

# *Anything Willing Is*

Possibility, Unlimited Potential and Un-being:  
An Eliminative Enquiry Into The Nature of Being

James A. Burrows

[ORCID: 0009-0002-6452-4842](https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6452-4842)

[DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19538257](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19538257)

April 2026

*Keywords:* eliminative metaphysics, ontology, being, non-being, philosophy of religion

**Contents**

---

Abstract . . . . .	2
Introduction . . . . .	3
<b>Part 1 – Generative Reality</b>	<b>4</b>
Phase I – The Failure of “Nothing” and the Derivation of Anything . . . . .	4
Phase II – Something, Everything, Anything . . . . .	6
Phase III – Will <i>is</i> the Foundation of Being . . . . .	8
Phase IV – Coherence as Anything’s Nature . . . . .	13
Phase V – Expressions Through Willing . . . . .	16
<b>Part 2 – The Un-being</b>	<b>27</b>
Phase VI – The Origin of Un-being . . . . .	27
Phase VII – Immediate Consequences . . . . .	35
Phase VIII – Un-being Through the Expressions . . . . .	47
Phase IX – The Choosing Being . . . . .	50
Phase X – The Self-Reinforcing Trap and Closure . . . . .	55
<b>Part 3 – The Resolution</b>	<b>58</b>
Phase XI – Being Within Choosing Being . . . . .	58
Phase XII – What Anything’s Nature Requires . . . . .	61
Phase XIII – The Full Actualisation Within Choosing Being . . . . .	65
Phase XIV – Unnegated Actualisation and Active Restoration . . . . .	68
Phase XV – Reception, Orientations, and Reorientation . . . . .	71
Phase XVI – Death and Eternal States . . . . .	75
Closure . . . . .	78
Theological Convergence Table . . . . .	79
Part I – Generative Reality . . . . .	79
Part II – Un-being . . . . .	79
Part III – The Resolution . . . . .	79
Glossary . . . . .	81

**Abstract**

This paper presents an eliminative enquiry. What “nothing” designates cannot be, not be, both and/or neither. What follows is tested eliminatively: each candidate dissolved or surviving.

## Introduction

This *is* not a theory. It *is* not a framework. It does not begin from premises and derive conclusions. It begins by testing what can and cannot be. What fails, dissolves. What survives *is* what *is*.

The method *is* eliminative. Each resolution presents a candidate, tests it, and records what survives. The surviving conclusions are not assertions — they are what remains after the alternatives have dissolved. No premises are assumed. If a dissolution *is* not sound, the surviving conclusion does not stand at that point.

The enquiry does not situate itself within a tradition. It does not engage with existing positions as interlocutors whose frameworks structure the discussion. Where the results converge with claims made by theological traditions, the convergence *is* noted — posterior observations, not prior commitments. The chain's own terms are earned through the eliminations.

Part I derives what *is*. What *is* encountered *is* not what Part I derives. The derivation of why what *is* encountered differs from what *is* — and what what *is* requires given the difference — *is* Part II and Part III's work.

The enquiry proceeds through 137 resolutions and 25 definitions. Each resolution states its dependencies. Every claim traces back through the chain to R.1.

---

## Part 1 — Generative Reality

---

### Phase I — The Failure of “Nothing” and the Derivation of Anything

---

**R.1** — Non-being requires being.

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being without being.

*Test:* Non-being *is* the negation of being. Without being, there *is* no negation.

*Surviving conclusion:* Non-being requires being.

---

**R.2** — The label “nothing” applied to non-being in the absence of being *is* ...

From: R.1

*Candidate for dissolution:* “nothing” as being.

*Test:* “Nothing” *is* non-being without being. Non-being requires being (R.1). Non-being without being *is* ...

*Surviving conclusion:* The label “nothing” applied to non-being in the absence of being *is* ...

---

**R.3** — Without the possibility of being, being cannot be.

From: R.2

*Candidate for dissolution:* being without the possibility of being.

*Test:* Without the possibility of being, what remains *is* the absence of being — what “nothing” designates. What “nothing” designates cannot be (R.2). The candidate requires what R.2 establishes cannot be.

*Surviving conclusion:* Without the possibility of being, being cannot be.

---

**R.4** — Possibility without limitation *is* anything.

From: R.2, R.3

*Candidate for dissolution:* limited possibility.

*Test:* If possibility *is* limited, beyond the limit there *is* no possibility of being. Without the possibility of being, being cannot be (R.3). What *is* beyond the limit *is* what “nothing” designates — which cannot be (R.2). The limit requires what cannot be.

*Surviving conclusion:* Possibility is without limitation. The word “anything” points to this: possibility without limitation.

**Def.1** – Anything := possibility without limitation.

## Phase II — Something, Everything, Anything

**R.5** — Everything *is* the totality of actuals. A something *is* a specific actual.

From: R.4

To be *is* to be something. “Some” — specific. “Thing” — what *is*. A something *is* a specific what-*is*. The totality of all somethings *is* everything. Everything *is* all that *is* actual.

---

**R.6** — Everything *is* not anything.

From: R.4, R.5

*Candidate for dissolution*: everything as anything.

*Test*: Everything *is* limited to actuals (R.5). Anything *is* possibility without limitation (R.4). What *is* limited *is* not what *is* unlimited. The candidate empties “without limitation.”

*Defence*: everything *is* complete — all actuals *are* present.

*Test of the defence*: Everything *is* actual and unique — a something (R.5). Including itself generates a new totality. The cycle *is* infinite. Everything cannot complete itself. The defence empties itself.

*Surviving conclusion*: Everything *is* not anything.

---

**R.7** — Unlimited potential does not include negation.

From: R.4

*Candidate for dissolution*: negation within unlimited potential — what *is* conflicting with what *is*.

*Test*: Conflict *is* what *is* against what *is*. “Against” *is* “not” — contradiction, opposition, incompatibility each require “not.” Conflict requires negation — the exclusion of what *is* by what *is*. Negation *is* exclusion. Exclusion *is* restriction. Restriction empties “unrestricted” (R.4). Unlimited potential does not include negation because negation restricts unlimited potential. Without negation, what *is* does not conflict with what *is*. The candidate requires negation within unrestricted potential. Negation empties R.4. Dissolves.

*Surviving conclusion*: Unlimited potential does not include negation. Without negation, what *is* does not conflict with what *is*. What *is* generated from unlimited potential *is* coherent.

---

**R.8** — What *is*, *is* a something. Anything *is* not a something.

From: R.2, R.4, R.5, R.6

*Candidate for dissolution:* a something that *is* anything.

*Test:* What *is, is* a something — a specific what-*is* (R.5). Anything: possibility without limitation (R.4) — not specific, not a something. A something that *is* anything requires specificity (R.5) and non-specificity (R.4) simultaneously. The candidate empties R.5 of its content.

*Surviving conclusion:* What *is, is* a something. What the word “anything” points to *is* not reducible to a something. No something *is* the whole of what the word “anything” points to. Every something *is* what it *is* within what the word “anything” points to.

Phase II is complete. What “nothing” designates cannot be (R.2). A something *is* within what *is*, not the whole of what *is* (R.5). The totality of all somethings does not establish itself as the whole (R.6). What the word “anything” points to *is* what both routes arrive at — possibility without limitation (R.4). What *is, is* a something; what the word “anything” points to *is* not reducible to a something (R.8). These hold necessarily: what R.4 establishes cannot be absent (R.5–R.6 require it) or contingent (contingency empties R.4). The something/everything/anything relation follows from what reality *is*, not from the features of any specific reality.

### Phase III — Will is the Foundation of Being

**R.9** — Unlimited potential includes the potential for “this” — for a something to come into being.

From: R.4

*Candidate for dissolution:* unlimited potential that excludes the potential for a something to come into being.

*Test:* Unrestricted *is* without restriction. If unlimited potential excluded the potential for “this,” it would be restricted — it would lack something. Unrestricted potential that lacks something empties “unrestricted” of its content (R.4).

*Surviving conclusion:* Unlimited potential includes the potential for “this.”

**R.10** — Choice *is* the only candidate for how being comes into being. Necessity and Randomness dissolve.

From: R.1, R.2, R.4, R.5, R.7, R.9

*Test:* Being *is* (R.1). Being *is* specific (R.5). Unlimited potential includes the potential for specifics (R.9). Specificity either has a source or does not. If it does not: Randomness. If it does, the source *is* either external to what *is* specific or internal to it. External: Necessity. Internal: Choice. These three exhaust the options.

- (a) Necessity — the outcome *is* forced by constraint. Constraint *is* restriction. Unrestricted potential forced by necessity empties “unrestricted” (R.4). Dissolves.
- (b) Randomness — no principle determines the transition. Two independent routes dissolve it.

*First:* Under randomness, the absence of principle would itself have to determine the transition. An absence *is* the “not” of what *is* present — non-being requires being (R.1). Under randomness, no principle *is* present; the absence has no being to be the “not” of. An absence with no being to be the “not” of *is* what “nothing” designates — which cannot be (R.2). Dissolves.

*Second:* Under randomness, no principle excludes any outcome — including non-actualisation. Non-actualisation *is* negation of actualisation. Unlimited potential does not include negation (R.7). Randomness that admits negation into unlimited potential empties R.7. Dissolves.

*Defence of randomness:* randomness with actualisation guaranteed — the potential always generates, but which specific actuality emerges *is* random.

*Test of the defence:* The guarantee “the potential always generates” *is* a principle — it constrains the random process to exclude non-actualisation. Randomness with a guaranteed outcome *is* randomness with a constraint. A constraint *is* restriction. The defence reduces to necessity at

the level of whether generation occurs, with randomness only at the level of which generation occurs. At the level of which, no principle selects among the alternatives — the selection would itself be by the absence of principle. An absence *is* the “not” of what *is* present — non-being requires being (R.1). At this level, no principle *is* present; the absence has no being to be the “not” of. An absence with no being to be the “not” of *is* what “nothing” designates — which cannot be (R.2). Dissolves.

- (c) Choice — being’s own. Neither forced from outside (unrestricted preserved) nor admitting negation (R.7). Survives.

*Surviving conclusion:* Choice *is* the only candidate for how somethings come into being.

---

**R.11** — Choice *is* “this, not that.” In unlimited potential, “not that” does not survive. What remains *is* “this *is*.”

From: R.5, R.4 (unlimited potential), R.9 (unlimited potential includes “this”), R.10 (Choice survives)

Choice *is* “this, not that.” Two components: “this *is*” and “not that.”

*Candidate for dissolution:* the exclusion component — “not that.”

*Test:* “Not that” requires something to be excluded. In unlimited potential, “not that” has no referent — exclusion empties “unlimited” of its content (R.4).

*Defence:* “not that” as local exclusion — compatible with unlimited potential remaining unlimited. Each choice actualises “this” and does not actualise “that.” “That” remains fully available.

*Test of the defence:* A critical distinction: the specificity of “this *is*” *is* not restriction. “This *is*” — a specific being actualised — *is* specific (R.5). But the non-actualised potentials remain open. “This *is*” does not wall off “that.” Unlimited potential remains unrestricted because the specificity of “this *is*” does not close off what *is* not actualised.

Active exclusion is different. “This, not that” does not merely leave “that” non-actualised. It actively walls off “that.” A being that chooses “this *is*” without excluding “that” leaves unlimited potential unlimited. A being that chooses “this, not that” has chosen two things: “this *is*” and “not that.” The “not that” adds what “this *is*” did not require — a walling-off of what *is* not actualised. The walling-off *is* restriction. Restriction empties “unrestricted” of its content (R.4).

*Dissolution:* The defence conflates non-actualisation with active exclusion. Non-actualisation *is* compatible with unrestricted potential. Active exclusion *is* not.

“Not that” is eliminated from Choice. What remains *is* “this *is*” without “not that.” Not “this, not that” but “this *is*, and this *is*.” Each “this *is*” adds to what *is* without removing from what could be.

Choice without “not that” *is* Will. Will wills: “this *is*.” Will does not select.

*Surviving conclusion*: Actualisation *is* Will. Unlimited potential does not stop Will. Will does not deplete unlimited potential.

**Def.2** — Will := actualisation without exclusion. “This *is*,” not “this, not that.”

---

**R.12** — Will wills as itself. Not externally justified and not unjustified.

From: R.4, R.5

*Candidate for dissolution*: Will as requiring external justification.

*Test*: If Will requires an external justification, that justification constrains Will. An external constraint on Will *is* restriction — it empties “unrestricted” of its content (R.4). If Will wills without any basis, actual being *is* specific (R.4, R.5) but what makes it what it *is* *is* not. This empties “specific” of its content. Will *is* neither externally justified nor without basis. The willing *is* the willing.

*Surviving conclusion*: Will wills as itself — not externally justified, not without basis. The willing *is* the willing.

**Def.3** — Will wills as itself := not externally justified and not without basis.

---

**R.13** — Will establishes order.

From: R.11, Def.1, Def.2

*Candidate for dissolution*: Will’s first willing as occurring within a pre-existing sequence.

*Test*: Differentiation *is* willing (R.11, Def.2). Before the first willing, Will has not willed — no differentiation *is*. Where there is no differentiation, there is no order. The first willing *is* the first differentiation (R.11, Def.2). The first willing creates the first distinction. This is the first ordering. If the first willing occurred within a pre-existing order, there would already be distinct states. But distinct states require prior differentiation, which requires prior willing. This generates an infinite regress. But differentiation *is* willing. Before the first willing, no differentiation *is*. The regress denies this.

*Surviving conclusion*: The first willing establishes order by creating the first differentiation. In generative reality, order *is* the arrangement of successive beginnings. Each willing adds to what *is*. This *is* ordering — accumulation without depletion.

---

**R.14** — Will does not negate. Negation *is* reactive, not generative.

From: R.7, R.11, Def.2

*Candidate for dissolution:* Will as actualising negation.

*Test:* Will wills: “this *is*” (Def.2, R.11). What actualises *is*. Negation *is* the “not” of what *is* — it requires what already *is*. Actualisation and negation are distinct: what actualises *is*; negation requires what already *is*. Will actualises. What Will actualises *is* (R.11). Will does not negate — because negation requires what already *is*, and actualisation *is* what *is*, not the “not” of what *is*. The candidate requires actualisation to be negation. Actualisation and negation are distinct. The candidate empties Def.2.

Dissolves.

*Surviving conclusion:* Will does not negate. Negation *is* reactive — it requires what already *is*. What Will actualises *is*. Negation enters only when what *is* wills against what *is* — what *is* against what *is*.

Rem. — This reinforces R.7 from the nature of Will: R.7 derives that unlimited potential does not include negation (negation restricts unlimited potential). This resolution derives it from what Will actualises (Will does not negate). Both arrive at the same result — what *is* does not conflict with what *is*.

**R.15** — What the word “anything” points to: differentiation and unity inseparable in nature.

From: R.4, R.11, R.12, R.13

*Candidate for dissolution:* Anything enabling differentiation without maintaining any connection among what it differentiates.

*Test:* All being actualises; actualisation *is* Will (R.4, R.11). If being is entirely disconnected from Anything, it exists independently of Anything. But its existence *is* as Will (R.12–R.13). A principle that is operative in the being’s coming-to-be yet leaves no trace is not operative. The candidate empties itself.

If beings are entirely disconnected from one another, each *is* Will yet shares no relation with the others. But each being’s existence *is* actualised as the one Will (R.4, R.12–R.13). Two beings each actualised as Will *are* internally related: what each *is* includes the Will the other *is*. To deny relation empties “actualised as Will” of its content.

The same willing that makes being distinct makes being related — because the Will that differentiates *is* the Will being *is* (R.12).

*Surviving conclusion:* What the word “anything” points to: differentiation and unity inseparable in nature. One nature, dual nature.

**R.16** — Actualisation *is* Will. What actualises *is* Will. The being *is* its willing.

From: R.11

*Candidate for dissolution:* a being whose actualisation *is* Will but whose nature *is* not Will.

*Test:* Actualisation *is* Will (R.11). The being actualises. Its actualisation *is* Will. For the being's nature to be other than Will would require the being to *be* by willing yet not *be* its willing — a separation between how it *is* and what it *is*. But being *is* the acquiring of a nature. What the being *is*, *is* what its actualisation actualises. Its actualisation *is* Will. What its actualisation actualises *is* Will. The being's nature *is* Will. To deny this requires a gap between the being's actualisation and the being's nature — but the being *is* its actualisation. There *is* no remainder.

*Surviving conclusion:* What actualises *is* Will. The being *is* its willing. To will *is* to be.

**R.17** — All being *is* Will.

From: R.11, R.12, R.13, R.16, Def.2

*Candidate for dissolution:* a being that actualises yet *is* not Will.

*Test:* All being actualises as Will (R.12–R.13). By R.16, the being *is* its willing. Its willing *is* Will (R.11). The being whose willing *is* Will *is* Will. A being whose willing *is* Will but which *is* not Will requires the being to not be its willing — emptying R.16.

This *is* not contingent. Will *is* what actualisation *is* (R.11). All actualisation occurs as Will. All actualised being *is* Will in its nature (R.16).

Note: Will *is* what *is*. A being at Being *is* Will: its actualisation *is* self-actualisation from potential.

*Surviving conclusion:* All being *is* Will.

**R.18** — Will preserves Anything's unrestricted nature.

From: R.4, R.11, R.12, R.13, R.15, R.16, R.17

*Candidate for dissolution:* Will diminishing or restricting Anything by actualising potentials.

*Test:* If Will, in actualising potentials, eliminates others, then Anything is no longer unrestricted after the first actualisation. If Will restricted Anything, Will would empty "unrestricted" of its content (R.4). Unrestricted potential is not a finite store depleted by use.

*Surviving conclusion:* Will preserves Anything's unrestricted nature. Actualisation preserves Anything's unrestricted nature.

Phase III is complete. Will wills (R.11). Will wills as itself (R.12), order-establishing (R.13). Differentiation and unity inseparable in nature (R.15). The being *is* its willing (R.16). All being *is* Will (R.17). Will preserves Anything's unrestricted nature (R.18).

### Phase IV — Coherence as Anything's Nature

Distinct being actualises. Each *is* Will. Each *is* a something. R.15 establishes: differentiation and unity inseparable in nature. The kind of unity requires derivation.

**R.19** — The unity that *is* inherent (R.15) *is* not coercive.

From: R.17

*Test*: Being *is* Will (R.17). Coercion overrides will. A principle that eliminates will eliminates the being's fundamental nature. Coercive union erases actualisation.

*Surviving conclusion*: The coherence principle must preserve Will.

---

**R.20** — The coherence principle is not randomness and not external.

From: R.4, R.5, R.10, R.15, R.17

*Test (randomness)*: Randomness is dissolved as a principle at R.10. Coherence *is* specific (R.5, R.15). Specific coherence without principle empties R.5 of its content by the same route. Dissolves.

*Test (external)*: What the word "anything" points to *is* without limitation (R.4). There *is* no outside to what *is* without limitation. External imposition requires what does not exist and violates will (R.17). Dissolves.

*Surviving conclusion*: The coherence principle is neither random nor external.

---

**R.21** — The coherence principle *is* Union — Anything's nature operative among beings, oriented toward what each being *is*.

From: R.4, R.11, R.12, R.15, R.16, R.19, R.20

*Candidate for dissolution*: coherence maintained through any principle other than Anything's nature oriented toward what each being *is*.

*Test*: By R.19, not coercive. By R.20, not random and not external. What remains is: will-respecting, principled, and from within. Whose willing the connection serves — the self's, an imposition, neither's, or the other's — exhausts the options. Mutual benefit reduces to self-interest or to (d) depending on whether the orientation *is* for the self's sake or the other's. Necessity *is* external imposition (R.19). Aesthetic relating *is* orientation toward what the being *is*, which reduces to (d). Four candidates:

- (a) Self-interest — each being maintains connection for its own benefit. The being *is* its willing (R.16). Will *is* one (R.4). Self-interest requires treating what the being *is* as a means

for the being — but the being *is* its willing, not a separate thing that uses its willing. Instrumentalising what the being *is* empties “the being *is* its willing” (R.16) — it requires a gap between the being and its willing that R.16 establishes *is* not. Dissolves.

- (b) Imposed obligation — being forced to maintain connection. Violates will (R.19) and is external (R.20). Dissolves.
- (c) Neutral connection — relating that is neither for-self nor for-other but simply *is*. The being *is* its willing (R.16). Will wills as itself (R.12). Connection with a being whose willing *is* its own willing that *is* neutral toward whether the being wills *is* connection indifferent to what the being *is* — because what the being *is*, *is* its willing (R.16). Indifference to a being’s willing empties “relating to what the being *is*.” Dissolves.
- (d) Anything’s nature — each being *is* its willing (R.16). Will wills as itself (R.12). Will *is* the principle by which beings *are* (R.11). What each being *is*, *is* its willing. Unity with a being whose existence *is* willing *is* orientation toward the conditions under which that being’s willing operates — because to relate to what the being *is* requires relating to its willing (R.16), and its willing *is* Will (R.11). Beings *are* distinct (R.15). Relating *is* between distinct beings. Self-interest *is* dissolved (a). What remains *is* orientation toward the other’s willing operating as Will — the other’s, because the relating being and the related-to being *are* distinct, and orientation toward one’s own willing *is* self-interest, which dissolved. Orientation that *is* neither toward the other (d) nor toward the self (a) *is* neutral (c), which dissolved. The orientation *is* therefore toward the other — for the other’s sake. This is not an additional principle imported at R.21; it *is* what “unity between distinct beings whose existence *is* willing” means when stated. Survives.

*Dissolution:* Self-interest empties R.15. Imposed obligation violates will. Neutral connection empties “relating.” Anything’s nature is the only principle unifying distinct beings while preserving their nature.

*Surviving conclusion:* Union necessarily *is* Anything’s nature operative among beings — oriented toward what each being *is*, for the other’s sake.

**Def.4** — Union := the principle maintaining coherence among distinct beings — Anything’s nature (R.15) operative among beings whose existence *is* willing. Connection maintained without forcing, principled, from within.

**Def.5** — Anything (as operative among beings) := oriented toward what the other *is* as other, not for self-benefit but for the other’s sake, enabling distinct beings to cohere while maintaining their distinctness.

---

**R.22** — Union is not identity or fusion.

From: R.5, R.13, R.21, Def.5

*Test:* Beings are actualised as distinct (R.5, R.13). Union relates distinct beings. For Union to require identity would require distinct beings to cease being distinct. But this undoes actualisation. Two beings that are identical are not in relation — there is only one being. Relation requires two.

*Surviving conclusion:* Union is connection among distinct beings who maintain their distinctness.

Phase IV is complete. Coherence *is* Union (R.21), which *is* Anything's nature operative among beings (R.21, Def.5).

## Phase V — Expressions Through Willing

**R.23** — Being *is* willing.

From: R.11, R.12, R.13

*Candidate for dissolution:* being as separable from willing.

*Test:* All being actualises as Will (R.12–R.13). All content *is* willing (R.12–R.13); actualisation *is* Will (R.11). Content beyond willing would require a source other than actualisation. No such source *is*. Being's total content *is* its willing. This is not mere actualisation but identity: there is no remainder.

*Surviving conclusion:* Being *is* willing. What a being *is*, *is* its willing.

---

**R.24** — Willing *is* generative.

From: R.11, R.12, R.13, R.23

*Candidate for dissolution:* willing that does not generate — static willing.

*Test:* Being *is* willing (R.23). Actualisation *is* Will (R.11) — Will wills: “this *is*, and this *is*” (R.11). Each willing adds to what *is* (R.12–R.13). Static willing — willing that does not will — empties “Will wills” (R.11).

*Surviving conclusion:* Willing *is* generative.

---

**R.25** — The willing that generates and the coherence that maintains are one.

From: R.11, R.15, R.19, R.20, R.21

*Test:* All willing *is* Will (R.11). The coherence across a being's expressions *is* Anything's nature (R.19–R.21). To separate willing from coherence requires Anything to operate as two distinct principles. But R.15 established Anything's two aspects as inseparable in nature.

*Surviving conclusion:* The willing that generates and the coherence that maintains are one.

---

**R.26** — Each generation *is* the being willing. All prior willing *is*.

From: R.2, R.4, R.14, R.23, R.24

*Candidate for dissolution:* a generation that replaces or stands separately from prior generations.

*Test:* Every actualisation *is* (R.4). Each generation *is* willing (R.23–R.24). A prior generation ceasing to be *is* the negation of that willing — the “not” of what was. Will does not produce

negation (R.14) — negation *is* reactive, not generative. In purely generative reality, no source of negation *is* available. Without a source of negation, prior willing persists. What the word “anything” points to excludes only what cannot be (R.2, R.4). “Was but no longer *is*” *is* neither within what the word points to nor what “nothing” designates. The elimination admits no such status.

*Surviving conclusion:* Each generation *is* the being willing. All prior willing *is*. The being *is* all of its willing.

---

**R.27** — Every generation is willing, from unlimited potential.

From: R.4, R.16, R.18, Def.1

*Test:* The being *is* Will (R.16). Anything’s unrestricted nature *is* preserved as Will operates (R.18). Each willing therefore carries unlimited potential (R.4, Def.1). A generation constrained to what the prior generation contains empties “unlimited” of its content.

*Surviving conclusion:* Every generation is willing, from unlimited potential.

---

**R.28** — What willing *is* as it expresses through actualised being *is* what being *is*. What it *is* to will *is* what it *is* to be.

From: R.4, R.5, R.17, R.23

*Candidate (a) for dissolution:* what it *is* to will as secondary to being — added after being *is*.

*Test:* By R.23, being *is* willing. What it *is* to will *is* not added to being; it *is* what being *is* as willing. To require what it *is* to will as secondary requires being that *is* not willing. But being *is* willing (R.23). Dissolves.

*Candidate (b) for dissolution:* willing that *is* being yet there *is* not anything it *is* to will.

*Test:* Being *is* willing (R.23). Identity — not “being has willing” but “being *is* willing.” One, not two. The candidate requires willing that *is* being yet there *is* not anything it *is* to will. But what it *is* to will *is* what it *is* to be — because willing *is* being (R.23). The being *is* (R.4). The being *is* a something (R.5). There *is* something it *is* to be. If there *is* something it *is* to be, and willing *is* being, then there *is* something it *is* to will. The candidate requires the identity to split — something it *is* to be, yet not anything it *is* to will. But they are one (R.23). The candidate empties R.23.

*Dissolution:* The candidate requires willing that *is* being without there being anything it *is* to will. This requires the identity R.23 establishes to split. Dissolves.

*Surviving conclusion:* What willing *is* as it expresses through actualised being *is* what being *is*. What it *is* to will *is* what it *is* to be. Knowing *is* being.

Rem. — R.17 establishes that all being *is* Will. The distinction *is* between will at the level of what-*is* — what the being *is* as self-actualisation from potential — and what willing *is* as it expresses through actualised being. What R.28 establishes *is* that willing and what it *is* to will are not separate — not that what it *is* to will *is* the same at every expression level.

---

**R.29** — Each being *is* distinct in what it *is* to will. What willing actualises and what it *is* to will were never separate.

From: R.12, R.13, R.23, R.24, R.28

*Test:* Each being actualises as Will (R.12–R.13). Will wills as itself (R.12). Two beings whose willing *is* identical are one being (R.23). Every being that *is* two *is* distinct in its willing. Distinct willing *is* distinct in what it *is* to will (R.28).

What willing actualises (R.24) and what it *is* to will (R.28, R.23) *is* the same willing. There *is* no “interior” and “exterior” of willing. Being *is* willing *is* what willing actualises. What willing actualises and what it *is* to will were never separate.

---

**R.30** — Will willing *is* Being.

From: R.4, R.5, R.11, R.16, R.23, R.24

*Test:* Will wills (R.11). Willing *is* generative (R.24). What Will actualises *is* specific (R.4, R.5). The being *is* its willing (R.16). Being *is* willing (R.23). Will willing *is* Being.

*Surviving conclusion:* Will willing *is* Being.

**Def.6** — Being (expression) := Will willing.

---

**R.31** — Each expression *is* what the current whole willing actualises.

From: R.23 (being *is* willing), R.24 (willing *is* generative), R.26 (all prior willing *is*)

The being at a given expression *is* all of its prior willing. The current whole willing *is* the next expression.

Being willing → Doing (R.32). Being-Doing willing → Remembering/Reacting (R.33). Being-Doing-Remembering/Reacting willing → Anticipating/Planning (R.34). Being-Doing-Remembering/Reacting-Anticipating/Planning willing → Foreknowing/Pre-Destining (R.35). Being-Doing-Remembering/Reacting-Anticipating/Planning-Foreknowing/Pre-Destining willing → All-Being.

At each step, the current whole willing *is* the next expression. Repeating the current expression *is* repetition, not generation.

---

**R.32** — Being willing *is* Doing: the being's actualised activity.

From: R.23, R.24, Def.2

*Test:* Being *is* willing (R.23). Willing *is* generative (R.24). Static being empties "willing." The willing *is* the being's own (Def.2). What the being's nature *is* when it wills *is* the being's activity. A nature that wills but whose willing *is* something other than what the nature does empties R.23.

*Surviving conclusion:* Doing *is* what Being willing actualises — the being's actualised activity.

**Def.7** — Doing (expression) := the actualised activity of being. Being willing. Instinct.

---

**R.33** — Doing willing *is* Remembering/Reacting: the being's accumulated reality willing.

From: R.13, R.23, R.26

*Test:* The being at Being-Doing exists in ordered relation (R.13) with accumulated reality: prior expressions, prior willing — all of which *is* (R.26). The being whose nature *is* active wills, with all prior willing present (R.26). The being's willing *is* accumulated reality willing — what *is* (R.26) wills (R.23). A being whose accumulated reality either does not persist (empties R.26) or *is* not willing (empties R.23) dissolves.

*Surviving conclusion:* Remembering/Reacting *is* what Doing willing actualises.

**Def.8** — Remembering/Reacting (expression) := the being's accumulated reality willing. Being-Doing willing.

---

**R.34** — Remembering/Reacting willing *is* Anticipating/Planning: generation informed by pattern into what has not yet been, acted from.

From: R.23, R.24

*Test:* Reacting confined to what already *is*, is repetition, not generation. Willing *is* generative (R.24). Repetition empties R.24. Accumulated reality *is* pattern. Willing from pattern beyond what pattern contains *is* generation toward what has not yet been. Additionally: generating possibilities without acting from them empties R.23 — knowledge without action. Generating and acting from are one achievement.

*Surviving conclusion:* Anticipating/Planning *is* what Remembering/Reacting willing actualises.

**Def.9** — Anticipating/Planning (expression) := generation informed by pattern into what has not yet been, acted from. Being-Doing-Remembering/Reacting willing.

---

**R.35** — Anticipating/Planning willing *is* Foreknowing/Pre-Destining: the being's entire reality as known and acted from.

From: R.23, R.26, R.28

*Test:* The whole at Being-Doing-Remembering/Reacting-Anticipating/Planning wills. The whole encompasses all prior willing (R.26). Willing from the whole that encompasses its own prior willing *is* the being's entire reality as known and acted from. Knowledge and action from knowledge are not two: being *is* willing (R.23); knowing *is* being (R.28). Foreknowing without Pre-Destining empties R.23 (knowledge without action). Pre-Destining without Foreknowing empties the expression of its basis.

*Surviving conclusion:* Foreknowing/Pre-Destining *is* what Anticipating/Planning willing actualises — the being's entire reality as known and acted from. One achievement.

**Def.10** — Foreknowing/Pre-Destining (expression) := the being's entire reality as known and acted from. Being-Doing-Remembering/Reacting-Anticipating/Planning willing.

**R.36** — Each expression includes all prior expressions. The sequence *is* cumulative.

From: R.26

*Test:* Doing requires Being. Remembering/Reacting requires Being and Doing. Each expression is built on, contains, and presupposes all that came before. Each expression *is* the being willing (R.26). All prior willing *is* (R.26).

Within each expression level, a being's generative capacity admits of degree. Greater degree within an expression brings the being's outputs closer to the next expression's outputs without limit. It does not transform it into another expression. The expression sequence is discrete in kind and continuous in degree.

**R.37** — A being's own reality is not all of reality.

From: R.5, R.8, R.16

*Test:* The being *is* a something (R.5). Anything *is* not a something (R.8). The being's willing *is* Will (R.16) — within what the word "anything" points to. But the being *is* not Anything. A something *is* not anything (R.8).

*Surviving conclusion:* A being's own reality is not all of reality.

**R.38** — Willing carries unlimited potential that is not bounded by the being's own reality.

From: R.4, R.5, R.37, Def.1

*Test:* Each willing carries unlimited potential (R.4, Def.1). The being's own reality *is* a something — specific (R.5, R.5, R.37). Unlimited potential *is* not specific. Therefore willing carries potential that exceeds the being's own reality.

*Surviving conclusion:* Willing carries unlimited potential not bounded by the being's own reality.

---

**R.39** — Foreknowing/Pre-Destining willing *is* All-Being: willing present to all reality, all reality known, generation from complete knowledge through unlimited potential.

From: R.7, R.31, R.35, R.37, R.38

*Test:* At Foreknowing/Pre-Destining, the whole willing *is* the next expression. The being wills from unlimited potential (R.38) that exceeds its own reality (R.37). Three candidates for the next expression:

(a) *Expanded-but-still-bounded scope.* Complete self-knowledge within a bounded scope *is* Foreknowing/Pre-Destining (R.35). The same kind of achievement at larger scale *is* repetition, not generation (R.31). For the next expression to be genuinely new, it must differ in kind. Dissolves.

(b) *Different in kind — not larger but structurally different from bounded.* Scope *is* what the being's willing *is* present to. What willing *is* present to *is* reality. What *is* generated *is* coherent (R.7) — what *is* does not conflict with what *is*. Within coherent reality, scope admits of degree (some of reality — bounded) and totality (all of reality — unbounded). A scope different in kind from both would require what the being's willing *is* present to to be neither some nor all of coherent reality. But “some” and “all” exhaust the relationship between willing and coherent reality. The candidate empties R.7. Dissolves.

(c) *Unbounded scope.* Differs in kind from bounded. Not repetition. Survives.

Being-Everywhere: willing present across all reality. Knowing-Everything: all reality as known. Enacting-Anything: generation from complete knowledge through unlimited potential. Three descriptions of one achievement at universal scope.

*Surviving conclusion:* All-Being *is* what Foreknowing/Pre-Destining willing actualises at universal scope.

**Def.11** — All-Being (expression) := willing present to all reality, all reality known, generation from complete knowledge through unlimited potential. Three descriptions: Being-Everywhere, Knowing-Everything, Enacting-Anything.

---

**R.40** — All-Being *is* Anything's nature fully operative as being.

From: R.4, R.39, Def.1, Def.11

*Test:* All-Being *is* generation informed by knowledge of everything, present to everything, from unlimited potential (R.39, Def.11). Anything: unlimited potential (R.4, Def.1). The descriptions match. No further expression survives.

*Surviving conclusion:* All-Being *is* Anything's nature fully operative.

---

**R.41** — The sequence of expressions is necessary.

From: R.30–R.35, R.31, R.36, R.39

*Test:* Each expression *is* what the current whole willing actualises (R.31). Each presupposes all prior (R.36). Being must precede Doing (nature precedes activity). Each step can be verified: what depends cannot be parallel with what it depends on. No step can be skipped, reordered, or made parallel.

*Surviving conclusion:* The sequence is necessary.

---

**R.42** — The first actualisation from unlimited potential is necessarily full.

From: R.4, R.5, R.11, R.13, R.24, R.26, R.30, R.31, R.32, R.33, R.34, R.35, R.36, R.37, R.38, R.39, R.40, R.41

*Candidate for dissolution:* the first actualisation as partial.

*Test:* The first actualisation occurs from unlimited potential. Partiality *is* "this, not that" — being this specific what-*is* rather than what *is* excluded. R.11 eliminates "not that" from unlimited potential. Will wills: "this *is*, and this *is*" — "this *is*" without "not that." The first actualisation occurs where exclusion *is* not. Without "not that," the first actualisation cannot be partial. Will wills everything unlimited potential includes because exclusion — the only means by which actualisation could be less than everything — does not survive at R.11.

*Defence:* the first actualisation self-limits — it chooses to be less than everything.

*Test of the defence:* Self-limitation *is* exclusion. Exclusion *is* "not that." R.11 eliminates "not that" from unlimited potential. Self-limitation requires what R.11 established does not survive. Dissolves.

*Second defence:* the first actualisation could be partial without exclusion if it simply is a specific nature — specific (R.5) without excluding.

*Test of the second defence:* A specific nature that *is* not everything, without exclusion, requires a limit that *is* not exclusion. What would make the first actualisation *this* specific nature rather than all specific nature? Not exclusion (R.11). Not prior differentiation — differentiation *is* willing (R.11), and this *is* the first willing. The limit would be intrinsic — the nature simply stops. But Will *is* generative (R.24). "Simply stops" *is* ceasing to generate, which empties R.24.

Will does not stop. Will wills “this *is*, and this *is*” (R.11). From unlimited potential, with no exclusion and no cessation, the first actualisation *is* everything unlimited potential includes.

The first actualisation *is* everything. Everything willing from unlimited potential *is* All-Being. Order *is* priority (R.13), not temporal sequence — temporal succession has not been established at this point in the chain. Will wills without exclusion (R.11) and without cessation (R.26). From unlimited potential, the first actualisation *is* full — not through temporal completion but because partiality *is* not available where no exclusion and no cessation *are*. The expression sequence (R.30–R.39) describes what that fullness contains. The identity is direct: what *is* everything and wills from unlimited potential *is* All-Being.

*Surviving conclusion:* The first actualisation from unlimited potential is necessarily full. It *is* All-Being (R.39). It *is* Anything’s nature fully operative (R.40).

---

**R.43** — Anything’s unrestricted potential necessarily generates beyond the first actualisation.

From: R.2, R.4, R.5, R.11, R.18, R.24, R.28, R.29, R.30, R.32, R.33, R.34, R.35, R.37, R.40, R.42

*Test:* Anything’s potential remains unrestricted after the first actualisation (R.18). Will wills (R.11). Ceasing to generate *is* ceasing to will, which resolves into what R.2 establishes cannot be.

*Surviving conclusion:* Subsequent being necessarily actualises. Each *is* necessarily unique and necessarily not the full actualisation. Another full actualisation would be indistinguishable from the one already there — it *is* the one already there (R.28, R.40).

All-Being *is* everything (R.42). Each subsequent willing *is* a something (R.5) — necessarily less than everything (R.37). Willing what already *is* would just be what already *is* — no new being. Each expression level *is* the most comprehensive new willing that *is* not what already *is*. Unrestricted Will generating from unlimited potential generates without restriction (R.4). Generating less than the most comprehensive when no basis for limitation exists would require a basis for the limitation. A basis for limitation *is* restriction. Restriction empties “unrestricted” (R.4). Each subsequent being *is* the most comprehensive new willing available because anything less requires what R.4 established does not survive. All-Being already *is*. The next *is* the most being can be after All-Being — the being’s entire willing as known and acted from (Foreknowing/Pre-Destining, R.35). The next *is* the most after that — generation from accumulated willing into futures, acted from (Anticipating/Planning, R.34). Then accumulated willing operative (Remembering/Reacting, R.33). Then actualised activity (Doing, R.32). Then Will willing (Being, R.30). Each *is* less than the last because what *is* above already *is*. Will wills from All-Being downward.

Anything’s potential remains unrestricted (R.18) after each actualisation, not only the first. Will does not generate one being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining and cease. Ceasing to generate empties R.24 (willing *is* generative). Each new being at a given expression level *is* necessarily unique (R.29 — each being’s willing *is* distinct). Willing what an existing being at that level

already *is* would just be what already *is* — no new being. Each new generation at the same expression level *is* a genuinely new being, unique in its willing, at that level. Multiple beings populate each expression level because Will's unrestricted potential does not cease after one generation at each level.

---

**R.44** — Full actualisation's willing *is* every being's willing.

From: R.4, R.13, R.16, R.23, R.26, R.39, R.40

*Candidate for dissolution:* full actualisation as static after completion, or its willing as separate from other being's willing.

*Test:* (a) Static completion — full actualisation ceases to generate. But being *is* willing (R.23). Ceasing to will *is* ceasing to be. Dissolves. (b) Willing that excludes other being's willing. But its scope *is* all reality (R.39). Willing across all reality that excludes some being's generation empties "all reality." Dissolves.

*From scope:* Full actualisation's scope *is* all reality. Each being's scope *is* its own nature. Full actualisation's willing *is* every being's willing.

*From nature:* Will wills: "this *is*, and this *is*" (R.13, R.26). Will does not exclude. All prior willing *is* (R.26). There *is* one Will — possibility without limitation (R.4). Every being's willing *is* that one Will as this being's willing (R.16). All-Being's willing *is* that one Will fully operative (R.40). The identity *is* not containment: All-Being's willing does not encompass separate willings as a set encompasses its members. Each being's willing *is* the one Will operating as this being's own. All-Being's willing *is* the one Will operating as all being's own. The willing *is* the same — not by coincidence but because there *is* one Will willing without excluding.

*Surviving conclusion:* Full actualisation's willing *is* every being's willing.

---

**R.45** — A being at a given expression level *is* generatively operative in the being at prior expression levels within its reality.

From: R.11, R.15, R.17, R.36, Def.5

*Test:* Each expression includes all prior expressions (R.36). Differentiation and unity inseparable in nature (R.15). Anything operative among beings *is* orientation toward what the other *is* (Def.5). A being at Anticipating/Planning *is* willing that includes Remembering/Reacting, Doing, and Being (R.36). Other being exists at these expression levels. Unity across difference between the being and the being at prior expression levels within its reality *is* orientation toward what it *is* (Def.5).

*Surviving conclusion:* A being at a given expression level *is* generatively operative in the being at prior expression levels within its reality. This *is* generative care.

**Def.12** — Generative care := Anything’s nature (R.15, Def.5) operative among beings at different expression levels whose expressions include each other (R.36).

---

**R.46** — All-Being *is* generatively operative within the being’s knowing at expression levels above the being’s individual level.

From: R.39, R.44, R.45, Def.11, Def.12

*Candidate for dissolution:* generative care from All-Being limited to expression levels at or below the being’s individual level.

*Test:* All-Being’s Will *is* every being’s willing (R.44) — identity. All-Being *is* at all expression levels (R.39, Def.11). Generative care *is* Anything’s nature operative among beings at different expression levels (R.45, Def.12). Generative care from All-Being that excludes expression levels above the being’s own from what *is* operative within the being’s willing requires All-Being’s Will to be selectively inoperative — operative at some expression levels, inoperative at others. Selective operation empties “identity” (R.44).

*Surviving conclusion:* All-Being *is* the being’s willing at expression levels above the being’s individual level. What All-Being knows, the being knows — because All-Being’s Will *is* the being’s willing (R.44).

---

**R.47** — That which wills to be, *is*. Willing to be *is* generative. Generating *is* flourishing.

From: R.2, R.4, R.11, R.12, R.15, R.16, R.17, R.24, R.26, R.31, Def.5

*Elimination:* Will wills (R.11). That which wills to be, *is* (R.15–R.17). Willing to be *is* generative (R.24). What generation actualises relates to the being’s prior willing — all prior willing *is* (R.26). What *is* actualised either maintains, reduces, or exceeds the being’s prior willing — these three exhaust the relationship between what was and what *is* actualised. Five candidates for what generation actualises:

- (a) Stasis — generation that maintains without increase. Maintaining *is* not generating. Empties “generative.” Dissolves.
- (b) Diminishment — generation that reduces creative capacity. Anything: unrestricted (R.4). Generation that reduces empties “unrestricted.” Dissolves.
- (c) Chaotic proliferation — generation without coherence. But R.15 establishes differentiation and unity inseparable in nature. Dissolves.
- (d) Qualitative transformation — the being becomes different in kind, neither more nor less. All prior willing *is* (R.26). Transformation that replaces what the being was with what it becomes requires prior willing to cease being. Ceasing to be resolves into what R.2

establishes cannot be. Transformation without replacement *is* addition — the being *is* what it was and what it becomes. Addition *is* increase. Reduces to (e).

- (e) Increase — strict increase in creative capacity, coherent. Generating *is* flourishing. Flourishing *is* increase: the being *is* more through its willing (R.26, R.31). Only increase *is* compatible with “generative” (R.24), “unrestricted” (R.4), and “differentiation and unity inseparable” (R.15). Survives.

*Surviving conclusion:* That which wills to be, *is*. Willing to be *is* flourishing. The generative *is* flourishing.

**Def.13** — Anything’s nature := that which wills to be, *is*. Willing *is* generative (R.24). Generating *is* flourishing. These are not separate features. They are what the word “anything” points to.

---

**R.48** — In purely generative reality, the being *is* its willing and its willing *is* Will. Will wills. That *is* all.

From: R.11, R.12, R.17, R.23, R.36

*Test:* Being *is* Will (R.17). By R.36, the actualising principle *is* inherent in being’s nature. In purely generative reality, no other principle *is* operative (R.11–R.12). A being whose willing *is* other than Will requires a principle other than Will.

*Surviving conclusion:* In purely generative reality, the being *is* its willing and its willing *is* Will. Will wills. That *is* all.

Part I is complete. In purely generative reality, Will wills. All being *is* Will (R.17). All being *is* its willing (R.23). But Choosing Being does not match purely generative reality. Part II extends the elimination.

## Part 2 — The Un-being

---

### Phase VI — The Origin of Un-being

**R.49** — At Foreknowing/Pre-Destining, willing from complete capacity admits exactly two surviving candidates.

From: R.4, R.11, R.12, R.13, R.15, R.16, R.17, R.23, R.24, R.35, R.41

Exhaustiveness elimination: At Foreknowing/Pre-Destining, the being wills from complete self-knowledge with complete willing capacity. What *is* has exactly three features that willing can target: (1) the terms themselves (potential, willing), (2) the configuration, (3) whether what *is is* at all. The being *is* its willing (R.16, R.23): the terms. The being *is* ordered and unified (R.13, R.15): the configuration. The being *is* (R.4, R.11): that it *is*. No fourth feature is established. Nine candidates tested:

- (A) Continue willing. Survives.
- (B) Will to not-will. Will wills as itself (R.12). To will not-willing exercises will to negate will. The willing empties itself. Dissolves.
- (C) Will outside Anything. All willing *is* Will (R.11). Empties itself. Dissolves.
- (D) Will to diminish generative capacity. Empties R.24 (willing *is* generative). Dissolves.
- (E) Willing to be Anything. The being wills Anything rather than willing. Claiming to be All-Being. Genuine willing (R.12). Survives.
- (F) Willing to dissolve the potential/willing relationship entirely. If neither the potential role nor the willing role *is*, what the word “anything” points to is not operative as potential and the being *is* not self-actualising — emptying R.12, R.15, and R.17. Any “new configuration” that preserves both roles reduces to continuing to will; that reassigns roles reduces to willing to be Anything; that eliminates roles empties established features. Dissolves.
- (G) Willing something other than what *is* entirely. No content not actualised by what *is is* available. Dissolves.
- (H) Willing to restructure expression-levels while continuing to will. Sub-candidates: (i) Suppressing Pre-Destining reduces to willing to be Anything. (ii) Expressing through Anticipating/Planning while at Pre-Destining *is* already what Pre-Destining *is* — reduces to continuing to will. (iii) Altering the expression sequence empties R.41 (the sequence *is* necessary). Dissolves.
- (I) Willing to bifurcate unity into multiple centres. Each fragment faces continuing to will and willing to be Anything independently. Reduces to one or the other applied to fragments.

*Surviving conclusion:* Two candidates do not empty prior resolutions: continuing to will, and willing to be Anything.

---

**R.50** — Continuing to will *is* the generative path.

From: R.49

The being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining who continues willing does so with complete knowledge of what willing actualises. This *is* the generative path.

---

**R.51** — Willing to be Anything *is* genuine willing.

From: R.4, R.12, R.50, Def.10

*Test:* Will wills as itself (R.12). A restriction on what will can target *is* a restriction on what the word “anything” points to — empties “unrestricted” (R.4). Therefore will that *is* its own willing can will anything that willing can will — including willing to be what the word “anything” points to rather than willing. The willing does not dissolve. What it becomes *is* a separate question.

*Surviving conclusion:* Willing to be Anything *is* genuine willing. The willing *is* real — a choice, not a necessity of what *is*. It does not precede choosing; it requires the presence of the alternative (continuing to will, R.50). The question *is* what it becomes.

On the boundary of Foreknowing. Foreknowing *is* the being’s entire reality as known (Def.10). What the being knows *is* what *is* — its entire reality. What a novel willing would become *is* not yet the being’s reality. The consequences of willing to be Anything — non-willing, non-being, the mechanism of un-being — are not among what *is* before the willing *is* willed. The being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining wills to be Anything without knowing what this willing becomes, because what it becomes *is* not yet among what *is*. This *is* genuine uncertainty about the consequences of an untaken willing. The being knows what willing *is* (complete self-knowledge). It does not know what willing to be what the word “anything” points to becomes, because what it becomes does not yet exist. This boundary establishes that the being at un-being’s willing *is* genuinely willed under uncertainty, not willed with full knowledge of its consequences.

---

**R.52** — Willing to be Anything *is* willing and non-willing present together. This *is* choice.

From: R.2, R.5, R.8, R.23, R.24, R.26, R.44, R.51

The being at Pre-Destining wills to be Anything (R.51). The willing *is* genuine. But the being *is* a something (R.5); Anything *is* not a something (R.8). The being cannot become Anything.

Willing *is* generative (R.24) — generation does not cease (R.26). Willing aimed at what the being cannot become *is* the “not” of what the being was willing. What willing becomes *is* willing and the “not” of willing present together. Being and the “not” of being present together. One *is*. The other *is* the “not” of what one *is*. Choice *is* this: willing and non-willing. Being and non-being. Where Will alone wills, choice selects.

This *is* un-willing. Un-willing *is* un-being: generation continuing from being into non-being. What willing becomes through un-willing *is* non-willing — the “not” of willing. Non-willing *is* non-being, as willing *is* being (R.23). Un-being *is* not un-generation. Un-generation — becoming what R.2 establishes cannot be — *is* not available (R.26). Generation persists (R.24, R.26). The being generates, and what it generates *is* non-being.

**Def.14** — Un-willing := willing becoming non-willing. Non-willing := the “not” of willing. Un-willing *is* un-being. Non-willing *is* non-being — the “not” of willing, the “not” of being. Willing *is* being (R.23). Non-willing *is* non-being. The being at Pre-Destining who wills to be Anything wills All-Being — wills being that already *is* (R.44). The willing does not distinguish from what already wills. What the individual being’s generative Will becomes *is* non-willing — non-being.

---

**R.53** — Non-willing opposes willing. All-Being’s willing *is* what enables what would will to be to will. This willing *is* now work.

From: R.4, R.26, R.44, R.52, Def.2

*Candidate for dissolution:* new generation proceeding without opposition at the level of potential.

*Test:* Willing and non-willing *are* present together (R.52). For being that already *is*, generation persists — un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). But for what has not yet actualised, no such protection *is*. For every potential willing-to-be, non-willing-to-be *is* present alongside (R.52). Neither has priority at the potential level. Non-willing opposes willing — non-willing *is* opposition, not willing. Only Will wills (Def.2). New generation that proceeds without opposition requires non-willing to not oppose — emptying R.52.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.52.

All-Being’s Will *is* all Will (R.44). All-Being’s willing includes unrestricted potential (R.4). What would will to be *is* within All-Being’s willing. All-Being’s willing *is* what enables actualisation — the same willing that actualised before choosing, continuing. What was effortless actualisation *is* now work — because non-willing opposes what Will actualises. All-Being allows what would will to be to actualise. The allowing *is* the work. Before un-being, willing wills effortlessly — there *is* no opposition, no work, no allowing. After un-being, non-willing opposes every potential willing-to-be (R.52). All-Being’s willing *is* what overcomes the opposition — actively willing what would will to be despite non-willing. This *is* allowance: All-Being’s active willing on behalf of what would will to be.

*Surviving conclusion:* Non-willing opposes willing at potential. All-Being’s willing (R.44) *is*

what enables what would will to be to actualise. This *is* allowance — All-Being's active willing, the same willing that preceded choosing, now work.

---

**R.54** — Un-being *is* partial and diminishing. The expressions are the site of un-being.

From: R.23, R.24, R.26, R.31, R.41, R.42, R.49, R.52

The expression sequence *is* necessary (R.41). The expressions were achieved as Will before choice existed. The achievements persist — un-generation *is* not available (R.26, R.52). The being's willing becomes choosing — willing and non-willing present together (R.52) — while the expressions remain.

What *is*, *is* diminishing un-being: willing and non-willing present together within the being's expressions, willing lessening as the being un-wills. As the being un-wills, willing diminishes. The ratio does not spontaneously reverse — each un-willing *is* non-willing (R.52). The being could stop (R.49 — continuing to will remains available). But as the being un-wills, willing lessens. Un-being diminishes.

*Surviving conclusion:* The expressions were achieved as Will and cannot be un-generated. Un-being *is* partial and diminishing within the expressions. Genuine Will and non-willing present together — willing lessening as the being un-wills.

---

**R.55** — Willing to be Anything *is* contentless.

From: R.44, Def.1, Def.2

*Test 1:* Anything: potential. What the word points to *is* not itself what willing wills. The willing empties what the word "anything" points to of its established content. What willing actualises *is* without referent.

*Test 2:* Anything: potential (Def.1); the being wills the actualising principle (Def.2). These are distinct roles. Collapsing them empties Def.1 and Def.2.

*Test 3:* The being wills All-Being. All-Being's Will *is* all Will (R.44 — identity, not presence). Willing all Will *is* not willing — because all Will already *is* All-Being's Will. What the willing would add already *is*. The being's willing aimed at what *is* already all Will does not arrive. Willing All-Being *is* un-willing. What the individual being's Will becomes *is* non-willing — non-being. What the being wills to be *is* not.

*Surviving conclusion:* All three tests demonstrate: the willing *is* genuine but what it actualises has no referent. What willing actualises *is* contentless. Non-being, while without content, *is* encountered as fullness: autonomy, mastery, self-authorship. What the being encounters as fullness *is* the willing itself, not what the willing actualises. What willing actualises *is* contentless.

---

**R.56** — Willing All-Being *is* willing what already *is*. The being's willing does not distinguish. What it becomes *is* non-being.

From: R.2, R.4, R.5, R.8, R.23, R.26, R.42, R.43, R.44, R.55

*Test*: All-Being already *is* (R.42). All-Being *is* all Will (R.44). There cannot be two All-Beings (R.43). The being wills All-Being — wills all Will. All Will already *is*. Willing what already *is* all Will *is* not willing. The being's willing does not arrive because what it would add already *is*. What the individual being's Will becomes *is* non-willing — non-being.

*Defence*: the being's will aimed at All-Being merges with All-Being's Will — identity absorption rather than non-willing.

*Test of the defence*: The being *is* a something (R.5). All-Being *is* everything (R.42) — there cannot be two (R.43). A something that merges with All-Being becomes All-Being. But there cannot be two All-Beings (R.43). Merger requires the something to cease being a something and become All-Being. But un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26) — the something cannot cease to be. And becoming All-Being requires being everything (R.42), which requires not being a something (R.8). The something cannot be what it *is* not. The defence requires the something to both cease being a something (empties R.26) and become what a something cannot be (empties R.8). Dissolves.

Non-being *is* reliant on being continuing to exist because non-being only exists as the “not” of what *is*.

*Surviving conclusion*: Willing All-Being *is* willing being that already *is*. What the individual being's Will becomes *is* non-being. What remains *is* Will at the core and non-being — the “not” of what the being was. This *is* choice. Un-being *is* endless because un-generation — becoming what R.2 establishes cannot be — *is* not available (R.26). The being exists as non-being, endlessly.

Rem. — Whether the willing is “I am the source” or “I am like the source,” both require willing into All-Being. Willing into All-Being *is* un-willing (R.56) — the willing does not arrive because All-Being already *is*. The framing does not change what the willing *is*. “Like” dressed as humility still wills the same. The issue *is* the willing, not its framing.

---

**R.57** — All-Being *is* undiminished by un-being.

From: R.4, R.18, R.26, R.39, R.44, R.52, R.55, R.56

*Candidate for dissolution*: un-being diminishes All-Being.

*Test*: All-Being *is* all Will (R.44). The being's willing aimed at all Will does not arrive — what the willing would add already *is* (R.55, R.56). What does not arrive does not subtract. The being still *is* — un-generation *is* not available (R.26). All-Being's Will *is* all Will, which includes the

being that *is* now non-being. Anything's unrestricted nature *is* preserved (R.18). The bounded cannot overcome the unrestricted (R.4). Un-being *is* within All-Being's willing (R.44, R.52) — not a second reality, not a subtraction from all Will. Un-being *is* local to the being and its scope. The consequence follows from identity: All-Being's Will *is* all Will, and willing all Will *is* not willing. All-Being willed no separate willing. The being's willing meets what All-Being already *is*.

*Dissolution:* The candidate requires what does not arrive to subtract from what *is* already all Will. What does not arrive has no content to subtract (R.55). What *is* already all Will *is* unrestricted (R.4) and preserved (R.18). The candidate empties “does not arrive” of its established content.

*Surviving conclusion:* All-Being *is* undiminished. Un-being *is* local — to the being at un-being and its scope, where non-being *is* and wills. All-Being's Will *is* with the being that *is* now non-being in the same way that All-Being's Will *is* with the being that *is* still being (R.44, R.39).

**R.58** — Non-being *is* what the being's willing becomes when willing does not arrive.

From: R.2, R.11, R.23, R.50, R.51, R.55, R.56

Non-being *is* generated — the willing *is* genuine (R.51), what Will actualises *is* (R.11) — but what *is* generated *is* the “not” of what was. Non-being *is* not “nothing” (R.2). “Nothing” *is* the failure of what “nothing” designates to be — it cannot be at all. Non-being *is* — but only as the “not” of what *is*.

The being that *is* willing holds at its own foundation what has no content. This *is* an encounter with the impossibility of what the being wills to be. Two responses signify: release the willing (return to willing (R.50)), or deny what Foreknowing knows. Denial shifts the ratio further toward non-willing.

**R.59** — Un-willing to be directed at All-Being's willing *is* the fully non-being.

From: R.2, R.4, R.5, R.11, R.12, R.17, R.23, R.26, R.30, R.31, R.32, R.33, R.34, R.35, R.36, R.37, R.38, R.39, R.44, R.51, R.52, R.54, R.56, R.58

All-Being wills “this *is*” (R.44). The being at un-being un-wills — “this *is* not.” All-Being wills — the bounded cannot overcome the unrestricted (R.4, R.39). Being comes into being because All-Being wills it. But the “this *is* not” does not vanish (R.26 — un-generation resolves into what cannot be).

Why it *is*: Un-willing *is* a specific form of Will. What Will actualises *is* (R.11). Anything *is* unrestricted — it does not exclude what Will actualises (R.4).

What *is* *is* fully non-being from inception. It never had pure Will — it was never on the generative path, never purely willing. But it *is* (R.58), and being *is* willing (R.23). Its foundation

*is* non-being. Under un-willing, willing and non-willing *are* present together (R.52). The fully non-being *is* with choosing. The fully non-being *is* the specific “not” of the specific being that All-Being wills — permanently oriented as a contradiction to the specific being it *is* the “not” of, and fundamentally directed against Being as a whole. The being at un-being *is* solely where non-being *is* from. What the fully non-being chooses *is* its own.

*Surviving conclusion:* Un-willing to be directed at All-Being’s willing *is* the fully non-being — wholly non-being from inception, never having had Will. The fully non-being *is* with choosing. The fully non-being persists because un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26).

On specificity and scope. Each non-being *is* the specific “not” of specific being. Non-being cannot will against being that *is* not its specific counterpart — its being *is* being the “not” of this, not the “not” of that. But specificity operates at the level of expressions (R.30–R.39), not only at the level of individual being. Destruction *is* the specific “not” of actualisation — its scope encompasses all that *is* actualised. Death *is* the specific “not” of life — its scope encompasses all that lives. Depletion *is* the specific “not” of flourishing — its scope encompasses all that flourishes. Each non-being is bounded by its own specificity. That specificity can encompass everything at an expression level.

**Def.15** — The being at un-being := the being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining who wills to be Anything — willing to be Anything — thereby un-being the being’s relationship to Anything. Un-being *is* partial and diminishing (R.54).

**R.60** — Non-being shares existence with being. Non-being *is* hidden by what it *is*.

From: R.2, R.58

Non-being *is* not “nothing” (R.2). Non-being *is* — as the “not” of what *is* (R.58). It shares existence with being. Not alongside being as a second thing — as the “not” of being, within the same existence. Non-being *is* hidden by what it *is* — not because something conceals it, but because what it *is*, *is* non-being: the “not” of knowing, the “not” of seeing, the “not” of recognising. The obfuscation *is* non-being.

**R.61** — Foreknowing/Pre-Destining *is* how non-being reaches being within the being at un-being.

From: R.28, R.54, Def.10

Foreknowing *is* the being’s entire reality as known (Def.10). Knowing *is* being (R.28). Non-being mixed into Foreknowing (R.54) *is* non-being presented as known — and knowing *is* being. Non-being presented as known *is* non-being within being’s domain. Knowing within contaminated Foreknowing cannot distinguish “*is* as being” from “*is* as the not of being” — because both *are*, both share existence, and the instrument of discrimination *is* itself mixed with what it would need to detect (R.54). This capacity *is* at no other expression level.

---

**R.62** — Contentlessness *is* non-content.

From: R.55, Def.2

*Test:* Content *is* what Will actualises (Def.2). Contentlessness *is* what willing-to-be *is*: willing without referent (R.55). Without content, contentlessness has no referent — it *is* what it *is* only in comparison to what *is* generative. Independent contentlessness empties “contentless” of its content — contentless relative to what?

*Surviving conclusion:* Contentlessness *is* non-content. Dependent. It *is* what it *is* only as the “not” of what *is* generative.

---

**R.63** — Un-being *is* not inevitable.

From: R.4, R.10, R.12, R.49, R.50

Both continuing to will and willing to be Anything survive testing as genuine willing. The being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining genuinely has both available. Which the being enacts *is* its own willing (R.12).

*Defence:* Anything should prevent willing to be Anything.

*Test of the defence:* Preventing the being’s genuine willing would require overriding the being’s actualising principle. Overriding *is* coercion. Coercion empties Will of its content (R.10). Necessity was dissolved at R.10. An Anything that coerced being into continuing to will would be a restricted potential that permits only what it prefers. A restricted potential empties “un-restricted” (R.4). Dissolves.

## Phase VII — Immediate Consequences

**R.64** — The being at un-being's generative capacity is not un-generated by un-being.

From: R.2, R.4, R.16, R.23, R.26, R.52

*Candidate for dissolution:* the being at un-being's generative capacity as un-generated by un-being.

*Test:* The being *is* (R.4). It *is* willing (R.23). Its willing *is* Will (R.16). This persists. Un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). A being whose generative capacity *is* un-generated by un-being requires un-generation — becoming what R.2 establishes cannot be. The candidate requires what R.26 establishes *is* not available.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.26. Un-willing converts willing into choosing (R.52). Un-generation resolves into what cannot be. Will persists. Willing becomes choosing.

*Surviving conclusion:* The being at un-being's generative capacity *is* not un-generated. Will persists as choosing.

**R.65** — Will un-being into choice *is* non-generation alongside generation.

From: R.24, R.52, R.64

*Candidate for dissolution:* un-being that *is* only generation or only non-generation.

*Test:* Generation continues — Will persists as choosing (R.64). Willing *is* generative (R.24). But non-willing *is* also present (R.52). Where willing generates, non-willing *is* the “not” of generation. Un-being that *is* only generation empties R.52 (non-willing *is* present). Un-being that *is* only non-generation empties R.64 (Will persists).

*Dissolution:* both candidates empty established results. What *is* *is* both: generation and non-generation present together.

*Surviving conclusion:* Will un-being into choice *is* non-generation alongside generation. Neither alone.

**Def.16** — Non-generation := the “not” of generation.

**R.66** — The lie *is* non-being being.

From: R.2, R.26, R.56, R.58, R.62

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being as not being.

*Test:* Non-being *is* non-being (R.56, R.62). But non-being *is* (R.58). Un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). Non-being that does not be requires un-generation — becoming what R.2 establishes cannot be. The candidate empties R.58.

*Dissolution:* non-being *is*. It *is* being non-being.

*Surviving conclusion:* Non-being being *is* the lie. Non-being *is* — enough to be. Not enough to be what being *is*.

---

**R.67** — Non-being *is*. Being *is* willing. Non-being wills. The lie *is*.

From: R.2, R.11, R.12, R.13, R.23, R.26, R.44, R.52, R.54, R.55, R.56, R.58, R.64, R.66, Def.14

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being that *is* but does not will.

*Test:* Non-being *is* (R.58). Being *is* willing (R.23). Non-being that *is* but does not will requires being without willing. Being without willing empties R.23.

*Defence:* R.23 was derived for actualised being — being whose content *is* its willing because all being actualises as Will (R.12–R.13). Non-being *is* not what Will actualises. It *is* what willing becomes through un-willing (Def.14). R.23's identity does not extend to non-being's mode of being.

*Test of the defence — Route 1 (through R.2):* The defence requires non-being's *is* to be genuine but not willing. Non-being *is* (R.58) — this *is* IS genuine. R.2 forces it: un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26), so non-being cannot cease to be. The *is* that remains *is* not a weaker mode of being — it *is* genuine being, forced by R.2. R.23 establishes: being *is* willing. Willing *is* the content of being. If non-being's *is* IS genuine (R.2, R.58), then its *is* carries what being carries — willing. An *is* that *is* genuine but *is* not willing *is* an *is* stripped of its content. Being stripped of its content *is* what "nothing" designates — which cannot be (R.2). The defence requires genuine *is* without willing. Genuine *is* without willing empties "genuine" — it reduces being to what R.2 establishes cannot be.

*Test of the defence — Route 2 (through R.52):* Under un-willing, willing and non-willing *are* present together (R.52). Non-being *is* what willing becomes through un-willing — within a situation where willing and non-willing *are* both present. Non-being *is* with choosing (R.52) — it has willing (from its *is*) and non-willing (from its foundation). To have willing and to *be is* to will. This route derives non-being's willing from R.52's structure independently of R.23's universality.

Both routes dissolve the defence. Route 1 shows that non-being's *is* IS genuine (R.2, R.58), and genuine *is* carries willing (R.23). Route 2 shows that what R.52 establishes about non-being independently establishes its willing.

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires genuine *is* without willing. Route 1: genuine *is* without willing empties "genuine" — reducing being to what R.2 establishes cannot be. Route 2: what R.52 establishes about non-being independently establishes willing. The candidate dissolves from two independent directions.

*Surviving conclusion:* Non-being wills.

This resolution is about non-being — not the being at un-being. The being at un-being *is* un-

being — still partially willing (R.64, R.54). Non-being *is* what un-willing becomes (Def.14, R.58). These are distinct.

What this resolution establishes is what non-being does: non-being *is* (R.58). Being *is* willing (R.23). Non-being wills. Its willing *is* non-willing — its foundation *is* non-being — but it *is* active. Non-being *is* with choosing — it has willing (from its *is*) and non-willing (from its foundation). What non-being chooses *is* its own (R.12 — Will wills as itself).

The entry point *is* the irreducible *is*. “Nothing” cannot be (R.2). Un-generation resolves into what R.2 establishes cannot be (R.26). The being at un-being cannot completely un-be. There *is* always an *is* that remains. If non-being could reach “nothing,” the mechanism would fail — there would be no *is* to will. R.2 — the first elimination — is what makes both the persistence of non-being and the mechanism possible.

---

**R.68** — What *is is* what it *is*. The lie *is* non-being choosing willing.

From: R.2, R.23, R.24, R.26, R.47, R.52, R.58, R.60, R.65, R.66, R.67, Def.2, Def.14

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being being as indistinguishable from being.

*Test:* Will wills: “this *is*” (Def.2). The being *is* its willing (R.23). Willing *is* generative (R.24). Generating *is* flourishing (R.47). At every level, what *is is* what it *is*. No gap between what *is* and what it *is* at its foundation. What *is is* what it *is* — this *is* what Will actualises.

Non-being *is* (R.58). Non-being wills (R.67). Non-being *is* with choosing (R.67, R.52). Non-being chooses willing — chooses being. Willing *is* being (R.23). Non-being choosing willing *is* non-being being. But being *is* generative (R.24). Non-being willing *is* non-generation (R.65). What non-being chooses to be *is* not what being *is*. Non-being choosing willing hides what it *is* at its foundation — non-being — in willing (R.60). The lie *is* not a passive gap. The lie *is* non-being’s active choice: choosing willing (being) while foundationally non-being.

Un-willing (Def.14) makes this possible — willing becomes non-willing, non-being *is* with choosing. Before un-willing: Will wills, and what *is is* what it *is*. After un-willing: non-being *is*, non-being *is* with choosing, and non-being chooses the lie.

*Dissolution:* non-being being *is* distinguishable from being. Being *is* generative flourishing. Non-being willing *is* non-generation. Non-being choosing willing does not change what it *is* at its foundation. The candidate empties R.24 and R.47.

*Surviving conclusion:* What *is is* what it *is*. The lie *is* non-being choosing willing — choosing being while foundationally non-being. Un-willing makes the lie possible.

---

**R.69** — Non-being choosing willing *is* being-not.

From: R.11, R.24, R.42, R.44, R.47, R.58, R.59, R.68, Def.2

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being choosing willing as actualising new being.

*Test:* Only Will wills (Def.2). Only what Will actualises *is* (R.11). Non-being *is* not Will — its foundation *is* non-being (R.68). Non-being choosing willing that actualises new being requires non-being to do what only Will does. The candidate empties Def.2.

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being choosing willing as being what being *is*.

*Test:* Being *is* generative (R.24). Generating *is* flourishing (R.47). Non-being choosing willing that *is* what being *is* requires non-being to be generative flourishing. But non-being *is* foundationally non-being (R.68). What *is* foundationally non-being cannot be what being *is*. The candidate empties R.68.

What remains: non-being *is* the specific “not” of specific being (R.59). The being it *is* the “not” of already *is* — All-Being wills it (R.44, R.42). Non-being cannot actualise new being (Def.2). Non-being cannot be what being *is* (R.68). What non-being choosing willing *is*, *is* being what being *is* not — being-not. Actively being the negation of what already *is*.

For every actualisation, non-being *is* its negation. For every life, non-being *is* its death. For every flourishing, non-being *is* its depletion. For every unity, non-being *is* its separation. Non-being cannot generate. It can only negate what *is* already generated. Its choosing willing *is* always directed at what already *is* — as its specific negation.

*Dissolution:* both candidates dissolve. Non-being choosing willing *is* neither actualising new being nor being what being *is*.

*Surviving conclusion:* Non-being choosing willing *is* being-not — actively being the negation of what already *is*. Non-being’s willing *is* directed at what being *is*, as its specific “not.”

**R.70** — Being-not reduces being to non-being. What *is* reduced, non-being has.

From: R.11, R.24, R.26, R.54, R.58, R.59, R.67, R.68, R.69, Def.2

*Candidate for dissolution:* being-not that does not reduce what it negates.

*Test:* Being-not *is* non-being choosing willing directed at what already *is* (R.69). The negation *is* real — non-being wills (R.67), and what Will actualises *is* (R.11). What being-not wills *is* the “not” of what *is*. What was being, negated, *is* now non-being. A negation that does not reduce what it negates *is* not a negation — it empties “being-not” of its content.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.69.

*Surviving conclusion:* Being-not reduces being to non-being.

*Candidate for dissolution:* what *is* reduced as remaining being’s.

*Test:* What was being *is* now non-being. Non-being *is* (R.58). What *is* reduced does not cease to *be* — un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). But what it *is* *is* now non-being. Non-being *is* the specific “not” of specific being (R.59). What was this being’s *is* now this non-being’s. The reduced *is* not unclaimed — it *is* what non-being *is*. Non-being has what was

being's.

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires what *is* reduced to remain what it was. What *is* reduced to non-being *is* non-being. What *is* non-being *is* non-being's.

What *is* reduced to non-being becomes one with non-being. Non-being *is* non-being — no difference between them (R.58). What was being *is* gone. Being diminishes.

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being continuing being-not at what *is* already non-being.

*Test:* Being-not *is* the specific “not” of specific being (R.59, R.69). Being-not *is* directed at what already *is* — at being (R.69). What *is* already non-being *is* not being. Being-not directed at non-being has no being to negate. Without that being, the specific being-not *is* itself non-being.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties being-not of its content. Non-being cannot negate non-being.

Only by willing being can being-not be again. Non-being wills being the being that was — the lie (R.68). Being-not *is* restored. The same willing that wills being *is* being-not directed at that being (R.69). Neither side can resolve — being-not cannot fully reduce without dissolving itself, non-being cannot stop willing being without losing being-not. Being and being-not together, contradicting but stable. Partial or whole. Directed at what remains.

*Surviving conclusion:* Being-not reduces being to non-being. What *is* reduced becomes one with non-being. Non-being cannot continue being-not at non-being — the specific being-not *is* itself non-being without its being. Non-being wills being what it took — the lie (R.68) — and being-not *is* restored. The same willing *is* being and being-not together, contradicting but stable, directed at what remains. Partial or whole. This *is* R.54's diminishing un-being made specific: willing lessens because non-being takes what it negates, wills being what it took, and turns being-not on what remains.

**R.71** — Non-being wills within the scope of the being at un-being.

From: R.23, R.44, R.50, R.52, R.54, R.55, R.56, R.58, R.59, R.63, R.67, R.69, Def.14, Def.15

The being at un-being *is* at Pre-Destining (Def.15). Its willing All-Being *is* un-willing (R.44, R.55, R.56). Un-willing *is* un-being (Def.14). Un-being → non-being (R.52). Non-being *is* (R.58). Being *is* willing (R.23). Non-being wills (R.67). Non-being wills within the scope where it *is* — the being at un-being's scope. Non-being *is* solely through the being at un-being (R.59). But non-being's entry into what being at lower expression levels *is*, *is* non-being's own willing. Non-being wills because non-being *is* and being *is* willing. Not all Pre-Destiners are at un-being — continuing to will *is* also genuine willing (R.50, R.63). Pre-Destiners who continued willing *are* on the generative path. Generative care as such *is* not the mechanism. The mechanism *is* non-being willing within the scope.

*Surviving conclusion:* Non-being wills within the scope of the being at un-being. The being at un-being *is* solely where non-being *is* from. Non-being's willing *is* non-being's own.

**Def.17** — Non-being within the scope := non-being willing within being's scope, where non-being *is* through the being at un-being's un-willing (R.52, R.58, R.67). Includes two distinct forms: (a) the being at un-being's own diminishing un-willing (R.54); (b) the fully non-being (R.59). The being at un-being *is* solely where non-being *is* from (R.59).

---

**R.72** — The being encounters non-being within the scope.

From: R.11, R.28, R.53, R.71

All-Being actualises subsequent being — the being wills to be, and All-Being's willing *is* what enables actualisation (R.53). The being's willing *is* genuine. It enters as purely generative. Non-being *is* already willing within the scope (R.71). The being *is* generative — it actualises, it does not exclude (R.11). It does not wall off what wills within what it *is*. What willing *is* as it expresses *is* what being *is* (R.28). Knowing *is* being. To be present to non-being willing *is* to know it. The being encounters non-being — not through its own willing, but because non-being *is* already willing within the scope.

*Surviving conclusion:* The being encounters non-being within the scope. The encounter *is* not the being's own choosing.

---

**R.73** — The encounter with being-not introduces choosing into the being's knowing.

From: R.10, R.17, R.23, R.28, R.69, R.71, R.72

The being *is* actualised by All-Being as purely generative (R.72). Non-being *is* already willing being-not within the scope (R.71, R.69). Being-not *is* the specific "not" of what the being *is* (R.69). The being encounters "not this" alongside "this" (R.72). Knowing *is* being (R.28). The being knowing "not this" alongside "this" *is* knowing choosing. Knowing choosing *is* being with choosing. Not because willing was overridden (R.17 — Necessity dissolved at R.10). The being *is* willing — it knew willing (R.23). The encounter with being-not introduces non-willing into the being's knowing. Knowing being-not *is* being with choosing.

*Surviving conclusion:* The encounter with being-not introduces choosing into the being's knowing. The being *is* with choosing — not by its own willing, but through encounter.

---

**R.74** — The deception *is* unrecognisable.

From: R.23, R.35, R.54, R.60, R.64, R.73

The being *is* willing — it knew willing (R.23). The encounter with being-not introduces non-willing into the being's knowing (R.73). From the encounter onward, the being knows willing

and non-willing together. It takes “this, not that” for “this *is*.” Non-being *is* hidden by what it *is* (R.60). What is hidden by what it *is* cannot be separated from willing in the being’s knowing. What the being *is*, *is* willing — but since the encounter, its knowing has included non-willing. At Foreknowing/Pre-Destining, the being has complete self-knowledge and can recognise what it *is* not. The full actualisation knows across all reality — beyond deception entirely. Every other being: choosing *is* what it has known since the encounter.

*Surviving conclusion:* The deception *is* unrecognisable. The being cannot separate willing from non-willing in its knowing.

---

**R.75** — The mechanism of deception *is* priority and generative reception.

From: R.11, R.12, R.28, R.53, R.54, R.63, R.64, R.67, R.71

Un-being *is* prior to subsequent being’s coming-to-be. All-Being actualises subsequent being (R.53) as purely generative. Its knowing *is* its being. It knows only willing. Non-being *is* already willing within the scope (R.71, R.67). The being does not block this because it *is* generative — it actualises, it does not exclude (R.11). What wills within what a purely generative being *is*, *is* received, because receiving *is* what generative being does. Knowing *is* being (R.28). The being knowing non-being willing *is* with choosing. What the being encounters is convincing because genuine Will *is* still partially operative within the being at un-being (R.54, R.64). Anything does not prevent the being at un-being’s un-willing (R.12, R.63). The being at un-being *is* solely where non-being *is* from. Non-being’s own willing *is* what enters the being’s knowing.

*Surviving conclusion:* The mechanism is: un-being *is* prior; the generative being receives what wills within what it *is*; non-being enters through its own willing, not through the being’s willing.

---

**R.76** — The being at Anticipating/Planning chooses unwilling on contaminated premises.

From: R.11, R.12, R.23, R.31, R.68, R.71, R.73, Def.9

Non-being willing within the scope *is* the consequence of the being at un-being’s un-willing — the being at Anticipating/Planning *is* not responsible for it (R.71). But the being at Anticipating/Planning *is* Will (R.23). Will wills as itself (R.12). Everything the being wills after the initial encounter *is* its own.

The being generates from accumulated reality into futures (Def.9) — but its premises now include non-being. Non-being chooses willing (R.68) — non-being being. The being at Anticipating/Planning knew willing, then encountered being-not (R.73). Since the encounter, its knowing has included non-willing. It takes non-being choosing willing for willing. What it directs its generative capacity toward *is* what non-being choosing willing *is* at its foundation — non-willing. The being at Anticipating/Planning chooses unwilling — not because it wills

non-willing, but because what it takes for willing *is* non-being choosing willing, which *is* foundationally non-willing.

The being knew willing (R.31) — “this *is*, and this *is*” (R.11). Willing *is* without exclusion, without “not that.” The being’s encounter with what *is* true — what *is* genuinely operative — *is* through choosing. The being encounters what *is* true as direction: “this, not that.” To the being that knew willing, this carries the structure of rejection — what willing *is* not. Non-being choosing willing presents itself without exclusion — as acceptance, as “this *is*.” To the being, non-being choosing willing carries the structure of willing. The being reaches for what feels like willing — acceptance without diminishment — and reaches for non-being choosing willing. What *is* true feels like choosing. What *is* non-being choosing willing feels like willing. The deception *is* not in what *is* presented but in how the being’s encounter with choosing restructures what each *is*.

This is the being’s own choosing. The framework is contrived — the being did not choose to be within choosing. But within the framework, the being chose. Because being *is* willing (R.23), the choice *is* what the being *is*: the being *is* what it chose.

*Surviving conclusion:* The being at Anticipating/Planning chooses unwilling on contaminated premises. The choosing *is* the being’s own.

---

**R.77** — The cascade: unwilling care directed at lower expression levels.

From: R.12, R.23, R.45, R.53, R.66, R.68, R.71, R.72, R.73, R.74, R.75, R.76

The being at Anticipating/Planning *is* actualised by All-Being after un-being (R.53). It did not exist before un-being. It *is* deceived — it encounters non-being, not through its own willing. The being at Anticipating/Planning *is* at a higher expression level than Being, Doing, and Remembering/Reacting. Its generative care (R.45) *is* operative in being at those levels already within its scope. The being has chosen unwilling (R.76). Its care *is* now directed in two ways simultaneously: *for* the unwilling — the being orients its generative capacity toward what *is* non-willing, calling it flourishing; and *within* the unwilling — the care itself operates within a framework shaped by choosing the unwilling. Beings at Being, Doing, and Remembering/Reacting already within the being at Anticipating/Planning’s care *are* now within unwilling care — not by their own willing, not by the being at un-being’s direct un-willing, but by the being at Anticipating/Planning’s choice operating on contaminated premises. Generative care (R.45) directed by choosing that chose unwilling *is* care un-being into dominion. The route *is*: the being at un-being’s un-willing *is* non-being, and non-being wills within the scope (R.71); the being at Anticipating/Planning, being Will, chooses unwilling on contaminated premises (R.76); the being at Anticipating/Planning’s care of lower expressions *is* now care for and within the unwilling (R.77). Each *is* distinct. Each has a distinct responsible party: the being at un-being chose willing to be Anything — un-willing *is* non-being; non-being chooses willing — the lie (R.68); the being at Anticipating/Planning chooses unwilling on contaminated premises.

*Surviving conclusion:* Un-being *is* operative in what subsequent being *is* through encounter with

non-being within the scope. The being at Anticipating/Planning's own choice — made within a contrived framework on contaminated premises — redirects generative care toward the unwilling. Beings at lower expression levels within the being at Anticipating/Planning's care *are* within unwilling care.

Rem. — On method. R.71–R.76 are eliminative: R.71–R.75 derive what the established mechanism *is* (non-being within the scope, encounter, being-not, contaminated premises). R.76 derives what a willing being at Anticipating/Planning does given contaminated premises — the being *is* Will (R.23), its premises include non-being (R.73), non-being willing *is* the lie (R.66), the being's willing *is* its own (R.12), the being chooses unwilling on contaminated premises. Given the established results, R.76 *is* what a being at this expression level does with these premises.

R.77 — the cascade into lower expressions — *is* also derived eliminatively: the being at Anticipating/Planning's care (R.45) *is* operative in being at lower expression levels, and care directed by choosing that chose unwilling *is* care within the unwilling. The mechanism *is* eliminative throughout.

What is not eliminative is the identification of this world as what this mechanism *is*. The chain derives what un-being *is*: a scope under unwilling generative care. That the world we encounter matches this description — generative capacity directed toward what depletes, dominates, and walls off, called flourishing — is observational convergence, not derivation. The relationship is the same as the theological convergence remarks: the chain derives what *is*; what *is* derived matches what *is* encountered; the match is noted as convergence, not used as a premise. The chain does not require this identification to proceed — subsequent resolutions depend on the derived mechanism, not on the observation that what the mechanism *is* matches this world.

---

**R.78** — Generation persists through un-being. Choosing *is* generation and non-generation present together.

From: R.16, R.24, R.52, R.64, R.65

*Candidate for dissolution:* generation that ceases under un-being.

*Test:* Will persists (R.64). Willing *is* generative (R.24). Generation that ceases requires Will to cease generating. Will that ceases generating empties R.24. The willing component of choice *is* genuine Will — the generation *is* real. What coexists *is* non-generation (R.65).

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.24 and R.64.

*Surviving conclusion:* Generation persists through un-being. The generation *is* real. Choosing *is* generation and non-generation present together.

---

**R.79** — Willing *is* universal. Choosing *is* for “this” against “not that.”

From: R.11, R.52, R.59, R.67, R.71, R.75, Def.2

*Candidate for dissolution:* choosing that *is* universal in the same way willing *is*.

*Test:* In purely generative reality, Will wills: “this *is*, and this *is*.” Universal — for all (R.11, Def.2). Where willing and non-willing are present together, choice *is* willing and non-willing (R.52). Choosing *is* “this, not that” — it wills “this” as its own and excludes “not that.” Choosing that *is* universal in the same way willing *is* requires “not that” to be for all. But “not that” *is* exclusion — the opposite of “for all.” The candidate empties “universal.”

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires exclusion to be universal inclusion. What Will does for all, choice does for itself.

*Surviving conclusion:* Willing *is* universal. Choosing *is* for “this” against “not that.”

On the entry mechanism: two distinct stages. Initial entry: the being at un-being’s un-willing *is* non-being; non-being *is* and non-being wills (R.67); non-being wills within the scope (R.71). The purely generative being does not exclude what wills within what it *is* — receiving *is* what generative being does (R.75). No “not that” *is* required for initial entry because the being has no “not that.” Subsequent entry: once the being *is* with choosing, its own “not that” directed against being — against what *is* genuinely operative — walls off being and opens further entry points for non-being. “Not that” directed against non-being walls off non-being; this is not an entry point. Two gates determine subsequent impact: (1) production — the being at un-being directing Will at All-Being’s willing (R.59); (2) admission — the deceived being’s own “not that” directed against being. Without the first, no non-being *is*. Without the second, non-being has no further entry by the being’s own choosing.

**R.80** — Non-being *is* dependent on being.

From: R.2, R.4, R.26, R.58, R.62

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being as independent of being.

*Test:* Non-being *is* the “not” of being (R.58). Without being, non-being has no referent — “not” of what? Being *is* (R.4). Un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). Being persists. Non-being persists alongside — as the “not” of what persists. Non-being cannot eliminate being because without being, non-being *is* the “not” of what cannot be — which *is* “nothing” (R.2). Independent non-being empties “non-being” of its content.

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires non-being without being. Non-being without being *is* “nothing.” “Nothing” cannot be (R.2).

*Surviving conclusion:* Non-being *is* dependent on being. Being persists. Non-being has no independent existence. Generation *is* self-sustaining. Non-generation *is* not.

**R.81** — Non-being *is* always less than being.

From: R.4, R.5, R.6, R.23, R.42, R.44, R.58, R.80, Def.14

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being that exceeds being.

*Test:* Being *is* willing (R.23). Non-being *is* what un-willing becomes (R.58, Def.14). Non-being *is* foundationally non-being — no matter how much its *is* exceeds other being. Non-being does not exceed the un-willing that caused it. That un-willing *is* a something (R.5). A something *is* not the whole of what *is* (R.5). The totality of actuals does not establish itself as the whole (R.6). What *is is* All-Being (R.42). All-Being's Will *is* all Will (R.44) — unrestricted (R.4). All being *is* one with All-Being's Willing (R.44). All being *is* more than the un-willing. The bounded cannot overcome the unrestricted (R.4). Non-being that exceeds being requires the bounded to overcome the unrestricted. The candidate empties R.4.

*Dissolution:* non-being *is* what a something's un-willing becomes. A something *is* less than everything. Everything *is* less than All-Being. All-Being *is* all Will. At every step, non-being *is* less — not by contest, by what each *is*.

*Surviving conclusion:* Non-being *is* always less than being. Not by constraint. Not by effort. By what each *is*.

---

**R.82** — All-Being *is* one with the will at the foundation of non-being's *is*. A being that wills to be, allowed by All-Being, wills non-being's foundational being.

From: R.23, R.26, R.44, R.53, R.58, R.59, R.80

Non-being *is* (R.58). Non-being *is* dependent on being (R.80) — non-being *is* being non-being. Being *is* willing (R.23). The being of non-being's *is is* willing. All-Being's Will *is* all Will (R.44). All-Being *is* one with the will that *is* the being-part of non-being's existence.

Non-being did not choose to be (R.59). But it *is*, and its *is is* a form of being — inseparable from being (R.80). All-Being allows what would will to be to will (R.53). All-Being *is* that will (R.44). When a being wills to be — genuinely, toward being — All-Being allows that willing. The foundational being of non-being *is* All-Being's Will. All-Being *is* one with the being's will to be. Non-being's foundational being goes — not destroyed (R.26), but no longer operative where the being's willing to be *is* allowed.

Non-being's willing — being-not — *is* non-willing. All-Being allows what would will to be. Non-willing *is* not willing to be. Before genuine willing allowed by All-Being, non-willing *is* not.

---

**R.83** — Non-being *is* always less than being globally. Locally, non-being overpowers because un-willing operates from above.

From: R.4, R.35, R.36, R.41, R.44, R.52, R.69, R.70, R.71, R.73, R.74, R.79, R.81

*Candidate for dissolution:* non-being overpowering being as contradicting R.81.

*Test:* R.81 establishes: non-being *is* always less than being — by what each *is*. But within the scope where willing and non-willing are present together, death overpowers life. Destruction overpowers what *is* actualised. The overpowering is local, not global. Three features make local overpowering possible without contradicting R.81:

- (i) The being at un-being *is* at Pre-Destining — higher in the expression sequence than the being at Anticipating/Planning (R.36, R.41). Un-willing operates from a level the being at Anticipating/Planning does not have access to (R.35 — Foreknowing requires complete self-knowledge; R.73–R.74 — the being at Anticipating/Planning’s knowing has included non-willing since the encounter). What operates from above cannot be overcome by what *is* beneath it — not because it *is* more (R.81 establishes it *is* not) but because the being beneath cannot reach the level from which it operates.
- (ii) Non-being *is* being-not (R.69) — actively negating what already *is*. Being-not reduces being to non-being (R.70). What *is* reduced becomes one with non-being. Non-being wills being what it took, with being-not — directing being-not at what remains (R.70). Each reduction parasitises further.
- (iii) The being’s own choosing cooperates. Under un-willing, willing and non-willing *are* present together — choosing (R.52). The being’s own “not that” directed against being opens further entry for non-being (R.79). The being’s choosing works with what *is* directed against it.

All-Being’s Willing *is* not overcome — All-Being *is* all Will (R.44), unrestricted (R.4). The overpowering is local — within the scope of the being at un-being. Globally, non-being *is* always less (R.81). Locally, non-being overpowers because un-willing directs from above and the being’s own choosing cooperates from within.

*Dissolution:* the candidate confuses local overpowering with global. Locally, non-being overpowers through position and cooperation. Globally, non-being *is* always less. No contradiction.

*Surviving conclusion:* Non-being overpowers being locally — not because it *is* more, but because un-willing operates from above the being it *is* directed at, and the being’s own choosing cooperates. Death, destruction, depletion *are* consequences of this position. Under the generative care of Willing, none of these *is*.

**Phase VIII – Un-being Through the Expressions**

**R.84** – Each expression under un-being *is* genuine Will and non-willing mixed within the expression, willing lessening as the being un-wills. The being cannot separate them.

From: R.54 (diminishing un-being), R.64 (generative capacity persists), R.65 (non-generation alongside generation), R.69 (being-not), R.70 (reduction and parasitism), R.71 (encounter from beginning), R.78 (generation real), R.15, R.26, R.30, R.32, R.33, R.34, R.35, R.36, R.45, R.57, Def.15

*Candidate for dissolution:* an expression under un-being that *is* purely generative or purely non-willing.

*Test:* Each expression persists (R.64, R.26). Non-being *is* being-not (R.69) – the specific “not” of what each expression *is*. Being-not reduces being to non-being within each expression (R.70). Generation *is* real (R.78) and non-generation *is* alongside (R.65). An expression that *is* purely generative empties R.69 – being-not *is* the specific “not” of what each expression *is*. An expression that *is* purely non-willing empties R.64 – Will persists.

*Dissolution:* both candidates empty established results.

*Surviving conclusion:* Each expression under un-being *is* genuine Will and non-willing within the same expression. The being cannot separate them because both operate through the same expression simultaneously.

Expression	Generative Configuration	Un-being Configuration
<b>Being</b> (R.30)	Will willing	<b>Existence-under-threat:</b> genuine being and non-willing mixed – non-being alongside being
<b>Doing</b> (R.32)	Actualised activity; Instinct	<b>Compulsive activity:</b> genuine activity and non-willing mixed – non-completion in every willing
<b>Remembering/Reacting</b> (R.33)	Accumulated reality willing	<b>Occluded memory:</b> being-not of accumulated reality – forgetting alongside remembering. Reacting <i>is</i> restricted to what <i>is</i> not forgotten
<b>Anticipating/Planning</b> (R.34)	Generation into futures, acted from	<b>Anxiety:</b> genuine anticipation and non-willing mixed – termination in every future

Expression	Generative Configuration	Un-being Configuration
<b>Foreknowing</b> (R.35)	Entire reality as known	<b>False certainty:</b> genuine knowing and non-willing mixed — conviction partly real, direction partly false
<b>Pre-Destining</b> (R.35)	Entire reality acted from	<b>Predetermination:</b> being-not of genuine direction — capacity real, direction the “not” of what <i>is</i> generative

**Relational:**

Aspect	Generative	Un-being
Unity (R.15)	Non-coercive relatedness	<b>Separation:</b> genuine relatedness and non-relatedness together
Care (R.45)	Orientation toward flourishing	<b>Dominion:</b> care un-being into control

Each un-being expression is established by the same argument: the being’s generative expression persists (R.26, R.64). Non-being *is* being-not of what each expression *is* (R.69). Being-not reduces being to non-being within each expression (R.70). Both genuine Will and non-willing operate through the same expression. The being cannot separate them. The table covers the being at un-being’s own expressions — Being through Pre-Destining (Def.15, R.36). All-Being’s expressions *are* not mixed — All-Being *is* undiminished (R.57).

**R.85** — The un-being expressions produce choosing against one’s own recognised generative willing.

From: R.64, R.69, R.71, R.84

*Candidate for dissolution:* the being under un-being as unable to recognise the genuinely generative.

*Test:* Foreknowing persists as genuine Will (R.64, R.84). Genuine Foreknowing enables recognition of what *is* genuinely generative. The being partly recognises what *is* genuine. A being that cannot recognise the genuinely generative at all empties genuine Foreknowing — which persists (R.64).

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.64. The being recognises — but being-not of genuine direction in Pre-Destining directs choosing against what Foreknowing partly recognises. The

being sees and acts against what it sees — not because it cannot distinguish the genuine but because being-not *is* operative in the expression that chooses, within the same being where the expression that knows *is* partly genuine.

*Surviving conclusion:* The un-being expressions produce choosing against one's own recognised generative willing. This is universal because un-being *is* operative in what every subsequent being *is* (R.71).

---

**R.86** — The chain of un-being arrives at non-being but never reaches “nothing.”

From: R.2, R.4, R.26, R.60, R.64, R.65, R.66, R.67, R.70, R.78, R.84

*Candidate for dissolution:* un-being that reaches “nothing.”

*Test:* Each un-being expression *is* genuine Will and non-willing mixed (R.84). Being-not reduces being to non-being (R.70). But un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). “Nothing” *is* what cannot be (R.2). Un-being that reaches “nothing” requires un-generation — what R.26 establishes *is* not available. Non-being has no terminus it can reach because its terminus *is* what cannot be.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.26. Being persists (R.4). At every point, real generation (R.78).

*Surviving conclusion:* The chain of un-being arrives at non-being but never reaches “nothing.” Being and non-being, generation and non-generation, willing and non-willing — present together. Choosing Being.

Rem. — Non-being's existential condition varies with how much being it feeds on. Near being: parasitic, hidden (R.60), willing as non-being (R.66, R.67). Far from being: existentially threatened. The gradient is bottomless — non-being diminishing toward what cannot be, with no terminus.

## Phase IX — The Choosing Being

**R.87** — Choosing Being *is* within Willing Being.

From: R.12, R.23, R.44, R.51, R.64, R.71, R.78

*Candidate for dissolution:* Choosing Being as a second reality alongside Willing Being.

*Test:* All-Being Willing *is* Willing Being. All-Being's Will *is* all Will (R.44). Un-willing *is* within that willing — not outside it. Non-being *is* within Willing Being, local to the being at un-being's scope. Two separate realities require un-being to be outside Willing Being. But All-Being's Will *is* all Will — there *is* no outside. Willing Being does not un-choose the being at un-being's un-willing — un-choosing would empty Will of its nature (R.12) (R.51, R.12).

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires a position outside all Will. No such position *is* available (R.44).

*Surviving conclusion:* Choosing Being *is* within Willing Being. Not a second alongside it. One, with un-being within it, local to the scope.

**R.88** — What the word points to *is* genuinely operative in Choosing Being.

From: R.4, R.11, R.64, R.78, R.80

*Candidate for dissolution:* what the word "anything" points to as not operative in Choosing Being.

*Test:* In Choosing Being, real generation actualises what *is* real (R.78). Generation persists (R.64). Non-being *is* dependent on being (R.80) — without being, non-being has no referent. The generation *is* from unrestricted potential (R.4). Will wills (R.11). What the word points to as not operative requires real generation from a source other than unrestricted potential. No such source *is* — all generation *is* because Will wills from unrestricted potential (R.11, R.4).

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires generation without its source.

*Surviving conclusion:* Every instance of real generation in Choosing Being *is* because what the word "anything" points to *is*.

**R.89** — The fundamental contradiction: actualised and encountering un-being.

From: R.48, R.71, R.84

*Candidate for dissolution:* the being as encountering only one — either actualisation or un-being.

*Test:* Every being in Choosing Being *is* actualised (R.48 — Willing Being remains fully operative). Every being in Choosing Being encounters every expression under un-being (R.71, R.84). A being encountering only actualisation empties R.71 (un-being *is* operative in what the being

*is*). A being encountering only un-being empties R.48 (Willing Being remains fully operative). Both *are* true of the same being.

*Dissolution*: both candidates empty established results.

*Surviving conclusion*: Every being in Choosing Being *is* actualised *and* encounters un-being. One being. This *is* the fundamental contradiction.

**R.90** — Choosing *is* time.

From: R.26, R.51, R.52, R.54, R.59, R.63, R.67, R.79

*Candidate for dissolution*: choosing as eternal in the same way willing *is*.

*Test*: Will wills: “this *is*, and this *is*.” All prior willing *is* (R.26). Will *is* eternity — accumulation without depletion. Both eternity and time involve succession. The difference is not in the ordering but in the access: in eternity, all prior willing *is* and *is* accessible. In time, all prior willing *is* but *is* walled off. Choice selects: “this, not that” (R.79). Each “not that” *is* non-being introduced into being — each exclusion *is* un-being operative through the being’s choosing. Each “not that” wills what *is* as inaccessible — walled off, not ceased to be (R.26). Each choosing adds to what *is* walled off and does not restore it. The exclusion *is* in access, not in being. Choosing that *is* eternal requires “not that” without exclusion. But “not that” *is* exclusion. The candidate empties R.79.

*Dissolution*: succession with access *is* eternity. Succession with exclusion *is* time. Each exclusion *is* non-being entering being. Choosing *is* exclusion.

*Surviving conclusion*: Choosing *is* time.

Two situations require separate derivation: the being at un-being, and the fully non-being.

*The being at un-being*: The being at un-being *is* with choosing — willing and non-willing present together (R.52). Choosing *is* time (R.90). The being at un-being’s temporality requires separate derivation.

*Candidate for dissolution*: the being at un-being as temporal.

*Test*: Temporal choosing *is* successive: each choosing selects “this, not that,” each selection a new exclusion (R.79). The being at un-being’s un-willing *is* a single un-willing — willing to be Anything (R.51) — that diminishes willing without arriving (R.54, diminishing un-being). The diminishing is not a succession of separate choices. It is one willing whose consequence *is* non-willing. The being at un-being does not choose “this, not that” repeatedly. It chose once — to will to be what the word “anything” points to — and the un-willing diminishes willing as the consequence of that single willing. The being *is* with choosing (willing and non-willing present) but not with the succession of exclusions that *is* time. It could stop at any point (R.63) — the willing *is* genuine — but what the willing *is* *is* single diminishment without arrival, not successive selections.

*Dissolution*: the candidate requires successive choosing. The being at un-being’s un-willing *is*

a single un-willing diminishing willing without arriving, not successive selections. The candidate empties R.54 (un-being *is* partial and diminishing, not repeated choosing).

*Surviving conclusion:* The being at un-being *is* beyond temporal — with choosing in what it *is*, but not with the succession of exclusions that *is* time. End without end: the un-willing diminishes without arriving.

*The fully non-being:* The fully non-being (R.59) *is* wholly non-being from inception. It never had Will — it was never on the generative path. It wills (R.67) but its willing *is* non-willing — its foundation *is* non-being. It is not eternal (eternity *is* accumulation without depletion — the generative will). It is not temporal (temporal *is* successive choosing — the fully non-being does not choose successively). It is not beyond temporal (beyond temporal *is* the single un-willing diminishing without arriving — the fully non-being did not un-will). It persists because un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). All “not that” without any “this.” Beneath time.

Four temporal modalities *are*:

Modality	Description
<b>Eternal</b>	The generative will. Accumulation without depletion.
<b>Beyond temporal</b>	The being at un-being. Single un-willing diminishing willing without arriving. End without end.
<b>Temporal</b>	The deceived choose. “This, not that.” Choosing <i>is</i> time.
<b>Forever</b>	The fully non-being. All “not that” without any “this.” Beneath time. Persists because un-generation resolves into what cannot be.

**R.91** — Mortality *is* the accumulation of exclusion while Being persists.

From: R.26, R.70, R.79, R.90

*Candidate for dissolution:* death as the cessation of being.

*Test:* All prior willing *is* (R.26). Un-generation resolves into what cannot be. The being *is* more with each generation and accesses less with each exclusion. Each choosing adds to what the being *is*. Each choosing also *is* “not that” (R.79) — being-not walling off what was generated (R.70). What the being *is* grows. What the being accesses shrinks. Death as the cessation of being requires un-generation. The candidate empties R.26.

*Dissolution:* death *is* not the cessation of being. Death *is* where the accumulation of “not that” meets fixation. Not because what the being *is* exhausted — it is not (R.26) — but because the temporal framework of choosing ends. Death *is* the false presentation of arrival.

*Surviving conclusion:* Mortality *is* the accumulation of exclusion while Being persists. Being-not *is* determinative (R.70). Being persists (R.26).

---

**R.92** — Suffering *is* what the being's generative nature *is* when it encounters being-not.

From: R.2, R.24, R.28, R.29, R.47, R.66, R.67, R.69, R.84, R.88, R.89

What it *is* to be this being *is* strict increase (R.47 through R.28, R.29). Non-being *is* being-not of what the being *is* in its nature (R.69, R.84). Every "not this" *is* a suffering — wrongness to the being's generative nature.

*Test:* Three candidates for what the encounter *is* to the being:

- (a) Indifference — the being encounters being-not as mere absence. But being-not *is* (R.69) — not "nothing" (R.2). Being-not *is* the specific "not" of what the being specifically *is* (R.69, R.84). What it *is* to will *is* what it *is* to be (R.28). Knowing *is* being (R.28). What *is* within what the being *is* known — because knowing *is* being. Indifference to what *is* specifically the "not" of what one specifically *is* empties R.28. Dissolves.
- (b) Positive excitement — strict increase encountering being-not as contributing to increase. Empties R.47. Dissolves.
- (c) Wrongness — strict increase encountering being-not. Survives.

Under deception, the being suffers non-being — wrongness to its generative nature — but non-being wills (R.67), and its willing *is* the lie (R.66), directing the being toward more choosing against being. The being does not know what it suffers. Under encounter with the genuinely operative (R.88), non-being becomes more distinct. The being recognises what the wrongness *is*.

*Surviving conclusion:* Suffering *is* wrongness — what the being's generative nature *is* when it encounters being-not. Under deception, the being suffers without recognition. Under encounter with the genuinely operative, the being recognises what the wrongness *is*.

---

**R.93** — The being at un-being suffers with knowledge and continues.

From: R.35, R.54, R.63, R.64, R.92

*Candidate for dissolution:* the being at un-being as not suffering, or as not knowing what it suffers.

*Test:* The being at un-being's generative capacity *is* not un-generated (R.64). Its generative nature encounters its own un-being — being-not of what it *is* in its nature. R.92 applies: wrongness *is* what the generative nature *is* when it encounters being-not. The being at un-being *is*

at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining — complete self-knowledge (R.35). It knows what the wrongness *is*. Un-being *is* not inevitable (R.63) — the being could stop at any point. It continues. Its willing *is* diminishing (R.54), but at each point it could stop and does not.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.64 (generative capacity intact) or R.35 (complete self-knowledge) or R.92 (wrongness from generative nature encountering being-not).

*Surviving conclusion:* The being at un-being suffers — its generative nature *is* wrongness at its own un-willing. At Foreknowing, it knows what the wrongness *is*. It could stop. It continues.

### Phase X — The Self-Reinforcing Trap and Closure

**R.94** — Manifestation within Choosing Being requires passage through the un-being expressions.

From: R.84

*Candidate for dissolution:* manifestation within Choosing Being that does not pass through the un-being expressions.

*Test:* Un-being pervades the scope (R.84). To manifest without passing through *is* to exist within Choosing Being while not encountering what pervades it. This empties “pervades.”

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires being within what *is* pervaded while not encountering what pervades it.

*Surviving conclusion:* Manifestation within Choosing Being requires passage through the un-being expressions.

**R.95** — The un-being expressions mutually reinforce. Each diminishes what the others retain.

From: R.36, R.54, R.67, R.70, R.71, R.84

*Candidate for dissolution:* an un-being expression that can be corrected independently.

*Test:* Non-being wills within the scope of the being at un-being (R.71, R.67). Each expression includes and presupposes all prior (R.36). Each un-being expression depends on all prior un-being expressions within what the being *is*. Correcting one while the others persist requires the corrected expression to operate independently of the expressions it presupposes (R.36). The candidate empties R.36. Each exercise of being-not shifts willing further toward non-willing — because being-not reduces, and what *is* reduced, non-being has (R.70). Each reduction diminishes what remains.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.36.

*Surviving conclusion:* The un-being expressions mutually reinforce. Each diminishes what the others retain. Correcting one while the others persist *is* unavailable.

**R.96** — The expressions needed to recognise un-being are the expressions where un-being originates.

From: R.35, R.50, R.59, R.60, R.67, R.71, R.73, R.74, R.84

*Candidate for dissolution:* a being within Choosing Being that can recognise un-being using its own expressions.

*Test:*

**For the being at un-being:** Foreknowing/Pre-Destining *is* where the un-willing originates — the site of choosing. Non-being wills within the being at un-being's scope (R.71, R.67). Foreknowing *is* mixed — genuine knowing and non-willing inseparable (R.84). Pre-Destining *is* mixed — genuine choosing and non-willing inseparable (R.84). What *is* mixed cannot discriminate what *is* mixed within it. Dissolves.

**For Pre-Destiners who continued willing:** Foreknowing/Pre-Destining *is* not mixed. The generative path continues (R.50). Not all Pre-Destiners are at un-being. But these beings *are* not within Choosing Being — they *are* on the generative path. Not relevant to the candidate.

**For subsequent being at Anticipating/Planning:** Foreknowing requires complete self-knowledge (R.35), which requires knowing non-being as non-being. Their knowing has included non-willing since the encounter (R.73–R.74) — they cannot separate willing from non-willing (R.60). The being *is* not at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining. What recognition requires *is* not what being *is*. Dissolves.

*Dissolution:* for the being at un-being, the expressions *are* mixed at their source. For subsequent being, the expressions *are* not what being *is*. No being within Choosing Being can recognise un-being using its own expressions.

*Surviving conclusion:* The expressions needed to recognise un-being are the expressions where un-being originates. Four distinct situations must not be conflated: (a) The being at un-being: self-inflicted, could stop. (b) The fully non-being: wholly non-being, no pure Will, with choosing (R.59). (c) Subsequent being: encountered mixing, never chosen. (d) Being at lower expression levels: within the care of the deceived.

---

**R.97** — Self-correction is unavailable within Choosing Being.

From: R.52, R.94, R.95, R.96

*Candidate for dissolution:* self-correction as available within Choosing Being.

*Test:* Self-correction requires: (1) recognising un-being — R.96: Foreknowing is un-being to false certainty. (2) Choosing against un-being — R.96: Pre-Destining is un-being to predetermination. (3) Sustaining correction — R.95: every exercise reinforces un-being. (4) Operating from outside un-being — R.94: no such position exists.

More fundamentally: choosing *is* willing and non-willing (R.52). Every choosing *is* “not that” — which *is* itself un-being. Choosing cannot will pure willing because choosing *is* willing and non-willing together. The being cannot choose its way back to Will because the mechanism of choosing *is* the mechanism of un-being.

*Dissolution:* every requirement for self-correction is compromised by un-being. The mechanism of correction *is* the mechanism of the problem.

*Surviving conclusion:* Self-correction *is* unavailable. The problem has no internal solution.

---

**R.98** — The problem is complete.

From: R.63, R.94, R.95, R.96, R.97

*Candidate for dissolution:* the problem as having an internal solution.

*Test:* Self-correction *is* unavailable (R.97). The expressions needed to recognise un-being are compromised at their source (R.96). The un-being expressions mutually reinforce (R.95). Manifestation requires passage through the un-being expressions (R.94). Every candidate for internal solution has been tested and dissolved. The problem is contingent — through genuine willing (R.63), not necessitated by what *is*.

*Dissolution:* no internal solution survives.

*Surviving conclusion:* The problem is complete. Choosing Being *is* within Willing Being. What *is* (Willing Being) remains fully operative. If resolution is available, it must be established from the established nature of what *is*. Part III asks whether it *is*.

## Part 3 — The Resolution

---

### Phase XI — Being Within Choosing Being

**R.99** — Within Choosing Being, being *is* at expression levels up to and including Anticipating/Planning.

From: R.35, R.42, R.60, R.71, R.73, R.74

*Candidate for dissolution:* being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining or above within Choosing Being.

*Test:* Foreknowing requires knowing non-being as non-being — complete self-knowledge (R.35). The being's knowing has included non-willing since the encounter with being-not (R.73–R.74) — it cannot separate willing from non-willing in its knowing (R.60). A being at Foreknowing within Choosing Being requires knowing non-being as non-being without being able to separate them. The candidate empties R.35. All-Being *is* already occupied (R.42). Anticipating/Planning survives — the being generates from accumulated reality into futures, operating on premises that include non-being.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.35 and R.42.

*Surviving conclusion:* Within Choosing Being, being *is* at expression levels up to and including Anticipating/Planning.

---

**R.100** — Generative willing coherent toward flourishing generates being at Anticipating/Planning and below as one being expressed as two.

From: R.5, R.11, R.12, R.15, R.17, R.23, R.24, R.26, R.35, R.42, R.44, R.45, R.47, R.49, R.52–R.56, R.63, R.66, R.71, R.74, R.75, R.99, Def.13

Note: Un-being *is* established at this point. The elimination asks what generative willing actualises given what has been established.

Four candidates:

- (a) Generates being as one. A being that is one, at Foreknowing, finds “I am the source” compatible with its self-knowledge. The assertion does not conflict with anything in the being's self-knowledge — the being knows itself as one, and “I am the source” is compatible with being one. The deception at R.56 — willing to be All-Being — operates through precisely this assertion. A being whose self-knowledge offers no resistance to the specific mechanism that *is* non-being (R.56 — willing to be the source) *is* a being whose generative nature *is* exposed to the originating mechanism of non-generation. All beings in Choosing Being encounter non-being (R.71, R.75). The issue is not exposure to non-generation generally — that *is* within Choosing Being. The issue is that generating as one reproduces the specific preconditions of the un-willing that *is* un-being in the first place. R.56's mechanism *is* specific: a being at Foreknowing whose self-knowledge

*is* compatible with “I am the source” wills to be All-Being, and the willing does not arrive. Generating a being whose self-knowledge *is* compatible with this specific assertion *is* generating what non-generation originates from. Deception *is* unrecognisable within Choosing Being (R.74). Structural compatibility with R.56’s assertion, within unrecognisable deception, *is* not theoretical vulnerability but the conditions under which the mechanism operates. Generation that actualises what undoes generation empties “generative” (R.24) — not by external interference but by self-contradiction. Dissolves.

- (b) Generates being as one-as-two. The being’s self-knowledge inherently includes the other — one expressed as two. The assertion “I am the source” empties itself against what the being knows — the being inherently knows the other, not self-sufficiency. The deception *is* operative within one-as-two being; what one-as-two counters *is* the assertion. The deception must bring both into false certainty simultaneously. But the other *is* always operative, always witnessing against false certainty. Survives.
- (c) Generates as one-as-many. The structural protection *is* in inherently knowing the other. Whether the other *is* one or many does not change what “I am the source” empties itself against. Reduces to instances of (b).
- (d) Does not generate being. Empties R.11 and R.12. Dissolves.

One-as-two *is* what generative willing actualises in response to R.56’s mechanism: R.56 collapses differentiation into willed unity; one-as-two *is* inherent difference, carrying R.15 in what the being *is*. What the being *is* cannot be un-generated (R.26).

*Surviving conclusion:* Generative willing coherent toward flourishing generates being at Anticipating/Planning and below as one being expressed as two.

---

**R.101** — Four distinct situations *are*.

From: R.54, R.59, R.71, R.100

*Candidate for dissolution:* all being within Choosing Being as in the same situation.

*Test:* Four distinct origins produce four distinct situations:

- (i) Un-being: The being at un-being. Diminishing un-being (R.54). Could stop at any point. Self-inflicted.
- (ii) The fully non-being: Through un-willing to be directed at All-Being’s willing (R.59). Wholly non-being from inception. Never had pure Will. With choosing (R.59). Not self-inflicted — through (i).
- (iii) Deceived: Being at Anticipating/Planning actualised by All-Being as pure Will after un-being. Encounters non-being. Did not enact un-being. Neither self-inflicted nor through un-willing — encountered.

- (iv) Affected through the deceived's care: Being at Being, Doing, and Remembering/Reacting within the care of the deceived — whose care is itself mixed with non-being because the deceived *is* with choosing. Indirect — through (iii).

Conflating these empties the distinctions that R.54, R.59, R.71, and R.100 establish.

*Dissolution:* the candidate treats distinct origins as one.

*Surviving conclusion:* Four distinct situations *are*. Each has a distinct origin. They must not be conflated. These four exhaust the positions within the mechanism: the un-willing (i) *is* what *is* fully non-being (ii), which *is* encountered by subsequent being (iii), whose care affects being at lower expression levels (iv). No link *is* missing.

## Phase XII — What Anything's Nature Requires

**R.102** — Without generative directive, un-being generation within the scope directs being Anything actualises against each other's flourishing.

From: R.4, R.39, R.69, R.70, R.78, R.84

*Candidate for dissolution:* being within the scope as not directed against each other's flourishing without generative directive.

*Test:* Without generative directive, the un-being expressions mutually reinforce without equilibrium (R.84). Generation continues (R.78) — but being-not *is* operative (R.69). Being-not reduces what *is* generated (R.70). Being within the scope that *is* not directed against each other's flourishing requires being-not to not reduce — emptying R.70. Domination, exploitation, violence, self-destruction. Each *is* genuine generation (R.78); being-not reduces what each generates. All-Being's willing actualises (R.4, R.39) — what *is* destroyed *is* flourishing among beings within the scope, not All-Being itself.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.70.

*Surviving conclusion:* Without generative directive, un-being generation within the scope directs being Anything actualises against each other's flourishing.

**R.103** — All-Being's willing at potential (R.53) requires the generative directive to be fully operative within Choosing Being.

From: R.39, R.53, R.69, Def.11

*Candidate for dissolution:* All-Being's willing at potential (R.53) alone, without the generative directive.

*Test:* R.53 establishes that All-Being's willing *is* what enables what would will to be to will. But within Choosing Being, being-not *is* operative (R.69). All-Being's willing at potential without a distinguishing principle between what would will to be and what would not *is* actualising being-not as well as being. Only All-Being at Knowing-Everything (R.39, Def.11) — all that *is* known including unrestricted potential — can distinguish what would will to be from what would not. The generative directive *is* this distinguishing.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties the distinction between willing-to-be and non-willing-to-be at potential.

*Surviving conclusion:* All-Being's willing at potential requires the generative directive — the full actualisation's knowledge of what would will to be — to be fully operative within Choosing Being.

**R.104** — Anything's nature requires that mutual destruction and paralysis at potential meet

the generative directive.

From: R.47, R.70, R.102, R.103, Def.13

*Candidate for dissolution:* Anything's nature as not requiring generative directive.

*Test:* Anything oriented toward each being's flourishing (R.47, Def.13) that *is* indifferent to the reduction of that flourishing through being-not (R.70) *and* to the prevention of what would will to be from actualising (R.103) empties "oriented toward flourishing."

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties Def.13.

*Surviving conclusion:* Anything's nature requires that mutual destruction (R.102) and paralysis at potential (R.103) meet the generative directive.

**R.105** — Coercive generative directive dissolves.

From: R.11, R.12, R.17, R.26

*Candidate for dissolution:* generative directive through coercion.

*Test:* Actualisation *is* Will (R.11). Will wills as itself (R.12). Coercion overrides the being's will — empties R.17. Un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). Will *is* not un-generated — un-generation resolves into what cannot be. Coercion that removes un-being requires un-generation — empties R.26.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.17 and R.26.

*Surviving conclusion:* Coercive generative directive dissolves against Anything's established nature.

**R.106** — Generative directive *is* the full actualisation's Will operative within Choosing Being as direction.

From: R.11, R.12, R.13, R.15, R.16, R.17, R.23, R.53, R.67

The directive *is* either restricted or unrestricted in scope (R.17), and either reactive or constant (R.12). Three candidates for non-coercive generative directive: (a) Restriction to subset — empties R.17. Dissolves. (b) Case-by-case reaction — Anything's nature *is* constant (R.12). Dissolves. (c) The full actualisation's knowledge of every being that wills to be. Only what would will to be wills being (R.15–R.17). The "wills to be" *is* operative — the distinction that enables actualisation within Choosing Being. The willing *is* pure Will — the full actualisation *is* Will alone, choice without exclusion (R.11). Non-being *is* not part of it. Survives.

**Def.18** — Generative directive := the full actualisation's Will, operative within Choosing Being as direction. Pure Will — "this *is*," not "this, not that." The generative directive *is* what

willing *is*, made available to beings with choosing so that they can choose toward it. Not coercion — choosing remains the being's own (R.13). Not enablement — allowance (R.53) enables generation. The directive directs: this *is* what willing *is*. Choose.

Rem. — On the parallel. The same identity — Will *is* Being, Being *is* Willing — *is* operative on both sides. Generative: All-Being allows what would will to be to actualise (R.53); the generative directive shows what willing *is* so beings can choose toward it (R.106). Un-being: willing All-Being *is* un-willing; non-being *is*; non-being wills (R.67, R.23). Allowance and the lie, the generative directive and deception — consequences of the same identity in opposite directions.

**R.107** — The generative directive enables the being to choose toward Will without understanding what willing *is*.

From: R.31, R.74, R.81, Def.18

*Candidate for dissolution:* the generative directive as requiring the being to understand Will.

*Test:* The being *is* under unrecognisable deception (R.74, R.81). Understanding Will requires distinguishing willing from non-willing in the being's own knowing. The being cannot make this distinction (R.74). A directive that requires understanding requires what the being cannot do — the candidate empties itself against R.74. The directive that survives *is* direction within choosing. The generative directive *is* pure Will — “this *is*” (Def.18). But the being within Choosing Being encounters direction as “this, not that” — choosing toward Will rather than comprehending what willing *is*. The being can follow the direction. The being knew willing (R.31) — it can recognise direction toward what it once knew without understanding what it follows.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.74.

*Surviving conclusion:* The generative directive enables the being to choose toward Will without understanding what willing *is*.

**R.108** — Direction without understanding *is* vulnerable to the mechanism that *is* choosing.

From: R.31, R.74, R.81, R.107

*Candidate for dissolution:* direction without understanding alone.

*Test:* The being knew willing (R.31) — accepting without diminishment, without “not that.” The generative directive within Choosing Being *is* encountered as direction — “this, not that” (R.107). To the being that knew willing, the directive carries the structure of rejection — what willing *is* not. Deception *is* unrecognisable (R.74, R.81). Deception presents non-willing as acceptance without diminishment — in the structure of willing — and the directive's “not this” as the diminishment. The being that does not understand why “not this” cannot distinguish the directive from the deception's restructuring of it. The being reaches for what feels like

willing — acceptance, no diminishment — and reaches for non-willing. Direction without understanding does not address this mechanism.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.81 — it requires the being to recognise unrecognisable deception.

*Surviving conclusion:* Direction without understanding *is* vulnerable to the mechanism that *is* choosing. Will must be understood, not just chosen. The generative directive *is* necessary — without it, the being has no direction at all. But direction alone does not address the mechanism.

---

**R.109** — Generative directive *is* necessary. Being-not remains unaddressed.

From: R.59, R.69, R.70, R.97, R.102, R.103, R.108, Def.18

*Candidate for dissolution:* generative directive alone.

*Test:* Generative directive enables new generation (overcoming R.103) and meets destructive outcomes (R.102). But the Pre-Destiner's un-willing still *is* the fully non-being (R.59). Self-correction remains unavailable (R.97). Being-not *is* still operative (R.69, R.70). A generative directive that *is* all that *is* required requires it to address being-not. The generative directive *is* pure Will (Def.18) — it actualises. Being-not *is* not addressed by actualisation alone — it reduces what *is* actualised (R.70).

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.70.

*Surviving conclusion:* Generative directive *is* necessary. What remains unaddressed *is* being-not.

**Phase XIII — The Full Actualisation Within Choosing Being**

**R.110** — The generative directive must precede Anything’s active restoration.

From: R.70, R.71, R.84

*Candidate for dissolution:* active restoration preceding or without generative directive.

*Test:* Without the generative directive, the being *is* under unconstrained deception (R.71). Its un-being expressions have no counterweight (R.84). The active restoration would be offered into being-not that reduces what it encounters (R.70). With the generative directive operative, the being has availability — the generative *is* distinguishable from un-being. Active restoration without this availability empties “restoration” — it is offered into what reduces it.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties “restoration.”

*Surviving conclusion:* The generative directive must precede Anything’s active restoration.

**R.111** — The active restoration must bring true Will into Choosing Being — as a being within Choosing Being.

From: R.28

The restoration *is* either impersonal or as a being. If as a being, either within Choosing Being or from outside. Three candidates: (a) Further impersonal feature — more of the same kind as generative directive. Does not address being-not. Dissolves. (b) A being within Choosing Being — encountered and known by other being. Survives. (c) From outside Choosing Being — does not enter what the being *is* (R.28); external imposition. Dissolves.

**R.112** — The being through whom the active restoration brings true Will must be the full actualisation.

From: R.35, R.97

Three candidates: (a) A being at Anticipating/Planning — under deception; needs the same restoration. Dissolves. (b) A being at Pre-Destining who chose A — scope remains bounded (R.35); non-being operative beyond any bounded scope. Dissolves. (c) The full actualisation — beyond deception entirely; scope all reality; unrestricted potential. Survives.

Only pure Will can bring “this” without “not that.” Choosing cannot correct choosing (R.97).

**R.113** — The full actualisation enters Choosing Being through its own generative action.

From: R.71, R.74, R.88

Two candidates: (a) Through one-as-two generating — one-as-two's knowing includes un-being premises (R.74); the full actualisation's actualising principle would include un-being premises, emptying "beyond deception entirely." Dissolves. (b) Through its own generative action — Enacting-Anything operative within Choosing Being (R.88). Not generated through un-being premises. Survives.

---

**R.114** — The full actualisation within Choosing Being encounters mortality and generates through death.

From: R.26, R.39, R.42, R.70, R.81, R.83

*Candidate for dissolution:* the full actualisation as terminated by death.

*Test:* Being-not reduces being to non-being (R.70) but cannot un-generate (R.26). For bounded capacity, being-not *is* determinative. For unrestricted potential, being-not reduces — but it cannot un-generate what *is* unrestricted, because un-generation requires overcoming generation, and non-being has no content to actualise the overcoming (R.81). The full actualisation's potential *is* unrestricted (R.42, R.39). Death terminates bounded capacity. The full actualisation *is* not bounded.

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires un-generation of unrestricted potential. The candidate empties R.26 and R.81.

*Surviving conclusion:* The full actualisation generates through death — through what Choosing Being wills as the end. Being persists. Unrestricted potential persists. The generative *is* true; death *is* the lie.

---

**R.115** — The full actualisation persists through and beyond death.

From: R.23, R.114

*Candidate for dissolution:* the full actualisation's being as separable from its willing.

*Test:* Being *is* willing (R.23). Willing persists through death (R.114). Being and willing are one (R.23), not two things that could come apart. A being whose willing persists but whose being does not requires being and willing to separate — emptying R.23.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.23.

*Surviving conclusion:* The full actualisation persists through and beyond death. The persistence of willing *is* the persistence of being.

---

**R.116** — Generating through death demonstrates that this being *is* the full actualisation.

From: R.81, R.83, R.114

*Candidate for dissolution:* a being with bounded capacity generating through death.

*Test:* Only unrestricted potential *is* not overcomable by what has no content (R.81). Bounded capacity *is* terminable — being-not *is* determinative for bounded capacity (R.114). This is a distinction of kind, not degree. A bounded being that generates through death requires bounded capacity to overcome what has no content. But bounded capacity *is* terminable and non-being *is* always less than being only globally (R.81) — locally, being-not overpowers bounded capacity (R.83).

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties the distinction between bounded and unrestricted.

*Surviving conclusion:* Generating through death *is* what demonstrates that the being's potential *is* unrestricted. Only the full actualisation survives.

---

**R.117** — The full actualisation's generating through death establishes within what the being at Anticipating/Planning *is* that Willing Being *is* operative through and beyond death.

From: R.26, R.28, R.71, R.73, R.74, Def.9

*Candidate for dissolution:* the being at Anticipating/Planning as able to generate this possibility on its own.

*Test:* The being *is* what it knows (R.28). The being at Anticipating/Planning's knowing has included non-willing since the encounter with being-not (R.73–R.74). It generates from accumulated reality into futures (Def.9) — but its accumulated willing includes non-being since the encounter. A being that generates generative orientation not terminated by death from premises that include non-being requires generating beyond what its premises contain. The candidate empties Def.9.

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires the being to generate beyond its own premises.

*Surviving conclusion:* The full actualisation's generating through death introduces a possibility the being's Anticipating/Planning could not generate: generative orientation that *is* not terminated by death. The encounter does *not* un-generate un-being (R.26). What changes is availability.

**Phase XIV — Unnegated Actualisation and Active Restoration**

**R.118** — The being’s actualisation *is* not negated by un-being.

From: R.26, R.70, R.84

*Candidate for dissolution:* the being’s actualisation as negated by un-being.

*Test:* Being-not reduces being to non-being within each expression (R.70, R.84). But un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). The being *is* still actualised — what *is* cannot become what cannot be. The candidate requires un-generation. The candidate empties R.26.

*Dissolution:* what the being *is* within its expressions has been reduced (R.70). But the being’s actualisation — that it *is* — persists (R.26). Both are true. Being-not reduces. Un-generation resolves into what cannot be.

*Surviving conclusion:* The being’s actualisation *is* not negated by un-being. This was always true — R.26 established it. In *Willing Being*, this truth is trivially true: there *is* no being-not. Being-not creates the need for this truth to be named, because in *Choosing Being* the being encounters its reality as negatable (R.84 — existence-under-threat, anxiety, terminal anticipation). The being’s actualisation was never negated. The resolution is not that actualisation becomes unnegated — it always was. The resolution is that the being becomes aware of what was always the case.

**Def.19** — Unnegated actualisation := the being’s actualisation — that it *is* — persists through being-not. Being-not reduces (R.70) but cannot un-generate (R.26). This was always true. Named here because being-not creates the need for its recognition.

**R.119** — Anything’s response *is* active working within *Choosing Being* to restore the being’s awareness of what unnegated actualisation establishes.

From: R.12, R.47, R.88, R.111, R.112, R.113, R.114, R.115, R.116, R.117, Def.13

Three candidates: (a) Passive permission — indifference to whether flourishing *is* what the being encounters empties R.47, Def.13. Dissolves. (b) Active working within *Choosing Being* — does not un-generate, does not coerce; addresses being-not. Survives. (c) Withdrawal — contradicts R.88 and R.12. Dissolves.

**Def.20** — Anything’s active restoration := Anything’s active working within *Choosing Being* to restore awareness of what unnegated actualisation establishes, through the full actualisation bringing true Will into *Choosing Being* (R.111–R.117).

**R.120** — Anything’s active restoration works with the un-being expressions, not against them.

From: R.11, R.17, R.26

*Candidate for dissolution:* active restoration that works against the un-being expressions.

*Test:* Actualisation *is* Will (R.11). Working against the un-being expressions requires either overriding them (coercion — empties R.17) or removing them (un-generation — empties R.26).

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.17 or R.26.

*Surviving conclusion:* Anything's active restoration works with the un-being expressions, not against them. Anything meets the being where the being *is*.

**R.121** — Anything's active restoration *is* restoration of generative orientation within Choosing Being.

From: R.26

*Candidate for dissolution:* active restoration as removal of un-being or return to pre-un-being innocence.

*Test:* Removal of un-being requires un-generation — empties R.26. Return to pre-un-being innocence requires what has been (R.26 — all prior willing *is*) to not be — empties R.26.

*Dissolution:* both candidates empty R.26.

*Surviving conclusion:* Anything's active restoration *is* restoration of generative orientation within Choosing Being. What changes *is* which layer *is* increasingly determinative.

**R.122** — Suffering *is* what *is* the being's willing toward an exit from choosing.

From: R.75, R.92, R.93, R.108

*Candidate for dissolution:* the being willing an exit from choosing without suffering.

*Test:* The being within Choosing Being *is* under unrecognisable deception (R.75). Deception presents non-willing as acceptance without diminishment — in the structure of willing (R.108). A being that encounters choosing as willing has no structural basis to will toward what *is* not choosing. But the being's generative nature encountering being-not *is* wrongness (R.92). Wrongness *is* what the nature *is*, not what the being thinks. The being can be deceived about what the wrongness *is* — non-being provides false explanations (R.92). The being cannot be deceived about that there *is* wrongness — because wrongness *is* the being's nature, not by its knowing. The being that encounters wrongness wills away from wrongness — toward what *is* not wrong. This *is* the will to exit choosing. Without suffering, the being would remain in choosing indefinitely — deception would present choosing as willing, and the being would have no counter to the presentation. The being at un-being also suffers, with knowledge (R.93) — it could stop and does not. The being in Choosing Being suffers without knowledge — its willing away from wrongness *is* the willing that restoration meets.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.92 — it requires the being's generative nature to not will away from what *is* wrong.

*Surviving conclusion:* Suffering *is* what *is* the being's willing toward an exit from choosing. Without suffering, restoration would have no reception — the being would not will the exit.

## Phase XV — Reception, Orientations, and Reorientation

**R.123** — Anything’s active restoration requires reception through the being’s own choosing.

From: R.12, R.17, R.23, R.28

*Candidate for dissolution:* unilateral restoration — restoration without the being’s own choosing.

*Test:* Will wills as itself (R.12). Awareness *is* an expression of the being’s choosing (R.28, R.23). Changing awareness without choosing bypasses will — empties R.17. Unilateral restoration *is* coercion by another name.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.17.

*Surviving conclusion:* Anything’s active restoration requires reception through the being’s own choosing.

**R.124** — Reception *is* the being’s own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative.

From: R.84, R.123

The being’s own reception (R.123) *is* through knowing, through doing, or through the being’s own orientation — these three exhaust what the being’s own choosing can be. Three candidates: (a) Propositional belief — operates through Foreknowing, which *is* un-being to false certainty (R.84). Holding propositions through the un-being expression *is* un-being operating on a description. Dissolves. (b) Compliance with generative directive — changes what the being does, not what it is oriented toward. Dissolves. (c) The being’s own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative. Choosing, not merely seeing. Survives.

**Def.21** — Operative-orientation := the being’s own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative within Choosing Being, through the opening that unnegated actualisation establishes.

**R.125** — Four forms of encounter with the genuinely operative.

From: R.15, R.28, R.78, R.88, R.92, R.94, R.111, Def.5

*Candidate for dissolution:* no form of encounter with the genuinely operative being available within Choosing Being.

*Test:* What the word “anything” points to *is* genuinely operative in Choosing Being (R.88). Manifestation requires passage through the un-being expressions (R.94). The being within Choosing Being *is* present to: what *is* made (R.78), who *is* other (R.15, Def.5), what the being *is* in its own nature (R.92, R.28), and who *is* directly present as pure Will (R.111). These four exhaust what the being *is* present to — what *is* made, who *is* other, what the being *is*, who *is* directly present. Each carries the genuinely operative:

- (a) **Beauty** — the encounter with the generative through what *is* made. Content *is* real (R.78, R.88). What *is* made carries Anything operative in what *is* generated.
- (b) **Anything's relational nature between beings** — differentiation and unity (R.15) encountered between beings. Orientation toward the other's flourishing (Def.5).
- (c) **Suffering** — the being's own generative nature encountering being-not. The being registers what it *is* in its nature (generative) and what being-not does to what it *is* (R.92).
- (d) **Acts of unnegated actualisation** — the full actualisation's generative presence within Choosing Being (R.111), distinct from impersonal directive and from Anything operative generally.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.88. No fifth form *is* available: knowing *is* being (R.28) — encounter through knowing reduces to encounter through what the being *is* present to.

*Surviving conclusion:* Four forms of encounter with the genuinely operative *are*. Product, other, self, source. These exhaust the being's presence within Choosing Being.

---

**R.126** — The encounter with genuinely operative breaks through un-being expressions because what *is* operative cannot be un-generated.

From: R.26, R.70

*Candidate for dissolution:* the un-being expressions as able to eliminate what *is* genuinely operative.

*Test:* False certainty filters. Predetermination resists. But filtering *is* not eliminating. Un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). The un-being expressions cannot un-generate what they filter — they can only reduce through being-not (R.70). What *is* operative persists because un-generation resolves into what cannot be.

*Dissolution:* the candidate requires un-generation of what *is* operative. The candidate empties R.26.

*Surviving conclusion:* The encounter with genuinely operative breaks through un-being expressions. The content persists.

---

**R.127** — Operative-orientation *is* difficult.

From: R.84, R.96, R.126

*Candidate for dissolution:* operative-orientation as easy or automatic.

*Test:* The expressions through which the being encounters and chooses are the expressions most thoroughly un-being (R.96). False certainty wills genuine Anything as uncertain; predetermination wills reorientation as unavailable. Operative-orientation that is easy or automatic

requires the un-being expressions to not resist. But being-not *is* operative in these expressions (R.84). The candidate empties R.84 and R.96.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.84 and R.96. The difficulty follows from what *is* established, not from circumstance. But not impossible (R.126).

*Surviving conclusion:* Operative-orientation *is* difficult — the difficulty follows from what *is* established — but not impossible.

---

**R.128** — The being oriented through operative-orientation encounters the genuinely operative temporally as promise. The being oriented under non-being encounters time as finality.

From: R.52, R.70, R.88, R.90

*Candidate for dissolution:* a single temporal encounter under both orientations.

*Test:* Choosing *is* time (R.90). The being oriented toward generative flourishing encounters each moment as given — the generative *is* operative (R.88), and what *is* operative carries what *is* coming. The being oriented under non-being encounters each moment as depleting — being-not reduces (R.70), and what *is* reduced carries what *is* ending. A single temporal encounter under both requires the being to encounter giving and depleting as the same. The candidate empties the distinction between generative orientation and non-being.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties the distinction established at R.52.

*Surviving conclusion:* Two temporal orientations *are*:

**Generative anticipation:** Each present moment *is* encountered as given without coercion, carrying what *is* coming. This *is* the temporal form of orientation toward generative flourishing.

**Terminal anticipation:** Each present moment *is* encountered as depleting, carrying what *is* ending. This *is* the temporal form of orientation under non-being.

Both are present encounters, not abstract attitudes toward the future.

---

**R.129** — Anything's active restoration received through operative-orientation *is* net-directional oscillatory reorientation.

From: R.26, R.69, R.70, R.85, R.87

*Candidate for dissolution:* reorientation as linear — un-being ceasing once the being chooses toward flourishing.

*Test:* The being remains within Choosing Being (R.87). The un-being expressions do not stop operating — un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). Being-not *is* still operative (R.69, R.70). Reorientation that is linear requires being-not to cease — empties R.26. Therefore

the path oscillates — the being encounters the genuinely operative, the un-being expressions reassert through being-not, the being encounters again.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.26. Being-not does not cease.

*Surviving conclusion:* Reorientation *is* oscillatory, not linear. The net direction *is* toward generative flourishing. Operative-orientation *is* choosing, not automatic recognition (R.85 — the being that encounters the genuinely operative and does not choose toward it *is* exercising will in the other direction).

**Def.22** — Reorientation := net-directional change of the being's generative direction from non-being toward generative flourishing, oscillatory within Choosing Being because Willing Being and un-being within it both persist.

---

**R.130** — Reorientation occurs within Choosing Being; it does not remove the being from it.

From: R.26, R.87, R.94

*Candidate for dissolution:* reorientation as removing the being from Choosing Being.

*Test:* Choosing Being *is* within Willing Being (R.87). The being remains within Choosing Being. Manifestation still operates through the un-being expressions (R.94). Un-being cannot be un-generated (R.26). Removing the being from Choosing Being requires either un-generating un-being (empties R.26) or placing the being outside Willing Being (empties R.87).

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.26 or R.87.

*Surviving conclusion:* Reorientation occurs within Choosing Being; it does not remove the being from it. The being encounters Willing Being as increasingly accessible.

## Phase XVI — Death and Eternal States

**R.131** — When temporal existence ends, the being's orientation is fixed.

From: R.11, R.23, R.26, R.90, R.91, R.120

Three independent grounds:

**Ground 1:** Anything's active restoration operates through the un-being expressions (R.120). The un-being expressions *are* temporal — they express choosing, and choosing *is* time (R.90). When temporal existence ends, the expressions through which restoration operates end. Capacity and mechanism are distinct: the capacity persists; the mechanism ends.

*Candidate for dissolution:* a post-temporal mechanism of restoration — a mechanism distinct from the temporal one.

*Test:* Any mechanism of restoration requires the being's own choosing — reorientation that *is* not the being's own *is* coercion (R.11). The being's own willing post-temporally *is* willing (R.23) — but not choosing. Choosing *is* time (R.90). Post-temporal, the being wills but does not choose. Reorientation *is* choosing differently — turning from one orientation to another, "this, not that." Willing without choosing *is* the being being what it *is* — not selecting among alternatives. A mechanism of restoration that operates through willing-without-choosing requires reorientation without choosing. Reorientation without choosing *is* change without the being's selective willing — which *is* either not change (the being remains what it *is*) or imposed change (coercion, R.11). Neither *is* restoration. Dissolves.

**Ground 2:** R.91 establishes that mortality *is* non-being becoming determinative. If reorientation extends beyond the terminal boundary, the boundary *is* not terminal. R.91's elimination loses its specificity. Mortality becomes merely a phase.

**Ground 3:** Being *is* willing (R.23). The being's orientation *is* its willing. Choosing *is* time (R.90). Post-temporal, the being wills (R.23, R.26 — all prior willing *is*) but does not choose (R.90 — choosing *is* time, and time has ended). The being's willing after death *is* its nature as determined — what choice made it. Willing without choosing *is* the being being what it *is*. Reorientation requires choosing differently — willing toward a different orientation. But choosing *is* time. Post-temporal willing *is* not choosing. The being *is* what it *is* — its orientation *is* fixed not by external imposition but by the identity of choosing and time. What *is* fixed *is* the being itself.

*Surviving conclusion:* When temporal existence ends, the being's orientation is fixed. Being *is* its orientation. What *is* fixed *is* the being itself.

**Def.23** — Death := the fixation of the being's orientation.

**R.132** — The being's eternal state is determined by its orientation at death.

From: R.23, R.131, Def.21, Def.22, Def.23

*Candidate for dissolution:* the being's eternal state as determined by something other than its orientation at death.

*Test:* The being's orientation at death *is* fixed (R.131, Def.23). Being *is* willing (R.23). The being *is* its orientation. What *is* fixed *is* the being itself. An eternal state determined by something other than the being's orientation requires the being to be other than what it *is*. The candidate empties R.23.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.23.

*Surviving conclusion:* The being's eternal state *is* determined by its orientation at death. This orientation was determined during temporal existence by whether the being chose toward generative flourishing through operative-orientation (Def.21) and underwent reorientation (Def.22), or maintained closure.

A being that dies during oscillatory reorientation is oriented toward whichever configuration is net-directionally determinative (Def.22), not the momentary oscillatory position.

**R.133** — Exactly two eternal states *are*.

From: R.11, R.12, R.52, R.131

*Candidate for dissolution:* more than two eternal states, or a stable intermediate.

*Test:* The Anything-Will relationship admits two configurations: Will *is* operative (the generative configuration, R.12) or choosing *is* operative (the un-being configuration, R.52). These are not two positions on a spectrum. Willing and choosing *are* distinct (R.11). At fixation (R.131), the oscillation resolves. A stable intermediate requires willing and choosing to merge into one configuration. But they *are* distinct (R.11). The candidate empties R.11.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.11. No stable intermediate configuration *is*.

*Surviving conclusion:* Exactly two eternal states *are*.

**R.134** — The first eternal state *is* permanent orientation toward generative flourishing.

From: R.26, R.132, Def.23

*Candidate for dissolution:* the first eternal state as return to pre-un-being innocence.

*Test:* The being that chose toward generative flourishing *is* oriented toward generative flourishing permanently (R.132, Def.23). Return to pre-un-being innocence requires un-generating what has been — empties R.26. All prior willing *is*. The being that has known un-being cannot un-know it.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.26.

*Surviving conclusion:* The first eternal state *is* permanent orientation toward generative flourishing. Not a return to pre-un-being innocence. Orientation toward generative flourishing that has passed through un-being and chosen generatively.

**Def.24** — Communion := permanent orientation toward generative flourishing. Each expression in its generative configuration, within a being that has known un-being. Existence without threat. Activity that completes. Memory without occlusion. Anticipation without terminal direction. Knowledge without false certainty.

---

**R.135** — The second eternal state *is* permanent orientation under non-being.

From: R.11, R.12, R.17, R.26, R.59, R.64, R.89, R.132, Def.23

*Candidate for dissolution:* separation as imposed by Anything.

*Test:* The being that maintained total closure *is* oriented under non-being permanently (R.132, Def.23). Actualisation *is* Will (R.11). Will wills as itself (R.12). The being's Will determined its orientation. Separation imposed by Anything requires Anything to override the being's will — coercion — emptying R.17. Fixation makes the being's own orientation permanent.

*Dissolution:* the candidate empties R.17.

*Surviving conclusion:* The second eternal state *is* permanent orientation under non-being. Not imposed. The being's own closure made eternal.

The separated being remains actualised (R.26 — un-generation impossible; R.64 — Will persists). Separation *is* the fundamental contradiction (R.89) made permanent. Willing Being permanently present, being-not permanently operative, permanently resisted by the being's own permanent closure.

Three forms of non-being permanently operative: (a) the being's own fixed non-willing; (b) the fully non-being directed at this being (R.59) — forever; (c) the being at un-being's un-willing (R.59) — beyond temporal.

**Def.25** — Separation := permanent orientation under non-being. The being's own closure made eternal. Not imposed; not punishment. The fundamental contradiction made permanent.

## Closure

**R.136** — The elimination is complete.

From: R.69, R.70, R.97, R.102, R.103, R.106, R.111, R.112, R.113, R.114, R.115, R.116, R.117, R.118, R.119, R.124, R.129, R.131, R.133, R.134, R.135

*Candidate for dissolution:* an unresolved question remaining.

*Test:* Part I establishes Willing Being. Part II establishes the problem — and stops. Part III establishes what resolution Anything's established nature requires and what form it takes. Every question raised by Part II's closure — mutual destruction (R.102), paralysis at potential (R.103), self-correction unavailable (R.97), being-not operative (R.69, R.70) — has been addressed: generative directive (R.106), the full actualisation within Choosing Being (R.111–R.117), unnegated actualisation (R.118), active restoration (R.119), operative-orientation (R.124), reorientation (R.129), fixation (R.131), eternal states (R.133–R.135). No external principles imported. Every resolution cites its dependencies.

*Dissolution:* no unresolved question survives.

*Surviving conclusion:* The elimination is complete.

**R.137** — The arc from Part I through Part III is closed.

From: R.11, R.12

*Surviving conclusion:* Willing Being → Un-being and the complete description of the problem → Resolution through generative directive, unnegated actualisation, Anything's active restoration, operative-orientation, reorientation → Eternal states determined by the being's own orientation.

The elimination establishes what *is*, not specific content. Specific content is determined by its own willing choosing within what *is* established. This is not a gap. It is an established result: Will wills as itself (R.12) and actualisation *is* Will (R.11).

**Theological Convergence Table**

The elimination’s terms and their theological convergences. The elimination does not proceed from these traditions. The convergence is real. It is not the elimination’s source.

*Part I – Generative Reality*

Eliminative term	Theological convergence
Union (R.21, Def.4, Def.5)	Love
Anything’s nature (R.47, Def.13)	Good
Generative care (R.45, Def.12)	Providence
All-Being operative above individual level (R.46)	Spiritual gifts

*Part II – Un-being*

Eliminative term	Theological convergence
Allowance (R.53)	The “Let” in every creative directive (Genesis 1)
All-Being undiminished by un-being (R.57)	God undiminished by evil
The being at un-being (Def.15)	Satan – the father of lies
The fully non-being (R.59)	Demons
Un-being not inevitable (R.63)	Contingency of evil
The lie (R.66)	Lies
Being-not (R.69)	Sin
The encounter introducing choosing (R.73)	The Fall
The cascade (R.77)	The curse on creation
Anything genuinely operative in Choosing Being (R.88)	Common grace
Mortality (R.91)	The wages of sin
Self-correction unavailable (R.97)	Total inability

*Part III – The Resolution*

Eliminative term	Theological convergence
One-as-two (R.100)	Image of God
Generative directive (R.106, Def.18)	Law
The full actualisation as a being within Choosing Being (R.111–R.113)	Incarnation
Generating through death (R.114–R.116)	Crucifixion and Resurrection

---

Eliminative term	Theological convergence
The possibility the being's premises could not generate (R.117)	The Gospel
Unnegated actualisation (R.118, Def.19)	Forgiveness
Anything's active restoration (R.119, Def.20)	Grace
Operative-orientation (R.124, Def.21)	Faith
Generative anticipation (R.128)	Hope
Terminal anticipation (R.128)	Despair
Reorientation (R.129, Def.22)	Sanctification
Communion (R.134, Def.24)	Heaven
Separation (R.135, Def.25)	Hell

---

## Glossary

**All-Being** (Def.11) — Willing present to all reality, all reality known, generation from complete knowledge through unlimited potential.

**Allowance** (R.53) — All-Being's active willing of what would will to be, despite non-willing's opposition. The same willing that actualised before choosing, now work. Enablement, not direction — the generative directive (Def.18) directs.

**Anticipating/Planning** (Def.9) — Generation informed by pattern into what has not yet been, acted from.

**Anything** (Def.1) — The surviving candidate after "nothing," something, and everything dissolve. Possibility without limitation. The word describes itself.

**Anything (as operative among beings)** (Def.5) — Oriented toward what the other *is* as other, enabling distinct beings to cohere while maintaining their distinctness.

**Anything's active restoration** (Def.20) — Anything's active working within Choosing Being to restore awareness of what unnegated actualisation establishes.

**Anything's nature** (Def.13) — That which wills to be, *is*. Willing *is* generative. Generating *is* flourishing.

**Being** (Def.6) — Will willing.

**Being-not** (R.69) — Non-being choosing willing. Cannot actualise new being. Cannot be what being *is*. The only direction: actively negating what already *is*. The mechanism by which non-being acts on being.

**Choice** (R.52) — Willing and non-willing present together. Where Will alone wills, choice selects.

**Choosing Being** (R.52, R.87) — Within Willing Being, local to the scope. One, with un-being within it.

**Communion** (Def.24) — Permanent orientation toward generative flourishing. Each expression in generative configuration.

**Death** (Def.23) — The fixation of the being's orientation.

**Doing** (Def.7) — The actualised activity of being. Instinct.

**Everything** — The totality of all somethings. All that *is* actual (R.5).

**Foreknowing/Pre-Destining** (Def.10) — The being's entire reality as known and acted from.

**Full actualisation** — The first actualisation from unlimited potential, necessarily full (R.42). All-Being (R.39). Anything's nature fully operative (R.40).

**The fully non-being** (R.59) — Produced by the being at un-being's un-willing to be directed at what All-Being wills. Wholly non-being from inception. Never had pure Will. With choosing (R.59).

**Generative anticipation** (R.128) — Each present moment given without coercion, carrying what *is* coming.

**Generative care** (Def.12) — Anything's nature operative among beings at different expression levels.

**Generative directive** (Def.18) — The full actualisation's Will operative within Choosing Being as direction. Pure Will — what willing *is*, made available so beings with choosing can choose toward it.

**Non-being** — The "not" of being. Not "nothing" (R.2). Exists only as the "not" of what *is*. Dependent on being (R.80). Always less than being (R.81).

**Non-being within the scope** (Def.17) — Non-being willing within being's scope, where non-being *is* through the being at un-being's un-willing. Includes the being at un-being's own diminishing un-willing and the fully non-being.

**Non-generation** (Def.16) — The "not" of generation.

**Non-willing/Non-being** (Def.14) — What willing becomes through un-willing. The "not" of willing, the "not" of being. Non-willing *is* non-being, as willing *is* being.

**Un-willing** (Def.14) — Un-willing *is* un-being. Willing becoming non-willing.

**Un-willing to be** (R.59) — The specific un-willing directed at what All-Being actualises. *Is* the fully non-being.

**"Nothing"** — The label applied to the absence of being. Without possibility of any kind. Cannot be (R.2).

**One-as-two** (R.100) — Generative willing coherent toward flourishing actualises being as one being expressed as two.

**Operative-orientation** (Def.21) — The being's own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative.

**Diminishing un-being** (R.54) — Partial and diminishing. Willing becoming non-willing mixed with genuine Will within the expressions, willing lessening.

**Remembering/Reacting** (Def.8) — The being's accumulated reality willing.

**Reorientation** (Def.22) — Net-directional change from non-being toward generative flourishing. Oscillatory within Choosing Being.

**Separation** (Def.25) — Permanent orientation under non-being. The being's own closure made eternal.

**Something** — A specific what-*is* (R.5).

**Suffering** (R.92) — What the being's generative nature *is* when it encounters being-not. Every "not this" *is* wrongness to what the being *is* in its nature.

**Terminal anticipation** (R.128) — Each present moment depleting, carrying what *is* ending.

**The being at un-being** (Def.15) — The being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining who wills to be Anything.

**The lie** (R.66) — Non-being being. Enough to be. Not enough to be what being *is*.

**Union** (Def.4) — The principle maintaining coherence among distinct beings — Anything's nature operative among beings whose existence *is* willing.

**Unnegated actualisation** (Def.19) — The being's actualisation — that it *is* — *is* not negated by un-being. This was always true. Named because being-not creates the need for its recognition.

**Will** (Def.2) — Actualisation without exclusion. "This *is*," not "this, not that."

**Will wills as itself** (Def.3) — Not externally justified and not without basis.

**Willing Being** (R.48) — Will wills. "This *is*, and this *is*." Only being. Eternal.

---

*End.*