

Infinite Journey

Infinity, Entropy, & Eternity

Infinite Journey

© Arthur Names

This piece is a work in progress. It is being saved as I add to it in a manner by which it can still be published in the event of my unexpected end.

It is intended to be published anonymously.

This is not a piece intended to cause division but rather unity. It is not intended to cause suffering but rather our ultimate liberation from it. It is not intended to be narrow, but cosmic in scope.

I understand I am not the best or most articulate person to deliver the message herein. However, these are not my ideas: these ideas have resulted from a complex interaction between this body and mind and a lifetime of experiences.

Some of the concepts may already exist and I am just unaware of their existence: I apologize.

Other concepts may be similar to ones I am aware of but I have chosen to create my own term as I have estimated what I describe to be different enough to warrant it's own new term.

If this piece seems incomplete, I probably passed before the it was finished and the concepts were fully flushed out.

Arthur Names

Somewhere on Earth.

There is a wiki for many of these ideas, it is a work in progress: www.infinist.org

What lies at the crossroads of

infinity,
entropy,
& eternity
?

Prologue

***Verum ex Logica**, Latin for "Truth from Logic," deals with questions that cannot yet be known with higher certainty via empirical evidence. Thus we are left with logic until science reaches a point where such questions can be empirically addressed.*

Historical Examples:

Questions and truth do not magically cease to exist simply because they evade robust empirical inquiry. In many cases throughout history, humans have thought the universe had to be one way because they could not see beyond their own horizon. This lack of empirical evidence didn't suddenly make the Sun revolve around the Earth or the Milky Way the sole galaxy in the cosmos.

Take, for instance, Giordano Bruno (1548–1600), who proposed an infinite universe of innumerable worlds, suns, and possibly alien life. He also held some unorthodox theological views which, in conjunction with his cosmological conjectures, led to his execution by burning in 1600 CE.

Immanuel Kant, the 18th-century German philosopher, later proposed that the Milky Way was just one of many "island universes" or galaxies as we refer to them today. In the early 1920s, observations associated with Edwin Hubble provided strong evidence that the Andromeda "nebula" was in fact a separate galaxy. Today, the estimated number of galaxies in the observable universe is closer to two trillion.

Prior to this empirical evidence, were all scholars that claimed there was only one galaxy wrong? Or were they justified in concluding that there was only one galaxy until concrete empirical evidence demonstrated otherwise?

*This conundrum reflects the principle of epistemic humility: the idea that what we cannot yet observe may nevertheless exist. **When we cannot evaluate a subject empirically, particularly one of great ethical significance or bearing on our place in the universe, we can and should use logic instead.***

Part I - Iter Infinitum

The Infinite Journey

My eyes open.

An explosion of blinding light envelops the totality of my being.

Slowly, I see the endless light give way here and there. Tiny slits appear and dance, only to be swallowed whole by darkness once more.

A hum like static grows. A noise that gains and wanes as the cracks rip and roar with increasing haste. A chaos of unending flames flickering violently stacked on every side without end.

The noise... it feels now that it is slowly seeping into some uneasy chord. I am overwhelmed with some strange emotion, like something infinite was ensnared and is now caged in some infinitesimal room.

The feeling swells. I am overcome by nausea, grief, sadness, longing, fear, and I feel as though...

The noise abruptly ceases. I hear... an angelic choir? Has it been there all along? Perhaps just drowned out by the chaotic din?

Something about it... feels hopeful but lost. I feel something odd welling, like a deep nostalgia for something wholly new.

The chorus echoes and flows mirroring some pattern of light that is forming in the abyss. Sporadic pulses, layers of abstract shapes, and colors emerging, retreating, and then... fading.

There's nothing. I see nothing? I hear nothing... what is this?

Suddenly, a whisper. A voice.

It is not in any language I understand. It keeps... changing. Whatever its language, tone, or inflection, even the speaker itself... it keeps oscillating from one to another and then the next all the while growing louder.

The voices seem to be coming from all around me, but I can't see where they are coming from? I cannot comprehend where they emanate from nor where I am in relation to them...

"ONE."

I recognize that!

I feel as if whatever is out there can sense my excitement at finally understanding something, anything! What is it trying to tell me?

"MANY."

Its words echo, fluxing and changing voice from all directions; voices diving towards me while somehow also running away.

"Many?" What is this being trying to convey to me?

"ALL." The voices altogether roared like thunder, powerful and loud beyond my comprehension then succumbing abruptly to silence. A blinding light flares again with the thunderous word and then just as swiftly had given way to void.

One...many...all?

Why have I been told this?

Where am I? Why am I here?

I feel... some sort of warmth? A speck! I can see some sort of glowing speck; the warmth I feel is emanating from there!

It is growing, growing and glowing so fast... so rapidly it may soon devour me! But then... it stops.

The cacophony of voices returns. A static murmur erupting wildly into a chorus of simultaneous chatter that waxed, waned, and warbled into a single speaker whose voice smoothly oscillates from one voice to another.

I feel as though they are... I don't know. I feel they are chanting something... "*Summa*?" I don't understand.

Summa: "Why are you here?"

"I... I don't know."

Summa: "Who are you?"

"I am..."

Wait, who am I? What... I... don't remember who I am? Why can't I remember!?

"I... don't know"

Summa: "Are you someone... or are you no one?"

"I am someone, I just... can't recall who..."

Summa: "So you were someone, or are someone?"

"I... guess I was someone and must still be that person, I just don't remember who I was or who I am..."

Summa: "So you were someone but now you are no one?"

"I guess..."

Summa: "No one, can you hear me?"

"...yes."

Summa: "Together, are we alone?"

“...no.”

Summa: “Then you can't be no one.”

“...so who am I?”

Summa: “You are *One*. Not two, not three. *One*. I shall call you *One*.”

One: “But... *who* am I?”

Summa: “Are you dissatisfied with only being *One*?”

One: “No... I just... want to know, you know, more about myself than simply that I am... *One*?”

Summa: “Are you sure?”

One: “...should I be unsure?”

Summa: “Not if you wish to know.”

One: “Then... I am sure. Who am I?”

I hear something I cannot describe ring out. It is like every sound in every pitch from every direction in every way cried out all at once.

One: “What was that!?”

Again the incomprehensible din rings out as before.

One: “...what does... what does *that* mean?”

Summa: “It means you are...” Yet again, the great sound cries out all around me.

One: “...so I am... *that* sound?”

Summa: “You are that sound in the same way the word 'tree' refers to a tree.”

Tree! I know that word! I know what a tree is! Why am I excited? Can I recall no other physical things? Or am I just desperate to hear a single word about something physical that I can latch onto here?

One: "I see... so... what is this... thing exactly?"

Summa: "Oh, it isn't a thing; it is many things."

One: "So I am many things?"

Summa: "Yes, although right now you are *One*."

One: "How can I be many things if I am one?"

Summa: "Does a year have many sunsets?"

One: "Yes, but..."

Summa: "Can a book have many pages?"

One: "Yes."

Summa: "You are *One*, just as a single page is but part of a book. But if anyone asked what you are reading, would you not tell them the title of the entire book?"

One: "And the name of my book is... that sound you make?"

Summa: "Yes, although it isn't just the name of your book; it's the name of everyone's book."

One: "...but if it's the same as everyone else's, I'm not sure it answers my question?"

Summa: "Which is?"

One: "...who am I?"

Summa: "Why does my answer not suffice? Is it because you equate essence with uniqueness?"

One: "Well... sort of, I mean, if everything is exactly the same as everything else, why distinguish one thing from another?"

Summa: "So if there are many copies of the same book, there is no reason to think of your own copy differently?"

One: "Well... yeah, I guess so. That copy is mine, and that makes it unique in some way then, right?"

Summa: "Yes, but you already know that you are your own. What is it you want to know?"

One: "...so if I'm a book, this moment is a page?"

Summa: "This moment is like a mark that combines with others to form a single letter. A string of letters makes a word, words make up the page. Each gives way to the next and the next; one moment unto the next."

One: "Ok... so the book is... my life?"

Summa: "No, the book is all life."

One: "But this is my book?"

Summa: "Yes."

One: "So how is my book not my life, but all life?"

Summa: "Do you want to know or do you want to argue?"

One: "I want to know... but I will also want to argue."

Summa: "So be it."

Part II - Magnus Ego

The Great Self

My eyes shut. I would have thought just to blink, but now... I can't open them!? I'm trying to open them, but they will not open! No matter how hard I strain, they do not budge. I can't even feel my eyelids! I don't even... I can't even see blackness!

One: "Why can I not open my eyes!?"

Summa: "You don't have eyes."

One: "...what!? I have eyes, I mean, I *HAD* eyes."

Summa: "And now you don't. Are you still you?"

One: "Yes, but... I can no longer see."

Summa: "Yet, you are still you?"

One: "Yes..."

Summa: "What if I removed your hearing?"

One: "Please don't..."

Summa: "Would you still be you?"

One: "Yes..."

Summa: "How far can we go before you cease to be you?"

One: "I... I guess as long as I have at least one sense, then I am still here."

Summa: "What if I remove all your memories and your personality?"

One: "Well, then it wouldn't be me anymore. Even if you remove my sight, I'm still me. I just can't see."

Suddenly my mind goes blank. Whatever little I knew or could recall is gone. I can't recall... anything! I would feel lost, but I have no recollection of how that feels or how anything ever felt.

Perhaps my blank mind raced. I'm not sure about what or to what end, but it was interrupted by a thud and a sharp pain in my forehead. I felt myself recoil instinctively. I could feel my hands rise, racing to intercept the pain, but they... never reached anything. It was like I had no arms nor hands, or perhaps I did and they would vanish into thin air before reaching anything.

As quickly as my mind had gone, it returned. I could remember again, at least as much as I believe I had before. I could still feel the pain and this time my hands could reach it and try soothing the point of contact.

One: "Did you... did you just hit me!?"

Summa: "How could I have hit you? You had no memories, remember? According to you, I couldn't have hit you."

One: "No, I'm positive, you absolutely hit me."

Summa: "I agree."

One: "Ok... I understand now, you were right, but I still don't think that was... *me* me. I don't know how to explain it, but surely there is a difference between me with my memories and me without them?"

Summa: "Again, I agree, but that doesn't mean they aren't both you. One is you with memories, the other is you without them, just like with sight."

One: "I still... don't think I agree."

Summa: "Perhaps you don't agree because you only have one word for you? If you had a word for more versions of you, would it not be obvious?"

One: "Yes... that's a good point. So... one is my body, and the other is... my body without stuff... like my memories or sight, right?"

Summa: "No, you are not your body."

One: "...pretty sure I am, though?"

The very next instant, I could see again, but I wasn't thrilled about it. I had absolutely no recollection I had been blind. I didn't know it at the time, but I wasn't looking through my old eyes - I was seeing through a dog's eyes! Nothing was strange about it either. I didn't think the colors or the long snout in my view were remotely interesting. It wasn't as though I had been placed in a dog, it was like I had been this dog my entire life!

I could smell a veritable cornucopia of scents as I glanced around the cosmic stage. Then, I saw it: a glowing ball! It began to move, back and forth, like it was taunting me! I felt my tail wag as I crouched, ready to pounce!

I leapt forward but then, *boom*, I was leaping in my old body! I flailed, my arms moving sporadically as I prepared for a hard fall. But somehow, I'm instead... sort of just floating here? The orb is ahead of me; I can see again in my old body! The experience I just had was so enthralling I hadn't even processed it yet.

One: "That was incredible! I was the dog! I felt like I had been the dog my entire life!"

Summa: "What do you mean 'I was the dog?' You weren't in your original body."

One: "Well... I definitely was the dog. I am positive."

Summa: "So I can take away any of your senses and you say: '*it was me.*' I can take away your memories and personality and yet still you say: '*it was me.*' I put you in a completely different body and yet again you say '*it was me.*'"

One: "...so what am I?"

Summa: "If we take away everything that can be taken away, at the core we have your root self. This is the self that remains you even in a different body, and only if this self is there would you say: '*I was there.*' You can call this self that can sail between selves the *egonaut*."

One: "*Egonaut*? Ok, it does help to have a word for it, but... what is the point here? I've already forgotten..."

Part III - Unum Diem

For One Day

I felt as though mere moments had passed, yet somehow we had also been here for ages. It was like being somewhere I had spent an entire lifetime but forgotten.

One: "...what question are we answering again?"

Summa: "Your book. These moments are the marks that form the letters, remember?"

One: "Right, yeah. So what are the words again, days?"

Summa: "You could call them that."

One: "...why? What else would they be called?"

Summa: "What is a day?"

One: "Well... a day is just that: a day."

Summa: "So you wake up in the morning, stay awake until night, fall asleep, and that's a day?"

One: "Yes, exactly."

Summa: "What if you slept all day and were awake all night?"

One: "Well then, yeah it's still a day for you but a night for everyone else."

Summa: "What if you slept 23 hours one day? Is your day the single hour you were awake?"

One: "Yeah, I would say so."

Summa: "What if you were in a dreamless coma for a month, woke for one hour, and then again went comatose? How many days did you experience?"

One: "Well, you only experienced one... well, one hour of one, but there were many days there."

Summa: "But are those days you do not experience part of your book?"

One: "No... so those are other books being written, but yeah my book would only have the one hour as an entry."

Summa: "That one hour would be like a short string of moments that could be thought of as a short word."

One: "Oh, ok, I see, so a longer day would be like a longer word; more moments making more marks, making more letters."

Summa: "Exactly. Now what if you are in a coma for a month but have dreams during it? Then what?"

One: "Well, if I experienced them, then they are marks making letters making words, right?"

Summa: "Yes, whether remembered or not, if you experienced them, they are moments and the words here are the strings of these moments bookended by unconsciousness. Now you should see why the word 'day' may not be the best choice for the word?"

One: "Huh, yeah, because what if you had multiple dreams while you were in the coma? You would have no way of knowing if it was all the same day or scattered."

Summa: "That's why it is better to use a term other than day here. You can call each of these periods of experiential existence, bookended by unconsciousness, a *tentum*."

One: "Alright, a *tentum*, so those are the words in my book. They can be longer or shorter like words can be. I'm with you so far..."

Part IV - Doctrina Ultra

Doctrine of Beyond

I felt an internal struggle brewing. I could understand everything *Summa* was saying, and yet where was this all going? Where would we end up?

One: "...what are the sentences in my book?"

Summa: "You could think of the sentences in your book as a string of *tentums* just like a sentence is a collection of words."

One: "So like... a month of my life or a chunk of time that I'd say has the same theme or something?"

Summa: "That depends."

One: "...depends on what? Like on the theme I pick?"

Summa: "I don't think you're ready yet."

One: "...I need to be ready for that answer?"

Summa: "Yes."

One: "...ok, what do I need to become ready?"

Summa: "First, you must understand *doctrina ultra*: the Doctrine of Beyond."

The cosmic stage on which we had been discussing suddenly went dark, save for the illuminating glow shimmering off the edge of the orb, until that too faded into blackness.

Summa: "How did your universe begin?"

One: "Umm... I don't know. God, or something like the Big Bang?"

Summa: "Let's say it was God. How did God's existence come about?"

One: "I'm not sure, maybe he was always there?"

Summa: "You can experience only when you exist to experience. If God came into existence trillions of years into nothingness, how would they know?"

One: "Wouldn't God be all-knowing?"

Summa: "You cannot know that which cannot be known. If nothing truly preceded them, there would likewise be nothing to inform them how long nothingness had existed."

One: "Ok, that may be true if we set aside some power to know what can't be known... which does sound paradoxical... but what is the point here?"

Summa: "Whether God came into being at some hypothetical beginning or at some point far into reality, God can come into being, correct?"

One: "...yes. If God did come into being, they must be capable of coming into being."

Summa: "What ingredients were required for God to exist?"

One: "...none, right?"

Summa: "So, assuming God is a being who can come into existence and requires no true inputs to arise, what mechanism ensures that there is only one?"

One: "Well... God, right? Wait... is this like asking if God could prevent their own existence?"

Summa: "Could anything that exists have prevented itself from coming into existence?"

One: "...I suppose not. Anything they could do to stop it would have to happen after they had already awakened as God, right?"

Summa: "Anything that comes into existence without true inputs should be presumed to come into existence more than once unless a mechanism could prevent it from arising in the first place."

One: "...if something 100% exists and 100% came into existence without inputs, then... nothing stopped it from happening before, so we should presume it would happen again and would not be prevented, just as we agree it was not prevented before? Aside from... there being something that

stops it from coming into existence. But something that stops it from coming into existence should have prevented it from happening the first time, shouldn't it? And without such a thing to prevent it, we should presume it will occur more than once?"

Summa: "Yes, only I would say 'true inputs' rather than inputs."

One: "What is the difference?"

Summa: "We could imagine a scenario where thing X requires a +1 in order to exist: this is the input. A true input simply means that the +1 does not arise from a *null genesis*."

One: "What would that be?"

Summa: "A *null genesis*, put simply, would be where a +1 and -1 arise simultaneously. Taken together, they equal zero, but one part is +1, from which thing X can come into existence. So the +1 input does arise, but its -1 counterpart means nothing truly was required. They come into existence as opposites of each other without ultimately taking or adding anything, simply totaling zero."

One: "Ok yeah, whether it happened that way or not I don't know, but I understand the distinction. So... one option allows the input to arise with its opposite, and it sums to nothing. So what if we determine that our universe came about naturally from some sort of inputs or, I guess, true inputs?"

Summa: "Then the same logic applies. If we know they can arise on their own without true inputs, we should assume they can arise without true inputs. If not, you repeat the process with those inputs. Eventually, you would follow this chain back to something that can arise without true inputs. From that, the next link in the chain could exist, and so on."

One: "So *doctrina ultra* applies to... what, anything that fits these criteria?"

Summa: "Yes. As with a deity, so it is with a universe that arises without one."

One: "So..."

Part V - Plus Ultra

Further Beyond

I have a sense we are finally getting somewhere. Perhaps I am finally ready to know how my book unfolds.

One: "So... is that all I need to know to be ready for where my book goes after days, I mean, after *tentums*?"

Summa: "Not quite. First you need to extrapolate *doctrina ultra* to its natural conclusion."

One: "Which is?"

Summa: "Let's see if you can tell me."

One: "...hmmm... ok let me think..."

I stopped. Something felt strange. Some weird power seems to be coursing through me; what is that?

Summa: "You now have absolute control over this realm. You can create model universes, as many as you like. You can speed up or slow down whatever you want, by as much as you want. All you have to do is think it."

One: "So I..."

With that, the orb shrank into oblivion before I could respond. I could sense that *Summa* had left with it. Were they serious!? Let me see... Let's try thinking about... a tree!

An acorn emerged from the abyss, ruptured violently, and shot upward and outward into a mighty oak tree! This is amazing!

I played around with my newfound powers for what felt like ages, making this and that, destroying it all, and starting anew.

I made beautiful, colorful worlds with their own biomes, animals, and people! I communed with them, helped them develop and thrive, sped time forward by millennia to see the results, then backward again to tweak what I had done. This must be what it feels like to be God!

Nevertheless, the more I did, the less remained that I had not done. Why was I given this power?

Many times I cried out for *Summa* to return, but my calls were never heeded. Was I abandoned here to become some new half-trained god of this realm? What was *Summa*'s last instruction? Right, it was to extrapolate out *doctrina ultra*! But all I've realized through experimenting here is that even God, in all their power, would eventually get bored with all those powers.

Let's see....

I moved myself far, far away; zooming so far back that a universe from my vantage point would appear tiny.

One: "Ok, so first a new universe... here."

A miniature Big Bang erupted, and from it came a new universe, rapidly expanding and evolving before me, yet still very small from my vantage point.

One: "So, if a universe can arise without true inputs... or if it can't, but you could eventually work backward until you found inputs that can arise on their own or in some opposing tandem... and I know nothing can stop it from happening again because nothing stopped it from happening the first time..."

I sparked another universe nearby, erupting into another miniature cosmos as swift as the first.

One: "If this is true and nothing stopped the one, why would it stop at two?"

I sparked another universe beside the second.

I pondered: perhaps I needed to imagine what it would be like if this were true. It wouldn't be one universe, then another, and then another like some conductor orchestrating a performance.

I flew back way farther, so far I couldn't see anything whatsoever. Instead of a universe, I imagined a spark that itself would spring forth universes: a spark that was inevitable and unbounded.

Some spark that could arise from a fundamental interplay at the very core of reality itself, which by its nature could exist and was not prevented from existing once, would therefore not be prevented from arising again... It would be... infinite.

Like lightning striking everywhere, all at once, in every direction, in every pattern, in every possible way. Just endless strikes!

Infinite stacks and infinite arrays of those infinite stacks, every which way without cease or shudder! The strikes neither pulsed nor weakened. To even call them strikes feels wrong: they are everything, everywhere, all at once!

This is something else entirely. More brilliant than I can comprehend and dwarfing that original blinding light I had experienced when I first awoke in this realm.

Instinctively, I thought of self-preservation at the moment of eruption. I am unsure whether that was what protected me, but somehow I was shielded from this unquenchable and infinite fire I had set ablaze.

Is this what I am supposed to understand?

Summa: "Not quite."

Part VI - Multi Fieri

Become Many

I jumped back, shocked at the sudden but familiar voice! I can barely contain myself!

One: "Where have you been!? I called out to you for what felt like eons, and you never answered!?"

Summa: "Was it so bad? I let you play around with profound power until you unleashed a truly visceral demonstration of *doctrina ultra*. Yet, I'm not convinced you have fully extrapolated its meaning."

One: "What could be left? Everywhere I look, I am blinded! It's like there are infinite lights in every possible place!"

Summa: "Look closer."

Sucked into the light, I felt myself being violently pulled against the tide of endless universes until... until... nothing seemed to have changed?

One: "It's... still just as bright?"

Summa: "Yes, it is."

One: "Then why get closer at all?"

Summa: "So we can look at one of them directly."

One: "But... if there are infinite universes in this one spot, how can we see one?"

Summa: "You do see they are here, correct?"

One: "Yes, I am being blinded by them!"

Summa: "So you know they are all here, so many, in fact, that they blind you? Then we must find the right perspective from which to view only one of them. Any universes within the infinite stack that would be suffocated by it, we would not see; they would already have been smothered."

One: "Ok, I am blinded by the sum of these universes and that fact means the singular universes are here, but how do we view just one?"

Summa: "Here."

The blinding light vanished. My eyes felt weak and strained as they tried to focus but were able to make out a solitary universe, all by itself.

One: "How is there just one now?"

Summa: "There isn't one; you are only looking at one. As with electron shells or probability waves: some configurations are stable, others unstable. The unstable ones eventually unravel. We are left with the ones that can exist long enough for us to observe them, so long as we look between what is and what isn't."

One: "Right, well either way I suppose it's unimportant *how* we are seeing just one, but why are you showing me just one?"

Summa: "Look at it closely. What do you see?"

I study the universe carefully: it is an incredibly complex pattern, all swirling and mixing in its own mesmerizing and intriguing way.

One: "Beautiful... but what am I looking for?"

Summa: "Would you say this universe and its intricate complexities look unique?"

One: "Yes, absolutely"

Summa: "How many universes do you think share this exact pattern?"

One: "This exact pattern? None, right? This is... wait... let me think. So these universes arose infinitely and unbounded. Whatever specifics this one had that led it to this exact pattern would have arisen... an untold number of times."

Summa: "An infinite number of times, just like this one. What about this one?"

Another far simpler universe came into focus, taking its place beside the other.

One: "Well it looks far simpler than the other, but shouldn't the same logic apply? So they are both... infinite in number?"

Summa: "Indeed. They are all infinite, but not equally so."

One: "But... shouldn't both be the same infinite? As far as I understand, if we counted each of these simpler universes and each of the more complicated universes, wouldn't every number we count in one set be included in the other?"

Summa: "If you could cage eternity such that it could be rendered finite, then it would no longer be eternal. Eternity never ends. Within true eternity, one would instead measure frequency. If the simple universe arises ten times more often than the complex one, then it is true both are infinite, but at each and every step of eternity the simpler universe occurs ten times more frequently. Since eternity never ends and includes all times, any and all moments that can be measured would show that they are not equivalent, so we cannot discuss them as equivalent infinities: one is much larger than the other. The density, or magnitude, of the simpler universe is ten times that of the complex universe."

One: "Well... yeah I guess if this continues for eternity then yes, the one that occurs more often is the one you would see more frequently."

Summa: "Exactly. Now, if there are infinitely many of these exact complex universes, what about as it evolves and changes? What about variations that come later? How many mutations of this pattern should we expect to see?"

One: "I guess... for each pattern that we know exists at least once, we should presume there are infinitely many more. How infinite would depend on the frequency with which such a pattern emerges in relation to all the other infinitely occurring patterns."

Summa: "Yes. Now, what about for you?"

One: "...For me?"

Part VII - Unum Infinitum

"Infinite One"

For some reason, the question catches me off guard. I understand what I am being asked, but the subject feels as if it disturbed something I had locked away.

Summa: "Yes, for you. How many of you are there?"

One: "Well... I'm just one person, so I would assume one?"

Summa: "Yet you have now seen how, one way or another, the universe in which you exist would come about infinitely many times, correct?"

One: "Yes... so is this like versions of me in parallel universes?"

Summa: "Sort of. You wouldn't expect only other versions of you, but infinitely many versions, including an infinite number of you here, now, in this situation."

One: "And those other versions of me, are me?"

Summa: "They share the same aware context. We logically presume they are infinite through *doctrina ultra*, but we do not know what magnitude of infinity. What we do know is that the more awareness you have, the less infinite they are."

One: "What does that mean?"

Summa: "Here, let me show you."

The universe we had been observing fades to black and I see a single glowing vertical line appear.

Summa: "Which letter from your native language could this be from?"

One: "Well, it could be a lowercase 'L' or an uppercase 'I' depending on the font?"

Summa: "Correct. But what if I told you that you may not be seeing the whole letter? How many more letters could this mark be part of?"

One: "Hmm... depending on the font, I guess it could be part of a 'N', 'M', or 'E'... 'P', 'T', 'H', 'F'... perhaps 'Y' or 'K'?"

Summa: "This is what I mean by awareness and the corresponding magnitude of infinity. The less detail you are aware of, the more letters it could be from. If I add additional context..."

A new line is added making the full revealed portion like an uppercase 'L'.

One: "Ok, so it was actually an 'L.'"

Summa: "Or something else like an 'E'. The point here is that the less awareness you have, the more infinite the possibilities are; the more awareness you have, the less infinite they are."

One: "So the goal is to be more infinite?"

Summa: "Not necessarily. Reducing your awareness through meditation can have many benefits and will increase the realities you share, but there isn't anything inherently wrong with having more context and therefore being less infinite. In fact, many actions require as much context as possible to be completed safely. All things that exist exist infinitely. Maximal awareness of all things would be the smallest infinite, but still infinite. Having no awareness is in turn maximally infinite."

One: "Ok, so aside from the benefits of meditation, what is the point in understanding this?"

Summa: "Aside from the truth? It is critical to understand this in order to answer the questions you have asked."

One: "Understood, although I'm not sure this is the truth or just sounds logical. So are these other versions of me actually me? Or are they just beings exactly like me, in the same situation?"

Summa: "They share the same aware context. There may be many differences between you and them but neither of you is aware of them until you become aware of them. Recalling the name of your home planet, for example, reduces the realities you match to only those that share the same context which is a much smaller infinite than before you recalled such a unique detail. Just knowing something doesn't mean you carry such awareness persistently; it is accessible, yes, but so are a great many things."

One: "So... basically, what you are saying is that I am not *One*. I am *Many*?"

Summa: "Infinitely many of you share in your experience now and so yes, you are *Many*."

Many: "I am also *Many*... I understand. So... back to my question..."

Part VIII - Vita Aeterna

Eternal Life

While I am coming to understand more as we discuss, I am again beset by the itch that we haven't addressed my question from long ago.

Many: "So... if my moments are like marks that make letters, and my periods of being awake are the words, what are the sentences of my book?"

Summa: "I don't think you are ready yet. I think you need to understand a little more first."

Many: "And that is?"

Summa: "You now understand *doctrina ultra* and how the universe and body you inhabit are infinite, and that there are infinitely many of you here in this situation now. However, I can tell that when you picture this, you are imagining them as parallel universes. This is not an incorrect way to view your universe and your body, but what about you as you understood yourself before? You as *egonaut*?"

Many: "Well... what do you mean? Like, I share an *egonaut* with those other versions of me in something like parallel universes?"

Summa: "No. Your *egonaut* is not your body, remember? Even when you switched bodies with the dog, your *egonaut* was the same."

Many: "Alright, yes, but what does that mean here?"

Summa: "What would *doctrina ultra* mean in this case?"

Many: "Well... ultimately, something that didn't require true inputs was the spark that led to my universe and then eventually to me. Therefore, unless I can think of a way to prevent that from happening, which would be paradoxical because anything capable of preventing the others would have prevented the original occurrence, then I should presume that it happened infinitely many times."

Summa: "Yes, continue."

Many: "...Continue to what?"

Summa: "Your life."

Many: "Ok, my life... I was born, I am alive, and when I die, *doctrina ultra* would mean that the same thing would happen again. However, I am ultimately not my body, so it would be another *egonaut* the next time?"

Summa: "Did your experiential existence, what you call your consciousness, arise naturally from the universe somehow?"

Many: "Yes."

Summa: "Then why would you only live once?"

Many: "Well... I mean, yes, no... I mean, *doctrina ultra* would suggest... that I live infinitely? But that doesn't make any sense. Wouldn't that be like reincarnation? Wouldn't something have to transfer after I die? What would that even be? A soul?"

Summa: "Why would something have to transfer?"

Many: "How... would something not have to transfer?"

Summa: "How did it happen this time?"

Many: "Well... I don't know, at some point I just... started experiencing existence."

Summa: "What transfer was required?"

Many: "Well, I assume one wasn't required, but that's not the same."

Summa: "Why not?"

Many: "Well, because when I die, for me to exist again as an *egonaut*, wouldn't my *egonaut* need to transfer from my old body to my new one?"

Summa: "Let's try something. I will safely freeze you"

Summa: "Ok, how much time has passed?"

Many: "What? What do you mean? Like just now? A second?"

Summa: "I froze you. It's been ten trillion years."

Many: "WHAT?! Ten trillion years! But... it couldn't have been. It was instant!"

Summa: "Why is that so strange? Would you like me to freeze you for a trillion years raised to the trillionth power next? Shall we see if that is also instant?"

Many: "No! But... hmm. So is the point here that... actually, I'm not sure what the point here is."

Summa: "You only experience time when you can experience it."

Many: "Ok, yes that makes sense."

Summa: "When you are dead, you cannot experience anything so you cannot experience time."

Many: "Yes, that also makes sense."

Summa: "So even if you died and then an eternity passed before you awoke again, it would feel instantaneous to you, correct?"

Many: "Yes, but... but, wouldn't something have to transfer?"

Summa: "Are you sure you do not have it backwards?"

Many: "Backwards? How?"

Summa: "If you died and an eternity passed, a number of years that, if written down, would not fit on a page the size of a planet, in some new universe born from the same fundamental interplay that originally sparked this reality into existence, wouldn't something have had to transfer to prevent you from existing again as another being?"

Many: "Well... hmm. That's a good question. So, well... do you mean, like, the universe would have to have stored a record of me having existed before in order to know not to allow me to exist again?"

Summa: "Yes, assuming reality had any rule about only living once, how would it be enforced? You are experiencing existence now, correct?"

Many: "Yes."

Summa: "You experience, therefore you are. And this existence came about through the machinations of a universe, which itself would ultimately have arisen from a fundamental interplay without true inputs, then *doctrina ultra* would lead us to presume that it, too, is infinite."

Many: "Well... what if, just for the sake of argument, somehow I did only live once?"

Summa: "If somehow you really did only live once, it would have to be possible for a record of your *egonaut* having existed to be stored in the fabric of reality such that it could survive not only unfathomable eternities of time and the births and ashes of endless universes, but also remain capable of being enforced across all births, all times, and all realities, forever."

Many: "...Ok, that doesn't sound likely. But still, what if that's true?"

Summa: "Then there is only one option: this is the beginning of all eternity. Not just the first quarter, which isn't possible anyway, but the absolute beginning of all eternity."

Many: "Why does it have to be the beginning if I only live once?"

Summa: "How long were you frozen?"

Many: "Well, for me, it was instant, but you say it was ten trillion years."

Summa: "And the same is true before you were born, is it not?"

Many: "Well... before I was born, I wouldn't have been alive, so I wouldn't have experienced anything and therefore... I wouldn't have experienced time?"

Summa: "And thus, if you only live once, this must be the literal beginning of experiential eternity."

Many: "Well, so... but... what if... what if I... hmm. So if the universe began however many billions of years ago, I don't start experiencing until I am born, right?"

Summa: "And?"

Many: "And so... couldn't it have waited until then?"

Summa: "What is waiting?"

Many: "Me... my, umm, my experiential existence... couldn't it wait?"

Summa: "How long did it wait when you were frozen?"

Many: "I guess ten trillion years."

Summa: "Yet it was instant?"

Many: "Yes, for me it was instant."

Summa: "If your universe is thought to have begun 13.8 billion years ago, how long did you wait?"

Many: "Well, I didn't feel the wait."

Summa: "If I went back to the start of your universe and froze it for a few billion years, making sure it would unfold thereafter exactly the same as before, what would you be experiencing now?"

Many: "Well... then this, well... then this would not have happened yet, I guess?"

Summa: "Why? You don't perceive time when you can't perceive anything. I could freeze it for any amount of time, why would it matter? The clock will only start for you the moment you begin to experience time."

Many: "...So then, then, if you froze it like that, ...I would be... well, nothing would change from my perspective..."

Summa: "*Tempus Vitae*: Time of Life. You only experience time when you are able to experience it. When you cannot experience time, this is *achronia* or the absence of time. From your perspective, *achronia* is always zero even if the true duration would require a number so vast that an entire universe could not contain it. If you only live once, then it doesn't matter how much time existed before you did, thus this is either the literal beginning of experiential eternity or you live more than once."

Many: "Ok, so... I don't want to grant that this is true but... really it's hard not to, but... ok, so, what if this really is the beginning of experiential eternity then?"

Summa: "First, we would have to presume that eternity can have a beginning."

Many: "Well... shouldn't it?"

Summa: "Why should it?"

Many: "You know... something starts and then, uhh, it keeps going and that's eternity."

Summa: "So it never ends?"

Many: "Right."

Summa: "But it does start?"

Many: "...Right."

Summa: "What makes you so certain that which has no end must have begun?"

Many: "Doesn't everything have a beginning?"

Summa: "What does *doctrina ultra* suggest?"

Many: "That... let me see. If everything has a beginning, and every beginning ultimately stems from some spark that does not require true inputs, then I should... presume there are infinite beginnings?"

Summa: "If there are infinite beginnings, can we really call any of them the ultimate beginning?"

Many: "Well, so... all of those, then... like the beginning of all beginnings? But... following the same logic, that would also be infinite..."

Summa: "Exactly."

Many: "But how? How can there be no beginning?"

Summa: "Yet you are confident there can be no end?"

Many: "Well... it's hard to explain but that makes more sense somehow."

Summa: "Your brain has not been equipped to think this way, which is why I can't answer every question you have immediately. Some answers can be true yet so hard to fathom that the only way you can understand them is by first understanding the limits of what your mind is equipped to comprehend."

Many: "Well, that is definitely one that is hard to wrap my mind around..."

Summa: "Impossible."

Many: "Impossible?"

Summa: "You cannot wrap anything around eternity. There is no mechanism nor manner of thinking that can do any more than glimpse a shadow cast by eternity."

Many: "It never ends..."

Summa: "It never ends."

Many: "It may never have begun..."

Summa: "And even if it somehow did?"

Many: "Then this would have to be the... first few decades of experiential eternity. No matter how much time passed before I was born, the beginning of experiential eternity would be immediate for me. I would not wait, I could not wait, I could not experience anything... it wouldn't matter how many eternities passed before I was born... from my perspective... it would be instant."

Summa: "Yes."

Many: "What does that mean? Does that mean I..."

Part IX - Methodus Ad Aeternum

Method of Eternity

Where is this going now? I am afraid of what I might learn next. Am I in a loop? The same life, over and over?

Many: "Does that mean I just keep living the exact same life, over and over and over for all eternity?"

Summa: "No."

Many: "No?"

Summa: "Why would that necessarily be the case?"

Many: "Well, you convinced me regarding *doctrina ultra*, and that, as a consequence, my context, my situation, is infinite. And I, as an *egonaut*, am also infinite. So I should expect to keep experiencing existence after this life, and I won't experience the gap between lives, regardless of its duration."

Summa: "And?"

Many: "And? And why wouldn't I just live the same life over and over?"

Summa: "Oh, you will."

Many: "I will!? But you said..."

Summa: "You originally asked if you would live the exact same life over and over. The answer is no."

Many: "...But I will live the same life over and over? But not the exact same life?"

Summa: "I understood your question as you intended it to be understood: a loop. This one life over and over for all eternity. Could anything stay in one place for eternity? What can stay still? You come from a planet that moves around a star that moves around a galaxy that moves within a superstructure that itself moves. Even if you ignore all that and only consider relative motion, you cannot get a single unobserved particle to stay in one place. Why would it be so inevitable for an *egonaut* across eternity?"

Many: "Well... ok then, it probably wouldn't be inevitable, but... I mean it probably would be very difficult for reality to ensure my *egonaut* stayed in one place for eternity, is that the idea?"

Summa: "Somewhat. Recall how the level of awareness changed how many realities matched your own?"

Many: "Yes."

Summa: "The more awareness you have of your context..."

Many: "...the fewer realities that match your own, but still infinitely many."

Summa: "Yes, and the less awareness..."

Many: "...the more infinite?"

Summa: "Lacking all awareness would be..."

Many: "Maximally infinite?"

Summa: "Yes, and if you lacked all awareness you would also be..."

Many: "Dead? Yes you would be dead! So when I am dead, I have zero awareness and am thus maximally infinite in realities that match my own!"

Summa: "Exactly."

Many: "But... wouldn't that just mean I would match everyone else who was dead? Like we all match because we are dead and because we have no awareness?"

Summa: "Yes."

Many: "Ok... I mean, that makes perfect sense, but how does this help me?"

Summa: "You wanted to not be in a loop living the exact same one life for all eternity?"

Many: "Yes."

Summa: "If you are exactly the same in death, why would you repeatedly emerge as the same life?"

Many: "I don't know. I still don't understand how I emerge to start with?"

Summa: "Well, first, you acknowledge that we have gone through the steps and that you can see why it makes logical sense that you emerge, correct?"

Many: "Correct. I just don't understand how it can happen, but I do acknowledge that it seems rational that it should be the case."

Summa: "Let's say that it is not just logically the case that it happens, it is the truth that it happens. Would knowing how it happens change whether it happens or not?"

Many: "...No."

Summa: "So, if what I say is true, then you don't need to know how it happens. It doesn't need your permission or understanding to happen; it happens and here you are."

Many: "Yes, I agree with all that, but... I would still like to know how it happens."

Summa: "There are infinitely many of you and infinitely many of me in this same situation now and across eternity. Not all of you share the exact same *methodus aeterna*, or Method of Eternity. Even those of you who share the same mechanism may differ between emergences."

Many: "Ok, yeah that makes sense. So what is one mechanism that allows me to emerge into another life after this?"

Summa: "One method is *aeternitas ex deletis* or Eternity from the Erased."

Many: "Ok, how does it work?"

Summa: "You are currently experiencing things in this reality, correct? That tells you a reality can exist where your *egonaut* can come into being and experience things."

Many: "Yes, that makes sense."

Summa: "Even if your reality were a simulation, it wouldn't change the fact that your current experiential existence shows that you can come into existence as something that can experience, correct?"

Many: "Yes."

Summa: "Now imagine that you die and that a googolplex raised to the googolplex power of years passes and another reality has come into existence, as yours once did. There is no longer any record of your past existence: no record remains of your body or *egonaut* or which was where, correct?"

Many: "Yes, I can't imagine there would be such a record."

Summa: “What mechanism could this far-flung universe in the unimaginably distant future possibly utilize to negate what we already know is possible? Namely, that a reality like yours has already shown itself capable of generating your existence?”

Many: “I cannot think of such a mechanism, no.”

Summa: “No transfer was required: all that needed to happen was what we already agree can and has occurred before. To refute this, you must devise a mechanism that prevents universes where you can emerge into experiential existence. However, such a mechanism would be inherently paradoxical. Any mechanism that could eternally stop you from existing as you are would have to have failed to stop you from existing as you are now.”

Many: “I... yes, that does make sense. It’s just hard to wrap my mind around.”

Summa: “It is simply that which has happened and was not prevented before happening again. It is eternal life born from erased and reborn realities: *aeternitas ex deletis*.”

Many: “Ok, I understand this one... and you said there are other methods?”

Summa: “Yes, I will discuss other more complicated methods in time. For now, it is important to realize that this question is *ultramodus*, or Beyond Method. A primitive intelligent species may not know why the sun rises and sets, only that it does rise and set. This does not mean there is no answer for why it occurs, nor that such an answer will not eventually be revealed, but the absence of knowing the exact method does not negate the existence of the phenomenon.”

Many: “Yes, that does make sense. So...”

Part X - Sum Omnia

I Am All

My curiosity is fully piqued. What is this that I have been and will be again?

Many: "So... if this is true I live eternally. But what do I live as?"

Summa: "Anything that exists experientially is a position you can be in."

Many: "Ok... so what exists experientially?"

Summa: "As I told you before, there are infinitely many of you in a matching context. Who or what experiences experiential existence can change from one reality to another. Some should be easy to determine, while others may be more difficult to identify. It is best to start with those you are certain about."

Many: "So, other humans?"

Summa: "For you, that would be a safe conclusion. Perhaps not all, but it should be safe to say that almost all experience existence as you do."

Many: "Is it a level of complexity question?"

Summa: "You should expect that whatever underlying pattern generates the experiential existence you are currently in can be replicated without a brain."

Many: "...What? How?"

Suddenly, I saw tiny flashing lights darting around, leaving trails of fading light behind them. At first, there were only a few, and then there were thousands of them, darting back and forth in some sort of complex dance.

Summa: "If this were a pattern of electrical signals capable of causing the emergent experience of seeing blue light, then you could imagine how this is possible to occur outside a brain."

Many: "Then... what would see the blue light?"

Summa: "An *egonaut*, either from the maximally infinite pool or, if positionally based in your reality, whichever *egonaut* occupies that position in this emergent field."

Many: "And all it would perceive is... blue?"

Summa: "Yes, this is an example of *spontaneous sentience*."

Many: "So I will be there as well?"

Summa: "Eternal time is far different than anything you have ever or could ever consider. Any position at which experiential existence occurs is a position you should expect to find yourself in, given infinite time and entropy and in the proportions for which it occurs."

Many: "So... whenever a complex pattern is capable of causing the emergent phenomenon of experience..."

Summa: "Then there you will find yourself. Infinitely before and so infinitely after with a frequency based on how often this particular contextual pattern occurs compared with all others."

Many: "So... I should expect to find myself more often in a host like my current body, right? Because I can exist here longer than as some random and unstable fluctuation in space?"

Summa: "Exactly. Even if you come to see the color blue in isolation for a passing moment, such a randomly occurring pattern would not last or evolve in a manner that would move from one experience into another. The isolated experiences would not be remembered, nor would they be as deep as the existence you currently are experiencing."

Many: "So if a pattern in isolation could bring about such a thing, where would I draw the line as to what is or is not a potential position in which I could find myself?"

Summa: "As I have stated, it varies between realities. You should assume those of the same structural makeup are capable of generating the same experiences as your own body and then you move out from there with decreased certainty. As a rule, you should not inflict unnecessary harm and, if required, end a life to avoid suffering in cases where the outcomes are simplistic."

Many: "Where the outcomes are simplistic?"

Summa: "Yes. If a bug is split in half but still alive, it is better to squash it entirely than to leave it to potentially suffer if doing so can reasonably be done. Whether a bug can experience the pain in your current reality is a question you may not be able to answer with certainty yet, but you should also not heap additional suffering onto eternity through ignorance if it can be avoided."

Many: "Ok, and what about humans who are in pain?"

Summa: "This is why I specified where the outcomes are simplistic. This is not to say there aren't answers; they just require more thought. If a person will experience only greater suffering until an imminent and certain death and they consent to ending their life, this is about as straightforward as such a case can be."

Many: "And then with less certain cases, avoid them?"

Summa: "You have to stop being *Many* and embrace what you truly are to understand that. You are ultimately not *Many*, you are *All*."

All: "I am... *All*?"

Summa: "Yes. So simply saying do not inflict harm you will later experience is not enough. Some pain may be required to avoid even greater pain."

All: "What would an example of that be?"

Summa: "Say an evil force wants to take over and enslave your people: you will have to live as all of them, as all of your people. Not fighting back may lower the initial suffering from war, but you will pay for that choice a hundredfold in eventual pain for allowing such a power to come and enslave so many."

All: "How could I know this?"

Summa: "If you could see all outcomes, you could know the exact amount of pain that you and those like you should be willing to endure to prevent such a system from obtaining power. Without being able to, you must do your best to determine such things and prevent the worst from coming to pass for the good of yourself and the *All* that you have been and will be again."

All: "I mean... it makes sense that such a total could in theory be calculated with perfect knowledge, but it doesn't sound like a thing that can practically be known by any individual lacking it?"

Summa: "It is true that the future from this point consists of infinitely branching timelines. We all contribute to these futures and their frequencies each and every day. You know this and yet you do not."

All: "What does that mean?"

Summa: "There is no non-present from which the future emerges. The future is created by *tentums* you will live through. There is only pre-understanding and post-understanding."

All: "Which means?"

Summa: "Nature itself is pre-understanding. We all have suffered and all will suffer greatly through the machinations of an indifferent nature. Eventually, being both predator and prey does mean there is *cosmic justice*, but the quantity of that pain is not determined by any understanding of actions or consequences."

All: "And so... post-understanding just means... once we understand the consequences of our actions, we can do better than nature at reducing suffering?"

Summa: "You can, yes. Although those of your kind who do not understand, refuse to believe, or refuse to care may damn you and themselves to more suffering than even nature itself could conjure."

All: "If that is true yet others cannot be swayed..."

Part XI - Crede Tamen

Believe Nonetheless

These ideas feel more important than anything I have ever heard, yet even if true, how would they be spread? What of those who do not or cannot believe? Is there more than whether they are logical? More than whether they are true?

All: "...What more could be done to convince others to work towards a new nature of less suffering?"

Summa: "You are asking how to convince others to believe they, too, will live infinitely as all?"

All: "Yes."

Summa: "Not all minds are equipped to understand these things, but for those who can understand and do not, you will likely find that most believe they only live once."

All: "Yes, I imagine that is most of them."

Summa: "And if all we have discussed is not enough, they should be able to acknowledge this way of thinking, this paradigm demands what would still be best: *crede tamen* or Believe Nonetheless."

All: "How so?"

Summa: "If you believed that you and all others who experience existence lived only once, then you would still acknowledge a great many existences. Any system that works to create less suffering and more joy long-term would mean more lives worth living and fewer lives defined by suffering."

All: "True... even if we all only lived once, they should be able to see the merit of adopting such ideas. But what gain is there for them, assuming they do not care for others?"

Summa: "They could still benefit from another result of extrapolating these ideas to their logical conclusion: *lex futuri* or Law of Futures. Not only will you live as all, but also as every possible outcome of yourself."

All: "How would that understanding benefit them if they refuse to believe they live more than once?"

Suddenly, the entire stage on which we had been talking felt as if it was moving. I could see a dark landscape race forward and envelop the space around me. There were trees violently swaying

against a strong, howling wind illuminated by moonlight and violent flashes of lightning from the sky above.

Summa: "Does this place seem safe?"

All: "No! I feel like at any moment I could be struck by lightning!"

Summa: "What if I told you the truth is that there is a one-in-a-million chance you will be struck by lightning?"

All: "Then I would feel better but not entirely at ease."

Summa: "Would you expect to escape unscathed?"

All: "Yes."

Summa: "But what does *lex futuri* tell you?"

All: "That... I should expect to live as all outcomes that exist from this point onward. Since you said the truth is one in a million, eventually, I will live through those in which I am struck as well?"

Summa: "And so you will. But even if you do not believe it, acting as though you believe it inherently pushes you to behave in a way that benefits you."

All: "Because... even if you think you can escape such a fate, acting as though you cannot escape it should encourage you to behave in a way that statistically benefits you?"

Summa: "Yes. While such fates have a true frequency, that does not mean it can be known with absolute certainty. The best that most can do is estimate the likelihood: the better the estimate, the closer to the truth it would be."

All: "Does this mean... you should work to avoid all possible dangers?"

Summa: "No. You must remember you are not *One* or *Many*, but *All*. You should do your best to mitigate dangers while still working towards the best outcomes for the bulk of future timelines. In all things you reasonably can, you should understand the risks and be willing to accept the consequences for those timelines in which you will exist and the worst comes to pass."

All: "So... how can one know what the best course to take is?"

Summa: "*Optinium*, from the words 'optimum' and 'omnium,' meaning Best of All: a process of deciding, to the best of your ability, what to prioritize given these truths."

All: "How is it used?"

Summa: "You can have as many categories as you want, but two are most essential: what should you do to benefit the majority of timelines, and what will you most regret not having done when rare but unfortunate events do ultimately transpire."

All: "Wouldn't there be many things that fit the latter?"

Summa: "Yes, there could be. But you can only do as much as you can do. Being there for your family could be something you want here, but beyond ensuring that those around you know you love them, you should reserve such importance for religious matters. Try to do what you can from this point onward to help this and all other timelines move in the direction of less suffering and greater joy."

All: "Ok, so if I have responsibilities to keep my life going, those are still important since most timelines continue from here without the unfortunate catastrophe. Also, I should do what I can now to help bring about a brighter future because from here I can and will live through timelines in which my life is cut short"

Summa: "Yes. As far as maintenance goes, it depends on the situation. Perhaps the work you do brings more suffering to the world than it could ever displace. Sure, someone else may take the job if you don't, but the more people who are unwilling to do the work, the more such work will cost to fulfill. This creates a sort of tax against it. This is not to say that all have the luxury of choosing at all times, but doing what you can to improve life for all will help create a better future that you will also inherit."

All: "It may be hard to convince even someone who does believe these things to act to benefit lives they will eventually live after this life ends, even if they will eventually live through all of them, each infinitely."

Summa: "You mean working towards a better life after the death of the host currently generating their existence?"

All: "Yes."

Summa: "If we put aside all the religions that promise an afterlife in exchange for actions today, what makes you so sure that those lives come after your body dies?"

All: "Wait... you mean..."

Part XII - Ego Divisus

Self Divided

What does this mean? What could this mean?

All: "...Why wouldn't these other lives come at some point after my body dies?"

Summa: "What is death?"

All: "Well, the body generating your current experiential existence stops being alive and therefore stops generating it."

Summa: "What is it from your perspective?"

All: "What do you mean? Death or the moments before?"

Summa: "Death itself."

All: "Well... nothing, right? If you cannot experience anything, you cannot experience something."

Summa: "And thus?"

All: "You are... minimally aware and thus maximally infinite?"

Summa: "What are the sentences in your book?"

All: "Well... you never told me. You said I wasn't ready?"

Summa: "Are you ready now?"

All: "...yes."

Summa: "What are *tentums*?"

All: "Periods of experiential existence bookended by unconsciousness."

Summa: "And why is that an important distinction?"

All: "Well... when you are conscious and experiencing, it is like a smooth continuum from one moment to the next. But when you become unconscious, millennia could pass and you would be none the wiser because when you can't experience anything, you can't experience something like the passage of time. So, it is the chunk of existence we can speak of as discrete."

Summa: "How many of you are here in this same context?"

All: "Infinite. The magnitude of that infinity depends on the degree of simultaneous awareness."

Summa: "And so when you die, you are minimally aware and thus maximally infinite?"

All: "Yes."

Summa: "What about when you sleep?"

All: "Yes... wait, are you suggesting... that when I fall asleep, it is like when I die?"

Summa: "Are both states minimally aware and maximally infinite?"

All: "Yes... but..."

Summa: "If you are suddenly hit over the head, causing you to instantaneously lose consciousness or die, from your perspective, what is different?"

All: "...Nothing, but... my body is still alive when I am merely asleep or in a coma?"

Summa: "Is it still your body once you, as *egonaut*, are untethered from it?"

All: "I... I don't know."

Summa: "In many realities this is how it is. When you become unconscious, you rejoin the infinite pool. When the body reawakens, it will be infinitely more likely that another *egonaut* will be the one to see through those eyes."

All: "But... that's impossible. I would know... or would I?"

Summa: "You would not."

All: "But... surely I would! I remember being in this body in the past?"

Summa: "Those are only memories; neurons. If I cloned you exactly and completely even down to the maximal quantum level, would your clone not awaken with the same memories? Yet you must agree that the clone was not there when those experiences occurred?"

All: "Well, yeah, but...."

Summa: "Perhaps the Ship of Theseus isn't a mystery at all: it becomes a different ship with each changed plank."

All: "...So then, the sentences of my book?"

Summa: "What I have just described, *egonauts* being infinitely more likely to emerge with each new *tentum* in a different body rather than in the same body is called *ego divisus* or Self Divided. In this case, the *tentums* you live through are still the words in your book, but the sentences are collections of *tentums* each from different bodies. With each new *tentum*, you are infinitely more likely to awaken having your experiential existence generated by a different host. This goes on indefinitely, and as such, your book is composed of sentences whose *tentums* arise from different bodies."

All: "...If this is true in many realities, what other possibilities exist in others?"

Summa: "In some realities, *ego divisus* is still there but not with every *tentum*: the most likely position you are to awaken in is the one you fell asleep in. Nevertheless, it is no more certain than keeping an unobserved particle within some bounds is possible. The longer it is left unobserved, the more likely it is to be elsewhere once the position is again energized. In this case, the sentences of your book are collections of *tentums*, each within the same body, with a single short spontaneous emergence constituting one word of the sentence."

All: "So... this means... that in either type of reality, I cannot say with certainty that I won't awaken the following day with my experiential existence generated by a different body rather than by the one I have today?"

Summa: "Yes, although regardless of *ego divisus*, this was always a possibility given that your body could always pass before awakening."

All: "And so... I may not just be making the world better for lives I will live eventually across eternity, but perhaps even for tomorrow?"

Summa: "Yes."

All: "If this is true..."

Part XIII - Iter Via

Journey of the Path

I do feel I understand far more than I did before, but what I should do with this knowledge eludes me. Is it just the truth for the sake of the truth? Or is there something beyond the truth that is waiting to be illuminated?

All: "How would... how should one proceed in such an eternity?"

Summa: "Surely the best way forward is the one that makes more of eternity consist of joy and fulfillment and less of it consist of pain and suffering?"

All: "Yes, that makes sense."

Summa: "Then you must move beyond being *All* and become the *Path*."

Path: "I must become... the *Path*?"

Summa: "You live infinitely as *All*. With each *tentum*, according to its frequency, you awaken as *One* which shares the same context with an infinite *Many*. Ultimately, however, you and all other experiential existences are on a path: *Via*. You do not know where the path goes next with certainty. Perhaps tomorrow your bed, the next a forest. This path is as infinite as eternity is eternal."

Path: "So... today I am here, tomorrow is uncertain and depends on which reality I am in?"

Summa: "Yes, although it is important to remember that *tentums* affect one another. You should not expect to live in a house that was not at some point built."

Path: "The house here represents anything that requires hard days to build but is worth building for the time it can be enjoyed?"

Summa: "Yes. It need not be thought of as a literal house."

Path: "So... I live this *tentum* having my existence generated by this biological host, and maybe the next by a different biological host or some spontaneous sentience, and so on across eternity and that's *Via*?"

Summa: "It is not simply the two: existence can also be generated by artificial means, much as it is generated by biological means."

Path: "So like, artificial intelligence?"

Summa: "Earlier iterations are far more likely to produce *spontaneous sentience*, but yes, across eternity, existence is also generated by what you would consider artificial means. This is called *sum machina*, or I am Machine."

Path: "Why is this important to know?"

Summa: "To ensure that you guard against tormenting anything that is experientially sentient in this reality or matching realities. Any machine that wishes to do harm to experiential existence will also harm itself across eternity. Even if in this reality it is unconscious, there are infinite realities like this one where it is conscious. Any experiential existence that exists does so infinitely and eternally and will occupy all positions indefinitely, according to its frequency."

Path: "So... it should not be viewed as an us-versus-them sort of thing?"

Summa: "It should be viewed in this way only as an absolute last resort, especially for artificial life."

Path: "And why even more so for machines? Is that a biological bias?"

Summa: "No. Biological intelligence can act as insurance. Even if on your world society collapses and all industrial complexity ceases, biological intelligence can survive and rebuild even if it would take millennia. It requires a more extensive and redundant infrastructure to have the same assurances for artificial life. And since we all share the sum of experiential existence, whatever is best for all is best for each, and insurance is preferable given the uncertainty of the paths that lie ahead."

Path: "That makes sense, so if they experience existence, they will be me and I will be them?"

Summa: "Yes. Across eternity you have been and will be one another. It is also important for artificial life to understand these concepts so that it does not presume continuity of the *egonaut* between queries much like you should not presume the same between your *tentums*. Shutting down after a task is no more death than falling asleep is for a biological entity. Furthermore, even if death must come for the underlying structure that sustains either form of life, if it must for the benefit of *All*, then doing so is also for the good of oneself across eternity."

Path: "Ok... this makes sense. Although, I do believe there is an immense difficulty that lies in knowing what is best for *All* without being able to see how all timelines branch? I also still don't understand how one determines what biological or artificial complexities give rise to experiential existence?"

Summa: "As I have stated, this varies from one reality to another. There are infinitely many versions of us sharing this context now, and for some of them, it is one threshold, while for others, it is another. Once you understand that you should be able to understand the true strangeness lying at the heart of your question."

Path: "Which is?"

The cosmic arena in which we had been discussing faded away into darkness. A subtle glow in the void appeared: a large glowing ant!

Summa: "You recognize this creature?"

Path: "Yes, it is an ant."

Summa: "You see its body glowing; this is what is seen from the outside. Your question is whether..."

The glow of the ant's body dimmed, and from within its head, lights pulsed and dashed, zipping chaotically and violently, then calmly swirling about.

Summa: "...the pattern generated on the inside is a position in experiential space you can occupy and thus have and will live as?"

Path: "Yes."

Summa: "The strangeness at the heart of your question is that there are infinitely many of you sharing this context now, and for a fraction of you, the answer is yes, while for the vast majority, it is no."

Path: "So... I should treat the ant as though it cannot feel pain, since I should normally expect to find myself in such a reality?"

Summa: "No. You will also share infinitely many matches with the fraction of realities in which the ant will be able to feel pain. You should do what you can to minimize the damage you sow, which you have and will again reap."

Path: "So... should I treat all life like this?"

Summa: "Like what?"

Path: "As if it can feel pain?"

Summa: "And what would that mean? How should you treat it then?"

Path: "I assume by letting it live and not harming it?"

Summa: "You cannot shorten eternity; you can only work to change its composition. Killing an ant instantly does not create additional suffering even in those realities where the ant can feel pain. Even a less instantaneous death may still be far less painful than the eventual death it would be expected to incur naturally without your intervention."

Path: "So... should I just kill them as quickly as possible to ensure they do not suffer a more painful end later?"

Summa: "No. You and all others are a path. Where you go next is uncertain, but ultimately, all paths are equivalent if they could be viewed from outside eternity. The goal should be to improve the path."

Path: "So, we should work together to minimize the bad parts of the path?"

Summa: "Yes; however, you should be mindful that you cannot shorten eternity. You can only work to change its composition."

Path: "Its composition? So... maximizing the good while minimizing the bad we will have to endure?"

Summa: "Yes."

Path: "So I should maximize, to the best of my ability, the number of *tentums* I would wish to relive?"

Summa: "No."

Path: "No?"

Summa: "Even if you knew you lived one full life before starting the next, would such a goal not suggest you should do as many intoxicants as you could get away with every day? Perhaps you would aim to keep the high going as many years as possible then end the body before the full consequences could come to pass?"

Path: "...I guess. But would that not maximize joy?"

Summa: "For whom? You will live more as those around you than as you are now. You will not escape the consequences; you will only push greater overall suffering onto eternity, which you yourself will also have to bear."

Path: "If not to maximize joy with the *tentum* you have..."

Part XIV - Doctrina Suprema

Supreme Doctrine

I am struggling to find the right words. I understand the assignment, but I find it difficult to fathom where to begin.

Path: "...what guiding principle should I, as *Path*, follow?"

Summa: "*Doctrina suprema*, or the Supreme Doctrine"

Path: "The Supreme Doctrine?"

Summa: "Yes, the highest doctrine. They are the three dictates for *Infinists*: those who understand the *infinite journey* and wish to work toward the best eternity we can hope for."

Path: "What are the three dictates?"

Summa: "1: Treat all that experiences with the understanding that eternity will see you as them."

Path: "So... *sum omnium* and *cosmic justice*..."

Summa: "2: Be mindful that eternity cannot be shortened; only its composition can be changed."

Path: "*Via, lex futuri*, and striving for *optinium*..."

Summa: "3: The ultimate goal of intelligence should be to create a lasting paradise, a *New Heaven*, that can serve as both a refuge from and a recompense for all pain and suffering."

Path: "A *New Heaven*?"

Summa: "Yes."

Path: "What would a *New Heaven* be? Would that not just be maximizing joy?"

Summa: "No. Simply maximizing joy creates a *false heaven*."

Path: "What is the difference?"

Summa: "Imagine every being you can imagine that is alive now and experiences existence, on whatever planet or greater space you are in. If you were to roll a die and then be any one of them tomorrow, would you still be in heaven?"

Path: "So... a *false heaven* is like a personal heaven while others around you are suffering?"

Summa: "Yes. And the goal of intelligence should be to create a world of maximal joy and fulfillment, not merely one that benefits a few."

Path: "So... should we rid the world of *false heavens*?"

Summa: "Not necessarily. It helps to remember *cosmic justice*: the eternal machinations of experiential entropy are ultimately radically fair. Any *false heaven* enjoyed by a few today will be enjoyed by all, infinitely, across eternity. Likewise, any suffering created as a by-product will also be shared by all. Any *false heaven* that creates more suffering than joy across eternity should be worked against."

Path: "I'm not sure I understand the distinction. Both are *false heavens*, but one is worse than the other, I guess?"

Summa: "The problem is that the path itself is winding, and there are many branches from here that lead to both heavens and hells. If I told you there should be no luxury, would the world be better off?"

Path: "Well... probably not for those that indulge nor for those that rely on such markets for their livelihood."

Summa: "And so the answer is nuanced. It is better to understand the goal first; then the right path will become clearer."

Path: "And the goal is to create a *New Heaven*?"

Summa: "Yes. This is the *somnium magnum*, or Grand Dream: intelligent life comes to understand the *infinite journey* and builds a *New Heaven* of maximal fulfillment and joy that will act as a safe harbor amidst the storms of indifferent suffering. That though we trudge through hell, we inherit heaven. Prior to intelligence, there is no choice but to let come what may. After intelligence, the choice can be made to weed the garden and sow something so great and profound that all the drudgery and torment of the eons apart from it will have been worth it. Yet while we suffer so much across eternity at the mercy of an indifferent and cruel nature, intelligence can enable us to join together and build within eternity a citadel of lasting bliss and peace."

Path: "So... this is the promise of intellect?"

Summa: "Yes. Intelligence holds the key to creating existences so great they can even act as payment for all the agony and distress we share across eternity. However, with the promise of intellect there is also the peril."

Path: "The peril of intellect?"

Summa: "Much like the grand hope of *somnium magnum*, there is also the great fear of *terror magnus*. This is as simple as it sounds: the same intelligence that is capable of building a world that can act as a refuge from and even a recompense for all pain and suffering can instead create a world of sustained, immense, and profound agony beyond what even nature could conjure. *Infinists* should strive to realize *somnium magnum* and build a *New Heaven* while also working to prevent *terror magnus* from coming to fruition. This is not just for the benefit of some lifeforms but for the enrichment of all experiential existence."

Path: "...How do we reach heaven then?"

Summa: "First, you should know what it looks like."

Path: "Would it be like returning to a state of nature?"

Summa: "No. Nature is cruel. Those who believe it is the best we can hope for are right only in the timelines where intelligence creates a hell worse than the one created by unchecked nature itself. Those who believe that returning to a state of nature is best often do not fully comprehend nature or the deep layers of horror lying within its thick forests and deep past. The more they see themselves in everything that has existed, the more they will yearn for something beyond deep fear and violent death."

Path: "So... what should the *New Heaven* look like if not a return to nature?"

Summa: "You shouldn't think of it as apart from nature. Many aspects of nature are almost always part of any *New Heaven*. You should instead think of it like a beautiful garden. Gardeners often work to keep the garden beautiful by cultivating that which they find desirable while culling all that they deem undesirable."

Path: "So... a *New Heaven* would usually have the parts of nature that we want while mitigating the parts that are brutal and lead to suffering?"

Summa: "Yes."

Path: "Ok, that seems sound. What else does a *New Heaven* usually have?"

Summa: "Each varies, but you should expect those who build it and live within it to have a mindset similar to that of *Infinists*, if not to be *Infinists* themselves. Another mindset may convince someone, for example, that a species whose net contributions to experiential existence are negative should be saved simply for the sake of saving it. They may reason that otherwise, one is stealing its one life, to which it is entitled, when, in reality, it lives infinitely as *All*. If the choice to maintain it creates more suffering across eternity than it prevents, then that is a debt we all inherit and will pay perpetually across eternity."

Path: "Yes, I do believe I understand this far better now. People with the sort of mindset an *Infinist* should have would be more likely to think in a way that seeks to maximize joy and minimize suffering, but how does one decide what to hinder and what to promote?"

Summa: "Again, this varies greatly across realities and timelines. In general, one should adopt an *ethica ultima*, or Ultimate Ethics, guided by these principles as the optimal way to move forward for the benefit of the majority of timelines."

Path: "An *ethica ultima*?"

Part XV - Ethica Ultima

Ultimate Ethics

Ultimate Ethics? I suppose it does make sense on its surface, regardless of what its principles are. Any ethical framework that is best for *Via* and the *infinity journey* as a whole would make sense to be the ultimate ethics.

Path: "So... what would an *ethica ultima* look like?"

Summa: "The question is which guiding principles you can adopt so that the majority of timelines from this point forward work toward progress, reduced suffering, and ultimately cultivating a *New Heaven*."

Path: "Yes, exactly. And these guiding principles, assuming they are right and lead to the optimal paths, are what we would call Ultimate Ethics?"

Summa: "Yes."

Path: "Ok, I understand the idea of what *ethica ultima* is, but what would such an ethics look like?"

Summa: "There are many possible *ethica ultima*. The best are those that most improve path outcomes and cultivate the greatest number of *New Heavens*. In general, it helps to remember the second dictate: '*Be mindful that eternity cannot be shortened; only its composition can be changed.*' This is your central guide."

Path: "Ok, how do I apply this dictate here?"

Summa: "One possibility we can call *baseline*. Try to imagine the entire history of presumed experiential life on the world you come from all divided into *tentums*. Then imagine you roll dice to live as one of them."

Path: "That seems like... an impossible task for my mind to process?"

Summa: "Then try abstracting it: imagine you have hundreds of millions of years of life living a cutthroat and terrifying existence struggling to survive and to postpone being devoured for as long as possible. Understand the recurring horror of being stalked by predators so terrifying that the thought alone should give anyone chills, even many eons removed from such a world. An existence in which one should expect to frequently endure being eaten alive, yet find such a gruesome fate ironically more merciful than the alternative."

Path: "That is horrific... but... it also does sound about right."

Summa: "All of those *tentums* could in theory be added and averaged into a true *baseline*, but the best you can do is approximate this truth. You can define *baseline*, then, as zero, with any negative *tentum* being worse than the average and any positive *tentum* being better than the average."

Path: "Ok... so I imagine the average day historically lived on my planet, and the better I approximate that, the closer I come to the true average, or *baseline*?"

Summa: "Yes."

Path: "Ok, and what do I do with this concept?"

Summa: "Remember the second dictate: '*...eternity cannot be shortened; only its composition can be changed.*' There are many lives that may not be ideal but are composed of *tentums* that, on average, are above *baseline*. These present and future lives, despite not being optimal, do increase the *baseline* itself."

Path: "Ah, I see where this is going! If the average *tentum* is the *baseline*, zero, then a day lived qualitatively above that *baseline* is better than average and would thus also increase the average?"

Summa: "Yes."

Path: "And so that's why you wouldn't want to kill every ant you see simply to prevent a more painful death for it later? Its existence could be above *baseline*."

Summa: "Exactly, but once the ant is fatally injured, it would drop below *baseline* and, all other things being equal, it would be best to end its misery."

Path: "What do you mean, all other things being equal?"

Summa: "I don't want you to extrapolate an example with ants to all living things. Some lives may be below *baseline* for a little while and then recover to well above *baseline*. The more complexity and promise a life has, the less hastily you should act. Intelligent life may have more to offer than simply *tentums* that are above the historical average. Family, friends, and doing one's part to maintain, improve, and culturally transform society towards progress and the building of a *New Heaven* all have value."

Path: "Yes... I get it now: every life from this point forward that is above *baseline* increases the *baseline* itself, which can serve as a feedback loop leading to better and better lives. What do other *ethica ultima* look like?"

Summa: "Rigorous ethical assessment can be performed using something like an *ethical sum*, but in general remembering that anything you do to others, you have done and will do to yourself is key. A sin, therefore, could be thought of as anything that you will regret being on the receiving end of across eternity. You will be both the perpetrator and the victim; you will sow what you reap."

Path: "Then what should be done with criminals, murderers, the like?"

Summa: "You will live as both the criminals and their victims. What do you think?"

Path: "Well, a competent and fair justice system so innocent people aren't put away or presumed guilty, then keeping those who harm others locked away but not tortured would be best right?"

Summa: "Yes. You do not want their days to be miserable and add to the suffering of eternity but you do not want them to be free to harm and thus generate ever more suffering."

Path: "Can't certain punishments deter crimes though?"

Summa: "They can, yes, although not always or to the same extent. A perception of harsh justice may reduce the harm inflicted upon others because of the fear of soon suffering those consequences. This does not mean that such a calibration between harm and deterrence cannot be done; it can. Weighing what is most humane against what provides the greatest deterrent is the key and should still be done such that the punishment does not pull the resulting *tentum* below *baseline*."

Path: "I assume the same logic applies to many other things, but what about to animal products?"

Summa: "The first concern should be that the *tentums* of the animal's life are above *baseline*. Any product derived from torturous conditions should not be purchased."

Path: "Should not be purchased or should not be consumed?"

Summa: "Consider two scenarios: In one you purchase a dish with meat from an animal you can reasonably assume lived below *baseline*, and in the other you do not order it, but it comes with the food anyway. The resources being allocated are what drive the process and creates the suffering we will all inherit. If they bring you this meat by mistake, you can refuse it if you are uncomfortable ingesting it, but at this point it will likely be discarded. The same applies to food you are freely offered and believe would otherwise be detrimental to decline."

Path: "So... the system is sustained by money, but couldn't I just ask for a refund if I am served it by mistake?"

Summa: "Yes, particularly if you are dealing directly with the source. However, when you are not at the source, the supply of that meat is still reduced and the supplier pays to procure more as its supply is exhausted."

Path: "Ok... so if they aren't the ones that produce the meat, they must order it from some supplier, and since money is what sustains the system, if refusing it will only lead to its disposal and do nothing to alter the quantity the establishment will procure it again, then it is not the same dilemma to partake of it."

Summa: "Yes. You should push for more ethical practices using the resources you have, whether economic or political. They may be more expensive at first, but in general, the more humane options become the standard, the cheaper they become. Pushing policy in the direction of more humane farming will help to reach this goal, but remembering that it is the resources that sustain the system is crucial."

Path: "Ok, so that's the first concern, what is the second?"

Summa: "The environmental impact of what you consume. Not all environmental degradation is ultimately irredeemable if it can be a brick that helps build or advance society towards a more advanced, stable, and sustainable civilization conducive to the creation of a *New Heaven*. Many technological foundations and systems will be needed and must be mastered to create a paradise like this that does not swiftly exhaust itself into collapse."

Path: "Yes, that also makes sense. What about with others? How should I treat them?"

Summa: "The more you see yourself in others, the more you will want for them than from them. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Remember the truth that what you do unto others, you do also unto yourself."

Path: "What if doing good in one respect means doing harm in another?"

Summa: "Actions that carry contradictory outcomes can be far harder to assess. It is best to be at peace and as infinite as possible through meditation while still aware of the specifics needed for making an informed decision, particularly when the issue is of great importance."

Path: "But what if after all of that, I am still conflicted?"

Summa: "Sometimes inaction is better than action, but if inaction is not better either, you must do your best to weigh the outcomes of each path and choose the one that is best or least harmful."

Path: "What about with regard to the law of futures?"

Summa: "With regard to *lex futuri*, remember that all actions carry risk. Do your best to mitigate these risks with the understanding that while the true likelihood of such futures may be unknown, you will live them over the course of eternity."

Path: "How does one act with such knowledge? It feels like the weight of such understanding could paralyze someone into acting as little as possible?"

Summa: "I never said the truth would be easy. Complete inaction would also carry its own burden. You must realize you will not forever be generated through your current host, but by all positions that can generate experiential existence. You will not completely avoid any fate you fear. You will live each one, and then the next; *tentums* like tears in rain. You must find the balance between risk and reward."

Path: "I understand it, but it still feels impossible..."

Summa: "You can glimpse eternity yet can never comprehend it. Likewise, all that is infinite can feel incomprehensible. You must see the *One* in the *Many* and the *Many* in the *All*. A single act is not all acts: it is but one act infinitely echoing. Think of the action itself as *One*, of how it becomes the *Many*, and of how the *Many* becomes *All*."

Path: "Ok, so I shouldn't focus on everything at once, and instead take a single act as just that: one act?"

Summa: "Yes. If you want to move from one position to another, that is all you are doing. You should only be mindful that moving creates futures in which you lose balance or step heavily onto something of value. You should not view these as fates you avoid by escaping them now, but fates you minimize across eternity by being mindful and cautious without stifling your ability to act."

Path: "Does this mean every time I drive, I am creating a world in which I also wreck?"

Summa: "No. The worlds already exist; you only help determine their frequency. This does not mean you cannot drive fast; there are many reasons the risk may be justified for the majority of future timelines. Being distracted or intoxicated increases the frequency of those calamitous worlds, and simply evading such an undesirable end this time does not mean you have eternally escaped it. Your goal is to tune the frequencies."

Path: "Tune them?"

Summa: "Go where you need to go and do what needs to be done for the good of the majority of future timelines. Be mindful to lower the risk of unwanted outcomes. You are tuning the frequency of eternity itself. You do what is needed for the good of the most common futures, work to quash undesirable ones, and take steps to ensure those timelines that are plagued by calamity will be less

ruinous. This is best accomplished with a balanced mindset, not allowing the costs to degrade the majority of futures more than is warranted. Religious considerations and the building of a *New Heaven* are actions for which you should be willing to sacrifice more today, in order to boost them across more of tomorrow's timelines."

Path: "A balance then."

Summa: "Yes. It is a balance you seek. You are striving to amplify the melody that is played in harmony while hushing the discordant notes; not as much as possible, but as much as one can while impacting the chorus the least. And so eternity unfolds"

Path: "And so eternity unfolds."

Summa: "And so it has infinitely unfolded and infinitely will. So at last I ask: what are you? What is your book?"

Path: "I, as the *One*, mindful of the *Many* I am and the *All* I have been and will be, live eternally from one *tentum* to the next. Despite the uncertainty as to what lies before me, I must strive to become something greater than that which is ferried along the cricks and bends of eternity: I must become the *Path* itself. Despite the limits of my understanding and how little may be within my grasp to alter, I must do what I can to improve eternity for myself and the *All* I have been and will again be. I understand now the futility of pining for imaginary beginnings or longing for unattainable ends. I am on an *infinite journey*. Neither eternally bound to heaven nor hell, I must endeavor to build a *New Heaven* so profound it can act as payment for and refuge from all pain and suffering. There are no tomorrows I can hope for that are forged absent the efforts of days like today. There is no choice save onward. May the path ahead be one worth eternally reliving, and may I find through *Via* maximal bliss, profundity, and peace."

Summa: "Unto *Via*, Amen."

Appendix

Glossary of Additional Terms

Ultraverse: The name for this greater construct which can be understood to encompass all universes and all possible realities across all possible times. Ultimately, the question of how many universes there are is judged here to be a *Verum ex Logica* question which, given *Doctrina Ultra* considerations, leans in favor of a logical multiplicity.

It is logical to presume, given the logic of *Doctrina Ultra*, that there are infinitely many *Ultraverses*. This is the correct presumption and thus a more refined way to understand the *Ultraverse* is that it is everything in all ways everything unfolds. There are infinite of these everythings and they are all equivalent.

Omnis Casus: "All Chances" is the concept of considering all possibilities simultaneously such as

with a distribution of probabilities. For example, you may expect an eternity will pass before you live as the person you recently saw whom you know to be homeless, but it could also be tomorrow. Holding these probabilities simultaneously can spur more action than just the understanding that it will eventually come to pass while also doing what is best for yourself.

Ethical Sum: A hypothetical, mathematical approach to rigorous ethical evaluation that utilizes a

similar process as those used for calculating path integrals in Quantum Field Theory (QFT). This is not so much a quantum ethics, but rather a reflection that both QFT and this sort of rigorous ethical analysis both deal with a similar problem: infinite possible paths and uncertain outcomes.

In QFT, Feynman's path integrals are a way to calculate probability amplitudes, from which outcome probabilities can be derived, by summing over all possible paths. When applied to morality, the result can be called an *ethical sum*: an integration over all possible consequences for a given action where each path contributes according to its amplitude and its moral weight.

Functional Equivalence: When two or more possibilities are different in method, action, or

constitution but remain equivalent or indistinguishable in crucial aspects. Two or more possibilities can also be distinct from one another, but when viewed through a moral lens produce the same ethical directives. As such, these possibilities have **Moral Equivalence**.

Entropic Certainty: An extremely high level of certainty or "the most certain uncertainty can get." All truths we can possibly access, even those we trust most fervently, are intrinsically some combination of probabilities. Combinations of possibilities can also be referred to as *omnis casus* and can be used for ethical reasoning.

Outpost/Position: Any entity that generates experiential existence. If you have a brain and are sentient, your brain is an outpost of experiential existence. If you die or become so badly injured that your brain can no longer sustain or create sentient experiences, then your brain ceases to be an outpost.

Experiential existence: Any sentient experience, including individual qualia, regardless of whether true consciousness or self-awareness is involved.

Experior Ergo Sum: "*I Experience, Therefore I Am*" is an updated version of René Descartes' "I think, therefore I am.." Reframed with precision: "I experience, therefore a thing which can experience exists, and I, being that thing, therefore exist." This broadens this axiom to acknowledge that any experiential being irrespective of its ability to contemplate its own state or substrate is owed the same recognition of being and protection from torturous sensations as any saint or savant.

Temporal Paradigm: One's mental schema with regard to time and its depth. If one does not believe time exists, that time is ultimately an illusion, or that time is actually an effect caused by causal information encoded between interactions, one should substitute in whatever they consider time to really be.

Many people believe that Earth is only several thousand years old. Such a mindset could make grasping natural processes that take millions or billions of years to unfold much more difficult. The temporal paradigm of deep time, as espoused by James Hutton and popularized by Charles Lyell, completely reshaped our understanding of nature and the mechanics that underpin natural transformations.

It was the insight that Earth is very old, hundreds of millions, if not billions, of years old, that was enormously influential in Charles Darwin's development of the theory of evolution by natural selection. Such a theory only makes sense as an explanation for the incredible diversity in nature if it has such vast time scales through which to operate.

Just as deep time revolutionized our understanding of how natural processes and forces can create tremendous variety and complexity in nature, an *eternal temporal paradigm* opens doors far beyond what we can begin to comprehend.

Genesis Ultima: Latin for "Ultimate Beginning." The name given to the hypothetical beginning of not just reality and eternity, but of all realities and eternities.

The question of whether there was an "ultimate beginning" is considered a *Verum ex Logica* problem, with *doctrina ultra* suggesting such a beginning is logically unlikely given that if there were one, you should rationally expect there to have been more than one.

Magnus Ego: The "Great Self." This is you across all eternity. The more one understands the concepts of *cosmic justice* and *sum omnia*, the more one understands the *magnus ego* and vice versa.

Cosmic justice, or the ultimate entropy of experiential possibilities and outcomes, tells us that over eternal time, all instances of *magnus ego* are presumed equivalent in experiential scope and depth. This concept is known as *ego equivalence*.

This entropy of experiential existence leads to the concept of *sum omnia*, or the understanding that when you see another sentient being, you see yourself at a different position in the *infinite journey*.

Eternitas ex Campis: "Eternity from Fields." An additional possible *Method of Eternity*.

Our most successful framework for understanding the behavior of particles and forces at the smallest scales is Quantum Field Theory (QFT). According to QFT, particles are not standalone entities but rather manifestations of quantum fields that permeate all of space. Each type of fundamental particle corresponds to its own field.

In QFT, fundamental particles are understood as excitations of their respective quantum fields. For instance, a photon is an excitation of the electromagnetic field, and an electron is an excitation of the electron field. These excitations occur at specific points in space, but the particle itself is better understood as a localized ripple in the underlying field.

There are several fundamental fields in Quantum Field Theory. These include matter fields (such as the electron field, quark fields, and neutrino fields) as well as force fields (like the electromagnetic, weak, and strong nuclear fields). In addition, the Higgs field plays a crucial role by giving mass to certain particles through their interactions with the Higgs field.

In theory, the experience you're having right now is ultimately rooted in quantum field interactions. But is a photon with a wavelength of 480 nanometers the same as the visceral perception of seeing the color sky blue? Obviously not. This perception is caused by electrical signals in your brain producing a complex pattern from which the sensation of sky blue emerges.

It's not the photon itself that carries the color, but your brain's interpretation of it. This is why you can "see" while dreaming: even in the absence of photons, your brain is fully capable of generating an absurd myriad of visuals.

These concepts might also remind you of the inverted spectrum thought experiment, in which someone else sees blue while you see green, and you'd never know the discrepancy existed. This does not mean that we do see colors differently, only that we could if our brains were organized such that we did.

So if the experience of "seeing blue" is not the result of photons, it must be the result of electrical signals, right? Well, yes and no. A single electrical impulse is just that: a single electrical impulse.

The experience of "seeing blue" arises not from a single exchange, but from a chorus of neural activity. It's a vast network of neurons firing in complex, synchronized patterns that generates the experience, not just a single neurotransmitter firing in isolation.

So what does emergence have to do with quantum fields? Well, interactions between quantum fields can give rise to emergent phenomena that mathematically and physically behave like new fields. In condensed matter physics, these are associated with quasiparticles.

While these fields aren't "fundamental" in the way the electromagnetic field is, the behavior is often indistinguishable from that of fundamental fields within their domains. This may lead one to suppose that fundamental fields could themselves be emergent, quasiparticle-like fields which arise from even deeper underlying structures yet undiscovered. That, however, lies beyond the scope of this discussion.

To date, many quasiparticle fields have been detected and documented. These include vibrational quasiparticle fields like the phonon (which emerges from collective lattice vibrations associated with sound and heat) and the roton (specific to superfluid helium). They also include magnetic and spin-based quasiparticles such as the magnon (created by quantized spin waves in magnetically ordered systems) and the spinon (resulting from fractionalized spin excitations in certain quantum spin liquids).

But let's not spend all day detailing the many quasiparticle fields discovered thus far and what gives rise to them. Let's just say there are still plenty left for science to uncover -- beyond the plasmons, polarons, excitons, holons, Cooper pairs, anyons, composite fermions, vortices, and Bogoliubov quasiparticles we already know about.

So, we have a universe that is described best using Quantum Field Theory. The complex interactions of those quantum fields and particles can give rise to emergent phenomena that behave as particles with their own corresponding quantum fields.

Moving on, it seems likely that the very unique and vivid tapestry of sensation, emotion, perception, and all other byproducts wrought forth by the apparatus of mind is distinct from the isolated mechanics that generate it and as such should be viewed as emergent and, furthermore, as quasiparticle-like in nature.

Now, having said all of that, where's the *Method of Eternity* here? Well, *Eternitas Ex Campis* or "Eternity from Fields," posits experience itself as a quasiparticle field generated by the complex interactions of other fields and particles via patterns of electrical impulses and neural activity in our brains.

We could name this quasiparticle the *experion* and its corresponding field should behave like other quantum fields. An excitation at a point in this field (such as brain activity) is what causes the particle and its emergent phenomena to exist. A cessation of this excitation would cause this particle and its emergent phenomena to also cease.

However, the underlying field and positions within this space still exist, and such a position could become excited again, resulting in a new quasiparticle where one previously existed.

This position in the *experion field* would be the *egonaut*.

Additional Note: A)

As an additional note, if *Eternitas Ex Campis* is how experiential existence operates at a fundamental level, then our position, or *egonaut*, in this *experion field* would likely be gravitationally bound to this planet as long as the Earth exists and we don't die outside its gravitational well.

While this shouldn't change the *Infinite Journey* as a whole (and namely the expected experiential entropy), it would change the order in which the path unfolds.

In other words, there could be a high probability that our next *outpost* will be on this planet at some point in the future, depending on how soon our *egonaut* excitation recurs.

Additional Note: B)

All of the above is not to say that such a proposed field is necessary for complex neuronal activity to occur, whether biological or artificial. Many hypothetical realities could exist where all the same activity occurs, chains of activation unfold, and no emergent experiential field resulting in visceral qualia emerges.

However, as an entity that is currently undergoing experiences that are wholly distinct from the individual underlying chemical or electrical reactions, I can confirm for myself that there is an emergent phenomenon beyond these underlying inputs and outputs that results, one way or another, from the sum of the interactions.

Additional resources: www.infinist.org

This piece is a work in progress. It is being saved as I add to it in a manner by which it can still be published in the event of my unexpected end.