

This paper addresses the viability of human survival. You don't need to agree with it; but, you do need to read it. It's purposely substantive to provoke dialogue. It dissects the cause which has led to the convergence of **weapons of human annihilation** with an ever growing field of **complexity** that is inherently prohibitive to their containment. Since no constraints on either antagonist exists, it is absolutely essential that we find a way to contain them before they destroy us. The option I've included is not a solution, but it does serve to provide an interim focus that can buy much needed time.

Although we've previously lacked definitive proof, it is now evident that the "**thought process**" that has provided us with the foundations, precepts, and presuppositions that we have come to rely upon is fated to promote our destruction. That's because of its affinity for "**Incomprehensible complexity**" – or, that which defies rational thought while supporting a sophisticated ignorance and the attendant arrogance that insures conflict by way of divide. This 'thought process' promotes itself by way of the juxtaposition of purpose in time. This inclines us to surrender the present for an unobtainable future, the imaginings of which have led to the compounding of quantity past the point where singularity can understand its relevance. On the way to our actualization of its inherency, this 'thought process' has provided us with both beneficial as well as detrimental results. Of singular concern is the means by which to affect "**human annihilation**." The arrival of this impending finality constitutes the missing proof which confirms that the unchecked expansion of information is inherently terminal to us. And yet it continues, lauded by those seeking advantage as the creativity of imagination. As complexity builds, confusion inevitably escalates, thus providing bias with cover for initiating conflict. This easement thus completes our vulnerability. All that remains is improving the efficiency by which our destruction will occur.

The Mechanics at Play – A breakdown of the natural and societal systems that support life on earth is now undeniable. Our contribution to it is already excessive. Yet, we continue to grow this fault exponentially. Our penchant for excess is directly traceable to a **fundamental mismatch in potential** between us and the thought 'process' we use to parse our reality. We are temporal in extension while it is unbounded in scope. Due to this mismatch, its possibility always eclipses our capability to envision it. This translates to an insatiable drive to gain unobtainable objectives. That proclivity has corrupted our language. Instead of serving the present it now serves a hypothetical future it can't encompass. The result is 'incomprehensible complexity,' which is inherently destructive to who and what we are. Its emergence confirms that the origin of our thought 'process' is not a codependent product of our difference; but, like the non physical existence of consciousness resident within physicality, both are ends in themselves. Where and how they originated is anyone's guess. We can't know, because the answer eclipses our capability to do so. What we do know is that in order to survive the use of this 'thought process,' it must be constrained. If it isn't, instances of excessive complexity will continue to multiply until they force destruction upon us. How close to that end are we? See "Cause for Urgency" at: <http://edenorg.com/edp-001b.htm>.

The thought 'process' to which I refer is reflective by function making it successive by application. As such it is linear or "quantitative" by description. And although it shares a beginning with a host, it then progresses by way of successive reflections towards ever more inclusive conclusions that are potentially endless. It is this unboundedness that causes a seductive inclination in us to pursue objectives that eclipse the boundaries central to the preservation of ourselves. With that violation, so goes our ability to control linearity and thus ourselves. So, although we are inseparably bound to linearity as our only means by which to know, its unrestricted use is inescapably terminal to us. **Consequently, it does NOT contain a solution to the threat of extinction that it poses for us.** Instead, extending its application in search of such a solution only hastens the inevitability endemic to our use of it.

Constraining linearity won't be easy. After all, it's the only game in town. And, in spite of the threat in evidence, it has undoubtedly provided us with many insights that have positively progressed the quality of our life. In return, we have tended to put a human face on it. However, that changes nothing. Linearity is still a purely deterministic process. And, as such, it can have no vested interest in either its own or our continued survival. Consistent with that, it yields both constructive and destructive ideas with the same force. Due to the wanton progression of its negative factor, we are now flirting with our own destruction. To make matters worse, we have yet to venture very far (emotionally) from the tree out which we've fallen. Hence, we're vulnerable to both insecurity and fear. This has caused many advancements in technology to find their way into weapons of destruction in the name of self defense. Unfortunately, their use is too often governed by rationally deficient (ego centered) individuals that are both morally and ethically bankrupt. This exposes us to bad decision making. The dead and wounded who have been conscripted to serve their purposes (throughout time) bear ample testimony to this.

To try and grasp the scope and immediacy of this problem, let's look at how far we've managed to progress our capability to yield complexity. Currently, super computers utilizing algorithms (a set of assumptions that appear to be relative to an objective being sought) are driven against a compilation of data (increments of assumed relevance) at speeds approaching 55 petaflops. The term petaflop is used to characterize a computer's ability to perform **one quadrillion floating point calculations per second**. That's a thousand trillion operations or 1 followed by 15 zeros. Now multiply that by 54. If you find it difficult to wrap your head around this number you're not alone. To put it in some kind of perspective: If everyone that ever lived was capable of coming together to try and decipher the certainty inherent to a calculation reached by way of just one second of run time (on the world's fastest machine) they would be unable to do so during their collective life time. The reasons are many, and the sheer quantity of information is definitely one. The fact that the parameters defining the attempt are ever changing doesn't help either. However, there are far more substantive problems here that can't be overcome quantitatively – problems that are endemic to the attempt itself.

At the core of it all is our inability to define the underlying foundation that allows for the sameness, and yet difference, between the self, linearity, and its many machinations. As a result, we can't know the "exact" point in either space or time where one increment of difference ends in order to give way to yet another – a necessity for us to definitively link them with 'certainty to ourselves and thereby to one another. To try and overcome this problem, we're reduced to proposing "hypothetical" starting points (or constants) by which to quantify all difference. Imagination provides for their distinction; relativity their foundation; and consensus their believability. And, all attempted linkage is thereafter constrained by way of these abstracts; or, that which is necessary to bridge the fundamental difference in temporality between us, what we believe we know, and the means by which we come to know it. Since 'certainty' is forever missing from this equation, all linkage is immediately reduced to approximation. This in turn relegates conclusion to assumption. It must then undergo interpretation at the hands of bias to find application. Yet, oblivious to it all, mankind plods merrily on its way with its faith firmly planted in the ever growing "alternate abstract reality" that technology (via linearity) promotes. In the process, the expanding field of assumption progressively contaminates the self's ability to retain its singularity.

Computers accelerate this problem by compressing larger and larger bodies of data into shorter and shorter intervals of time. Intervals that are inherently foreign to us. As these aggregates impact upon us, they cause an alteration in the way the self sees itself. Instead of retaining its singularity, consciousness is seen to fracture into conflicting parts – one being singular, one being plural, and one being total and/or universal in objective. This loss of foundational focus makes the self prone to the hypothetical

singularity attributed to the unity of society. In this way, the self becomes vulnerable to societal objectives and the laws that claim to advance its cause. As the more aggressive succeed in forcing acquiescence in the name of societal objectives, the innate value of the “human person” is progressively reduced until it is seen to be of little or no consequence. This counter intuitive reductionism has now escalated to the point where killing by reference to "collateral damage" is believed to be justifiable by principals representing Nation States in their quest for global dominance.

In the process of being systematically debased, the self's need to assign value to its function undergoes a shift to the material world. Due to its dependence upon linearity's unbridled potential, that shift winds up manifesting as an insatiable appetite bent upon realizing yet to be obtained objectives. Bigger, faster and stronger increments of perceived advantage come to serve as a closest approach to materializing the unobtainable. Efficiency emerges as a constant relative to the attempt. It then transitions to aggressiveness as a means to secure advantage in the face of limited opportunity. Greed arises from one's pre-occupation with the need for advantage. It intensifies as the insecurity it causes increases. Eventually, greed becomes all consuming – for one can never get enough of what they don't need. In the end, process and process reliant objectives come to dominate the self. Materialism is but an interim focus for self destruction which is the innate eventuality in play – it stemming from our vain attempt to try and contain linearity within temporality.

At the same time that linearity is instilling unrealistic approximations of reality into man's psyche that are based upon an analysis of assumptions regarding mankind's potential (were he not temporally bound) it is also imbedding in us the necessity for our continued reliance upon its progression into complexity – in order to obviate any advantages that competing position might gain from concretizing aspects of linearity's progression first. In particular, concern centers around the advancement of thought relative to more efficient weapons of control and destruction. In this way, **linearity instills fear into the human equation that promotes its continuance under the guise of insuring ours.**

It's time to wake up. The need to employ the idea of “mutually assured destruction,” as a means to deter the use of ‘weapons of human annihilation,’ clearly confirms that the advancement of destructive technology has already become self defeating. Even the passive acceptance of this idea is inherently damaging to one's moral/ethical integrity. That's because it condones the reduction of ALL life to a world without realization, or **suicide without benefit**. Since the result is blatantly purposeless, the idea is clearly moronic. With the threat of human annihilation now in evidence, while idiocy attempts to justify its continuance with nonsensical rhetoric, the danger that linearity poses to humankind should be more than evident.

Given the veneration that linearity's progression now enjoys (via socially based education) capping it won't be easy. It's also evident that the financial sector in league with big business is going to object to any attempt to contain quantity – believing that they have the most to lose. And, from a strict quantitative cents (\$) that appears to make sense. But, we're not talking about possessions here. We're talking about the promise of life itself. And when that goes, one's possessions become totally irrelevant – as in death. So, whatever sense of long term security one places upon their possessions, it is destined to prove meaningless if linearity can't be constrained. For linearity doesn't just hold the key to destroying some life, it holds the key to destroying the essence of life itself, inclusive of that of one's progeny, thus rendering legacy meaningless. If that scenario doesn't sit well with you, then it's essential that you join with us to try and turn this thing around.

Currently, 1% of the population owns the game. They also control the resources necessary to ensure that its outcome remains favorable to them. What is not understood is that linearity is the root cause of this imbalance – because of its spiral nature. As such, it promotes repetitive cycling from singularity to multiplicity, to ever greater forms of compounded unity, each of which serves as singularity for the next cycle. Whoever or whatever remains constant between cycles therefore comes to possess that which is concretized by way of them. This accounts for the acquisition of wealth as well as power. It's a natural outgrowth of linearity's progression. However, that does not exonerate those who are privileged with regard to how they use it. Moral/ethical responsibility necessarily remains particulate.

Despite misinformation to the otherwise, the world's economy continues to grow more and more unstable. And, as linearity progresses into complexity that is destined to increase. A recent analysis by professors at Berkeley and the Paris School of Economics indicates that 95% of the economic gains made since the last recession have gone to the top 1%. In other words, fewer and fewer individuals continue to control more and more, a predictable outcome from our attempt to contain linearity within temporality. The "sad" consequence from this lies in the cost that this consolidation of power has on the less fortunate. When it leads to the restriction of basic essentials, it transitions from being a natural out growth of linearity's progression to being a foundational obstruction to its continuance. It does this by breeding greater and greater systemic instability.

For those interested, here is how the few manage to maintain and increase their control. Carl Rove egotistically let this insight in a recent interview. He said...

"We (the 1%) act and while you're studying that reality—judiciously, as you will—we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can also study, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors... and you, all of you, are left to just study what we do."

So, in effect, by initiating repetitive actions of adequate consequence, sufficient time is removed from the equation for implementing a response. It can't be done, due to the changes that occur during the time needed to understand how to institute one. This makes their trap fool proof, thus insuring that those in control retain control. And, up until now it has served them well. **But, due to the impending threat that linearity now poses to ALL of us (including the privileged) everyone is reduced to the same necessity.** And, if the privileged choose to ignore that fact, they'll come to suffer just like everyone else – even though it may take a little longer in the case of some of the rich.

How long this inequity can persist remains to be seen. As it does, unrest continues to grow. If history can be believed, this unrest will inevitably spill over into the streets – for morality is obligated to seek a temporal resolve to inequity regardless of the consequences. With 'weapons of human extinction' in the hands of the fearful, as Chaos progressively onsets by way of complexity, it obviously doesn't bode well for anyone. If we are to stand any chance of turning this thing around, the privileged need to get on board quickly. For, without their resources mankind's destruction is all but a given.

Although this picture definitely looks bleak, there is still some room for hope here. That's because linearity's threat to human survival is of "universal" proportion, thus making it singularly unique. As such, it constitutes the 1st credible cause for "universal" cooperation around which all divergent position can finally coalesce. Short of an alien invasion, no other objective holds this promise by way of necessity. In spite of the promise in evidence here, the question still remains. What can be realistically done to turn our impending fate around?

It only serves to reason that sufficient education must precede any and all attempts at sculpting a solution capable of insuring human survival. However, because of the magnitude of this objective, a credible foundation capable of demonstrating “international neutrality” needs to be established first. Since the “uniting of nations” has now lost viability, **the sole remaining option is to convey responsibility into the hands of the people that make up this World.** This can be done by offering them a way to contribute to the identification of those “questions” whose answers can best resolve the “critical issues” now under consideration in the international arena. Why seek questions as opposed to answers? Because, they constitute the least confrontative aspect of human knowing around which “cooperation” can coalesce. And, ‘cooperation’ is the Holy Grail of conflict resolution.

Once this initial approach gains acceptance, it can then serve as a stepping stone to address the greater problem – linearity’s threat to human survival. The goal in both instances is to provide the means to create a **unity of intent** around a singularity of objective that is both relevant and yet non-threatening, in order to improve “**trust**” between all peoples. It is this ‘trust’ that is essential to both the sculpting and implementation of any viable solutions that might come from these efforts. Whatever the outcome, this is the only chance we have to try and make the needed difference. There is no other way to contain linearity by way of linearity. So, don’t be deceived into believing that any exist. **More of what got us into this mess CAN’T get us out of it, regardless of what that imagining looks like.** The only chance we have that doesn’t continue to grow the field of complexity, and hence our vulnerability to it, requires turning linearity upon itself. And, utilizing question provides the only way.

The first step towards achieving this much needed goal can be found on the Eden Institute's web site at <http://edenorg.com>. International “lip service” legitimizing this effort is already significant. Hence, the groundwork has already in place. "Endorsements" can be found at: <http://edenorg.com/edp-001a.htm>. A workable route to implementation does not appear on this site. It does however exist! It has been purposely omitted to insure that this effort is not prematurely subverted by self absorbed ignorance. All necessary particulars for initiating contact can also be found on this site.

To affix relevant value to thought, some people require far greater detail than others. For those who fall into this category, I have provided what I "believe" to be the more subtle dynamics at play in this unfolding tragedy that’s been visited upon us. Be forewarned though, language is often inadequate when attempting to render the dynamics central to an understanding of how we are able to think – as opposed to what we are able to think about. That's because words necessary to this edification are already inclined towards the explication of the latter. That's why "knowledge theory" lags the rest of our fields of inquiry. **It’s not necessary that you comprehend this subtlety, but it does add another dimension to one’s understanding of how we got to where we’re at.** If you try, it’s best to read this material through to its end, even though portions of it may initially appear to be unintelligible. With successive re-framing that should change. Afterwards, legitimate concern can be addressed through future correspondence. However you choose, a consideration of the final “**Summation**” is still in order.

It’s only normal to wonder how we could have found association to that which is unbounded given the fact that we’re limited. And, all the great thinkers have been thus absorbed. In spite of linearity’s unfettered potential (which we obviously lack) we have managed to find temporary relevance to it by way of the possibility for endless process that is inherent to human progeneration. In other words, theoretically, through the linking of linearity’s potential to the unobstructed continuance of human possibility,

however realistic that may or may not be. This linkage inadvertently causes process to be forever dynamic even though the objective of its quest is always static. And, it is this living paradox that explains the individual's tendency to confuse its significance with that of an expanding collective.

Although this linking allows us to use linearity, it limits consciousness' conception of itself to being an undefinable functionary that is potentially unbounded. This then lays the foundation for a further link between unlimited potential and that which prevents its unfolding. This conjunction assumes to form as **dichotomy** – or, the means by which the possibility for obstruction finds association to the potential for unfolding by way of 'process.' In other words, dichotomy is the form by which the conjoining of opposites result in successive states of “nothing” that come to constitute “something” in the form of a 'process' that doesn't preclude its own unfolding by way of its product.

To restate: All dichotomies are comprised of opposing difference that is self canceling. As a result, they yield “nothing” obstructive, relevant to the parent association. The successive proposal of dichotomy establishes a 'process' by which distinction within the field of 'nothing' occurs in the form of “zero” comprised of successive “zeros.” This 'nothing' is actually the ‘something’ that inherently ensures continuity within consciousness. It also allows consciousness to assume to the form of being a singularity (one) by way of its function or process. The conjoining of **unlimited potential** (inherent to linearity) with **limited temporality** (innate to the individual) by way of **possibility** (attributable to the potential for endless generations) has a downside. Because of the incongruity in the temporal structure of these elements, all conclusion reached via reflection is reduced to assumption. This is born out by the fact that there is no linear (temporal) link between 'zero' and 'one' or 'one and 'zero' by way of process. Instead, there is only an endless digression and or progression (respectively) of incremental difference. The reason is due to “**reflection,**” or the means by which possibility finds sequential actualization within the self.

Without a host and its ability to **reflect** linearity would be unable to manifest. But, the price it pays for doing so always includes a residual in the form of an additional movement that is necessary to qualify each incrementation. As such, it is ‘reflection’ that prevents linearity from yielding an objective absolute. In other words, ‘reflection’ imparts an endless necessity for movement to process in order to try and complete what it inherently prevents itself from realizing. The substrate integral to and upon which the sequencing of attempts sit is called “**time.**” Like the process that births it, 'time' too is unbounded. Together, their unboundedness indelibly confirms linearity's inability to encompass an objective absolute. As a result, all reflective beings are left without a confirmable foundation in the form of an unchanging ‘one’ (**certainty**) upon which to qualify idea.

IF process was infinitely capable all difference could be successfully conjoined. And, this is the impetus behind faster and faster computation – the transformation of possibility into form, or succession into simultaneity. However, the closest approach to realizing this objective requires the actualization of "something" that is inherently different from 'nothing,' while still sharing its form. In other words, the actualization of an all encompassing 'one' by way of 'zeroes.' **IF** this was possible, process would then become (for itself) a true “objective” difference from which all of its many parts could be posited with ‘**certainty.**’ However, because of the unboundedness of linearity, and hence its ability to yield endless 'zeros' by way of dichotomy, process lacks the possibility for its own completion. Nonetheless, the attempt to conjoin opposites can still be sustained relative to a host's limited temporality. And, the mechanics involved in doing so are always the same. So, even though the underlying objective (the qualification of ‘**certainty**’) is lost by way of the approach, what arises from this attempt is a marginal “relativism” between the many aspects of assumed difference – all of which are further associable to one

another as limitations to the host. It is this association that affords us our communal sense of 'time.' **And, it is in this way that we come to believe that we know something about something, even though we can never confirm with 'certainty' what that something is.**

A lot of ground has been covered here in a very short period of time. Therefore, I will recap for the sake of clarity. The conjoining of opposites, by way of process, yields a relative form of 'nothing' comprised of successive 'zeros' for the entertaining host. And, the mechanics by which this occurs are always the same, regardless of whatever opposites are being conjoined by way of dichotomy. This in turn allows repetitive function to assume to the form of being a 'one' even though it is comprised of a multiplicity of 'zeros' which are perceived as being different, based upon their specific relevance to changes that occurred within the host during the attempt to reduce those opposites to 'nothing.' **Due to the multiplicity resulting from successive reflection, it is evident that process does not provide access to an objective or singular 'anything.'** Nonetheless, when differences find association by way of the same identical approach, they wind up having a common relevance to each other as well as to the host(s) attempting to facilitate their conjoining.

This shared commonality then becomes the ground upon which the acceptability of "convention" rests. So, it is the differences between what was initially sought – a single successful merge of all difference in the form of 'nothing' – the successive reduction of perceived difference to 'nothing' by way of process – and what the functionary actually experiences within the steady state of one's self during this attempt (via 'reflection') – that becomes the substance of what comprises our world of thought. Due to the changes in self that occur during the attempt to distinguish and conjoin, yet another indeterminate enters into this equation. It centers around whether the self initiating the inquiry is really the same self appraising oneself of the result. Since it is impossible to know, because of the potential effect that framing the inquiry has had upon the self, this prevents actual confirmation of whether the initial objective (a successful merge of difference) was achieved. To try and compensate for this liability, all elements associated with the attempt must be available to the ever changing form of the self (when needed) to insure that nothing of substance changed, so as to prevent belief in a successful merge. Hence, we are left with a process within a process to try and confirm both approach and outcome relative to an initial objective. Although this is sufficient to establish 'convention,' it can't authenticate fact with regard to reality.

Nonetheless, it can and does establish process as the dominate element in the life of the self – regardless of the cost. Cease to ascertain continuity within relative certainty and it causes the loss of any "hope" of substantiating a valid foundation upon which to thereafter link difference. However, since unconstrained process inevitably yields 'incomprehensible complexity,' it simultaneously undermines any 'hope' that this march into complexity is survivable, let alone capable of delineating reality. So in effect, **we are being mindlessly led into a relative form of chaos, through the unconstrained use of process, even as we are being stripped of any 'hope' that it contains a solution to the dilemma it creates.** And, as fate would have it, due to the mismatch in grounding between the self and the potential inherent to linearity, it was inevitable that we would wind up exactly where we are. In big trouble!

Unaware of this liability en-route, we have mindlessly forged ahead. However, because the actualization of thought is dependent upon the contrasting of opposing positions (dichotomy) for determining an unchanging foundation for one's self, linearity winds up validating both the beneficial as well as the detrimental compliment of each attempt. Over time, because the obstruction to beneficial unfolding is less labor intensive than its maintenance, the convergence of unwanted factors have slowly but surely tipped the scales in their favor. In addition, because the quantity of information defining difference is constantly

increasing, the ability to neutralize the negative result has become ever more complicated – **IF** indeed it still remains possible at all. **The inability to realize a successful merge between opposites translates to the increasing polarity that now dominates everything from politics, to religion, to life styles, to the economy.** Indirectly, it even affects the weather through inaction. And, it's destined to get worse. For, linearity (due to its unbounded nature) inherently promotes irresolvable complexity which prevents the neutralization of difference through compromise. If you didn't consider the material supplied via the "Cause for Urgency" link, you should do so now. (<http://edenorg.com/edp-001b.htm>)

Traditionally, the difference between 'zero' as the ultimate form of 'one' and process as the relative form of 'one' is tied to the ideas of objectivity and subjectivity. And, in an ideal world of thought that would be the end of it. However, given the presence of a host with inherent limitations, these differences have undergone yet another split. Regarding this secondary split: **Objectivity** pertains to the primacy of unity within process as the singularity by which process finds relevance to the singularity of the self. On the other hand, **Subjectivity** pertains to the primacy of multiplicity comprised of a potentially endless number of self contained unities circumscribed by the unboundedness of process as the singularity by which it finds relevance to the self. This unboundedness of process is characterized by a push into the unknown from the unity of self as it is presupposed from its dependence upon the unity of process.

A consideration of boundaries should add more clarity to this discourse. **Boundaries** are what affix limitation to the way in which we see and comprehend meaning in the world around us. In physics, the foundational boundaries of thought – as reality is imagined to be – are presumed to rest upon our ability to distinguish between "space" and "time" as they provide location within the "place" of ourselves. If this is true, then an understanding of boundaries is of paramount importance to understanding who and what we are, along with the responsibility that comes with our ability to think. Hopefully, the included **diagram** will help clear up existing confusion between what we believe we know, what we believe we can know, and what we know we can never know – because of the temporal limitations that physicality brings to the table. It should also clear up the reason why we must view the unknowable as a plurality as opposed to the singularity that linearity would otherwise ascribe to it – so as not to include a paradox within itself which would defeat its claim to unity via continuity. It's for this very reason that language only supports the existence of one unknowable.

As you view the diagram at the end of this discourse: the relative form of the “unknowable” that precedes mind's awareness of itself is necessarily different than the relative form of the ‘unknowable’ that comes to be post self – due to the activity that self contributes to this equation via linearity. This temporally bound relationship between these unknowables serves as our only touchstone to what constitutes “**actuality**” beyond the framework of our reality. To prevent the contamination of our interface with that 'actuality,' we superimpose everything we are able to distinguish upon its opposing difference, in order to reduce the residual to 'zero' as defined by one act of process – or, the same quantitative result that comes from trying to link the two ‘unknowables’ together. This is the role that dichotomy plays. It is the form or imprimatur that guarantees continuity between the all encompassing convergence of difference (space/time) and the successive merge of all temporal difference that follows. Staying true to this form is what allows us to view process as a legitimate singularity or 'one', even though it is comprised of a multiplicity of functions. So in effect, an understanding of the interrelationship between boundaries is all important relative to the retention of continuity in the way we think.

Since the multiplicity that comprises **subjectivity** relates to perceived change within the self during the time allotted to the merging of potentially endless opposites, the possibility for seeing difference via

linearity's unboundedness is inherently incalculable. Unable to affix 'certainty' to the results of its function, consciousness needed a way (in theory) to contain linearity's potential. Without it, a transition from randomness to probability was not predictable, thus throwing the existence of order into question. Enter "infinity" a non process related difference. Although incomprehensible in scope, infinity nonetheless constitutes a theoretically fixed container. And, by way of that subtle difference relativity assumed to form. Numbers and symbols in league with their defining language have come to qualify it. And, since Symbology is foundational to mathematics and thereby advanced inquiry, deception has been complete.

This theoretical switch which allows the incalculable nature of potential to be operationally viewed as fixed, by substituting infinity for unboundedness, definitely solved one problem; but, it unfortunately caused another. It put us in a mental box of probability that prevents us from seeing anything other than the box we're in. Unquestionably, we have prospered while exploring it. So, there's been little reason to question it. But, with the arrival of '**incomprehensible complexity**' in league with '**weapons of human annihilation**' that has now changed. With their conjunction, we must now face the fact that our box of presumption is crumbling with us in it. Lacking anything else to blame, it's apparent that our attempt to alter linearity's inherency from being unbounded to infinite is at fault.

In spite of the quantitative quagmire that we find ourselves in, the **objective** or qualitative side of our nature has remained in tact. That's because it assumes to form by way of epiphany – or that which momentarily overwhelms the mechanism that yields difference. As such, it constitutes self awareness prior to the realization of its occurrence and the pitfalls it incurs. The result is a direct **experience** of singularity. However, this experience is short lived, since the realization of its occurrence introduces process into the equation, along with the multiplicity of possibilities that seeks to confirm the happening. So, even though we have real cause to believe in the objective by way of experience, we are unable to reexperience it as it was, or prove what we did experience to another.

Instead, we are left with a reality called 'relevance' that is precariously balanced between two hypothetical absolutes that are arbitrarily denoted by us as 'space' and 'time.' And, the assumption regarding their universal compatibility is what provides the foundation for temporality as it finds form within the hypothetical place of the self – wherein we assume this joining occurs. Hence, if a thing does not exist in both 'space' and 'time' (at the same time) for all potential observers, it fractures the sense of unity by which process is seen to hold everything together. This is why a space/time/place holder of common or universal presumption is essential to this equation, for were it to be absent it would invalidate the linearity of thought by which the self thereafter confirms its temporal existence. And yet, that is exactly what the results of this presumption does. It yields 'incomprehensible complexity' which necessarily destroys the validity of everything that comes before as well as everything that comes after it, including the means by which it arises. So what are we to make of this fated paradox?

Regardless of what we've managed to achieve by way of the underlying assumption that 'space' and 'time' are compatible with one another, we can't and don't know if they **actually** are compatible with each other outside of the place of ourselves wherein we assume that they are – via the function by which we arbitrarily link them. What we do know is that '**excessive complexity**' is an outgrowth of our attempt to link them. And, since this 'complexity' is imminently destructive to us, it is likewise destructive to our presumption regarding space and time. So, in a rather circuitous fashion, time has shown us that it can't be employed by temporally limited beings to confirm the union between itself and space.

And when that fact ignored, it causes linearity to yield a complexity of possibility that overwhelms the host's ability to conceptualize its own boundaries. In other words, it causes the host to self destruct. Aware of this fundamental liability, the issue we now face concerns how to get the genie back in the bottle once it has been loosed. For, if this movement into complexity is allowed to progress without constraint, linearity's unimpeded usage will inevitably yield a reality devoid of the human factor that progressed it. And, this outcome IS essentially inescapable if we continue on our current path – due to the thought process which now propels its momentum forward by way of us. **The ONLY option open to us is to try and contain linearity's momentum.** In effect, we have been set up to become a casualty of the symbiosis between non-temporal and temporal elements – a necessity for knowing to know that it is. By whom, or what and why? That's impossible for us to know, due to the temporal limitations that our form imposes upon us. What we do know, because of our progression of thought, is that linearity possesses the ability to persuade us to venture beyond the boundaries that allow for our existence. And, once there, circumstance pays no quarter to rich, poor, black, white, notable or otherwise. The cost is always the same. You go missing.

Given the "mystery" in evidence here, the idea of Divinity has found cause to be within this equation. However, due to the incomprehensibility of the role that Divinity needs to play in order to give sense to our understanding of It, It can't assume to temporal relevance for us without the aid of that which supplants belief for understanding. Its called "faith." However, the problem with this swap is legendary as seen by the many different belief systems it has spawned. Nonetheless, this unique merge between what can be known, and what must be believed in order to sustain 'hope' in what seems to be evident, but is not demonstrable by way of linearity, has given us many important insights into how we might stave off the hopelessness associated with linearity's inevitability. I am referring to a codex of moral and ethical consequence by which one might assume to sufficient importance (to one's self) to warrant belief in their inclusion into an ideality they are unable to confirm, yet nonetheless 'hope' for.

Unfortunately, neither approach, either the one that rests upon linearity's endless extension into the field of possibility, or religion's offering as a way to resolve existing problem through belief has a valid track record upon which to realistically pin one's 'hope.' And, without 'hope' everything is self terminating. Thus, we are thrown back on our own devices to try and find a solution to this quandary – or, a route to 'hope' that is actually believable. By manifesting a sincere effort to defuse the threat of annihilation hanging over us, the resulting intent gives birth to a dynamic form of 'hope' that inadvertently allows its static form to remain a viable possibility. **And, since we all have a similar stake in insuring that the destruction imbedded in linearity's unchecked progression never overtakes us, it's reasonable to believe that we can unify around this objective.** In this way 'hope' lives on.

As I previously noted, the threat we are currently facing could be likened to an alien attack upon earth that is intent upon destroying our species in order to populate our planet with their own. In this case, there's little doubt as to how the peoples of earth would react. Clearly, they would put down their differences and come together in order to fight off the common enemy. The threat we now face (from linearity) is not very different in result from the hypothetical one just referenced. True, it is not coming from without as an alien attack would, but rather from within. Hence it's a little more difficult to comprehend its existence and the consequences involved. But yet, it is nonetheless as dangerous. Destruction is in the offering in both cases. Hence the need to act is just as urgent!

Summation: If you have managed to follow this material (or not) it should still be obvious that we need to find a way to slow down linearity's continued progression toward the 'incomprehensible complexity' by which its potential to eradicate us becomes a reality. And, I want to be perfectly clear here for those still sitting on the fence. Besides the approach laid out on <http://edenorg.com> there are **NO** other offerings capable of making the needed difference out there. None! Nada! So don't be deceived into believing that any exist – or, that so called "experts" somewhere in some "elite" grouping are engaged in formulating or implementing one. And, that includes the high visibility suspects like the UN, the Bilderburgers, the Club of Rome, the Tri-lateral Commission, the FED, the BRIC, the IMF, the WTO, the World Bank or the endless "think tanks" from which they draw counsel. It also includes "aliens" in whatever form they may or may not exist, as well as all the "good wishers" who have come to believe that "collective agreement" is all that is necessary to bring about needed change – regardless of how complex it might be. Granted, individuated spirit correctly aligned is definitely important. But, it is forever limited by its temporal knowing and therefore incapable of the required unity. That only leaves Deity with its inherent transcendence that is able to affect the needed resolve; and unfortunately, its attention appears to be focused elsewhere at the moment, thus leaving us to our own devices.

So, here's what we know: No process dependent individual or group of individuals has any superior insight into how to use **MORE** process to resolve our problem. And, the reason is blatantly clear! **A means to continuance cannot come from advancing a medium that is inherently destructive to its own function.** Hence, the only option open to us is to use linearity to impede its own unfolding. Since the problem we face is universal in scope, the approach must be also. And, that's exactly what the Eden Project offers – a non confrontative (yet universal) approach to increasing human awareness as it relates to human survival. I realize that "global" anything scares the pants off of everyone who gains their sense of security by specifically defining their difference. And, with regard to economically influenced political schemes by which to force a "one world government," that fear is more than well placed. But, like it or not, technology has progressed us past the point where difference can survive its use. Hence, we need a workable game plan that can overcome this problem. And, that's what I'm offering.

It doesn't matter whether you agree or disagree with my analysis of how we got to where we are. The fact is that we're still there. And, due to the immediacy of this situation, we can't afford to get caught up in meaningless intellectual arguments over specificity that have **NO** bearing on resolving the threat that linearity poses to us. It's clear that weapons of human annihilation now exist along with an ever growing field of complexity that is inherently prohibitive to their containment. And, together they constitute a finality in waiting for us. Since it is now evident that the unconstrained use of our 'thought process' is actively engaged in trying to make us the final casualty of its function, it's absolutely imperative that we find a way to contain it before it's successful. In lieu of any other option, the **Eden project** at least provides an interim focus that can buy us much needed time.

If you have questions about this material, ASK! As previously indicated, all necessary information for initiating contact can be found on the above site. The "Site Map" indicator in the top left and bottom right of the home page will open the remainder of this site up for your consideration. Take the necessary time to do so. Your life and the lives of those you profess to love depend upon it. And, above all else remember, if you're not part of the solution then you're part of the problem. This is undoubtedly a bad epitaph to carry forward, or leave behind, depending upon what comes next. Therefore, I suggest that you choose wisely!

The Relationship between Boundaries

