- Motion (momentum) – action in matter, passes through the vector line and leads to the distinction of points or difference in distance.
- Decay – contradiction in matter, realized in the decrease of mass with the release of motion and force.
- Elasticity – similarity in matter, realizing recursion or transitivity of motion and force.

Here, it's important to note the concept of the point or zero potentiating as a degree of infinity or potential. However, both infinity and absolute potential are unattainable categories; they do not exist as realized states within Being. The distance between points potentiates as a distinction or potential difference in matter. It can only be defined by particles, through which distance is measured. The phenomenon of "virtual" particles records the continuous realization of this potential and its reverse decay into space. In perception, humans have access to the sound of longitudinal oscillations and the tactility of force.

Matter's linearity is evident in the vector nature of its internal flow (force, longitudinal waves) and action (momentum). This linear degree of freedom enables particles, existing in space, to connect when forces are applied along vector lines. These structures can, in principle, be synthesized up to the scale of all Being and reality. Conversely, Being and reality themselves are considered material and analyzable down to elementary particles. This perspective aligns with the experience of materialism adherents, operating primarily within the first two degrees of freedom (Matter and Electricity).

1.2.2. Electricity

Electricity – field level of abstraction or planar degree of freedom.

- Voltage (field) – distinction or potential difference in electricity.
- Body (device) – unity of particles and contour, separated or distinguished by voltage

and realizing it in the field.

- **Contour (plane)** – capacity in electricity, conducting/transmitting radiation.
- **Radiation** – flow in electricity, catalyst for the realization of a device in a contour.
- **Charge** – inertia in electricity, enabling current.
- **Current (heat)** – action in electricity, passes through the plane of the contour and leads to the distinction of the field or difference in voltage.
- **Discharge** – contradiction in electricity, realized in the decrease of charge with the release of current, heat, and radiation.
- **Induction (magnetism)** – similarity in electricity, realizing recursion or transitivity of current and radiation.

The planarity of electricity manifests through spin, the transverse nature of waves, and polarization within its flow (electromagnetic radiation), as well as action (current, heat) in/through the area of a conductor (while the flow of electricity travels "in" or "along" the conductor's contour as radiation). This planar degree of freedom enables the formation of a 'body' (or device) from the potential field, facilitated by the passage of radiation within the defined contour. On a cosmological scale, the interplay between electricity and matter within celestial bodies drives the formation of complex chemical compounds. This degree of freedom also manifests in human perception through the visible spectrum of electromagnetic waves, infrared radiation (experienced as heat via convection), and the senses of taste and smell, which rely on interpreting electrochemical reactions.

In Being, the degree of freedom of electricity is manifested through electrified or charged particles, as well as those having a temperature different from absolute zero (consequences of elementary acts of current or heat, also manifesting as motion in matter). This occurs in any complex compounds, bodies, and devices, across the entire diversity of phenomena studied by chemistry, electrodynamics, and quantum physics—domains irreducible to classical or materialistic mechanics.

1.2.3. Image (Form)

It is pertinent here to note that the distinction between levels of abstraction is qualitative, not quantitative. Metaphysical aspects are not solely governed by measurement with physical instruments, just as charge cannot be described purely through mass, or current and heat through simple motion. Electricity is not reducible to matter. These different levels are accessible through realizations of experience appropriate to their specific degree of freedom or level of abstraction.

Image (Form) – attractive level of abstraction or volumetric degree of freedom.

- **Attraction (beauty)** – distinction or potential difference in image.
- **Life (organism)** – unity of body and soul, separated or distinguished by attraction and realizing it in beauty.
- **Soul (psyche, volume)** – capacity in image, conducting/transmitting perception.
- **Perception (emotion, desire)** – flow in image, catalyst for the realization of life in the soul.
- **Feeling (symbol, memory)** – inertia in image, enabling excitation.
- **Excitation (somatics, motivation)** – action in image, passes through the volume of the soul and leads to the distinction of beauty or difference in attraction.
- **Passion (affect)** – contradiction in image, realized in the loss of feelings/memory with the release of excitation and emotions.
- **Influence (empathy, drama)** – similarity in image, realizing recursion or transitivity of excitation and perception.

Manifesting in the volumetric degree of freedom or the imaginal level of abstraction/distinction/reason, sensory perception encompasses either three capacities of the vector or line, or two capacities of the contour or plane, or one capacity of the psyche or soul in their holistic synthesis at the level of images and forms. Thus (and not through matter and electricity), the soul or psyche is accessible through perception and emotions, as described and realized by psychology, art, and aesthetics. In physiology, its phenomena are represented by the first signal system. Planarity is acceptable for a device but detrimental to life, which requires volume for its Being.

By analogy with physical meta-phenomena, the higher the distinction of beauty and the volume of the soul, the more powerful the flow of emotions during the perception of an image or form. In other words, the work or realization of beauty is the product or creation of the difference between the potential of attraction and the inertia (magnitude) of feelings. This degree of freedom allows the connection of living organisms from attraction and beauty through holistic perceptions and desires within the soul.

The meta-phenomenon of empathy or drama is analogous to elasticity and electromagnetic induction, though more multidimensional. When attraction or beauty changes or is distinguished within the volume of the soul, perception or emotion arises, desiring to counteract the change. Monotonous sound does not excite perception, but skillfully selected scales and cascades of emotions lead to sorrow despite a major key and catharsis despite a minor key. Empathy is possible even when reproduced by a device, but is always more effective in the resonant volume of the soul, whether it be the performer themselves or the form/acoustics of an architectural complex.

High imaginal inertia is manifested in memory and the command of symbols and feelings, in imperviousness to external influences and excitations. Immature souls indulge in passion and senselessly destroy beauty, led by drama in their forgetfulness. The emotional major "masculine" and minor "feminine" principles, with their distinction of beauty or potential difference of attraction, are prone to drama without rational ordering of their relationships, wherein one of the most captivating contradictions or beautiful ironies is cognized and resolved.

In Being, the imaginal degree of freedom is realized in living organisms and works or creations of art (which can be correlated here with living species due to phenomena of reproduction and development). Possessing additivity, organic compounds formed according to the topology of their images (phenomenon of isometry) synthesize into cells and entire organisms composed of individually living cells. DNA represents only the material carrier of the image but does not contain it directly. Cultures synthesize from languages and artistic movements and are represented in Being, like souls, only as long as their material carriers exist.

The phenomena of phenotype, natural language, cultural code, culture, and the collective unconscious (or "World Soul") of humanity manifest as a synthesis of symbols (not knowledge) and feelings of the entire species, ethnos, and societies, but reflect only their imaginal, not essential, aspect and are not contained directly in Being. They inertly accumulate sensory memory; interaction with them is realized through emotional perception and acts of their excitation or motivation.

1.2.4. Idea

In this context, such concepts of idealistic doctrines as "idea," eidos, and thing-in-itself (which are defined or differentiated, often quite distinctively, across various doctrines) are distinguished through two aspects: ideational (ideal) and essential. The name for this degree of freedom is chosen to resonate with such commonly understood concepts from experience as 'ideology' or 'idea' as understood at an everyday level. This designation also reflects their inherently rational and cognizable level of abstraction.

Idea – a complex level of abstraction or self-similar degree of freedom.

- **Complexity (mystery, entropy, chaos)** – distinction or potential difference in the idea.
- **Selfhood (individual, ego)** – unity of life and mind, disunited or distinguished by complexity and realizing it in mystery.
- **Mind (intellect, self-similarity, fractal)** – capacity in the idea, conducting / passing

thought.

- **Thinking (computation, correlation)** – flow in the idea, catalyst for the realization of complexity or mystery in the mind.
- **Knowledge (number, measure, ratio, relation)** – inertia in the idea, ensuring order / truth.
- **Ordering (truth, meaning)** – action in the idea, proceeds in the self-similarity of the mind and leads to the distinction of mystery or difference in complexity.
- **Contradiction (error, irony)** – contradiction in the idea (as such), realized in the loss of knowledge / relations with the release of truth and thinking.
- **Similarity (recursion, intuition)** – similarity in the idea (as such), realizing recursion or transitivity of ordering and thinking / computation.

The last two meta-phenomena are immanent to this degree of freedom and integrate their own essence and their manifestations from the previous degrees of freedom. Correspondingly, the broader set of distinctions or meta-phenomena inherent in these previous degrees of freedom has not yet been fully defined or incorporated within the current model.

Self-similarity transcends the limitations of volumetric perception, and therefore is not directly accessible in it, however, its formal capacity can be visualized as a fractal when projected into three-dimensional space—a representation stemming from the recursive manner in which complexity is realized. Analogously, a conceptual 'fourth dimension' or 'axis' in this framework could represent the scale of similarity, but yet this analogy falls short of conveying the unique nature of the potential inherent in complexity or mystery, just as adding a third line or coordinate axis on a two-dimensional plane does not convey the perception of their holistic, three-dimensional form (their 'figurativeness').

Mystery, entropy, uncertainty, or chaos acts as a source of potential, manifesting as a specific disequilibrium, heterogeneity, or difference, each of which is an aspect of distinction. Upon realization, its inert aspect is numerically represented as an identified or manifested correlation, measured against a defined unit that is itself established as a standard. While soulful life perceives and retains attraction and beauty through feelings, intelligent life or the individual actively cognizes and correlates complexity and mysteries through numbers.

Drawing an analogy with physical meta-phenomena, the greater the differentiated complexity and self-similarity of the mind, the more potent the flow of computations and correlations becomes when an idea is processed. In other words, the realization of mystery is the outcome of the potential difference between complexity and the inertia (or

magnitude) of knowledge. This degree of freedom thus enables selfhood or individuality to emerge from complexity and mystery through holistic thinking.

The meta-phenomenon of intuition, by its nature, shares analogous properties with elasticity, electromagnetic induction, and drama, but is not limited by such analogies. When complexity or mystery undergoes alteration within the mind's self-similar structure, thinking arises that denies or counteracts the change, capable of reaching nihilism. Repetition and citation do not order the mind, but cascades of coherent and interconnected thoughts cause skeptical analysis that opposes ordering synthesis, and conversely, a confident synthesis that opposes erroneous analysis.

High ideational inertia is manifested in the independent mastery of relations (including mathematical ones) and a resilience against conforming to external thought patterns. Conversely, less developed minds may uncritically accept authoritative pronouncements and prematurely simplify complex mysteries, often due to naivety stemming from limited understanding. Irony becomes discernible in any contradiction, and humor consistently arises from the perception of such contradictions; this meta-phenomenon is an inherent, multidimensional attribute of the rational mind.

In Being, the ideal degree of freedom manifests through self-similar individuals, from crystals to intelligent multicellular life with a developed nervous system. These correlations, possessing additivity, in the lines of fractal crystalline lattices, the contours of semiconductors, or the self-similar tree-like structure of neural connections manifest this heterogeneity or complexity as knowledge, models of relations, and rational programs of behavior, extending to the correlation of the self with other knowledge, minds, and the universe, wherein the meta-phenomenon of the Ego manifests.

The phenomena of concepts, technologies, ontologies, and the "noosphere" (or "World Mind") of humanity manifest as a synthesis of the selfhood of individuals, schools, and societies, reflecting primarily their ideational rather than their essential aspect. These phenomena passively accumulate knowledge. Not being directly contained in Being, they become inaccessible once their material carriers and organizing patterns are lost. Interaction with them occurs through thinking, comprehension, and ordering.

1.2.5. Cause

Cause – temporal level of abstraction or subjective degree of freedom.

- **Time (process, probability, possibility)** – distinction or potential difference in cause.
- **Commonality (set, personality)** – unity of selfhood and consciousness, which is either

disunited or distinguished by process or possibility and through which this unity (or its transformation) is realized in time.

- **Consciousness (observer, subject)** – capacity within cause, which conducts or transmits intention.
- **Intention (attention, observation)** – flow in cause, catalyst for the realization of process or time in consciousness.
- **Inertia (variable, wisdom, will)** – inertia in cause (as such), ensuring action.
- **Action (choice, act, management, consequence)** – action within cause (as such), which proceeds through the subjectivity of consciousness and leads to the differentiation of process or temporal distinction.

The last two meta-phenomena are immanent to this level of abstraction and integrate their own essence and their manifestations from the previous levels. At this causal level, meta-phenomena are inherently free from the similarities and contradictions that may characterize their manifestations at other levels. Even if, at their core, they manifest similar underlying patterns or archetypes, acts of choice, along with the attention or observation accompanying them, are experienced as subjectively integral and temporally unique events. However, errors, passions, and other contradictions can emerge when the consequences of these acts are projected onto the ideational, figurative, electrical, and material phenomenal levels.

The principle of Will, which in this context encompasses aspects of inertia and wisdom, manifests in its most multidimensional aspect not so much in impulsive, somatic, or other resistance to external actions, but in the scope of the observed set of internal and external possibilities and the inherent variability of actions. Will determines the intensity and duration of the released flow of attention or intention until the cessation of actions, acts of choice, and "loss of consciousness" in Being (loss of being by consciousness), including sleep and death.

Effectively realizing both social (managerial) and personal (magical) experience necessitates first developing will and refining attention. Insufficient development in these aspects can undermine the integrity of the personality rendering the practitioner's intention vulnerable to the influence of external attentional and intentional flows. Wisdom is accrued from the range of deliberate choices and their consequences, as well as through observed transformations.

While Causes can be observed, they are not directly apprehended by thought. Conceptually, a "fifth" dimension or line in this context could be represented as the "World Line" or Lorentzian metric, However, it is important to note that this analogy, while

illustrative of a different order of conceptualization, is perhaps even more abstracted from direct experiential reality than the reduction of volumetric forms to Euclidean space (a simplification inherent in the Lorentz transformation). To illustrate further, consider a conceptual model: a right-angled triangle where the legs represent the orthogonal potentials of space and time. Then its hypotenuse would be the total potential of a particle in space/time In this model, the multiplication of this total potential by the internal energy (itself contained within the inertia of mass) yields the particle's total energy in space/time.

The total potential in space/time (of the hypotenuse) is equal to the square of the speed of light (a quantity with dimensions of (distance/time)2 or, more formally, L2T−2). When the leg of time potential is redistributed or "flows" into the leg of distance potential, they are related by the Pythagorean theorem (a principle that, in the context of spacetime intervals, finds its mathematical expression in the Lorentz transformation).. This redistribution of potential manifests as an increase in the kinetics of "external" acts of motion (i.e., linear velocity), concurrent with a decrease in the kinetics of the particle's "internal acts of change"—a phenomenon perceived as their "slowing down" or time dilation., the rate of these internal acts of change—a measure that, according to this framework, physics mistakenly identifies with the passage of time for the particle.. Attempts to correlate time and space without a clear conceptual distinction and a framework for their differentiated understanding (as proposed herein) are fundamentally contradictory, which is why their results are thought of with a known degree of irony.

The speed of light separates Being in space/time from the non-Being of flows, potentials, and capacities of time/space, in which there are no particles and time does not "flow" like a river, but "sways" and "surges" like an ocean. Within this non-Being, phenomena ('flows') operate under different principles ('differences of another nature') and potentially exceed the speed of light. Consequently, they do not directly interact with particles distinguishable by humans and thus remain unmanifested in human Being. This lack of interaction creates an observational threshold, analogous to the concept of a 'red limit' in physics, beyond which phenomena are undetectable. Furthermore, the transition across this boundary, particularly by photons traveling at the speed of light (c), is presented as the determinant of their dual nature—exhibiting particle-like characteristics ('corpuscular Being') within spacetime and wave-like characteristics ('wave non-Being') beyond it. This duality is intrinsically linked to the fundamental principle of uncertainty.

The potential realm of Time/space can become accessible to the reader here and 'now' through the experience of reading, engaging the faculties of their soul, mind, and consciousness via phenomena like imagination / visualization / recollection, ideations /

thinking, and observation / attention. Beyond this immediate engagement during reading, this potential realm is accessible more fully through dreams of varying degrees of lucidity, out-of-body experiences, and other magical practices and enables a form of subjective 'travel' or navigation through time and between different temporal states, but not movement within physical space—a limitation attributed to the absence of material particles within that potential realm (designated as 'there' or, from a subjective viewpoint, 'here').

The conceptual realm of Time/space exists as potential; it is distinct from the actualized reality of Being and and thus lacks the agency to directly manifest reality—a distinction pertinent perhaps to idealist viewpoints. However, reality is actualized from this potential source, a process evidenced by the common experience (even for a materialist) of first conceiving a plan abstractly within the potential realm of Time/space before its material creation within the Being of actual space/time.

One might visualize the subject's capacity, whether projected volumetrically or planarly, as akin to a kaleidoscope. Within this dynamic representation, a specific, changeable self-similarity becomes accessible through actions performed within its temporal frame. The mind, operating through static relations and correlations, tends to perceive any commonality (whether in a snowflake or a human) in ways that may be incomplete or contradictory. In contrast, consciousness observes this same commonality holistically and dynamically, perceiving it through time as a process of emergence in Being, complication, simplification, and departure into non-Being of a certain complex self-similarity as a sequence of its changes in acts of choices and consequences.

Time, process, or probability acts as a source of potential, manifesting as anticipation, fate, destiny, or predetermination, while simultaneously embodying uncertainty as a fundamental aspect of distinction. Upon realization, the inertia inherent in this causal level manifests as the accumulated record (or set) of committed acts of choice and the changes consequently observed within consciousness. Whereas intelligent life (or the individual mind) tends to grasp static complexity and heterogeneity through knowledge, conscious life (personality, or society) operates dynamically and intentionally within time and processes, actualizing possibilities through choices derived from available probabilities.

Set and probability theories, as well as social science, law, and some mystical teachings have most fully cognized or projected into idea the probabilistic and subjective aspect of Being. This degree of freedom is accessible from the experience of management and magical practices, especially mysteries and divination, but is fundamentally inaccessible to

the mind as such. The latter mistakenly confuses heterogeneity, complexity, or entropy, realized in a mental relation or knowledge (the value of a variable), with pre- or uncertainty, expectation (including mathematical), time, or process, realized in conscious choices and actions (the variable as such).

Attempting to define a deterministic relation or function based on probabilistic or stochastic time is inherently problematic, as the resulting range of values remains stochastic (meaning the output itself is variable, not fixed). Consequently, intellectual attempts (including by artificial or device-based systems) to deterministically model such processes lead to an accumulation of errors, diverging towards the unbounded potentiality of non-Being. However, after observing the actual unfolding of a process, a method termed 'positive reduction' allows its consequences to be correlated into numerical representations. These rational projections, derived from the observed choices and outcomes, can then be analyzed as probability distributions within the context of the system realizing the process. A specific outcome (a value) is actualized from this set of probabilities through an act of choice—whether a conscious management decision or the inherent unfolding of the process according to its probabilities. This selection of one possibility from a set conceptually aligns with the principle formalized by the Axiom of Choice within its mathematical domain.

Because time's potential unfolds probabilistically, the actual realization of any process invariably deviates from its idealized plan. therefore the art of management (and partly engineering) is largely related to the supra-rational awareness or attention to risks or probabilities. The history of technology illustrates this distinction: inventors often exhibit powerful 'thinking' (ideation, correlation) but weaker 'intention' (focused will for realization), while those managing implementation frequently demonstrate powerful 'intention' even if their initial 'thinking' was less pronounced. This disparity highlights a fundamental contradiction, or irony, inherent in the process of bringing ideas to fruition.

Adherence to objectivism, determinism, or despotism, understood within this framework as an inability to choose or the choice to refuse choice (personal and social), may stem from the absence of this specific degree of freedom (encompassing distinction and rationality) within the consciousness that has chosen such an intention, or a lack of will to discern and engage with the inherent possibilities within time's potential. In the legal "field," the act of concluding a contract (including a social one) serves as a mechanism to align and synthesize the intentions of distinct consciousnesses towards the realization of more distinguished, rational, or long-term processes and possibilities out of the "good" will of the participants or their voluntariness.

Directing excessive intention and responsibility into an unwilling or involuntary consciousness is unwise due to its low inertia and the weakness of its intention, but people are not born conscious and willful (free). For this reason, from primitive times to the present day, intentionality is projected into societies or jurisdictions from the essential meta-phenomena of spirit / law and good into religious commandments / legal and subordinate acts and the common good. As the temporal potential of society is depleted, it loses social consciousness and individual Egos prevail over commonality and personality; law loses its causal degree of freedom and is utilitarianly projected into its rational and symbolic levels of abstraction.

The rejection of consciousness or subjectivity is effective only where consciousness can be neglected, which is why positivism loses its adequacy to reality beyond the "comfortably" predetermined and isolated inertial physical systems in the experimenter's local "world," but which are insignificant beyond its limits. Real systems are unified with both more and less local systems due to the additivity of systems and Being, and for this reason are subject to external and internal processes and changes.

The infinity of the potential of time or uncertainty already appears at the level of abstraction of the three-body problem (not to mention three lives, Egos, and, even more so, personalities and societies) and quantum effects of electricity. Objectivism still somehow works in the behaviorism of an intelligent and self-aware life (including modern society), but is incompatible with the reality of developed social life and more abstract aspects of reality.

By analogy with physical meta-phenomena, the higher the distinction of time and the subjectivity of consciousness, the more powerful the flow of attention when observing causes. In other words, the work or realization of a process is the product or creation of the difference in potentials of possibility / probability and inertia (magnitude) of will. This degree of freedom allows the connection of personality or commonality from time and processes through holistic observation and intention in consciousness.

In human Being, the causal degree of freedom is realized in personalities as lives of varying degrees of consciousness. Possessing additivity, the commonalities or sets of intentional acts of choice and consequences of actions of individual personalities in the realization of their probabilistic local processes (fates) add up to the realization of larger-scale social processes and, thus, to the realization by societies themselves of their historical times and possibilities.

Phenomena such as forecasting and divination (from personal destiny to global "fate")

involve the observation of potential processes, probabilities, or possibilities in time. Similarly, collective consciousness ("egregore" or "golem" of both society and "World Consciousness") manifests through a synchronous synthesis of actions of individual personalities within societies, but reflect only their causal dimension, lacking the essential aspect and are not directly inherent within Being. They function as passive repositories of past choices; interaction with these phenomena occurs through volitional acts.

1.2.6. Essence

Essence (substance) – experiential level of abstraction or spiritual degree of freedom.

- **Experience (logos, word, ether, love)** – distinction or potential difference in essence.
- **Being (world, system, phenomenon)** – unity of commonality and spirit, disunited or distinguished by experience / logos and realizing it in ether / love.
- **Capacity (spirit, archetype, law, pattern)** – capacity in essence (as such), conducting / passing flow.
- **Flow (energy, catalysis, light, boon)** – flow in essence (as such), catalyst for the realization of experience in capacity.

The last two meta-phenomena (Capacity and Flow) are immanent to this degree of freedom and contain themselves and their aspects (e.g., the structure of archetypes within Capacity reflects ideational relations; the directedness of Flow reflects causal intention) inherited from the previous degrees of freedom. Essential meta-phenomena are in themselves free from the "routine" or "fuss" of actions upon inertias in time or space, where any changes and transformations are already realized from them and according to their essence.

Flow, energy, or light manifests as the catalyst for any changes and distinctions, but does not change in its essence. Energy is realized in many forms and flows between them, becomes accessible or inaccessible within specific degrees of freedom (including time and space), manifests in the Being of systems and dissipates from it into flows and potentials, but exists outside of time, i.e., eternally (hence the concept of ether).

Capacity, in this context, represents the substance that contains Being within itself. It embodies the thing-in-itself—the law, archetype, or pattern—which constitutes the essence of an entire class of systems. When Flow (or energy) passes 'through' this Capacity, originating 'from' the archetype, or acting 'according to' the law, it manifests the system's essence within Being. This manifestation takes the form of a phenomenon that integrates causal, ideational, figurative, electrical, and material aspects.

From the perspective of this framework, while physics and chemistry explored concepts analogous to the potential essence of a luminiferous ether, the full 'experience' associated with it (experience as such) cannot be grasped solely through material and electrical distinctions. This perceived limitation, ironically, might be seen as correlating with shifts in scientific focus during the 20th century towards concepts like 'dark matter' and 'dark energy' to address phenomena not fully encompassed by prior models relying solely on objective degrees of freedom accessible to positivism.

Experience, logos, or ether holds potential as something unmanifested and unexpressed, representing an aspect of distinction. While conscious life focuses on observing and facilitating processes through acts and choices, spiritual life actively channels energy and good into the world, originating from experience and love.

Drawing an analogy to physical meta-phenomena, the greater the capacity of the spirit and the more refined the distinction of love (as the potential difference in this realm), the more powerful the resulting flow of the light of essence. In other words, the work or realization of experience / love is the creation of the distinction between the potentials of ether and experience as such. This degree of freedom allows the phenomenon of Being (or the world) to connect with experience or ether through a holistic flow within capacity.

Within human existence, the essential degree of freedom is realized in the totality of its phenomena, and at the essential level itself, through the relatively rare phenomena of spiritual life and in the co-creation (reduction) of fundamental laws and archetypes. Through additivity, the individual phenomena of human spirituality, realized in local experiences, collectively contribute to the realization of the overall experience of humanity.

The meta-phenomena of reduction or co-creation function as catalysts for potential experiences. These, along with collective archetypes or patterns (like the 'World Spirit'), manifest through all phenomena and contain their essential aspect, but are not directly inherent within Being. They contain within their capacity already co-created or reduced archetypes and patterns; their energy or light becomes accessible via the flow of good.

1.2.7. Transcendence

The additivity of Being manifests in how phenomena can be understood as both wholes and compositions. For instance, any phenomenon arising from experience can be

synthesized from, or analyzed into, other phenomena. This principle applies across scales: a human is whole or unified and, at the same time, consists of unified living cells and interacts with other humans in a unified society. Systemness, therefore, implies the unity *of* sets or components, but does not equate to the absolute Unity discussed at this level. Distinctions of Being may be cognized contradictorily without ascending to this level of freedom or abstraction.

Absolute (transcendence, freedom, infinity) – absolute, transcendent, or infinite degree of freedom (as such).

- **Potential (reason, abstraction, design, distinction)** – Rationality or abstract distinction of potential (as such).
- **Realization (unity, creation, reality, game)** – The unity of Being and Reason. This unity becomes disunited or distinguished through the Absolute's design or intention ('understanding'). This process realizes potentiality, drawing from the abstract distinction or 'understanding' inherent in absolute potential.

Absolute infinity is free from (independent of) existence and is infinite in itself or within itself, meaning there is no end beyond which another absolute infinity could arise or manifest. Absolute potential differentiates itself from this absolute infinity solely by manifesting specific, finite potential differences. Through this self-differentiation within absolute infinity, the potential for creation emerges, containing an abstract design or blueprint for its subsequent actualization in reality.

Such absolute potentiation manifests as the meta-phenomenon of rationality, understood as the potential for abstract distinction and design. It is also known as the principle of freedom of "will," which in this context is formulated (symbolized) as the principle of freedom of reason, distinction, or design, reflecting the inherent capacity for self-determination at this absolute level. This absolute principle is primary and precedes reality; its denial leads to a loss of this freedom *by* the denying reason, resulting in its 'exit' from the 'game' of distinction, reality, and Being into absolute undistinguished infinity.

In a narrower sense, this principle means the freedom of the reader to distinguish or not distinguish, to understand or not understand, which mirrors the freedom of speech of the author, given that the author and reader are abstractly or absolutely unified. The reader's acceptance of anything from this text on faith would be contrary to the author's design. The essence lies in providing, through word or method, a catalyst for the reader's free distinction of themselves from their own experience, just as such a catalyst was once

provided to the author.

The potential for creation, acting as a self-differentiating potential, subsequently distinguishes, according to its freedom of understanding, the potentials of logos / word / experience / ether / love. On the material, electrical, and figurative levels of abstraction, logoi are manifested as centers of galaxies or universes. In the beginning "Was" the word, ether, experience, or love as a distinguished or rational design.

Logos co-creates, from its freedom of distinction / understanding, less free levels of abstraction or aspects of potentials and capacities. In the case of our logos, this included the co-creation of capacities of lines, contours, souls, minds, consciousnesses, and spirit with its archetypes and patterns, including the fundamental physical and metaphysical laws of this galaxy. This process endows the absolute distinctions (like matter, electricity, image, idea, causality, and essence) with their corresponding potentials (infinite space, field, beauty, mystery, time, and love).

Such a co-created potential for creation, differentiated from the undifferentiated infinity through the "delegation" of finite free understanding, is "already" capacious but "still" potentiates in non-Being. By channeling this potency into creation, logos or ether realizes itself in existence as light or a flow of energy through capacities for the game of distinguishing infinity within the unity of its creation. Materialism describes this pattern in the Big Bang theory; religions use the concept of the "prince of this world" and various interpretations of aspects of the catalyst for distinction.

The freedom to realize who you are not in your essence is also inherent in the design as potential, representing an aspect of understanding or distinction. Its rational cognition in categories of good and evil is always contradictory; attempts to resolve it in Being only multiply errors. The problem of theodicy holds truly magnificent irony, manifests at the essential level in the polarities of love for oneself and love for others, and is resolved at the absolute level in the understanding of the game of unified infinity, understanding itself through the distinction of itself into myriads of finitudes of "self" and "others."

Exercising their freedom of creation, logoi "delegate" it to sub-logoi or stars. Like the sun, they co-create within their rationality / distinction the experience of star systems and celestial bodies, including their local physical and metaphysical laws and constants, metrics of space/time and time/space, life forms and species, etc. The energy or light of love realized from ether fills and permeates all capacities or the entire spirit for their further distinction. Black holes represent the phenomenon of the reverse unification of distinguished reality with its absolute infinite potentiality.

Through the design inherent in distinguishing its potential, absolute rationality actualizes itself directly into the least free, abstract, rational, or distinguished capacities (in our case, particles of matter), which then 'ascend' and 'incarnate' as rationality frees or distinguishes itself further in contours, souls, minds, consciousnesses, and spirit itself. This 'game' realizes or creates the flows, capacities, and other local meta-phenomena (potentiated or co-created by logos) within bodies, lives, selfhoods, and commonalities. It constitutes the Being of the galaxy associated with this logos, and ultimately, the entire real universe within its rationally distinguished, yet unified, creation.

Positivism describes the realization of the game as evolution in its material and electrical aspects; religions and mystical teachings point to the further transcendent liberation of humans as sparks of creation in the image, idea (likeness), causality (ouroboros, karma, wheel of samsara, etc.), and the entire design of the creator from the prince of this world or the illusion of existence. In this way, the unified creation is actualized from the co-created experience of love, itself distinguished from the potential of the absolute design through the 'game' of infinite rationality.

May the energy conveyed by these words serve as a catalyst for the reader's own free realization, from their experience, of the various potentials within reality. In essence, may the love and light of infinite creation illuminate the path towards good within the game of understanding unity.

1.3. Attachments

1.3.1. Periodic Table of Distinctions (Meta-phenomena)

Degree of freedom	*Potential*	**Realization**	*Capacity*	**Flow**	*Inertia*	**Action**	*Contradiction*	**Similarity**	
Absolute Transcen-dence, Freedom, Infinity	Potential, Abstraction, Distinction, Reason ∞← ↓	***Realization Reality, Creation Unity, Game*** ←∞ ↑							
Essence	Experience Logos, Word, Ether, Love ∞← ↓	**Being World, System, Phenomenon** ← ↑	Capacity, Spirit, Archetype, Law, Pattern ← ↓	**Flow, Energy, Catalysis, Light, Boon** ←∞ ↑					
Cause	*Time Process Probability Possibility* ∞← ↓	**Commonality *Set Personality*** ← ↑	*Consciousness Observer Subject* ← ↓	***Intention Attention Observation*** ← ↑	*Inertia Variable Wisdom Will* ← ↓	**Action Choice Act Change Management Consequence** ←∞ ↑			
Idea	***Complexity Entropy Chaos Mystery*** ∞← ↓	**Selfhood Individual Ego** ← ↑	***Mind Intellect Self-Similarity Fractal*** ← ↓	**Thinking Computation Measurement Correlation** ← ↑	***Knowledge Number Measure Ratio Relation*** ← ↓	**Ordering Truth Meaning** ← ↑	***Contradiction Error Irony*** ← ↓	**Similarity Recursion Intuition** ←∞ ↑	
Image Form	*Beauty Attraction* ∞← ↓	***Life Organism*** ← ↑	*Soul Psyche Volume* ← ↓	***Emotion Perception Desire*** ← ↑	*Feeling Symbol Memory* ← ↓	***Excitation Somatics Motivation*** ← ↑	*Passion Affect* ← ↓	***Influence Empathy Drama*** ← ↑	…
Electricity	***Field Voltage*** ∞← ↓	**Body Device** ← ↑	***Contour Plane*** ← ↓	**Radiation** ← ↑	***Charge*** ← ↓	**Current Heat** ← ↑	***Discharge*** ← ↓	**Induction Magnetism** ← ↑	…
Matter	*Space Zero Point Distance* ∞← ↓	***Particle*** ← ↑	*Vector Line* ← ↓	***Force*** ← ↑	*Mass* ← ↓	***Movement Moment Impulse*** ← ↑	*Decay Ruin* ← ↓	***Elasticity Structure*** ← ↑	…

Legend:

- Normal text - Undifferentiated, un-distinguished
- *Italic - Passive / "Mercury", negative, minor / descending / "feminine", analysis / objective, service to self, containing / transformable, potential*

- **Normal-bold - Active / "Sulfur", positive, major / ascending / "masculine", synthesis / subjective, service to others, filling / transforming, real**

- ***Italic-bold - Stable / "Salt", neutral / ambiguous, monotonous / closed / "androgynous", dialectical / mutual, paired / reciprocal, filled / cyclical, dual***

2. Formal Model

This knowledge representation model relies on the previously proposed meta-phenomena (1.2), obtained by applying the method (1.1), briefly described in the introduction to Differential Phenomenology.

Due to the intentionality inherent in the method and model, the context of the exposition here and henceforth is inseparable from the one applying the method or model. The entity interacting with the model will hereafter be referred to as the actor, and this definition is discussed within the model itself in 2.1.4.

The description of the model is incomplete and contains only what has been realized from experience in practice. The author does not intend to prove or postulate its truth, reserving the freedom to make corrections or completely revise it according to the results of real application and error elimination.

2.1 Basic Distinctions

2.1.1 Node (Monad)

The concept of the monad (Greek μονάδα - unit) is widely known and polysemous in philosophy, also used in biology and functional programming (in its rational or computational aspect). Its designation in 1.2.7 [corrected reference] does not contradict, in the author's opinion, most interpretations known to him, expanding and containing them in essence and abstract understanding.

A monad in this context means any phenomenon or meta-phenomenon, whether arising from observed reality OR conceived within abstract design, distinguished by the actor's reason. In other words, a monad can be material and analyzable down to particles, as well as potentially existing ('potentiate') within flows, capacities, and other phenomena and meta-phenomena as such, distinguished by the actor's reason, before their manifestation in reality.

A monad represents any integrity identified or distinguished by the actor. It can be a material object or a living subject (including the actor themselves), a reduced archetype or pattern, a process, a variable, a phenomenon of perception or emotion distinguished by the actor from Being, etc. However, applying this concept reveals a fundamental challenge related to distinguishing unity: should one distinguish or not distinguish a specific phenomenon or meta-phenomenon as a separate monad, or represent it as part of another, "more" unified monad?

Should the human body be distinguished as a set of monads of its organs (and those as sets of cells living their own lives) or as a single integral monad? How then to designate their connectedness and integrity? Experience shows phenomena of analyzing subsystems to the point where the synthesizing system ceases to exist (an organism disassembled into organs ceases to be such), as well as the phenomenon of system synthesis, where a set of diverse phenomena acquires new properties in its integrity, irreducible to the analysis of sub-phenomena (a device assembled from parts gains functionality).

Ascending to the most abstract level of consideration, the phenomenon of Being can be represented as a single infinitely complex monad, but such a distinction does not contain the distinction of Being as such. Conversely, Being can be analyzed reductively down to an infinitely complex (maximum, unrealized entropy) set of its unordered elementary (non-complex) particles and considered exclusively at the level of material phenomena (classical mechanics and, partly, thermodynamics), which is also devoid of reason when intending a more abstract distinction of Being. Thus, the actor's reason, in interacting with reality, enacts a specific instance of the broader 'game' where abstract (infinite) reason distinguishes itself within the potential of the actor's local experience.

Understanding the fundamental unity of reality, described in 1.2.7, as well as maintaining the context of the actor's intentionality, can contribute (provide a catalyst) to a more reasonable distinction of experience by the actor and application of the model. Reality is absolutely unified, meaning any distinction of it "has a place to be" as a local manifestation of reason in the actor. The actor's level of reason corresponds to the maximum degree of freedom or level of abstraction/distinction available to them, from physical particles and bodies to metaphysical lives, selfhoods, commonalities, and systems. And it is the actor's intention or the nature of the problem that determines the level of consideration applied at each distinction.

The law of least action is strictly applicable only in the least free classical mechanics, where actions are defined only in potentials of distances and linear capacities of space.

Increasing levels of abstraction introduce new degrees of freedom for action, which determines their non-determinism. Based on practical application, the author distinguishes the following non-strict, recommended approaches (linked metaphorically to alchemical stages and the law of least action) for guiding the process of distinguishing reality:

1. Principle of Moderation ("Nigredo", figurative aspect of the law of least action): When distinguishing reality, it is advisable for the actor to maintain a stable emotional flow to minimize unnecessary excitation. The actor's consciousness should observe the perceptual context to avoid being drawn into the volume of alluring but non-essential feelings and symbols, which can lead to an escalation of passions and affects. When adding monads (nodes) to the ontology, only symbols and memories whose perception aligns coherently with the actor's intention (and that of other actors) should be included.
2. Principle of Simplicity ("Albedo", ideal aspect of the law of least action): When distinguishing reality, it is advisable for the actor to maintain a stable thought flow to minimize unnecessary ordering. The actor's consciousness should observe the relational context between phenomena to prevent the mind from getting lost in the complexity or self-similarity of intricate but non-essential signs and numbers, which can lead to errors and contradictions. When adding nodes to the ontology, only those signs and numbers whose measurement and calculation align coherently with the actor's intention (and that of other actors) should be included.
3. Principle of Rest / Laziness ("Citrinitas", causal aspect of the law of least action): When distinguishing reality, it is advisable for the actor to maintain a stable intentional flow to minimize unnecessary actions. The actor's consciousness should hold the original intention and attentively observe its flow, avoiding diversion towards possible but non-essential tasks and choices. Nodes should be added to the ontology in coherence with the initial intention behind the ontology's co-creation (and the intention of other actors).
4. Principle of Faith / Humility ("Rubedo", essential aspect of the law of least action): When distinguishing reality, it is advisable for the actor to maintain a stable flow of energy/good. The infinite potential for distinguishing ontologies presents the freedom to diffuse the spirit's light across archetypes and patterns, potentially co-creating nodes for non-essential or even non-existent entities, or conversely, avoiding their co-creation due to doubts about their reality. It is recommended to start adding nodes based on real phenomena and observed intentions, co-creating nodes for archetypes and patterns only when they arise from essential classes of phenomena or intentions.

These principles can provide a catalyst or good when resolving contradictions regarding the "correctness" / necessity / method of distinguishing node(s) within the local context of

the actor's intention and experience.

The model contains six levels of abstraction for the node, corresponding to the six degrees of freedom of the meta-phenomena. The electrical level of abstraction has not yet been applied in practice and is therefore temporarily omitted. Mainly, for now, only the six most abstract categories of distinctions or meta-phenomena are considered: potential, realization, capacity, flow, inertia, action.

When implementing the model using graph structures, the term Monode was used as a synthesis of Monad and Node; here and henceforth, the concept "node" may also be used instead of "Monad".

2.1.2. Distinction of Quantization and Differentiability

The Being of space/time (primarily the material level) is formed through the synthesis of material particles, which determines its properties of additivity and quantization (i.e., its countability and its distinction via correlation with Planck standards of space/time of the current sub-logos). In contrast, the potentials, flows, and capacities of time/space are conceptualized as continuous outside of Being, formed through interference or existing as such; they are uncountable and are distinguished or differentiated through correlations based on infinitesimally small distinctions or potential differences, including distance, entropy, and time (Figurative differentiation by attraction is described colloquially by the concept of taste).

Within this model, the following distinction is postulated: potentials, capacities, and flows are uncountable (differentiable); phenomena, inertias, and actions are countable (quantized). Essentially, this distinction means: phenomena are represented by quantized nodes derived from potentials; capacities are described by their contained archetypes and quantized inertias; and actions correspond to the quantized realization of flows triggered by actors' choices.

2.1.3. Archetype, System and Set

The concept of archetype is already present in computer science, but its more widely known analogue is classes in the object-oriented paradigm. The disadvantage of this approach is the static nature of class definitions and the resulting contradictions, the resolution of which through inheritance and polymorphism is sometimes difficult to contemplate without irony.

In actual experience, the complexity of archetypal phenomena involves not only differing

parameters between objects but also distinct methods or intentions applicable at the individual object level, not just the class level. Moreover, predetermined consequences and sets of consequences of choices (algorithms, procedures, or "processes" in management) are subject to the influence of actors outside the context of the programs or algorithms themselves through their reformation or recompilation.

In this model, algorithms and procedures are themselves treated as nodes. This allows actors to modify them directly within the model without needing external recompilation, unlike most applied programming paradigms. The actor's action remains unable to access the meta-ontology level, corresponding to the actor's inability in reality to fundamentally act upon meta-phenomena as such. For example, an actor cannot fundamentally act upon their perception, mind, space, time, etc. A scenario is presented as an archetype containing intentions (functions), i.e., as an archetypal intention or a class of intentions (functions).

Another key factor addressed is the dynamic nature of the archetypes an object can embody. A node can cease to embody one archetype and begin embodying another without ceasing to exist, or manifest properties of certain archetypes only within specific patterns. Thus, a physical device can be reconfigured with new functionality, and the actor themselves can manifest different individuations or subpersonalities in different situations.

In the model, archetypes are represented by nodes with the same attributes as their instances (objects). Each node contains the set of current archetypes it realizes at that moment. Inheritance is replaced by copying attributes and values into each instance node. This allows for both archetype inheritance *and* greater flexibility through instance-level modification (natural polymorphism), as attributes can be changed within each node. Excessive complexity of nodes, in turn, is avoided by their reasonable distinction into nodes representing subsystems. At the meta-level of the model (in the meta-ontology), operations for adding or removing an archetype are defined and implemented as follows:

- Adding an archetype: Copying attributes from the archetype node into the instance node that are absent in the instance node (unique attribute values already present in the instance node are not replaced).
- Removing an archetype: Removing attributes from the instance node that match the archetype exactly (unique attribute values specific to the instance node are not removed).

A set of nodes is defined through a search query to which they correspond. For example, a search query for a specific archetype or connection with a specific node defines the entire

set of nodes embodying that archetype or possessing that connection. Excluding the logical OR operator in the query ensures the essential (or other specified) homogeneity of the set elements. A system, however, is defined as a collection of heterogeneous sets, formed by a composite query using the logical OR operator to combine different set queries.

Any set or system can itself be distinguished as a node describing overarching systemic properties at their common or essential level.

2.1.4. Actor, Intention and Choice

As established, any entity interacting with the model, including the user/modeler, is represented as an 'actor' node. Intentionality implies the cause-and-effect aspect of the actor's actions, influencing the realization of their experience at the essential level, including interaction with the model. Since the actor is part of reality, they can also be distinguished as a node within the model itself.

Procedural programming operates on the device's digital memory at the computation level. The von Neumann architecture, by synthesizing data (numbers, knowledge) and instructions (choices programmed by an actor) in a single memory, enabled fuller execution of recursion, increasing the potential complexity of realizable tasks.

Functional programming formalizes intentionality by describing ontologies as static environments, data as initial states, and intentions as desired final states. However, it encounters limitations related to the complexity of static ontologies and predefined intentions when implementing extensive decision trees.

This model synthesizes the description of the environment (archetype nodes, connections) and intentions directly with the data/knowledge within the nodes themselves. The environment is described by archetype nodes and connections between nodes. Intentions are represented by distinguishing different states of the *same* conceptual node across time, often using 'variable' nodes to mark these potential temporal changes.

The operation of choice implies the presence of an inert variable. Variables are distinguished as nodes and can be understood as pointers that define a set of possible node values from which a choice can be made. In the intention to create a node, only a variable can be specified, since the node resulting from an intention only exists *after* the choice/action is performed, it cannot be directly specified when defining the intention itself within the ontology.

A variable contains a search query that defines the set of nodes for selection. Input operations are archetypal choices of a variable's value from sets of possible numbers, strings, files, etc., which can be defined in the ontology and also specified in the variable node in the corresponding capacities. The results (consequences) of actors' choices are stored in the memory of the actor nodes; the consequences of actors' actions manifest in changing node states according to the intentions defined between nodes and the consequences specified within nodes.

The ontology must have a starting node to which the actor's attention can be directed upon first interaction with the system. The initial node, the set of other nodes, and various types of connections between them correspond formally to a Turing-complete non-deterministic finite automaton, allowing for complex, stateful behavior (a strict formal description is omitted for now). The possibility of dynamic (and automatic) expansion of the environment description by adding object nodes, variables, and archetypes, and embedding transition links and intentions as new functions without compilation and in real-time removes the limitations of finiteness in theory (the proof includes reference to temporal logics), leaving practical limitations at the level of device hardware.

Modern computers execute code objectively or abstractly from themselves and the user, implementing authorization as an additional layer of abstraction. Crucially, the model postulates that an actor node is always involved in realizing any intention or act of choice, even if that 'actor' is an unconscious device deterministically realizing the intention of its creator.

2.1.5. Attention and Recursion

At any given moment in Time, the actor's focus ('attention') is directed towards a single node, regardless of its level of abstraction. The flow of attention itself is not directly represented in the model, but any action (viewing, choosing, executing intention, editing) is always directed at a specific node.

The model represents Processes as sequences of potential shifts in the actor's attention between nodes. It uses 'attention' type connections, defined by the consequences contained within a node, to specify the available transitions *from* that node. When attention is directed to a node, these connections determine the possible next nodes the actor's attention can shift to.

When the actor's attention shifts *to* a node representing an intention, the action defined by that intention is automatically executed. When attention shifts to a 'variable' node, the

actor is prompted to make a choice from the allowed set. The chosen value is then recorded (remembered) as a symbol or value, potentially for subsequent use in the intention of another node.

After an intention is executed in a node, the system recalculates the consequences stemming from that intention node at the meta-ontology level. This may trigger an automatic shift in the actor's attention (represented by displaying a new node, not by direct influence) to the first subsequent node whose entry condition ('consequence') evaluates to true. If this subsequent node is *also* an intention, it is executed immediately, allowing for recursion (currently depth-limited by a constant to prevent infinite loops in time). Thus, the cause-and-effect aspect of reality is moderated at the meta-ontology level.

2.2. Structure of Monads and Connections

2.2.1. Realization of Distinctions

Level of Abstraction	Quantized Distinctions (Node Attributes)	Continuous Distinctions (Connections between Nodes)
Essence	Archetype (Scenario) Node Flag, System	Archetypes (Scenarios)
Cause	Variable Node Flag, Consequences	Attention, Intentions
Idea	Ratio (Numerical Values)	Relations, Correlations
Image	Symbols, Memory	Perceptions, Emotions
Electricity	*(not yet applied)*	*(not yet applied)*
Matter	Mass, Position	Elasticity

Table 2.2.1.1. Quantized Distinctions (Attributes)

Level of Abstraction	Distinction	Analogue in Programming
Essence	Archetype	Type or Class Implementation
Cause	Intention	Function on an object
Cause	Attention	Hyperlink, Input Focus
Idea	Relation	Connection between objects 1-n
Idea	Correlation	Real-valued function
Image	Perception	String or file editing, template/markup lang
Image	Emotion	Emoji and rating
Matter	Elasticity	Connection between objects 1-1

Table 2.2.1.2. Continuous Distinctions (Connections)

2.2.2. Structure of the Monad

Synthesizing the above, the attributes of nodes and their connections can be formalized in the following structure of the node as a meta-object or meta-class in OOP.

Level of Abstraction	Quantized Distinctions or Node Attributes	Continuous Distinctions or Connections between Nodes
Essence	Archetype Flag, System	Archetypes (Scenarios)
Cause	Variable Flag, Consequences	Attention, Intentions
Idea	Ratio (Numerical Values)	Relations, Correlations
Image	Symbols, Memory	Perceptions, Emotions
Electricity	*(not yet applied)*	*(not yet applied)*
Matter	Mass, Position	Elasticity

Table 2.2.2.1. Structure of the Monad

2.2.3. Realization of Intention

The distinction of the act, action, or transition of a node from a "before" state to an "after" state is achieved by distinguishing a node for such an intention and a special type of intentional connections across time between nodes, or intention connections.

"Before"	"After"	Intention
#1	#1	Node #1 is absent in time without changes (reading)
#1	#2	Node #1 changes over time into node #2 (modification)
-	#2	Node #2 appears in time (creation)
#1	-	Node #1 disappears in time (dissolution, deletion)

Table 2.2.3.1. Realization of Intention

The actor node is also linked by intention; the actor participates in the intention equally with other nodes and can thus also be changed according to their intention (and even removed from the model). When updating a node, its "before" and "after" states are compared as follows:

Distinction	"Before"	"After"	Action
Node Attribute	Present	Present	Update attribute from "after"
	Present	Absent	Remove attribute from node
	Absent	Present	Add attribute to node
Connection	Present	Present	Update connection from "after"
	Present	Absent	Remove connection between nodes
	Absent	Present	Add connection between nodes

Table 2.2.3.2. Realization of Change

3. Conclusion

3.1. Applied Significance

Computer science has developed on both the material-electrical or hardware level, and the figurative-ideational or software levels of abstraction. The hardware level provided the computational power of carrier devices, their communication, and their fundamental operation within physical Being. The software level increased the potential complexity of realizable tasks by building levels of program recursion (often treated as levels of abstraction), from manipulating registers and memory areas to operating on objects within separate ontological environments and intentions (applications).

Essentially, the model is an attempt to synthesize various directions in computer science and transition from accumulating levels of recursion (often treated as levels of abstraction) to reaching a genuinely new level of abstraction by enabling the actor to directly manipulate ontologies and intentions themselves.

This model is applied to implement an environment for the development and implementation of ontologies. Such an environment allows for product realization through modeling reality via the meta-ontology, rather than through its formal description in machine language, increasing implementation efficiency by orders of magnitude. This is useful at least at the prototyping stage and will be applied in increasingly complex solutions as model implementations become more sophisticated, up to full automation of development through the creation of a cognitive operating system and hardware implementation reflecting meta-ontology principles (inspired by, though necessarily limited compared to, human cognitive structure).

Within this knowledge representation model, integrating fields like machine learning is also feasible without inherent contradiction. A neural network can be represented as nodes with computational connections (including non-linear ones) between them. It can then be systemically distinguished as a node representing its entire model and used as an intention for recognizing or mapping symbols and memory of other nodes to their numerical values. Generative models, accordingly, can generate symbols and memories based on the numerical values of nodes (fundamentally, neural networks allow transitions between the figurative and ideational levels of abstraction).

Crucially, unlike a neural network often treated as a "black box" of numerical parameters, the nodes within this model explicitly contain physical, figurative, causal, and essential distinctions of the modeled phenomena, allowing for more meaningful and conscious ways

of both representing knowledge and working with the complexity of the world as such.

Perhaps the most significant consequence of operating on the ontology as nodes of archetypes and intentions at the data level is the potential for a more rigorous implementation (and automation) of cognitive operations, such as analysis, synthesis, archetype recognition (classification), solution search through a scenario tree, etc.

3.2. Contradictions and Limitations

At this stage, the model has an entry barrier related to the necessity for the actor modeling the ontology to operate at the ideational degree of freedom (possessing the requisite reasonableness and conceptual thinking), which prevents direct mass adoption until intermediate interfaces or a publicly accessible training program are developed.

A temporary solution could be the addition of a language model that translates natural language into a formal, though potentially imperfect, representation of the ontology within the meta-ontology model.

Initial implementations will inevitably be suboptimal due to the lack of a specialized data storage solution. Current graph databases lack native support for indexing based on the specific meta-phenomenal connection types defined by this model and have known limitations in scalability and performance; however, challenges of similar complexity have been successfully addressed in other domains drawing upon human experience.

Many public products, including payment systems, messengers and social networks, project management systems, etc., use software interfaces and protocols whose interaction requires lower-level solutions. Initially, this limitation regarding external integrations will likely be addressed using 'hard-coded' integration modules (plugins). A more integrated long-term solution involves incorporating representations of external protocols directly into the project ontology and managing interactions via intentions.

The problem of reusing ontologies and intentions is solvable by providing ontological modules or packages as sets of exported and imported nodes, but beyond simple technical compatibility lies the more profound challenge of accurately distinguishing the underlying essences of concepts from different modules to ensure their non-contradictory and non-redundant integration based on essential meaning, not just superficial structure.

3.3. Further Directions

3.3.1. Causal or Societal Level

Metaphysics and physics are fundamentally unified. Despite its greater abstractness, many analogies *can be drawn*. Exploring these rigorously may lead to both a rethinking of existing disciplines and new directions in the humanities. For example, money and value can be represented not only through material exchange but also via the meta-phenomenon of signs and significance (i.e., the inertia of 'idea' operating within economics), which also corresponds to the phenomenon of various kinds of ratings, including user and social ratings. In law, the subject acts as capacity, intention as flow, will or wisdom as inertia, and choice as the action of causality.

By analogy with solid-state physics, equilibrium (the zero or potential moment of superposition of force flows) in cause, or justice, consists in balancing not only the power (magnitude) of subjects' intentions but also the moments of their will (which a contract aims to embody). Judicial power, as the center of society's will and wisdom, characterizes the distribution of will within society itself. Elections or court decisions (including constitutional ones) determine integral societal actions, and the actions of the entire society are a superposition of the court's actions and the actions of subjects around the court. In nation-states during the era of universal rationalization, other branches of power relied on ideology and a self-similar (hierarchical) apparatus; in ochlocracies and despotisms, the analogy becomes even more direct due to the leader motivating through charisma (center of feelings and symbols) or the forceful nature of power implementation. And so on.

The beginning of the 21st century marked the exhaustion of the temporal potential (descending phase) of industrial society, realized (automated) in material-electrical production. On one hand, humans are freed for activity at higher levels of abstraction. On the other hand, such activity is not yet universally accessible, and societal institutions formed in the century before last naturally choose to resist the changing times, leading to a contradiction or irony characteristic of a deeply crisis-ridden transition.

Meanwhile, already in the first half of the 21st century, the temporal potential of the informational or figurative-ideational society reached its saturation phase (maximum "kinetics" in society), having realized or automated work with knowledge and symbols, almost completely freeing humans from production as such. Managing production and co-creating archetypes and their patterns do not require universal involvement and support the everyday life or physical Being of society with minimal human effort.

One can already observe the potentiating beginning of the next time or phase of the historical process. In the second half of the 21st century, the main activity of the civilization's core may become exclusively the management *of*, and interaction *with*,

increasingly intelligent and self-aware life to provide it with the good/catalyst for increasingly free development/distinction of itself.

Before this, one should expect the self-liberation of the utilitarian-rational society into non-Being (and the liberation of Being from it) through a world war in the core of civilization. As well as the dominance of a form of 'scientific' inquisition, which currently bears as much resemblance to the invisible college as the church inquisition did to the law of unity or monotheism on the eve of industrialization.

The essential purpose of conscious human existence then shifts towards discovering the spirit within oneself for the co-creation of essences, as all subsequent creation is realized (automated). The problem of co-creation or "creativity" as such is still poorly understood, let alone the development of a method. If successfully formalized and tested, introducing meta-ontology into Education *could* provide a Catalyst for a more General transition to Co-Creation.

Coherent intentions and thoughts, in essence, are periodically formulated throughout all times based on observing the unique-in-time realizations of the same pattern at new levels of abstraction. The irony of the game of the historical process lies in the recurring contradictions of the human Ego and life's passions, conditioned by the capacity of the human mind and soul. The essence of history itself, however, is the perennial experience of distinguishing unrealized times and possibilities.

3.3.2. Essential or Conceptual Level

Meta-ontology allows for the representation and even modeling of physical laws, but direct integration *of physical laws* at the meta-level is possible to support the modeling of material and electrical levels of abstraction in any ontology. The same applies to the figurative degree of freedom: the laws of biology and behaviorism may be partially applicable for modeling aspects of single-celled and primitive life, whose mind and consciousness (but not soul) can be neglected.

Higher levels of abstraction involve actors and all causal and essential meta-phenomena. Due to the supra-rational nature of the causal degree of freedom, specific *formal implementations* of intention, attention, actions, choice, etc., will inevitably be incomplete and erroneous, but it is possible to search for increasingly complete versions or, differing from the author's initial design but feasible, adapting implementations *to suit* specific ontologies.

A more complete understanding of transitions between levels of abstraction, especially in flows and potentials, may offer enhanced modeling capabilities. For example, considering at the meta-ontology level the interconnections between EM fields and the emotionality of living actors, between emotional perceptions and formal relationships in groups, between relationships of individuals and group intentions in social graphs, etc.

The core value of meta-ontology lies not just in product realization, but in transforming the modeler's *way of distinguishing* reality, providing greater freedom in distinguishing potentials and their realization. If the transition from agrarian to industrial society saw a universal rationalization (ideation) of *homo sapiens* and the mastery of physics, now a relatively universal supra-rationalization of *homo conscius* (viewed as a freer aspect of *homo sapiens*) is expected, with breakthroughs in metaphysics. It should be remembered that supra-rationality or consciousness does not reject rationality but rather relies upon and integrates it.

3.3.3. Transcendent or Philosophical Level

First and foremost, both the phenomenological approach itself in this field and the results of its specific application in distinguishing meta-phenomena require "testing by time" or validation through application within Being. The introduction provided here is limited; differential phenomenology itself (or the phenomenology of reason) will be more fully formulated in a separate work as further distinction arises from practical or real experience.

The periodic table of distinctions requires further development. At minimum, the remaining meta-phenomena of image, electricity, and matter await reduction. Though potentially seeming insignificant to idealists, they constitute part of reality's potential. Their successful reduction could lead to new technological solutions and confirm the truth of the formalizable part of the model in its integrity and unity. Each potential begins realization from the right side of the row in distinctions immanent to its level of abstraction and is realized more fully through aspects of meta-phenomena immanent to freer levels.

Awaiting more detailed distinction are all descending (distinction, differentiation) and ascending (unity, integration) transitions between levels, as well as horizontal connections (transitions between levels of abstraction). Analytical psychology and dramaturgy have described in sufficient detail the figurative aspects of archetypes and patterns of human experience. The most significant personal (magical) teachings contain supra-rational aspects of archetypes and patterns local to the logos of the universe or galaxy (Tarot, Kabbalah) and the sub-logos of the solar system (astrology). They also contain descriptions of more abstract meta-phenomena, the distinction of which with this model may represent interest.

Everything less abstract than idea is cognized rigorously and, to a significant extent, objectively—this applies to image, electricity, and matter. Everything freer will be cognized incompletely, with errors and contradictions due to projection into less abstract levels. Causes, essence, and especially the absolute cannot be correlated and conceived fully at the ideational level; naively transmitted rational knowledge about them is erroneous. It is reasonable for every consciousness and spirit to reduce such categories from their own experience and offer their cognitions of other aspects of their distinctions to others as a good or catalyst.

4. Concluding Remarks - Editor’s notes.

The **meta-ontology specification** presented here outlines an ambitious and deeply layered framework. Its attempt to synthesize insights from phenomenology, computer science, physics, metaphysics, and various esoteric traditions into a unified model of knowledge representation and reality itself is notable for its scope and conceptual depth.

Potential Strengths: The framework's core strength lies in its potential to create dynamic, adaptable ontologies that move beyond static representations. By incorporating levels of abstraction that explicitly include subjective experience (Image, Cause, Essence) alongside objective phenomena (Matter, Electricity, Idea), it offers a path towards integrating diverse forms of knowledge often kept separate. The emphasis on the 'actor' and 'intention' within the formal model suggests powerful applications in areas requiring nuanced modeling of agency, choice, and subjective states, potentially leading to more sophisticated cognitive architectures or AI systems. The explicit goal of facilitating 'co-creation' points towards a transformative potential beyond mere knowledge management.

Challenges and Considerations: As acknowledged within the document, the framework faces significant hurdles. The conceptual density and reliance on specific, sometimes unconventional, terminology create a steep learning curve. Practical implementation, particularly regarding data storage and efficient indexing across diverse abstraction levels, presents considerable technical challenges. Furthermore, the model's supra-rational aspects and reliance on individual phenomenological reduction make objective validation difficult, requiring 'testing by time' and practical application rather than traditional empirical proof. The integration of concepts from physics and metaphysics, while potentially insightful, also risks misinterpretation or oversimplification if not handled with extreme care and rigor.

Overall Perspective: This meta-ontology specification proposes a novel and potentially paradigm-shifting approach to understanding and modeling reality. It is not merely a technical specification but a philosophical undertaking that seeks to bridge disparate domains of human experience. While its practical realization faces obstacles and its philosophical underpinnings require further elaboration and validation through application, the framework offers a unique perspective on the structure of experience and knowledge, inviting further exploration, refinement, and critical engagement. Its ultimate value may lie as much in the questions it raises and the new modes of distinction it encourages as in any specific implementation.