

# SUPPORTING DATA

## Philosophical & Metaphysical

### Concerning the Dynamic Field Concept

Twenty-five years ago I spent some time consulting the standard Greek philosophers plus Spinoza, Descartes, and Bergson. I was looking for field concepts, hoping to find one that might relate in some way with ideas I had come across in some Eastern metaphysical writings. These I would describe as "cosmogonic assertions". There was no attribution as to original source, and details were very short, but I felt somebody had put more into the few words than could be passed over as mere hints. Somehow I got the notion there could be some significant relation to subatomic particles -- though nothing was thought to be known along those lines in ancient eras prior to the Vedas. I had never studied particles myself but found particle theory intriguing due to my interest in ontology.

Here then is my careful rendition of the "clues" which have thus far resulted in the Metaparticle Theory. Interpretive or explanatory remarks are given in italics.

**Motion is one of the three aspects of the Absolute -- Abstract Space and Duration being the other two.**

**(There is) but one principle in nature -- spirit-matter or matter-spirit, the third the ultimate Absolute or the quintessence of the two.**

*In the thickest dictionary I have consulted, the word spirit is given twenty-six definitions. I intend no disapproval of any of them when I observe that "spirit" is a sure means of inviting confusion when used without specification in instances where precision matters.*

*I have learned over time that if one rearranges words so they fit some tested and understandable frame of reference, knowledge is often better served. The wording in question here was not said to have been discovered chiseled in stone.*

*The "Absolute" may not be a principle identifiable "in nature", but wherever it resides, "spirit-matter or matter-spirit" must certainly be derived from it, rather than the other way around. Note that the third "clue" below, found in the same book by the same author (who was obviously not the original framer of such an axiom) tends to verify my interpretation.*

**Spirit and matter stand to each other as the two poles of the same homogeneous substance, the root principle of the universe.**

*This one, as you will have seen right away, is the one that did it. Nothing I had read in books about particles said anything about two poles. In those days it was one "spinning" point particle with an electrical charge plus all kinds of invisible waves. Further, the use of the word homogeneous struck me as implying a field. And the "root principle of the universe" could only equate with absolute, primordial reality; how could you get more basic than "root principle"?*

I must add, with chagrin, that in my initial research an entire Ancient Greek Genius somehow slipped completely past me back then and I missed an ideal quotation from Anaximander, student of Thales. I did not acquire this important data until 2003. It sounds very much like Anaximander knew a lot more 2600 years ago than most of the world's philosophers do today.

**Anaximander described a basic primordial "element" that differed from "all the heavens and worlds" created from "its infinite nature". He said this *apeiron* was an "eternal and ageless substance" encompassing all worlds, to which its "infinite motion" gave birth.**

Now there was a man who would have spared a kind word for Metaparticles. I would wager that if Anaximander were among us today he could gain the attention of leading scientists. Providing he held a Ph.D. in astrophysics.

— — — — —

**BACKUP MATERIAL USED IN MAKING THE TRANSITION  
FROM DYNAMIC FIELD – VIA DIVERGENT BALANCE -  
TO METAPARTICLE MODELS OF PHYSICAL ELECTRONS**

Since there is only one Dynamic Field but a number of different names for it, it is of first importance here to identify and try to clear away some of the confusion this has caused. If I occasionally sound proclamatory, it is not because I consider myself an unchallengeable authority, but for the sake of brevity.

First let me make a distinction between substantive and conscient metaphysics. I think much depends on such a bifurcation for the future of scientific investigation, and hope this version will be improved upon.

## **SUBSTANTIVE METAPHYSICS**

Deals strictly with the origins, unseen structures, forces, and differentiations of matter, implied as well as evidenced. Though subjectivity may or may not be a factor in some categories of matter, it is to the greatest extent possible excluded from the material concerns and substantive aspects of the cosmos.

## **CONSCIENT METAPHYSICS**

Does not ordinarily deal with grades or ranges of matter and energy and most often subordinates materiality to spiritual states, teachings, religious doctrines, and other belief systems. Expanded or elevated states of consciousness and expectations of survival are emphasized. It is the automatic association of "conscient" attributes with metaphysics in general, minimizing the importance of the "substantive" aspects, that should be discouraged and distinctions promoted -- for the good of both sides.

### **Confirmations of the Dynamic Field Premise**

Beyond the fragmentary "clues" presented first in this section, I was never able to find anything in my years-long research that added further to them in the way of specific facts, reports, teachings, etc., regarding the composition and actual formation of primordial matter. Anaximander, of course, was the shining exception where reassuring generalities are concerned.

I did, however, collect quite a few examples from reports by people telling of a certain kind or category of "transcendent subjective experience". Most of these were from Zen Buddhism, and this always guarantees extreme brevity and no analytical comments. ("Everywhere nothing but shining like the blue sky" is an extra-long memoir when it comes from a Chinese or Japanese Zen master.)

But there were more detailed examples, a few from India and two from German and American sources. Conclusions that I find logical and convincing can be drawn, and I will synopsise them below. But first let me say what has to be said -- and can be put in few words indeed.

### **Being and Existence**

Most people (including a few dictionary compilers) make little or no distinction between Being and Existence. But where metaparticle basics are concerned, such a distinction is absolutely and rigorously necessary. The entire process of material creation (or production - whichever the reader prefers) depends upon the fact that Existence is not the same as Being.

Being, in its cosmic sense, remains hidden to human consciousness. Existence stands out to be objectively knowable. Presence in a dictionary doesn't make something a fact. But Webster's College Dictionary defines Existence perfectly in the sense desired here, as "having being in time and space". (Oddly enough, Webster's seven-pound Unabridged comes nowhere near that; they must have gone back and abridged it.)

### **Examples from Research Relating to Dynamic Field**

Of course, nobody from anywhere used our term "Dynamic Field". I could never tell which term, "satori" or "shunyata", applied to what could be called the "Field experience" in Zen. In both Eastern and Western metaphysical literature the word most frequently applied to this particular experience was "voidness". But that expression was not employed in the remarkably interesting and reassuring accounts left by the medieval German ecclesiastic Meister Eckhart. What he recorded in detail from his multiple inner experiences was without doubt the same phenomenon other penetrators call voidness, the "zero state", Space consciousness, etc. As far as I am aware, Eckhart was the first to call it "the Godhead".

What is of prime import to the Metaparticle Theory is this: Meister Eckhart experienced "the Godhead" many times, according to his writings. Yet he emphatically distinguished this sense of spacelike emptiness from "the awareness of God". He wrote that on occasions his consciousness spontaneously alternated between the two states of perception, which he found to be decidedly different. He preferred the awareness of God. With the Godhead he seems to have encountered the more widely reported sense of voidness.

Here is how Meister Eckhart put the comparison: "God has all the glory. The Godhead seems as empty as though it were not."

These East-West voidness coincidences, as the dubious would surely call them, were reinforced in the writings and in personal conversations with my own mentor, Franklin Merrell-Wolff, now departed. He was the author of two unique, profound books, *Pathways Through to Space* and *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*. Dr. Wolff, as he preferred to be called, coined his own term for the voidness perception which, unlike Eckhart, he considered the ideal and consummate state of consciousness. It was to him "the High Indifference".

Dr. Wolff explained his choice of the word Indifference in this way:

The dominating impression on first encounter was of a "vast Space", empty, but filling consciousness with the realization that such a seeming emptiness was the mind's interpretation of an infinite, complete fullness. Plus a sense of constant balance.

At this point I will stop and acknowledge something that will have already occurred to anyone in the sciences, whether or not you are personally inimical to all things "metaphysical".

Data supportive of the Dynamic Field premise are very scarce in literature qualifying as metaphysical in the substantive sense. From my own experience it is not likely that many books to be found on New Age shelves contain much that so qualifies. Over years I have turned up bits in literature of older days, and the best of it has been presented above. I think there is enough to suggest certain restrictive conclusions, but that is all. There could not be any empirical evidence whatsoever in the area of the Dynamic Field itself. As I admitted earlier, that area is as metaphysical as you can get -- even if it were all substantive.

But now I am brought up by the obvious: The "supportive" material for the (I can't say existence, of course)...for the cosmic reality of the Dynamic Field is all from subjective experiences. Modern science skillfully nullifies any value available from that source. They declare it is not admissible as evidence. Which is actually a wise and pragmatic attitude to take, considering the mean sapient content of six billion homo sapient brains. Though it's too bad if ninety million of them report essentially the same experiences when resuscitated under one condition or another. (Makes no difference, still subjective.) And anyhow, our brains are genetically sapient even when we are not. They produce reassuring Near-Death Experiences when...what, the brain?...is afraid that...who, we?...might be dying.

But never mind all that; this is an uncertified, semi-scientific theory, and under that aegis I see there are only three conclusions I can draw that are really pertinent to Metaparticles. They are:

- 1 - People writing about the "voidness" category of supernormal subjective experiences do not report that even an intuition of a Godlike entity is part of them. Consequently I conclude that is a logical exclusion to make.
- 2 - Since it can be proved that complete homogeneity in something that is intangible is often interpreted as emptiness or a relative void, an almost identifying similarity can be drawn between certain postulated features of the Dynamic Field and the emptiness-as-fullness concept from conscient metaphysics. Regarding the Merrell-Wolff notations, it is true that he found much more that was significant and confirmatory to him in "the High Indifference" than I came across in all my other "voidness" research put together. But in concluding his account of the experience, he wrote: "Neither I nor God were there, only BEING remained." (I would venture to say he brought the seeds of all the other impressions with him.)
- 3 - Consequent to the above, the conclusion I reach that is most pertinent to the Metaparticle Theory is this: Any impressive, above-the-background presence of God is absent from the Dynamic Field as conceived in the Metaparticle premise. But we should recall that the Field is characterized as being absolute "substance". I think it is accurate to say that in Judaism and most Christian teachings, the ultimate Godness is not only beyond all substance but beyond the entire cosmos. So there may be other aspects of "absoluteness" consistent with those beliefs.

May I add a word in closing. It may be supposed by some that I myself have had -- or think I have had -- episodes of "paranormal" experience consonant with or even approaching those attributed to Franklin Merrell-Wolff, the British author and Sanskrit scholar Ernest Wood (of my close acquaintance), or other outstanding figures in metaphysical enquiry. Where such levels of achievement are concerned, I can only say I haven't been there, haven't done that.

*Particles are the interface between  
absolute and relative reality.*

*In what we term matter,  
particles join together essence and existence*



**Cosmic and Natural Laws follows on next page**